The Greening of Social Work

A Paper Developed for the Council on Social Work Education Global Commission

Vijayan K. Pillai

University of Texas at Arlington

Rashmi Gupta

San Francisco State University

Perhaps one of the most revolutionarily social perspectives that emerged in the 20th century is related to sustainability. In many respects the acceptance of this new perspective is so widespread that it is allied to almost all aspects of modern day living. To this extent, it may be called a paradigm, because the perspective now offers a new lens, a new way of understanding reality. In addition, it calls for determined and consistent changes in our relationship with the environment. The paradigm emerged at a juncture, when we began to realize that human actions were eating away the very fragile environment on which our own lives depend. This immediate connection with the physical environment during the early days of the emergence of the sustainability paradigm has to an extent influenced the popular understanding of sustainability as an environmental phenomenon.

Almost always, the term *sustainability* invokes in one's mind pictures of ominous environmental disasters. As a result, scholars, practitioners, and advocates from the environmental and physical sciences have had an enormous influence on the field of sustainability. However, lately a new awareness is emerging that environment is related to all other facets such as the social and economic aspects of life. This view has led to the legitimate emergence of social scientists as one group among several stakeholders in achieving sustainability (Paehlke, 2001). This paper critically examines the roles social workers can play in manipulating the social, economic, and physical environments for improving human well-being. We argue that, if sustainability is a new paradigm, social work as a discipline provides the design for sustainable thinking and actions.

1

The recognition of the equality among social, economic, and physical environments has several implications (Kondrat, 2002). A part of this is historical. Prior to the 1980s, environmental degradation was attributed to population explosion in the countries of the southern hemisphere. The thinking was very Malthusian, and the reaction was to implement massive population control programs. This view was revised later to reflect a growing condemnation against widespread use of coercive tactics to achieve birth control quotas and targets in developing countries such as India. There was a move away from placing the blame for environmental degradation solely on population growth. The Brundtland report (United Nations, 1987), titled *Our Common Future*, places ecological sustainability on an equal footing with social and economic sustainability. Massive consumption of world renewable and nonrenewable resources in countries of the North was noted as a contributor to the environmental degradation. Recognition that both population growth and consumption can have deleterious effects on the environment began to influence the sustainability debate.

Four years after the World Commission on Environment, which produced the Brundtland report, Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit reiterated and added to the approach toward sustainable development. The Rio summit called for a global partnership for sustainable development especially through poverty reduction (Glasmeier & Farrigan, 2003). Poverty is the biggest polluter. It pollutes systems at all levels, social, economic, and environmental. All three are of equal importance. The principle of connectivity suggests that the three are interconnected and that improvement in one may not be achieved without changes in the others. It became clear that environmental degradation cannot be stopped unless poverty and social inequalities created by market and nonmarket forces are addressed through poverty reduction measures (Carrilio, 2007). It also became clear that economic development in most developing countries was also followed by increases in social inequality. Awareness that economic development alone is not the answer to environmental preservation gave rise to the idea of human development rather than economic development as an approach to environmental preservation. Thus, the Rio summit as

well as the Brundtland report contributed to the conceptualization of sustainability as an outcome of three components: ecological sustainability, intergenerational equity, and human development.

Social Work, Ecological Sustainability, Human Rights, and Poverty

Of the three components, two—human development and intergenerational equity—are areas in which social workers have done both practical and theoretical work for decades (McKinnon, 2008). In social work the term *social development* frequently is used to refer to human development. As conceptualized by Agenda 21, the term *human development* is related to human rights, empowerment, and meeting basic human needs. These three indicators are clearly related to social development as most social workers have known it.

Social development approaches, also called developmental social work, have focused on building basic capacity among individuals, groups, and communities through addressing issues of basic needs (Midgley & Conley, 2010). As individuals gain the capacity to participate in social and economic institutions, the number of realistic social choices is bound to increase. Though this approach is now widely attributed to Sen's theories of functioning and capabilities (Sen, 2000), it had already been part and parcel of social work approaches to community building and development. Social development approaches have a long history in social work and are well-positioned to address human development issues with respect to sustainability policies and programs (Mohan, 2007).

A second component of the human development approach involves protection of human rights. Ecological sustainability is seen as inseparable from social and economic sustainability. In addition, the presence of social inequalities and curtailing of individual freedoms is viewed as antithetical to sustainability activities. This view resonates with the current spread of ecofeminist values and ideas spearheaded by Shiva (2010) and Warren (1997). Ecofeminists suggest that there is a strong correlation between oppression of women and environmental degradation.

The role of human rights in social work has been elaborated by a number of scholars (Mapp, 2007; Reichert, 2003; van Wormer & Besthorn, 2010; Wronka, 2008). Human rights

provide a newly articulated value frame for doing social work. The fundamental values of social work, such as the right to human dignity and the right to self-determination, are essentially human rights values, though they are not always articulated in the language of human rights. Given the long history of human rights values in social work, the human rights perspective is now receiving widespread attention as a universal medium for the use of social work tools.

The social work profession is strongly founded on human rights values. Social work interventions at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels are scrutinized for violation of human rights standards. In particular, there have been more recent affirmations from the Council on Social Work Education and the National Association of Social Workers to mandate that human rights norms and values are not violated. The teaching of human rights also is an integral part of the social work curriculum in the United States.

