



June, 2010

Dear AASWG Members, Survey Participants and All Interested in the AASWG *Standards*,

As you know, the Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups, Inc. (AASWG), an International Professional Organization, is a non-profit, member-driven organization, promoting excellence in group work practice, education, field instruction, research and publication. The AASWG *Standards for Practice of Social Work with Groups* present the Association's understanding of the values, knowledge and skill bases essential for professionally sound and effective social work practice with groups. The *Standards* are intended to serve as a guide to professional, high quality practice with groups.

The AASWG *Standards* were originally developed by the Practice Committee of the AASWG, with the First Edition adopted by the AASWG Board in 1998 (revised in 1999), and the Second Edition in 2005. The AASWG Practice Committee engages in periodic review of the *Standards*. In 2009, we conducted an Online Survey (<http://www.surveymonkey.com/AASWGStandardsRevision>), requesting feedback on the relevance and currency of the *Standards*.

Thank you to all who participated in the Survey about the AASWG *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*. As promised, this Report will be posted under the "Standards" section of the left side menu at www.aaswg.org. This Report consists of three sections:

- Overview of the survey on the AASWG *Standards* (pages 2-4)
- Literature Review on how social work and related organizations develop and revise standards (pages 5-9)
- Digest of findings of the survey on the AASWG *Standards* (pages 10-26)

We are hopeful that this overview, review of the professional literature and digest of findings will provide a good deal of guidance as we evaluate possible revision of the AASWG *Standards*.

In addition to specific feedback, a very exciting consequence of the survey was increasing discussion and utilization of the *Standards* in practice, as well as networking around this area of interest. As part of our next steps, a special "Think Tank" session has been scheduled at the AASWG Symposium in Montreal on June 5, at 13:15 (1:15 PM), focused on the cross-cultural elements of the *Standards*. Carol Cohen, Mark Macgowan, Barbara Muskat, and Amy Olshever will facilitate this Invitational Session. Findings from this event and additional discussions will also be posted in this section of www.aaswg.org. We continue to welcome your thoughts about any aspect of the *Standards* – Please feel free to contact us for further information and discussion.

Thanks Again!

Carol S. Cohen, Associate Professor
Adelphi University School of Social Work
Garden City, NY, US
(cohen5@adelphi.edu)

Amy Olshever, Manager, Social Work
Visiting Nurse Service of NY/Hospice Care
New York City, NY, US
(olshever@verizon.net)

Section One:
Overview of the Survey on the AASWG Standards for Social Work Practice
Carol S. Cohen & Amy Olshever

In 2009, as part of our work to have the AASWG *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups* reflect the distinguishing features of group work and illuminate the unique perspective that social group workers bring to practice, we embarked on a project to solicit feedback from AASWG members and others. The first step in this project was an online survey conducted through this past fall. As noted earlier, another next step in this project will take place in Montreal, at the AASWG 32nd International Symposium on Social Work with Groups. We look forward to your contributions about how the *Standards* can be amended in the next edition, and how they can be used and disseminated.

This overview focuses on the Survey's purpose, methods and salient results. It is followed by two separate sections: an extensive literature review and references and a digest of survey findings.

Survey Purpose

The purpose of this survey, conducted in 2009, was to solicit feedback regarding the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups* of the Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups. There have been two editions, with the first developed and adopted in 1998, and the second edition adopted in 2005. As stated in the Preamble, the AASWG *Standards*:

represent the perspectives of the Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups, Inc., on the value and knowledge and skill base essential for professionally sound and effective social work practice with groups and are intended to serve as a guide to social work practice with groups. (AASWG, 2006, 1, available at: <http://www.aaswg.org/node/377>).

The AASWG Practice Committee engages in periodic review of the *Standards*, and this survey was part of the effort to gather member input regarding members' familiarity with the *Standards* and opinions regarding the usefulness, understandability, comprehensiveness, and cross-cultural relevance of the current *Standards*. In addition survey questions asked respondents how they have used the *Standards*, how they could be disseminated, and how they should be amended and/or edited in a possible Third Edition of the *Standards*.

Survey Methods

This survey was conducted on-line, using *Survey Monkey* software. The survey can be viewed at: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/AASWGStandardsRevision>. Survey questions relate directly to the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*, including opinions about the current *Standards*, utilization, and recommendations for dissemination and revisions. Potential respondents who followed the survey link were first presented with consent documents, explaining the purpose, content, and confidentiality protections for the survey. If they consented, they entered and participated in the survey if they wished. As indicated in the survey entry screen, responses were confidential, and respondents could reply to all, none, or some of the questions. Privacy issues related to computer-based surveys are discussed in the consent document. It is not possible to assess the number of email invitations that were sent to members. Although there were a total of 137 visits to the website survey site, 60 respondents completed the survey. We believe that many of the 137 visits represented people who assented to the consent in order to see the actual survey, and then decided either not to participate, or came back to complete the survey at a later time.

Two email notices about the survey were sent to AASWG members for whom email addresses were available. Both notices invited members to participate in the survey on line, with the second sent as a follow-up reminder. The group emails to members also offered the opportunity for respondents to request paper surveys, by emailing or telephoning Carol Cohen, the Principal Investigator. In the event that paper surveys were requested by email or telephone, a copy of the survey would be sent. Respondents then had the option to return the survey as an email attachment (without confidentiality), or mail their responses without return address (limited confidentiality). In addition, on-line survey participation offered to doctoral students at the Adelphi University School of Social Work who were studying social work with groups and working in the field. We also developed a plan for survey distribution at an AASWG meeting, but this option was not used. As it turned out, no paper copies were requested, and all surveys were completed through the *Survey Monkey* site.

There is a range of ages in the AASWG membership and the respondents to the survey. All are adults. Membership is international, with a majority of members from North America. Most members identify as social workers, but other professional affiliation does not restrict membership. Members can be students (advanced undergraduate and graduate), active and retired practitioners and educators. Email notices and the survey were in English, the predominant language of the Association, but this may have limited responses by people who speak languages other than English.

The voluntary survey was relatively brief, and pilot respondents completed the Survey in 15-30 minutes. It contained quantitative questions (such as demographic and likert scaled opinions), and qualitative questions (such as how they applied *Standards* and suggested areas for change). No risks to participation in the Survey were anticipated, and the contact information for the Principal Investigator was provided to all respondents. Confidentiality and its limits are explained in consent documents. This research was reviewed and approved by the Adelphi University Institutional Review Board.

Survey Monkey software was used to conduct statistical analysis, including frequencies and cross tabulations, sufficient for the study's purposes. Narrative answers were analyzed for themes, including ideas for application and suggested areas for revision of the *Standards*, and all responses and suggested themes were reviewed by Carol Cohen and Amy Olshever, and was distributed to the AASWG Practice Committee for discussion.