Social Work and Ecological Approaches

Ecological sustainability views the environment as a dynamic outcome resulting from interaction among all elements that populate the environment (Coates, 2005). From an ecological point of view various elements can be grouped into systems, and observing interactions among various systems provides an uncomplicated approach to an understanding of the changing environment. The perspective that all client systems such as individuals, groups, and communities are influenced by multiple systems is fundamental to the social work approach. The emphasis on theories such as systems and person-in-environment reflect the deep rootedness of this approach in social work (Green & McDermott, 2010). There are unmistakably recognizable similarities between the ecological and social work approaches. In general, ecological approaches to sustainability mirror social work methods toward rehabilitating, restoring, and maintaining client systems to satisfactory levels of functioning and satisfaction (Chapin, Kofinas, & Folke, 2009).

The ecological sustainability approach is lacking in that it does not take into consideration the role of power (Dominelli, 2012). But social work considers power as important

4

within the system framework. Ecological sustainability approaches have traditionally operated on the assumption that ecological balances and continuity can be achieved by skillfully manipulating the population, technologies, and the existing organizational structures used for sustenance. Conventional ecological approaches to tackling sustainability at times attempt to find solutions through quantifiable relationships among measurable components such as carrying capacity, niche size, and reproductivity. However, this approach does not consider the power relationship among various subpopulations in a society. Power matters. The Brundtland commission report explicitly recognized it. The report, though, suggested that sustainability is related to respecting "common interests and equity" (United Nations, 1987, p. 50). However, in achieving common interests, especially in the presence of deteriorating ecological conditions, the competition for scarce resources is likely to increase resulting in gargantuan power gaps between the rich and the poor. In this regard, the report *Our Common Future* states that "our inability to promote the common interest in sustainable development is often a product of the relative neglect of economic and social justice" (United Nations, 1987, p. 49). The report calls for the use of social justice principles for achieving sustainability.

Social justice principles are central to social work methods. Adherence to social justice principles encourages social workers to scrutinize all their helping activities through the lenses of equality, fairness, and egalitarianism. Social workers are committed to the notion that all clients are equal regardless of their position, status, or power. In addition, all clients have a right to have basic needs met while we ensure that opportunities are made available to all, based on achievement rather than ascriptive criteria. Community development programs are sustained by nurturing common interests through programs that are sensitive to social justice issues. In general, social work problem solving methods are not only compatible with ecological approaches to sustainability but also provide the much needed sensitivity to social justice concerns.

The well-known Brundtland definition of *sustainability* suggests that it cannot be achieved without contemplation of intergenerational equity. Sustainability is thus about well-being of the current as well as future generations. The importance of catering to future generations is ingrained into sustainability methods and buttressed by social development and human rights approaches. Improvement in levels of social development is almost always accompanied by gains in realistic social choices for the maximization of well-being. The human rights approach ensures that all generations have the right to maximize their well-being. The social work profession has not only championed social development and human rights approaches but has also invested in the maintenance and care of individuals at all stages of life, from cradle to death. One may be hard-pressed to find another profession that is so fully invested in caring and helping individuals and communities. More important, from a sustainability perspective the social work discipline does so taking into account the generational ties that bind people within groups, families, and communities. In general, social work offers skill sets and tools necessary to address issues of intergenerational equity characteristic of ecological approaches to sustainability.

The importance of managing power at the macro level for human well-being is clearly recognized by social work approaches to problem solving. The empowerment approach as a part of human development (Breton, 1994) is now espoused also by ecological sustainability movements. Empowerment involves provision of information on human rights, involving the client at all levels of decision making with respect to problem solving, and arriving at a negotiated pace of use of services either provided gratis or at a cost (Lee, 2001). The social work approach is a strength-based approach, and it enables people to use their own strengths and accumulate resources necessary for problem solving. Empowerment is perhaps the most widely used intervention tool in the field of social work. Activities oriented toward ecological sustainability have become increasingly oriented toward developing trusteeship and enabling communities and individuals to protect and maintain local resources. Developing community capacity through empowerment to preserve and develop local resources is now widely accepted

as an integral aspect of ecological sustainability. In general, empowerment approaches have a long history in social work and are well-positioned to address human development issues with respect to sustainability policies and programs.

Sustainability: Inevitable Roles for the Profession

Within the ecological sustainability movement there is a slight bias toward the whole as opposed to the parts. "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (Leopold, 1949, pp. 224–225). Nevertheless, the presence of multiple levels of structural influences is explicitly acknowledged within ecological sustainability approaches. Perhaps this bias toward the integrity of the whole results from an unintended neglect of social justice issues. Reciprocal influences among multiple levels of social, economic, and ecological factors are likely to exist and are to be considered in infusing sustainability. Awareness of the importance of multilevel influences on client systems is entrenched in social work methods. Thus, individual behavior within a group may be affected by the composition of the group with respect to a given characteristic, as well as the effect of the same characteristic on individual level behavior. In particular, social workers who specialize in groups are often well-versed in manipulating the micro and macro environments of the group to maximize individual level functioning within the group. Ecological sustainability advocates and agents may gain immensely from collaborations with social workers.

The broad macro sociocultural context of the sustainability movement appears to be negligent issues of power and influence in the public and market spheres with regard to environmental concerns. When huge corporations espouse "green" ideologies, it is sometimes because alignment with the green movement can increase sales and consumption. Three factors have contributed to an inopportune context for the sustainability movement: (1) the emergence of footloose multinational corporations with massive social and investment infrastructure or profit maximization, (2) the appearance of the International Monetary Fund supported by the G-7 countries with a focus on economic development at any cost in developing countries

(Bredenkamp & Pattillol, 2010), and (3) the current clash of civilizations (Huntington, 1997) for economic and social dominance rather than for environmental protection. At the same time there are very hopeful signs and trends that will foster the life of the sustainability movement. These consist of the presence of the environmental justice movement in many developed and developing countries; the emergence of a large number of nongovernmental organizations dedicated to the cause of environmental sustainability; and finally, the witnessing of an impressive backing for the 1997 Kyoto protocol calling for global action to bring about carbon dioxide emission reduction by the year 2012. Clearly, at the macro level the sustainability agenda is wrought with tensions and conflicts. As social workers we have to clearly align ourselves with selected environmental agencies and networks engaged in bringing about environmental sustainability (Hasenfeld, 1987).

The environmental sustainability movement clearly projects a vision of what is sustainable. It is intimately linked to multitudinous ways of life. Not all ways of life are sustainable. Those that are sustainable also should be desirable. The environmental sustainability movement identifies a number of aspects such as democratic engagement, social and economic participation, and social justice as defining desirable aspects of a sustainable way of life (Sneddon, Howarth, & Norgaardf, 2006).

An extension of our current focus on social justice for environmental inequities and inequalities will release enormous opportunities for social workers to participate in the sustainability movement (Hoff & Pollack, 1993). Poor people in developed and developing countries are pushed aside to physical spaces with the poorest environmental quality relative to residential spaces of the rich, with serious consequences for the health of the current as well as future generations of the poor (Rogge, 1995, 1996; Sachs, 1996). This plight of the poor in developing countries especially has been recognized in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. Goal 7 calls for concrete steps to achieve environmental sustainability through four explicit targets: integration of the principles of sustainable development into governmental policies and programs, reduction of biodiversity loss, halving the proportion of the

population without access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation, and achieving a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers (United Nations, 2008).

Mosher (2010) points out that a social work perspective on sustainability is influenced by the paradigms within which the perspectives are designed. Two major paradigms—the mechanistic and the holistic—influence social work theories and perspectives. The mechanistic paradigm incorporates a scientific and rational approach to creating knowledge. The holistic paradigm is based on interdependence, partnership, cooperation, and respect for nature (Mosher, 2010). Values such as long-term sustainability, deep ecology, spirituality, and ecofeminism also characterize the holistic paradigm. The strengths-based approach and concern for social justice among social workers are also outcomes of the holistic paradigm. Mosher (2010) further argues that sociopsychological problems that social workers attempt to resolve should call for approaches and perspectives that accommodate interdependencies and complexities. In this regard Mosher (2010) claims that the holistic paradigm is far more useful than the mechanistic.

For sustainability approaches the holistic paradigm offers a partnership approach to solving problems. This approach involves cooperation, sharing of power, use of strengths, and mutual sharing and learning of skills for problem solving with clients at various levels of interventions (Mosher, 2010).

The sustainability paradigm has emerged in our recent history against the background of a human-made environmental crisis. However, some of the elements of this new paradigm preexisted, most certainly within the field of social work. As helping professionals, social workers have always been concerned with attrition in the effectiveness of interventions. Systematic approaches to these concerns have resulted in theoretical and methodological advances within social work that can be adopted by sustainability advocates, policy makers, and theory builders. Thus, we believe that if sustainability is a new paradigm, social work as a discipline provides the design for sustainable thinking and actions.

In this essay we have argued that social workers focus on both social inequality and poverty as the underlying causes of ecological degradation and poor intergenerational equity. Social workers believe that reductions in social inequality and poverty can be achieved through the use of social work methods such as social development, empowerment, and advocacy for human rights. These methods enable communities to organize themselves and form partnerships within and across communities, thus enhancing social choices. Social development, and improvement in social choices, promote intergenerational relationships and contribute to intergenerational equity. Social workers use both the pie and system approaches in working with client systems.

References

Bredenkamp, H., & Pattillo, C. A. (2010). *Financing the Response to Climate Change* Retrieved from International Monetary Fund websitehttp://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/spn/2010/spn1006.pdf

Breton, M. (1994). On the meaning of empowerment and empowerment-oriented social work practice. *Social Work With Groups*, *17*(3), 23–37.

Carrilio, T. E. (2007). Utilizing a social work perspective to enhance sustainable development efforts in Loreto, Mexico. *International Social Work, 50*(4), 528–538.

Chapin, F. S., Kofinas, G. P., & Folke, C. (2009). *Principles of ecosystem stewardship: resilience-based natural resource management in a changing world* (pp. 319–337). New York, NY: Springer.

Coates, J. (2005). The environmental crisis: Implications for social work. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 16*(1), 25–49.

Dominelli, L. (2012). *Green social work: From environmental crises to environmental justice.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Glasmeier, A. K., & Farrigan, T. L. (2003). Poverty, sustainability, and the culture of despair: Can sustainable development strategies support poverty alleviation in America's most environmentally challenged communities*? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 590*, 131–149.

Green, D., & McDermott, F. (2010). Social work from inside and between complex systems: Perspectives on person-in-environment for today's social work. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*, 2414–2430.