Review and possible revision of the *Standards* is an area of active discussion for the AASWG. Respondents and non-respondents will have numerous opportunities to engage in this work, including direct feedback to the Practice Committee and the participation in forums devoted to this subject at meetings of the Association, such as the Think Tank session scheduled for June 5, at the International AASWG Symposium in Montreal, Canada. AASWG members will receive periodic updates on the feedback collection, analysis, and review process through emails and posts on the Association website.

Survey Results

The following summary of findings provides a broad view of the Survey results. For more detailed findings, please refer to the third section in this report, which includes all responses to the survey by question. Participants were asked for their perceptions of the usefulness, understandability, cross-cultural and cross-national relevance, comprehensiveness, and practice relevance of the current *Standards for Social Work with Groups*. Participants were also asked what challenges they perceived or experienced in using the *Standards*. Finally, participants were asked to include ideas for other ways to collect feedback about the *Standards* and anything else that they felt was important to share. Our analysis of the 60 responses thus far suggests that the following results, described in both quantitatively and qualitative terms.

Usefulness of the Standards: 95% of those responding to the survey reported that the AASWG *Standards* were either extremely useful (61%) or moderately useful (34%) in education and practice. Those providing comments suggested that the *Standards* should be more accessible, specific and applicable to more types of groups.

Understandability of the Standards: 95% of those responding to the survey reported that the AASWG *Standards* were either extremely understandable (60%) or moderately understandable (35%). Those providing comments referred to technical aspects of the presentation of *Standards*. Some also highlighted the subjective nature of understanding.

Cross-Cultural/ Cross-National Relevance of the Standards: 77% of respondents reported the AASWG *Standards* to be either extremely relevant (20%) or moderately relevant (57%) both cross culturally and cross nationally. Some narrative responses described the *Standards* as relevant and appropriate. Other responses suggested that the *Standards* are written from a specifically North American perspective, and shared the perception of needed change to enhance the cultural relevance of the *Standards*. The answers to this survey question raise the issue of whether the *Standards* can be used by multiple cultures with its focus is on process, as well as whether cross-cultural relevance can be achieved.

Comprehensiveness of the Standards: 97% of respondents felt the *Standards* are either extremely comprehensive (56%) or moderately comprehensive (41%) and address a diversity of types of groups, aspects of practice and areas of practice.

Relevance of the Standards to Practice: 94% felt the *Standards* were either extremely relevant (59%) or moderately relevant (35%) in practice settings, organizations. Comments included the need to increase their inclusion in educational settings as well as their limitations in specific practice settings with specific populations.

Challenges to Using the Standards: Narrative responses included that the *Standards* should be included more universally in Academic Curricula, the need for wider availability of *Standards* and evidence that they are being used (i.e. in academic articles), and the challenges in different settings due to different levels of agency support for group work.

Ideas for Gathering Feedback on the Standards: Respondents offered many ideas including using focus groups of students, practitioners, AASWG members, agencies, with different cultural and faith group representation, making the *Standards* more visible through libraries, websites and classrooms, distribute the *Standards* and surveys at conferences, presenting workshops, developing panels of practitioners, educators, students and consumers/service users to meet regularly and review the *Standards*, and sharing the *Standards* with international groups.

Conclusion

The Survey results indicate that there is a great deal of satisfaction and growing recognition of the importance and applicability of the *Standards* in practice and education. On the other hand, we have work ahead to insure that our *Standards* reflect our international and diverse cultural identity. The two remaining sections of this Report, including the Literature Review and Digest of Findings, support approaching the *Standards* as an evolving document that represents the AASWG and group work practice. The spirit of questioning, growing and challenging ourselves must continue in order to develop and use *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups* that are dynamic, flexible and relevant across to contexts in which we practice.

Section Two:
Review of the Literature on the Evolution of Standards in Social Work and Related Fields
Amy Olshever & Carol S. Cohen

We conducted our literature review with the goal of finding information or data on the processes by which professional groups develop and revise their standards of practice. Our search was initially limited to social work and specifically excluded technical practices, like engineering. In addition to utilizing databases of professional peer reviewed journals, websites of professional social work associations, NASW for example, that published standards of practice were gleaned for information on the process of how they came to develop or revise these standards. Most often, we found that only the standards themselves were available.

Our search broadened to include other types of professions including counseling specialties, psychologists, physicians, dieticians, nurses and accountants. Ultimately, we identified thirty-two documents, including both journal articles and electronic documents obtained from the websites of the organizations that refer with varying degrees of specificity to the process of development and revision of the standards of professional practices.

Findings of the Review

There was consensus across professional disciplines that development of standards is important, as represented in the following statement:

Practice standards are the hallmark of calling one's self a professional. Members should fulfill their responsibilities as professionals by instituting and maintaining standards against which their professional performance can be measured. (Gardner, Willey, & Eide, 2000, p.5)

Among the 32 documents we identified, we found thirteen professional organizations represented. These included:

- American Association of Diabetes Educators (AADE),
- American Association of Spinal Cord Injury Psychologists and Social Workers (AASCIPSW),
- Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW),
- The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES),
- The American Holistic Nurses Association (AHNA),
- The Association for Specialists in Group Work (ASGW),
- The General Social Care Council (GSCC—Great Britain),
- The International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW),
- The International Federation of Social Worker, (IFSW),
- The National Association of Social Workers (NASW),
- New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants (NYSSCPA),
- Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE—Ireland) and the
- United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP)

(AASW, 2001; Ablack, 2008; Bauman, 2004; Bosshart, et al., 2009; Duffy, 2006; Dye & Borders, 1990; Frisch, 2001; Gardner, et al., 2000; Giles, Laragy, Scott, & Bland, 2004; Gingerich, 2007; GSCC, 2002a, 2002b; Healy, 2004; Juliusdottir & Petersson, 2004; Martin, Daly, McWhorter, Schwie-Slavin, & Kushion, 2005; NASW, 2001, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e, 2004 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d, 2005e, 2007; Nelson, et al., 2007; Noble, 2004; Pink, 2010; Scott, Laragy, Giles, & Bland, 2004; Sewpaul, 2005; Sewpaul & Jones, 2004, 2005; Sewpaul & Lombard, 2004; Shaneyfelt,

Mayo-Smith, & Rothwangl, 1999; Steinmuller, et al., 2009; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; Williams & Sewpaul, 2004; Wilson & Newmeyer, 2008; Yip, 2004).

The professional disciplines represented were enumerated as follows: Sixteen social work, of which seven were specifically focused on social work education; five counseling; four interdisciplinary (three of those were within healthcare settings and one was academic); two physician focused medical; two nursing; one psychology; one nutrition/diet; one psychotherapy (which was interdisciplinary, including social work, psychology, counseling and psychiatry); and one accounting.

In addition to concurring that development of standards is an important aspect of the development of a profession, there was also general agreement that standard development is an evolutionary process, as noted by Sewpaul and Jones:

The process of developing global standards for social work education and training is as important as the product, the actual standards that have been developed. (Sewpaul & Jones, 2005, p. 218).

In a related vein, Martin et al (2005) point to the need for practitioners to:

critically evaluate and challenge current practice standards and guidelines and be willing to explore new avenues to improve both processes and outcomes of...care. Similarly, the scope and standards...have and will continue to evolve to meet the needs of...professionals," (p.511).

Frisch (2001) encourages reflection on current professional standards as well as thoughtful dialogue to provide revisions that reflect the values of the profession, with the activity of revision actually incorporated as an integral part of the standards.

While there was much agreement on the importance of standards, the methods and processes of standard development and revision varied across the different documents and disciplines; most of the organizations were in agreement that defining goals and purpose were important, as exemplified by the following: "Clarity of purpose is critical to the process of standard's development" (AASW, 2001).

Further, while all agreed that some kind of process is necessary in the development of standards, there was significant variation in the types of processes they engaged in, in the suggested constituents to be included, and in the strategies used or recommended for collecting information. For example, several organizations engaged task forces to develop practice standards (Bosshart, et al., 2009; Frisch, 2001; Gardner, et al., 2000; Nelson, et al., 2007; Sewpaul & Jones, 2005). The composition of these task forces ranged from expert, experienced professional members utilized by NASW, to forming various work groups to Northern Ireland's SCIE blended groups of "experts by experience," service users, social work educators, students and workers (Duffy, 2006; NASW, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e, 2004 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d, 2005e, 2007, 2008).

Among the organizational approaches studied, a variety of methods of information and data collection were utilized and described. In Australia, the AASW circulated documents by mail, newsletters and at professional gatherings to obtain feedback from their membership. They also conducted focus groups with both professional members as well as consumers of social work services. In England, the GSCC used both in-person public forums as well as online questionnaires and mailed paper surveys to reach their membership, employers of social workers and social work clients. Duffy (2006) describes extensive information gathering measures that included literature reviews, face to face meetings, focus groups and paper and on-line surveys conducted with a wide variety of stakeholders including service users, educators, social workers and policy makers, focus groups.

Another area in which views differ regarding development and revision of practice standards is the focus on outcomes of practice versus a focus on the process of practice. For example, at one end of the

spectrum, Nelson et al (2007) describe how a set of marriage and family therapy competencies was compiled, utilizing a task force of “experts,” brainstorming conference calls, literature reviews, email discussions and ultimately an educational summit. These competencies were selected, in part, on their “measurability” to enable collection of empirical data that can be useful to connect practice standards with the reality of client outcomes and in future revisions.

Limitations and Summary of the Literature Review

While this literature review was not exhaustive, having been limited to English language documents and service delivery professions, it did reveal a consensus that developing standards of practice occurs across disciplines and continents, and all the disciplines represented in our search agree that this is an important process.

Additionally, Sewpaul and Jones (2005) caution that development of practice standards should not yield a finite, static end product. Rather, professionals need to consistently question the value of what we are doing and how we are doing it. The methods and goals utilized to achieve this varied within and across disciplines but this literature review revealed strategies and processes that can be applied to the revision process for the AASWG standards of practice.

References

- AASW (2001). Australian association of social workers proposed format for practice standards.
http://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/16 retrieved 2/23/10, 1-3.
- Ablack, C. (2008). UKCP Standards Board Update. *http://www.psychotherapy.org.uk/latest_news.html* retrieved 4/1/10, 1-2.
- Bauman, S. (2004). Association for Specialists in Group Work Core Training. *www.asgw.org* retrieved 9/28/09, 1-2.
- Bosshart, H., Bitt, I., Cushman, L., David, M., Deguire, L., & Kleinman, J. (2009). American Association of Spinal Cord Injury Psychologists and Social Workers (AASCIPSW) - Standards for SCI Psychosocial Rehabilitation. *http://psychologists-social-workers.ascipro.org/standards-sci-psychosocial-rehab.html* retrieved 4/1/10, 1-15.
- Duffy, J. (2006). Participating and Learning Citizen Involvement in Social Work Education in the Northern Ireland Context A Good Practice Guide. *University of Ulster, Londonderry*.
- Dye, A., & Borders, L. (1990). Counseling Supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 1-4.
- Frisch, N. (2001). Standards for holistic nursing practice: a way to think about our care that includes complementary and alternative modalities. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 6.
- Gardner, J., Willey, S., & Eide, B. (2000). Statements on standards for tax services: an examination and overview. *CPA JOURNAL*.
- Giles, R., Laragy, C., Scott, V., & Bland, R. (2004). AASW Practice Standards Development Process.
http://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/16 retrieved 2/23/10, 1-2.
- Gingerich, B. (2007). Quality and Competence in End of Life/Palliative Care. *Home Health Care Management & Practice*.
- GSCC (2002a). Codes of Practice for employers of socal care workers. *http://www.gscoc.org.uk/codes/* retrieved 1/5/10, 1-18.
- GSCC (2002b). GSCC Standards development. *http://www.gscoc.org.uk/codes/* retrieved 1/5/10, 1-1.
- Healy, L. (2004). Standards for social work education in the North American and Caribbean region: current realities, future issues. *Social Work Education*, 23, 581-595.
- Juliusdottir, S., & Petersson, J. (2004). Nordic standards revisited. *Social Work Education*, 23, 567-579.

- Martin, C., Daly, A., McWhorter, L., Schwide-Slavin, C., & Kushion, W. (2005). The scope of practice, standards of practice, and standards of professional performance for diabetes educators. *The Diabetes Educator*, 31, 487.
- NASW (2001). NASW standards for cultural competence in the practice of social work. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2003a). *NASW standards for continuing professional education*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- NASW (2003b). *NASW Standards for Integrating Genetics into Social Work Practice* Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2003c). *NASW Standards for school social work practice*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2003d). *NASW Standards for the Practice of Social Work with Adolescents* Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2003e). *Standards for Social Work Services in Long-Term Care Facilities*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2004). *NASW standards for palliative and end of life care*. . Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2005a). *NASW and ASWB Standards for Technology and Social Work Practice*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2005b). *NASW standards for clinical social work in social work practice*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2005c). *NASW Standards for social work practice in child welfare*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2005d). *NASW standards for social work practice in health care settings*. Washington, D.C.: NASW.
- NASW (2005e). *NASW Standards for Social Work Practice with Clients with Substance Use Disorders*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2007). *Indicators for the achievement of the NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- NASW (2008). *Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- Nelson, T., Chenail, R., Alexander, J., Crane, D., Johnson, S., & Schwallie, L. (2007). The development of core competencies for the practice of marriage and family therapy. *Journal of marital and family therapy*, 33, 417.
- Noble, C. (2004). Social work education, training and standards in the Asia-Pacific region. *Social Work Education*, 23, 527-536.
- Pink, D. (2010). UKCP e-Bulletin Issue 1. *UKCP News*, http://www.psychotherapy.org.uk/latest_news.html retrieved 4/1/10, 1-6.
- Scott, V., Laragy, C., Giles, R., & Bland, R. (2004). Practice standards in Australia: implications for social work education. *Social Work Education*, 23, 613-624.
- Sewpaul, V. (2005). Global standards: promise and pitfalls for re-inscribing social work into civil society1. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 14, 210-217.
- Sewpaul, V., & Jones, D. (2004). Global standards for social work education and training. *Social Work Education*, 23, 493-513.
- Sewpaul, V., & Jones, D. (2005). Global standards for the education and training of the social work profession. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 14, 218.
- Sewpaul, V., & Lombard, A. (2004). Social work education, training and standards in Africa. *Social Work Education*, 23, 537-554.