Hasenfeld, Y. (1987). Power in social work practice. *Social Service Review, 61*, 469–483.

Hoff, M., & Pollack, R. (1993) Social dimensions of the environmental crisis: Challenges for social work. *Social Work, 38*, 204–211.

Huntington, S. P. (1997). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Kondrat, M. E. (2002). Actor-centered social work: Re-visioning "person-in-environment" through a critical theory lens. *Social Work*, *47*, 435–448.

Lee, A. B. (2001). *The empowerment approach to social work practice: Building the beloved community.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Leopold, A. (1949). *A sand county almanac*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mapp, S. (2007). Human rights and social justice in a global perspective: An introduction to international social work. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McKinnon, J. (2008). Exploring the nexus between social work and the environment. *Australian Social Work*, *61*, 256–268.

Midgley, J., & Conley, A. (2010). *Social work and social development: Theories and skills for developmental social work.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mohan, Brij. (2007). *Fallacies of development: Crises of human and social development*. New Delhi, India: Atlantic Publishers.

Mosher, C. (2010). A wholistic paradigm for sustainability: Are social workers experts or partners. *Critical Social Work, 11*, 102–121.

Paehlke, R. (2001). Environmental politics, sustainability and social science. *Environmental Politics, 10*, 1–22.

Reichert, E. (2003). *Social work and human rights: A foundation for policy and practice.* New York, NY: Columbia University.

Rogge, M. E. (1995). Coordinating theory, evidence, and practice: Toxic waste exposure in communities. *Journal of Community Prac*tice, *2*(2), 55–76.

Rogge, M. E. (1996). Social vulnerability to toxic risk. *Journal of Social Service Research, 22*(1/2), 109–129.

Sachs, A. (1996). Upholding human rights and environmental justice. In L. Brown (Ed.), *State of the world 1996: A Worldwatch Institute report on progress toward a sustainable society* (pp. 133–151). New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Sen, A. (2000). *Development as freedom.* New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Shiva, V. (2010). *Staying alive: Women, ecology, and development.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Sneddon, C., Howarth, R. B., & Norgaard, R. B. (2006). Sustainable development in a post-Brundtland world: Ecological economics. *Ecological Economics*, *57*, 253–268.

United Nations. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

United Nations. (2008). *Millennium development goals report 2008.* New York, NY: Author.

van Wormer, K., & Besthorn, F. (2010). Human behavior and the social environment, macro level: Groups, communities, and organizations. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Warren, K. J. (1997). *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Wronka, J. (2008). *Human rights and social justice: Social action and service for the helping and health professions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Social Work and Sustainability

Syllabus for the Global Commission of the Council on Social Work Education
Fall/Spring

Instructor: Rashmi Gupta, Ph.D., MSW
Email: rg1996@gmail.com

I. Course Description

The course is offered at the graduate level. *Sustainability* was defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission) in 1987 as "meeting the needs of society of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (p. 50). The course is designed to incorporate sustainability concepts in the generalist approach in social work. The generalist approach provides for holistic interventions at the individual level undertaken only in relation to a person's social, economic, and ecological environment. Interventions are often evidence-informed, bringing about planned changes in mutual agreement with the client system and taking into consideration the stability and sustainability of desired outcomes. All interventions are value based. However a sustainability focus within social work should consider not only the relevance of traditional values such as social justice, diversity, and human rights but also environmental rights. Although social workers have a professional commitment to infuse traditional social work values, this course focuses on the need to actively include sustainability concepts as a social work value. The goal of this course is to develop the knowledge as well as the skill levels necessary to enhance the capacity in every student to address sustainability as an outcome of interventions at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

II. Learning Objectives

By the end of the semester, students should be able to
1. understand the working concept of sustainability at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels of social work practice;

2. examine the relationships among the concepts of environmental, economic, and social sustainability through major theories of human behavior (systems, empowerment, antioppression, and biopsychosocial);

3. examine the effects or contributions of national and international sustainability approaches to social work theory and practice;

4. explain the connection between membership in a marginalized and oppressed population and vulnerability to environmental, economic, and social injustice;

5. address the interconnectedness of sustainability with social work values and ethics; and

6. understand the role of community partnerships in addressing environmentally sustainable and socially cohesive systems.

III. Textbook

Rogge, M. (2008). *Social work in a sustainable world*. Chicago, IL: Lyceum Books.

Brown, L. (2009). *Plan B 4.0: Mobilizing to save civilization*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton. Available from
http://www.earth-policy.org/images/uploads/book_files/pb4book.pdf

Taylor, R.W. (2012). *Taking sides: Clashing views in sustainability*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

IV. Instructional Methods

The course will be taught in a seminar format. In this regard, student responsibility for preparation and contribution to the class is essential. Classes will involve lectures, discussions, student presentations, papers, and assignments.

The course includes computer support in the form of iLearn, which will be used to post class materials. From time to time students will be asked to participate in class by posting to a course threaded discussion.

V. Assignments
Three assignments are designed for graduate students.

1. Short Paper Defining Sustainability (30%)
A short paper will be due on November 4 in which each student provides his or her personal definition of sustainability from the environmental, economic, and social point of view. Next, the paper will apply these concepts of sustainability to work with a group of people at risk (for example, low-income residents of different sections of the San Francisco Bay area, children with disabilities, farm workers, or older adults). The paper will finish with a discussion of the ways in which environmental, economic, and social sustainability interact in the lives of the group at risk. The papers will each be six to eight pages in length, excluding references, title page, and abstract page and will be based on the assigned course readings. Papers should be double-spaced; format should conform to the 6th edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA).