- Shaneyfelt, T. M., Mayo-Smith, M. F., & Rothwangl, J. (1999). Are guidelines following guidelines? The methodological quality of clinical practice guidelines in the peer-reviewed medical literature. *JAMA*, 281, 1900-1905.
- Steinmuller, P. L., Meyer, N. L., Kruskall, L. J., Manore, M. M., Rodriguez, N. R., Macedonio, M., et al. (2009). American Dietetic Association Standards of Practice and Standards of Professional Performance for Registered Dietitians (Generalist, Specialty, Advanced) in Sports Dietetics. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 109, 544-552.
- Sue, D., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Williams, L., & Sewpaul, V. (2004). Modernism, postmodernism and global standards setting. *Social Work Education*, 23, 555-565.
- Wilson, F., & Newmeyer, M. (2008). A Standards-Based Inventory for Assessing Perceived Importance of and Confidence in Using ASGW's Core Group Work Skills. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 33, 270-289.
- Yip, K. (2004). A Chinese cultural critique of the global qualifying standards for social work education. *Social Work Education*, 23, 597-612.

For additional information about this Report, questions and further discussion please contact:
Carol S. Cohen, Associate Professor
Adelphi University School of Social Work
Garden City, NY, US
(cohen5@adelphi.edu)

Amy Olshever, Manager, Social Work
Visiting Nurse Service of NY/Hospice Care
New York City, NY, US
(olshever@verizon.net)

Section Three:
Digest of Findings of 2009 Survey on AASWG Standards on Social Work with Groups
Responses as of November 14, 2009 (N=60)

By completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in this research. Please click in the box and then next, if you agree to participate:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	137
	<i>answered question</i>	137
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

*Note: Respondents must say "yes" each time they go to the web site to view the questions in the survey. Approximately 44% of 137 visits to the site resulted in completion of the survey (60 respondents).

1. Familiarity with the Standards: A. How would you rate your familiarity with the Standards?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Know it very well	38.3%	23
Know it a little	48.3%	29
Never saw it before today	13.3%	8
	<i>answered question</i>	60

B. Where have you seen the Standards? (Please check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
AASWG Website	69.1%	38
AASWG Meeting	40.0%	22
Agency	7.3%	4
College/University	47.3%	26
Textbook	18.2%	10
Classroom	10.9%	6
Other (please specify)		3
	<i>answered question</i>	55

Narrative responses regarding source of Standards: (6)

1. Handed out in group class
2. From John Ramey
3. At a conference
4. Was involved in their editing
5. In survey invitation
6. Bought copies
7. Workshop
8. I have a copy
9. Paper Booklet

C. Approximately how many people in do you think are familiar with the *Standards*? (Please give a rough estimate for each of the following categories of people)

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Count
Students	360.37	41
Practitioners	197.05	38
Educators	172.21	39
<i>answered question</i>		41

*Note: Respondents guessed the number of people in each category, and then all responses were averaged

2. Usefulness of the *Standards*: Now that you have seen the *Standards* (even if today was the first time at <http://www.aaswg.org/standards-social-work-practice-with-groups>), what do you think of the Usefulness of the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Extremely Useful	61.0%	36
Moderately Useful	33.9%	20
A Little Useful	5.1%	3
Not at All Useful	0.0%	0
Please explain your answer and how the overall <i>Standards</i> and/or particular sections could be more useful.		29
<i>answered question</i>		59

*Note: As you review narrative responses, consider that the number of the statement in each set of questions does not consistently identify the same respondent – some respondents provide narrative answers to some questions and not to others. Responses in this section and throughout were not edited, and are presented as written, except when they included identifying information.

Narrative responses regarding usefulness: (29)

1. Making it readily/easily/commonly available to individuals. That is, it should pop-up on search sites, be in libraries, reading assignments, handouts, etc.
2. I think they clearly delineate expectations for group practice. Although it might be a huge and ever changing task, I think it might be helpful to be explicit about the types of groups referred to, perhaps as an appendix.
3. The standards do not speak to involuntary groups. For instance I run a batterers intervention group, as well as supervise counselors that run similar batterers intervention groups. Involuntary groups have a very different "spirit" from how the standards appear to be framed, e.g. voluntary, perhaps even informal groups. Developing standards for involuntary groups is important, b/c it is very easy for poor group counselors to blame the client for poor intervention outcomes; having standards that delineate clear standards for involuntary groups would be of great benefit to practice community. Mandatory groups addressing domestic violence, substance abuse, and child maltreatment are three important areas that could seriously benefit from standards. The second concern that I have with the standards is that they point to tasks and even processes but they provide no empirical evidence (or citations) that point to best practices. This makes the standards weak on a number of levels, and should be revised to clearly reflect

- the most current literature identifying best practices. Providing an empirically based set of standards would be of tremendous added value to the profession as well as the AASWG.
- 4. I'm planning to incorporate them into the course I am teaching next year on social work practice with groups.
 - 5. They are thoughtful, not uncontroversial but generally clear, and can be a counterweight to today's tendency to lump, sometimes under the banner of "evidence-based standards," a kind of naive lumping together of social work methods. In such a lumping, as always, the minority (in this case group work) disappears. They need to be topics of major sessions at CSWE and SWRS national sessions. Perhaps another aid would be significant articles in the CSWE journal.
 - 6. I think the concepts are extremely useful and should shape how group work students are taught, but when teaching interns/students, I have found that hands on experience is more useful than a long document.
 - 7. In describing the broad range of groups that may be found in practice the standards only brush the surface regarding function and process. I don't know if what I am hoping for is possible or practical but I would hope for more descriptions of the variety of group practice as part of the standards to draw more creative practices to the fore.
 - 8. Great for social workers doing groups. Sets the stage
 - 9. It is most useful if people have had a grounding in group work
 - 10. These standards and norms should ideally be part of a social group work educational process. That being said, there will be group facilitators who may come from diverse disciplines and it would be helpful for them to have a universal set of standards and expectations for practice with groups.
 - 11. I found the Standards to be a summary that gets to the heart of social group work, defines it, details what makes group work group work. Very helpful.
 - 12. They would be more useful if more people knew about them.
 - 13. Not a lot different from the NASW code of ethics. It seems to me that if one follows the NASW code of ethics, most of these rules would already be followed.
 - 14. They often feel quite removed from the group work expected in the psychiatric setting I am currently employed
 - 15. Could be tied explicitly to licensing standards
 - 16. They could provide a guide for how you set up your groups. By knowing about the standards you will know why they were written and appreciate their purpose in the profession of group social work which has many differences from one on one social work.
 - 17. It is quite useful for educators in organizing their teaching of group work content. It provides a cogent summary of core knowledge, values, and skills useful for students as well.
 - 18. Very helpful in teaching Group Work to MSW students-especially the prior standards that had a bulleted list of worker tasks for each stage of group
 - 19. One way would be by sponsoring workshops to make them come alive
 - 20. To be more useful, a short example of each standard would illustrate the main idea.
 - 21. I am not certain if "Standards" like this are still relevant at this era - it feels like practitioners collect practice data from a multitude of sources and synthesize it themselves
 - 22. It sets forth the core values and knowledge of group work and then views these through the development of groups. The Standards give a brief overview that helps to integrate the novice to group work practice.
 - 23. Good basis to understand the standards of good clinic groupwork

24. Practitioners refer to it in case of dilemma, and get more specific information on tasks and skills at each stage of group development.
25. Standards establish parameters under which proficient group workers should practice. Just as NASW provides guidelines for practice, I believe that the AASWG standards provide the same set of guidelines for group workers. I find that it is useful in educating group workers in ethical and well informed clinical practice.
26. They potentially could be extremely useful, i.e., if more people were aware of them. I'll be including these in courses where possible, now I know about them.
27. The standards are extremely useful because they provide a standard of practice and commitment for facilitating groups. It legitimizes group work and reminds students, practitioners, and educators that group work is an important modality of social work practice that empowers people. It is also helpful in breaking of specifically outlining specific tasks and skills of group work practice/process.
28. Some of the standards overlap with professional codes and standards of practice
29. I think all standards should be reviewed every 5 years. A committee should be made up of faculty, professionals in group practice, MSW students who have worked in the field as undergraduates, LCSW and people who do groups with teens juvenile justice & addiction. In this way their would be a broad evaluation; and discussion to see what practices work & what practices & sections need to be changed to be more effective for practices & clients.

3. Understandability of the *Standards*: Now that you have seen the *Standards* (even if today was the first time), what do you think of the Understandability of the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Extremely Understandable	60.3%	35
Moderately Understandable	34.5%	20
A Little Understandable	5.2%	3
Not at All Understandable	0.0%	0
Please explain your answer and how the overall <i>Standards</i> and/or particular sections could be more understandable.		21
	<i>answered question</i>	58

Narrative responses regarding understandability (21-1 referenced previous answers)

1. I think it is easy to understand and should stay the way it is, unless an overwhelming response say otherwise.
2. P. 7, h, line 2 - I believe give would be more appropriate; p. 8 - I think it would be clearer if - i, line 4 the word this were followed by the word purpose; p. 18, e, line 2 - I would place a comma after appropriate and leave off the comma after the word time in the next line; p. 23 B.1 - line 5 - I would change the word ends? to the phrase leaves the group;
3. Simpler structure
4. I think the standards make good sense to group workers, particularly "group work majors." However, we were always a small minority in social work and our minority status has become increasingly evident in recent years. As we move towards combined methods, now almost a universal, the minority--in this case, group workers--disappears. For the most part, I think that's what's happening within clinical social work, especially outside of a few geographical areas, such as metropolitan New York. Possibly, it's happening even there. Abroad, I have the impression that the opposite is happening, but perhaps that's wishful thinking on my part.

5. Clinical language is, obviously, extremely subjective. Everyone reads and comprehends at a different level. I think the wording is relatively clear, but could always be more succinct.
6. My experience is that the standards are fairly straightforward and clear. I do not find it confusing in its construction
7. Perhaps some examples of application
8. I thought it was well written. What is missing is a dialogue in the group work community about the Standards (to my knowledge and limited experience), in MSW programs (I only know about the one I attended) and in agencies (the concept of social group work is completely absent in the agency in which I work.)
9. There are codes of standards for every iteration of social work. I think that the codes or standards for a particular modality should reference the NASW Code and only address issues specific to that modality.
10. I think more examples need to be used after the sections especially for students studying social work with groups. When studying for my MSW many students were apprehensive about the clinical year group section of the clinical year even though there was a group practice course. IN the social work MSW level I think there should be 2 group practice courses one before you study the DSM4 and the second group course spring semester of the last courses before the end of the degree.
11. I am particularly pleased that the focus of the new Standards is on competencies and at the same time clearly articulates the core values and skills.
12. Again, if there was a way to re-incorporate the bulleted-type list of worker tasks in each stage- would be more helpful
13. The language is perfect, no need to change anything.
14. I think they are very understandable but I studied group work - I wonder if the typical social work generalist might find the language and format a little dated
15. Although a bit wordy at times, the standards offer clear and concise guidelines.
16. Under 3 (a) I have had class discussion regarding the need for specificity of property damage (i.e. slashing a tire vs. tearing a coat sleeve). The actions to be taken are identified as "and/or" which gives the group counselor the discretion to decide the proper action.
17. Too verbose at times which might lead to reading it too fast
18. But need to be better structured; at times I feel there are repetitions. A presentation in tables would help the reader.
19. There does need to be some work done on the standards to make them more understandable for practitioners and students. There also needs to be some updating on verbiage and the organization of the standards document.
20. The standards are very clear.

4. Cross-Cultural and Cross-National Relevance of the *Standards*: Now that you have seen the *Standards* (even if today was the first time), what do you think of the Cross-Cultural and Cross-National Relevance of the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Extremely Cross-Culturally and Cross-Nationally Relevant	20.7%	12
Moderately Cross-Culturally and Cross-Nationally Relevant	56.9%	33
A Little Cross-Culturally and Cross-Nationally	17.2%	10

Relevant		
Not at All Cross-Culturally and Cross-Nationally Relevant	5.2%	3
Please explain your answer and how the overall <i>Standards</i> and/or particular sections could be more cross-culturally and cross-nationally relevant.		24
<i>answered question</i>		58

Narrative responses regarding cross-cultural and cross-national relevance (24)

1. Not sure
2. I am not sure as I haven't had the opportunity to consult with others from cultures other than my own.
3. The standards should strive to include Africa and other developing countries where group social work exist to make it more globally relevant
4. To be cross culturally and cross nationally relevant the standards would have to have (a) have working groups that represented and spoke for specific groups within the parameters of AASWG, and (b) would have to be provided space to present and maintain standards that are specific to the cultural needs of that said group. In fact, I would think that the AASWG would sponsor various group specific standards of practice. Again to focus on the standards at this level, with solid empirical research supporting those standards, would be of great added value.
5. I think the Standards as outlined are enough process oriented that they can apply/are transferable - and can be utilized both trans- culturally and within various cultural mores and/or constraints.
6. We could emphasize more clearly the view of the human condition and the views of pathology and health which are immanent in work with groups. Not that this area is weak, but it could be stated more strongly.
7. Nothing is ever cross cultural or cross national if written in vague language. Obviously the Standards' intent is to have a global perspective, but often these types of rules go out the window when working with a specific population, regardless of who it is.
8. I have been involved in numerous discussions with colleagues about the difficulty in making cross-cultural statements about practice with groups because of the fascinating differences in the points of reference for work with groups (even beyond social work with groups). The standards have not yet expanded to include those other perspectives and theoretical frameworks and so are not yet fully relevant.
9. My experience is that social workers' understanding of cultural competence is superficial, when I was in school and in my agency. I don't know that the Standards could foster the dialogue and focus necessary to promote depth of understanding and practice culturally.
10. Many cultures are not comfortable working in groups. Most of the standards apply to willing participants
11. They represent a North American perspective
12. Cultural competence is cultural competence.
13. I think there is always room to see the standards reworked; as people conduct more social work with group practice specialties. As people who are educators or write the documents for standards time changes specialty areas of practice as well as theorist in the social work field of study & practice.