2. Class Project and Presentation (30%)
Paper

Working in groups of two, students will be expected to work on any one of the five topics listed in the Presentation section. Please check with me and get your project selection approved.

Each group paper will be 12–15 pages long and in APA style. This final paper will build on your reading for the class, your own presentation, and your own creative thinking. In this paper you will reflect on your readings. About 10 outside references need to be included in this final paper, which is due on December 9.

This paper will be evaluated based on clarity, organization, coherence of arguments, appropriate use of references, and writing style.

Presentation
Each two-person group will share its PowerPoint slides with the rest of the groups at least 5 days before the class presentation. The class presentation (10 minutes for each group) will be on the last day of the class.

Select from the following topics:

1. Keep a log of all sustainability projects on campus (both university initiated and others). What are the current themes? How are they changing?

2. The Arizona State University initiated a program to examine sustainability issues with regard to dining services (see http://www.nwf.org/~/media/Campus-Ecology/Files/Case-Studies/Arizona-State-University-Fellow-FINAL.pdf?dmc=1&ts=20130304T1007177950). Critically analyze this program (gather more information if necessary) and develop a program to improve environmental conservation at all levels.

3. In what ways do well-meaning sustainability initiatives collide with social work ethical principles? For example, large corporations are very much involved in the green movement. They are accused of double talk. A few analysts argue that profit maximization objectives may not be compatible with environmental protection. Analyze a well-known case such as the oil spill following the collapse of BP oil rigs in the Gulf Coast. Discuss the response of BP to the disaster from an ethical perspective.

4. How can we increase community participation in making environment safer while addressing issues of social justice? The Cochrane Sustainability Plan is an example of a strategy that was developed at the grassroots level. Cochrane is a small community in Ontario, Canada. The Cochrane Sustainability Plan may be downloaded from http://www.cochranesustainability.ca. Can similar plans be developed by small communities in your area? What are the strengths and resources that will make such an initiative possible? What are the constraints that will make it impossible? Outline an advocacy plan for sustainability on behalf of the community.

5. Ecotourism projects offer a useful research site to study the conflict between local control of resources and global capitalism. Critically evaluate the article "Garifuna Land Rights and Ecotourism as Economic Development in Honduras' Cayos Cochinos Marine Protected Area" (Brondo & Woods, 2007; available from http://opwall.com/wp-content/uploads/Brondo-and-Woods-Garifuna-Land-Rights-and-Ecotourism.pdf). Using this article as a guide, consider whether there are examples of global encroachment into the lives of the poor in and around your community. Write an article for a local newspaper on the issues you have identified. Focus on solutions to the problem from a generalist perspective. Focus on environmental activism as it relates to community engagement.

OR

Single student presentation

View one movie listed from Movies listed Online or Netflix, and describe the emerging issues related to environmental sustainability. Synthesize class lecture/ additional readings and provide the backdrop of the issues related to sustainability and what are the implications for social work practice, policy, research and education.

3. Class Participation
Because this class is a seminar, the participation of each student in class meetings and online discussions is critical. Attendance at each class session is essential; students who must miss a class session should notify the instructor prior to class.

IX. Evaluation

Grading will be based on

- Short paper, 30%,
- Project paper, 30%,
- Presentation, 30%,
- Class preparation and participation, 10%

Grading System
A+ = 100-97% A = 96–94% A- = 93–90%
B+ = 89–87% B = 86–84% B- = 83–80%
C+ = 79–77% C = 76–74% C- = 73–70%
D+ = 69–67% D = 66–64% D- = 63–60%
F = 59% and lower

X. Assigned Readings and Topics

Week 1: Sustainability Concepts

Required Readings

Read chapter: Taking sides—Introduction (pp. xxv-xxxiv)
Plan B 4.0, Preface (pp. xi-xiv)

Mary (2008); Chapter 1: Social Work's Role in the Sustainable Future

1) Rotabi, K. (2007). Ecological theory origin from natural to social science or vice versa: A brief conceptual history for social work. *Advances in Social Work, 5*(2) 113–129.

2) Molyneux, R. (2010). The practical realities of ecosocial work: A review of the literature. *Critical Social Work, 11*(2). Retrieved from http://www.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/the-practical-realities-of-ecosocial-work-a-review-of-the-literature

3) Bohm, P E. (2005). Environmental issues. In F. J. Turner (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Canadian social work* (pp. 122–123). Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

4) Walz, T., & Ritchie, H. (2000). Gandhian principles in social work practice: Ethics revisited. *Social Work*, *45*(3), 213–222.

Week 2: Sustainability definitions
Mary (2008); Chapter 1: Social Work's Role in the Sustainable Future

Required Readings

Plan B 4.0 – Selling our future (pp. 3–27).

1) Springett, D. (2003). Business conceptions of sustainable development: A perspective from critical theory. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *12*, 71–86.