14. I'm not sure how much the new standards actually advance a persistent problem many experienced in the older versions and models of practice that seemed to focus on the needs of dominant white, English speaking, and heterosexual populations
15. Needs more development of the norming phase and the termination phase for more international cross-cultural relevance.
16. The standards contain an explicit awareness of cross-cultural themes but much less so of cross-national themes
17. The language is perfect, no need to change anything.
18. The Standards are very focused on a "Group Worker's" vision of social services that feels very middle-class and somewhat academic - very much part of the dominant culture
19. Although the term diversity is used three times in the standards, a fundamental term for social workers - "social justice" is not used at all and social change is used 2 times and social action only once. Other than in the title of organization, the term international is not used at all.
20. This is a new area of competency and we must allow for more understanding growth in this area
21. It is aimed at practitioners who need to master the values, tasks and skills...
22. The Social Justice portion could be more culturally sensitive; democracy is not necessarily desirable in all contexts, for instance.
23. The standards are relevant to all group workers. However, the challenge is in making sure that they are available to a broader cross section of the national population. There are way too many BSW's and MSW's who were never trained in group work who are actually facilitating groups without knowledge of AASWG or the Standards.
24. We live in a very changing world. We talk all the time about the sensitivity to person place environment & culture.

5. Comprehensiveness of the *Standards*: Now that you have seen the *Standards* (even if today was the first time), what do you think of the Comprehensiveness of the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Extremely Comprehensive	55.9%	33
Moderately Comprehensive	40.7%	24
A Little Comprehensive	3.4%	2
Not at All Comprehensive	0.0%	0
Please explain your answer and if you think the <i>Standards</i> should be more comprehensive, what should be added.		19
<i>answered question</i>		59

Narrative responses regarding comprehensiveness (19 – 2 referenced previous answers)

1. This is because I am not sure of how well it cuts across cultures.
2. As I previously stated, I might add the various types of groups as an appendix.
3. It is comprehensive but I do not think it covers all aspect of social work practice with groups.
4. It provides detailed information on the all stages of group development, the skills and tasks at each stage.
5. It covers group work in general, but practitioners know that each kind of group work follows its own set of standards.
6. As an attempt to provide a broad framework for practice, the standards don't yet touch on the broader than social work perspectives. The need to identify the emerging areas of practice in

all of the realms where work with groups occurs seems clear but creates a tension against the need for the standards to be readable, usable and functional. Not sure how exactly to resolve that tension.

7. I found it to be an excellent sweep of social group work. It covers all areas necessary for a well intentioned social worker to check her/his practice. Beyond that, additional study, supervision and dialogue would be necessary.
8. They do not cover all types of groups.
9. Overly comprehensive, (see above)
10. More cross-national content, especially in view of our being an international organization
11. The language is perfect, no need to change anything.
12. More cross-national content, especially in view of our being an international organization
13. The language is perfect, no need to change anything.
14. They cover the basics - which is usually enough
15. The standards need to be able to cover all types of group work not just clinical practice, so although the language is general, I believe it is necessary to be inclusive.
16. covers everything
17. The standards do not cover all of the practice issues necessary to make this a working document for all practice settings. Work needs to be done to make it more generalizable across disciplines.
18. The Standards are very comprehensive.

**Note: Some respondents reference their previous responses, suggesting that answers address multiple areas.*

6. Relevance of the *Standards* to your Practice: Now that you have seen the *Standards* (even if today was the first time), what do you think of the Relevance of the *Standards* to your practice with groups?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely Relevant	58.6%	34
Mostly Relevant	34.5%	20
Minimally Relevant	6.9%	4
Not Relevant at all	0.0%	0
Please explain your answer and how the overall <i>Standards</i> and/or particular sections could be more relevant to your practice.		19
<i>answered question</i>		58

Narrative responses regarding relevance to your practice (19)

1. Because I am beginning group work practice, I am able to align my approaches with the standards.
2. The standards seem to fit social work practice.
3. One can use the standards as reference for practice
4. The standards are at most guide posts, they do not set real standards of care/practice. Like the NASW Code of Ethics, which is generally quite broad in my opinion, the result seems to be a body of codes that can be safely ignored, while also useful to provide "evidence" to support a political or economic position that is usually also advantageous to the organization.
5. They could be stronger in two areas: standards of knowledge and support, including financial, for practice with groups.

6. I think it's a helpful "jumping off point" for us. We could make better use of the standards by incorporating it as a document into our practice and our students' education.
7. Groups in the real world often do not conform to the descriptions for practice in the standards. That can be frustrating. Standards create a connotation of quality that needs to include room for not-so-good fitting agency purposes, funding requirements, service demands and participant intentions. Work with groups is fraught with challenges that don't get captured and when practitioners engage in the practice of social work with groups they need a framework beyond "best practices" to be able to balance purpose with the demands of the members and the environment which are largely out of the control of the facilitator
8. The standards, as they are written, should be relevant to all practice areas.
9. The limits in practice in my agency have to do with open-ended groups, no concept of group integrity, no possibility for pre-planning with potential members, no way to foster consistency and commitment on the part of participants.
10. Includes accepted standards.
11. It is important to follow standards established for the field: and what other social workers are doing in the field.
12. The language is perfect, no need to change anything.
13. This is what I was taught and practice by Roselle Kurland - they feel very on target for my practice and much of my staff
14. As an educator and practitioner the standards are very relevant to what I do everyday, in both educating MSW students and the ongoing facilitation of groups - from task to therapeutic groups.
15. More specificity on differentiating values and ethics as well as judgment and ethical reasoning.
16. personally is covers me but there might be areas in which need strengthening for working in agencies with multiple disciplines
17. It addresses what practitioners need to know at each stage of group development
18. The standards guide practice and even for veterans serve as a reminder of what good group work practice is and helps practitioners master the tasks and skills of group work so that it is beneficial to the people that we serve.
19. We have different small group meetings around the state & university's we attended and very often for attending these meetings or conferences ceu's are granted. I think a three hour time slot one hour for overall explanation of the standards of group work presented by one facilitator and one hour and a half for a panel from each area of group work specialties children & families, aging teens ,marriage counseling etc.

7. Challenges to Using the Standards: What are three challenges, barriers or difficulties in using the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups* in your practice, teaching and/or training?

Response Count	40
----------------	----

Narrative responses regarding challenges to using the Standards (40-2 reference previous answers)

1. Empowerment perspective with vulnerable populations, program policies may hinder involvement due to time constraints, its very specific in term of tasks, should be more philosophical and principle driven.
2. None as of yet
3. Some of the record keeping standards seem onerous.

4. In my teaching in a French speaking country (Senegal I need to translate the content in French.
5. To teach these standards would be difficult since they raise as many questions as they answer. The guidelines being too broad fail to provide a clear sense of what is not permissible. Students often need to know what not to do, in addition to what the expected outcomes should be accomplished. Training would fall under the same criticism.
6. No challenges in particular other than lack of visibility across the profession and particularly in academia. I would like to see yearly blasts to all members of the Standards (e.g., an email with a link) with the request that the recipient forward that email to colleagues (I would forward it to co-faculty, for example). I would also like to see them retitled in some way that includes either "code" and/or "ethics" in the title, which they (both) are - they need to be understood as integral to ethical practice with groups - at least social work practice with groups. Finally, while they are good online I think a colorful booklet (for example, institutional members should receive beautiful publicity packets each year with information about membership accomplishments (e.g., a beautiful bib) and other things - including a hard copy of these Standards (with again information for faculty - how to link, why it's important to pass these around - faculty need CONSTANT reminding that groups are perhaps even more common than individual counseling now - at least in many, many venues).
7. Remembering where they are partializing each standard so they are able to be understood and distinguished and applied over time.
8. A/ Reimbursement standards for private practice and organizational support. B/Views of the human condition which are immanent (in-dwelling) in work with groups. C/Operationalized standards of growth/success in work with groups in various populations.
9. As noted earlier in this survey, the issues and barriers lie in the constraints brought by trying to make the standards brief, comprehensive and cogent. As a practitioner, mentor and trainer, I find myself helping facilitators to understand and work in the tension between "best practices" which are captured in the Standards for many voluntary Western groups and their members and all the non-voluntary, not so Western groups and their members that need to be served by social workers and agencies. Standards set the bar for practice and can be used to measure goodness of fit for a program or practice but don't acknowledge or deal with the complexity of the range of groups that may be. As I have noted earlier, I have no idea if expanding to include any of these complexities make sense or would be appropriate but I feel the tension between these practical matters in my work.
10. Social workers don't have group training
11. A/Need to study them in a group or class forum; B/Need for them to be part of an academic course or several, the way that NASW standards are; C/Need on going education to see how they apply to current practice.
12. Getting the information to the group facilitators if they have not completed a social work education program or a comparable program.
13. Needs a wider distribution.
14. A/Agency ignorance of social group work; B/The drop-in expectation for clients, no expectation of commitment to a group; C/Supervisor's complete lack of knowledge about social group work, and imposition of simple answers to issues with group work in this agency.
15. Teaching: language sophisticated; lay-out uninviting; needs examples.
16. Working with difficult populations. In order to become a competent facilitator you need to first facilitate several groups to get hands on experience, but until then, you couldn't be considered a competent facilitator, and that is the ethical dilemma. Having inexperienced facilitators just

- "winging it". Many employment settings do not give adequate training on running groups, and unless you received training in school or other courses, competency will be an ethical issue.
17. A/Not a "group work" focused agency; B/Getting students to understand the importance of using standards when focus of agency is not on group work.
 18. Distribution, marketing the target audience, familiarity of practitioners.
 19. None at this point. Just the need to incorporate
 20. A/Group process not as valued as it used to be in my organization B/Some of these concepts not familiar to colleagues
 21. None that I can see, just too repetitive.
 22. One should work through the barriers or difficulties to be able to use the standards that have been written.
 23. I am currently working to articulate a post-modern and constructivist approach to group facilitation. So this new set of Standards opens new possibilities but still seems focused on an older, traditional model of group practice.
 24. None
 25. Lengthy, easy to forget, no universal site where they can be quickly referenced. In the professional world, no one usually rehearses or revisits the standards, so they are not always enforced
 26. Needs to happen in a class
 27. I use them in my teaching and do not experience challenges, other than the need to impress upon my students their importance
 28. I don't foresee any challenges to using the standards. However, students and professionals should reference the standards in their writings, in their practice with groups and every where the can to let the community know how they are to operate.
 29. Language needs to align more with code of ethics - social justice and social action. Standards need to be valued, respected and used more: AASWG needs to be more visible and respected within the field of Social Work - serving as an advocate on the national scene. AASWG needs to be more inclusive, actively supporting group work in innovative ways. Too much maintenance of status quo."
 30. covers social work practice but needs to look at working with groups with other disciplines whose standards or focus might be slightly different
 31. Making them available to students.
 32. practical application, articulation of standards to non practitioners are the only two issues I've encountered
 33. On hands training essential in really reinforcing them lack of groupwork training at most universities.
 34. It is comprehensive and one needs to use it regularly to be acquainted with its content. Long and extensive, time consuming
 35. There needs to be work done on the organization of the document. Application of the standards information would be a better "fit" for most practitioners if there was an update of the current edition of the document.
 36. Getting the word out about them.
 37. One of the challenges is educating more students and practitioners about the standards. Another is providing a forum for discussing the standards and relevance to practice in a more consistent manner.
 38. Overlap with general social work professional standards

8. Ideas for gathering Feedback: Please share your ideas about how we could gather additional feedback about the *Standards for Social Work Practice with Groups*.

	Response Count	28

Narrative responses regarding ideas for gathering feedback (28)

1. Focus group with 2nd year MSW students, NASW local chapters, outreach to large and mid-size agencies
2. Making it readily/easily/commonly available to individuals. That is, it should pop-up on search sites, be in libraries, reading assignments, handouts, etc.
3. Distribute the survey at conferences concerning social group work. Perhaps have focus groups to discuss the standards.
4. Periodic survey to all members
5. Ask chapter members to commit a few hours brainstorming on the standards.
6. First, the current standards need to be revised with an eye toward empirical evidence that supports the current standards. If evidence cannot be located then those standards need to be reviewed. Cultural groups that are well represented, perhaps at this particular time, faith based groups, and perhaps Latinos should be tasked to develop standards that mirror established culturally defined values, and if possible also supported by empirical evidence that indicates that the standard enhances the intervention's strength and efficacy.
7. Agencies that serve as educational fieldwork sites could be asked (for example, all field instructors that serve as supervisors for MSW and/or BSW interns) for feedback. Field instructors who participate in seminars could be asked for same.
8. Collect tips on how to use them in class or in practicum field instruction or in supervision
9. Presentation and request for inputs from a) Deans and Directors, b) Chairs of Curriculum Committees of members of CSWE. I think the responses may be startling.
10. Through field supervisors and their use of these standards or not
11. Send the standards to social service agencies, hospitals, and substance abuse programs where social group work is conducted, but groups may not be facilitated by social workers or similarly licensed and knowledgeable professionals.
12. Present a workshop/dialogue at the conference; ask local chapters to spend time and give attention to the Standards in the form of one or more meetings in which dialogue occurs; e mail the Standards on the e mail list to all members to bring their attention to them; ask one or a few members to present their perspective on the usefulness of the Standards in their work at the symposium or a local chapter meeting.
13. Meet with new and "old" group workers in the field during an informal get together.
14. present at regular meetings, share with Deans and directors of programs and asked to present at least one faculty/curriculum meeting, and follow-up with faculty that teach group courses.
15. Get to alumni of various social work schools that have or have had group work majors
16. This works pretty well for people who are interested.
17. Run them by Boards of Social Work and social work regulators.
18. Have 2 meetings a year with people who were responsible for writing the standards as a panel and educators students and professionals an opportunity after a presentation from each person on the panel; and time for questions from the floor by those attending the day.
19. Brief survey to graduate students
20. Share the standards with international groups to get reaction.