2) Zapf, M. K. (2010). Social work and the environment: Understanding people and place. *Critical Social Work*, *11*(3). Retrieved from http://www.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/social-work-and-the-environment-understanding-people-and-place

3) Shaw, T. V. (2011). Is social work a green profession? An examination of environmental beliefs. *Journal of Social Work, 13*(1), 3–29. doi: 10.1177/1468017311407555

Week 3: Sustainability Issues: Social inequality, Poverty, and Environment
Mary (2008); Chapter 2: Long-Term Sustainability and the Environment

Plan B 4.0 – Population Pressure: Land and Water (pp. 31–54)
Plan B 4.0 – Climate Change and the Energy Transition (pp. 55–76)

Required Readings
1) Jordan, B. (2008). Social work and world poverty. *International Social Work*, *51*, 440–452.

2) Hoff, M., & Pollack, R. (1993). Social dimensions of the environmental crisis: Challenges for social work. *Social Work, 38*(2), 204–211.

3) Reed, M. G., & Chrisitie, S. (2009). Environmental geography: We're not quite home: Reviewing the gender gap. *Progress in Human Geography, 33*(2), 246–255.

Week 4: Poverty and Sustainability

Required Readings

Mary (2008); Chapter 2: Long-Term Sustainability and the Environment (continued)

1) Princová, K. (2010). Globalisation, vulnerability, poverty and human limits. In *Beyond globalisation: Exploring the limits of globalisation in the regional context* [conference proceedings] (pp.131–137). Ostrava, Czech Republic: University of Ostrava Czech Republic. Retrieved from http://conference.osu.eu/globalization/publ/16-princova.pdf

2) Mantle, G., & Backwith, D. (2010). Poverty and social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, *40*, 2380–2397.

3) Landy, T. M. (1994). Connecting poverty and sustainability. *Boston College Environmental Law Review, 21*, 277. Retrieved from http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/ealr/vol21/iss2/6

4) Farias, C., & Farias, G. (2010). Cycles of poverty and consumption: The sustainability dilemma. *Competitiveness Review, 20*, 248–257.

5) Plan B 4.0 – Eradicating Poverty and Stabilizing Population (pp. 168-191)

6) Sachs, J.D. (2005). Can extreme poverty be eliminated? Retrieved from http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/Scientific_AmericanSept2005.pdf

7) Taylor, R.W. (2012). *Taking sides: Clashing views in sustainability.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. Read from the Taylor book—Taking sides – Issue 6: "Is Global Environmental Degradation an Issue of Poverty Rather Than Environmental Policy?" (pp. 134-161)

Week 5: Understanding Systems Approaches
Mary (2008); Chapter 3: New System Thinking and Web of Life

Required Readings
1) Khan, H., Imammulla, E., & Shams, K. (2009). Population, environment and poverty in Pakistan: Linkages and empirical evidence. *Environment, Development and Sustainability, 11*, 375–392.

2) Berger, R. M., & Kelly, J. J. (1993). Social work in the ecological crisis. *Social Work*, 38, 521–526.

3) Webb, S. A. (2003). Local orders and global chaos in social work. *European Journal of Social Work*, *6*(2), 191–204.

Week 6: Understanding Systems: Interrelationships
Mary (2008); Chapter 3: New System Thinking and Web of Life (continued)

Required Readings
1) Reitsma-Street, M. (2008). Deep democracy: Three questions facing social work. Keynote address delivered at the Symposium on Social Work and Social Justice, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.socialwork.mcmaster.ca/40th-anniversary-celebration/Marge%20Reitsma-Street%20revised%20speech%20Deep%20democracy_McMaster%20nov15%202008.pdf

2) Wolf-Branigin, M. (2009). Applying complexity and emergence in social work education. *Social Work Education*, *28*(2), 115–127.

3) Li, Y. (2011). Studying the effects of social environment on health in China: Challenges and solutions. *China Journal of Social Work, 4*(2), 153–164.

4) Hong, P.Y. P. (2010). Globalization of social work practice: Global and local responses to globalization. *International Social Work*, *53*(5), 656–670.

Week 7: Influence of Ideologies: Religion
Mary (2008); Chapter 4: Spirituality and Science

Required Readings

1) Reese, D. (2001). Addressing spirituality in hospice: Current practices and a proposed role for transpersonal social work. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought, 20*(1–2). doi: 10.1080/15426432.2001.9960285

2) Zapf, M. K. (2005). The spiritual dimension of person and environment: Perspectives from social work and traditional knowledge. *International Social Work*, *48*, 633–642.

 3) Holst, W. (1997). Aboriginal spirituality and environmental respect. *Social Compass*, *44*(1), 145–156.

4) Bonneycastle, C. R. (2006). From social equality to compassion: A critique of the 2005 CASW Code of Ethics. *Canadian Social Work Review, 23*(1–2), 77–94.

Week 8: Influence of Ideologies: Radicalism
Mary (2008); Chapter 4: Spirituality and Science (continued)

Required Readings

1) Besthorn, F. H. (2002). Radical environmentalism and the ecological self: Rethinking the concept of self-identity for social work practice. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, *13*(1), 53–72.

2) Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal, 40*(3), 286–300.

3) Littig, B., & Grirbler, E. (2005). Social sustainability: A catchword between political pragmatism and social theory. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, *8*(1–2), 65–79.

Week 9: Community and Sustainability
Mary (2008); Chapter 5: Redefining Economy

Required Readings

1) Schmitz, C. L., Stinson, C. H., & James, C. D. (2010). Community and environmental sustainability: Collaboration and interdisciplinary education. *Critical Social Work,11*(3). Retrieved from http://www.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/community-and-environmental-sustainability-collaboration-and-interdisciplinary-education#top

2) Friibergh Workshop. (2000). Sustainability science. Available from http://sustsci.aaas.org/category.html?categoryid=65

3) Serageldin, I., Littig, B., & Griessler, E. (1996). Sustainability as opportunity and the problem of social capital. *Brown Journal in World Affairs 3*(2), 187–199.

4) Entrikin, J. N. (1997). The betweeness of place. In T. Barnes & D. Gregory (Eds.), *Reading human geography: The poetics and politics of inquiry* (pp. 299–314). London, UK: Arnold.

Week 10: Social Development and Sustainability
Mary (2008); Chapter 6: Sustainable Politics

Required Readings

1) Gray, M. (2002). Developmental social work: A 'strengths' praxis for social development. *Social Development Issues*, *24*(1), 4–14.

2) Ahmadi, N. (2003). Globalisation of consciousness and new challenges for international social work. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 12*(1),14–23.

3) Waha, C. K., & Lee, J. (2010). Rethinking the social development approach in the context of East Asian social welfare. *China Journal of Social Work, 3*(1), 19–33.

4) Estes, R. (2010). Toward sustainable development: From theory to Praxis. In N. Negi & R. Furman (Eds.), *Transnational social work practice.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Week 11: Human Rights and Sustainability
Mary (2008); Chapter 7: A Model of Social Work for a Sustainable World

Required Readings

1) Latta, A. (2007). Environmental citizenship: A model linking ecology with social justice could lead to a more equitable future. *Alternatives: Canadian Environmental Ideas & Action, 33*(1), 18–19.

2) International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW). (2004). *International policy statement on globalization and the environment*. Retrieved from http://ifsw.org/policies/globalisation-and-the-environment/

3) Kauffman, S. E. (1994). Citizen participation in environmental decisions: Policy, reality, and considerations for community organizing. In M. Hoff & J. McNutt (Eds.), *The global environmental crisis: Implications for social welfare and social work* (pp. 219–239). Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.

Week 12: Partnerships: Effects on Sustainability
Mary (2008); Chapter 8: Evolving Partnerships

Required Readings

1) Kagan, C., Lewis, S., & Brennan, E. M. (2008). Building community supports for work–life integration. In J. M. Rosenzweig & E. M. Brennan (Eds.), *Work, life and the mental health system of care* (pp. 325–350). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

2) Browne, C. V., Smith, M., Ewalt, P. L., & Walker, D. D. (1996). Advancing social work practice in health care settings: A collaborative partnership for continuing education. *Health & Social Work*, *21*(4), 267–276.

3) Mosher, M. (2010). A wholistic paradigm for sustainability: Are social workers experts or partners. *Critical Social Work, 11*(3), 102–121.

Week 13: PIE Approach and Sustainability
Mary (2008); Chapter 8: Evolving Partnerships (continued)

Required Readings

1) Rogge, M. E., & Cox, M. E. (2001). The person-in-environment perspective in social work journals: A computer-assisted content analysis. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *28*(2), 47–68.

2) Walsh, T. (1999). Person–environment practice: The social ecology of interpersonal helping. *Child and Family Social Work, 4*(1), 93–94. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2206.1999.0113e.x

 3) Carrilio, T. E. (2007). Utilizing a social work perspective to enhance sustainable development efforts in Loreto, Mexico. *International Social Work, 50,* 528–538.

Week 14: Remarks on Social Work-Sustainability Paradigm: Interventions

Required Readings
1) Lyons, M., Smuts, C., & Stephens, A. (2001). Participation, empowerment and sustainability: (How) do the links work? *Urban Studies*, *38,* 1233–1251.

2) Korten, D. (2011). *Economic Rx: How we get out of this mess* Retrieved from http://www.sustainabilityprofessionals.org/system/files/Korten%20Economic%20Rx.pdf

3) Lovins, A. B., Lovins, L. H., & Hawken, P. (2008).
A road map for natural capitalism. Retrieved from
http://salient.nohomepress.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/03/hbr-rminatcap.pdf

4) Yamashiro, G., & Matsuoka, J. K. (1997). The environmental impact statement system: an organizational assessment for community preservation. *Social Development Issues*, *19*(1), 1–16.

Week 15: Sustainability and Intergenerational Equity

Required Readings
1) Barry, B. (1997). Sustainability and intergenerational justice. *Theoria*, *45*(89), 43–65.

2) Page, T. (1997). On the problem of achieving efficiency and equity, intergenerationally. *Land Economics*, *73*, 580–596.

3) Hediger. W. (2000). Sustainable development and social welfare. *Ecological Economics*, *32*, 481–492.

4) Norgaard, R. B. (1992). *Sustainability and the economics of assuring assets for future generations* [Policy Research Working Paper Series: 83]. Washington, DC: World Bank.

****

Additional References

Brondo, K. V., & Woods, L. (2007). Garifuna land rights and ecotourism as economic development in Honduras' Cayos Cochinos marine protected area. *Ecological and Environmental Anthropology*, 3(1). Retrieved from http://opwall.com/wp-content/uploads/Brondo-and-Woods-Garifuna-Land-Rights-and-Ecotourism.pdf

Sustainable Development Gateway
http://www.sdgateway.net/

International Institute for Sustainable Development
http://www.iisd.org/

Annotated Bibliography on Sustainable Development
http://people.bu.edu/wwildman/WeirdWildWeb/proj_bibs_sustainability_themes_general.htm

Universities and Research Centers
University of California, Berkeley
http://oskicat.berkeley.edu
Berkeley Institute of the Environment (BIE) brochure: *The Future of the Planet*
http://www.learningace.com/doc/2292605/74793e3e7bc2c9621d9ba62b297b377e/biebrochure

Sustainability at the University of California, Berkeley
http://sustainability.berkeley.edu/cacs/
http://sustainability.berkeley.edu/

Cal Student Sustainability Education Coordinator: Sustainability Starts Here
http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~recycle/ssec/programs/rsec.html

Harvard University
Sustainability Science Program at Harvard's Center for International Development
http://www.cid.harvard.edu/sustsci/overview.html

(Note that the Sustainability Science program at Harvard consists of a mix of Kennedy School of Government types and science and technology types.)

Public Documents and Publications
http://ksgnotes1.harvard.edu/bcsia/sust.nsf/publications

San Francisco State University
http://www.sfsu.edu/~sustain/about.html
http://www.sfsu.edu/~ppd/
http://www.sfsu.edu/~sustain/operations.html

Columbia University (The Earth Institute)

The Earth Institute at Columbia University
(Warning: very slow to load)
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/

About Us: Mission: Solutions for Sustainable Development
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/1791

Research: Research: The Foundation of the Earth Institute
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/1788

Education at Earth Institute
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/50

Introductory and Core Curriculum
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/5

Doctoral Programs
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/8

The Earth Clinic
http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/articles/view/1790
Current projects include the Millennium Villages Project, the Millennium Cities Initiative, expanding healthcare in Ethiopia, and reducing arsenic exposure in Bangladesh.

VIDEO: In The Classroom
Course: The Challenge of Sustainable Development
Class: The Challenge of African Poverty
Feb. 20, 2008
Jeffrey D. Sachs
Director of The Earth Institute,
Quetelet Professor of Sustainable Development

and Professor of Health Policy and Management at In The Classroom
Course: The Challenge of Sustainable Development
Class: The Challenge of African Poverty
http://www.earth.columbia.edu/sitefiles/file/about/director/documents/africa_2005_mccordsachswoo_000.pdf

Arizona State University (School of Sustainability)
ASU School of Sustainability
http://schoolofsustainability.asu.edu/

ASU library catalog
http://library.lib.asu.edu/
1,172 results searching in the online catalog for library holdings using the search term *sustainability*

United Nations Programs, Declarations, and Reports (Plus U.S. Affiliates)
Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on environment and development: "Our common future."* New York, NY: United Nations.
http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/SMK/Vedlegg/Taler%20og%20artikler%20av%20tidligere%20statsministre/Gro%20Harlem%20Brundtland/1987/Address_at_Eighth_WCED_Meeting.pdf

Periodicals and Journals
The International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education (IJSHE)
http://info.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=ijshe

Sample Articles From IJSHE

"Education for Sustainability: Developing a Postgraduate-Level Subject
With an International Perspective"
http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/viewPDF.jsp?Filename=html/Output/Published/EmeraldFullTextArticle/Pdf/2490080101.pdf

"Institutional Motivations and Barriers to the Construction of Green
Buildings on Campus: A Case Study of the University of Waterloo, Ontario"
http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/viewPDF.jsp?Filename=html/Output/Published/EmeraldFullTextArticle/Pdf/2490080305.pdf

Sustainability Science Abstracts
http://www.csa.com/factsheets/sustain-set-c.php

Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy (SSPP)
http://sspp.proquest.com/

Studies and Reports (United States and International)
The Stern Report

Stern Report, Executive Summary (27 pages, PDF)
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/30_10_06_exec_sum.pdf

Full text of the Stern Report (700 pages, PDF)
http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http:/www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_review_economics_climate_change/stern_review_report.cfm

Movies Online or on Netflix
http://www.filmsforaction.org/articles/films_for_action_presents_the_top_100_documentaries_inspiring_the_shift_to_a_sustainable_paradigm/

1. *Six Degrees Could Change the World* (2007)
2. *A Crude Awakening: The Oil Crash* (2006)
3. *Carbon Nation* (2010)
4. *Gasland* (2010)
5. *Colony* (2009)
6. *Collapse* (2009)
7. *Crude* (2009)
8. *Cool It* (2010)
9. *An Inconvenient Truth* (2006)
10. *Plastic Planet* (2009)
11. *Wasteland* (2010)
12. *Urbanized*
13. *Vanishing of the Bees*
14. *Blue Gold: World Water Wars*
15. *Tapped*
16. *Frankensteer* (2006)
17. *Ted Talks: Chew on This*
18. *The Business of Being Born*
19. *Diamonds of War: Africa's Blood Diamonds*
20. *Dying to Have Known* (2006)
21. *Waiting for Superman*
22. *Ingredients*
23. *The Age of the Stupid* (2008)
24. *Money and Medicine*
25. *World Population: A Graphic Simulation of the History of Human Population Growth* (2003)

Portions of the syllabus adapted from Prof. Mary Rogge (spring 2006), Seminar on International Social Welfare and Sustainability (University of Tennessee). Additionally, readings adapted from Prof. Chris Johnson (spring 2012),SUS 102- Introduction to Sustainability. http://www.winthrop.edu/cas/sustainability/default.aspx?id=24514