21. surveys in group work classes, surveys of practitioners in the field of social work who facilitate groups
22. Good question -- I don't know, perhaps the listerv?
23. By counting the number of times group members who publish reference the standards.
24. Ask group work faculty to have their students use the standards in at least one application assignment and critique the value of each standard. Questions like the ones in this survey could be used as part of the assignment and completed online.
25. more training and consultation
26. Ask practitioners for feedback. Set a permanent link on the Association site for feedback.
27. This survey is a good start. Perhaps there could be a forum at the Symposium each year to discuss a specific aspect of the Standards and challenges, barriers and difficulties encountered.
28. To form a committee comprised of some faculty from the schools of social work in a given metropolitan area. Example (Miami-Barry University, Florida International, and university, faculty, a group of students in final year doing clinical social work from the MSW programs; and some private practice social workers who do individual counseling and groups. in this way making it like what MSW took for advanced research a study with people in various specialties in social work. Children & families aging, teens juvenile justice, marriage & family counseling. In this way evaluating the standards of social work with groups.

9. What is your primary professional discipline? (please select one item from the following drop down menu)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Social Work	92.9%	52
Psychology	1.8%	1
Rehabilitation Counseling	0.0%	0
Mental Health Counseling	0.0%	0
Education	5.4%	3
Nursing	0.0%	0
Medicine	0.0%	0
Law	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)	0.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		56

Answers to "Other"

1. Higher Education
2. Aging and health care

10. What is your primary professional role? (please select one item from the following drop down menu)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Direct practice	26.3%	15
Supervision	10.5%	6
Administration	8.8%	5
Politics	1.8%	1

University/ College Instructor	36.8%	21
Other (please specify)	15.8%	13
<i>answered question</i>		57

Responses for “other primary professional role” (13): 1. Plus direct practice; 2. Student; 3. Emeritus professor; 4. Group facilitator; 5. Facilitator; 6. Field instruction; 7. Program Manager; 8. Coordinator; 9. I have worked with teenagers in groups in juvenile justice & presently in the past 10 years with seniors in a HUD building for low income living. Over the last two years I have worked as an MSW in home health and I’m presently not working with groups but plan to go back to it. 10. Consultant 11. Practice and supervision, equally 12. LCSW 13. Direct practice & counseling with the senior population specifically age 62 & up.

11. What is your primary area of practice? (based on NASW categories) (please select one item from the following drop down menu)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Mental health	21.8%	12
Adolescents	7.3%	4
Child welfare/family	23.6%	13
Addictions	1.8%	1
Aging	9.1%	5
Health	7.3%	4
School social work	3.6%	2
Developmental disabilities	0.0%	0
Occupation social work/EAP	0.0%	0
Displaced persons/homeless	0.0%	0
Violence	1.8%	1
Criminal justice	1.8%	1
Community development	0.0%	0
International	1.8%	1
Other (please specify)	20.0%	15

answered question

55

Responses for “other primary area of practice” (15): 1. Mental health; 2. Social work education; 3. Adolescents, program development, program evaluation; 4. Social work education; 5. Women; 6. Marriage and family; 7. Community Organization; 8. LGBT issues; 9. Poverty/homelessness; 10. Trauma. 11. Social Work Education 12. University professor 13 and mental health 14. Education and group work 15. Aging & Health Care

12. Additional examples of “Best Practices” from other professional organizations: We would like to look at other professional standards as part of this process. Do you know of any other set of standards that could be considered examples of “best practices”? Please include the name of

the standards, a link or location, and your reason for recommendation.

Answer Options

Response Count

19

Narrative responses of sources of “best practices” (19 – 6 were “no”):

1. See: quantumunitsed.com/materials/1111_grouptherapytreatment.pdf
2. The best set of standards that encompass a wide range of professionals at this time is the Society for Prevention Research. They are dedicated to set of goals that members strive to meet through research, practice, and policy. Their standards of research and advocacy can be found at: <http://www.preventionresearch.org/commlmon.php>.
3. You might try ACR (Assn for Conflict Resolution)
4. NASW Code of Ethics
5. APA groups standards AGPA
6. I know of best practices from other Jewish organizations. If you'd like to see these, please email me at meisen@jfedor.org
7. Minnesota's Practice Act (Licensing Law)
<https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/statutes/?id=148D>
8. <http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/index.asp> -- Evidence based practices website
9. Have those who publish illustrate the best practice evidence of a standard that they used in practice.
10. NCATE standards for teacher educators.
11. adventure based counseling
12. It not really called standards but Code of Ethics of the NASW
13. Check NASW

13. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Response Count

20

Narrative responses of “anything else to add” (20-5 were “no”):

1. I really think that making the standards readily/easily/commonly available to individuals can be very helpful (increase familiarity and feedback). For example, it should pop-up on search sites, be in libraries, reading assignments, handouts, etc.
2. This didn't take too long!
3. There is a need for French speaking countries to get a French version of the Standards.
4. If members cannot donate their time to work on this, then the organization should hire leading practitioners and researchers in the field to develop a Researcher/Practitioner Advisory Committee, which would then be tasked to develop a really strong set of standards. This could be modeled after Prevent Child Abuse America's Researcher/Practitioner Advisory Committee (See this link for reference to an article regarding this particular partnership:
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a903464790>).
5. Unless we lead a movement towards reimbursement for group services (clinical) we run a serious risk of disappearing in social work education and, before long, in social work practice. At the same time, other professions have become aware of the power of group experiences. It would be a shame for this to happen. Our stay within the social work profession has, overall, been a productive one for both parties, in my view. But it may yet come to an end.
6. I appreciate this opportunity and look forward to some dialogue on the Standards.

7. I look forward to sharing this with colleagues.
8. I think that all MSW students taking Social Work with Groups class should have the standards given out to them.
9. Good luck with this effort!
10. Continue to ask these questions so that the standards may evolve and meet the needs of current students and practitioners.
11. Thanks for doing this survey.
12. Use of groups as part of supervision and working with clinical interns and those new to group work. Also, the type of documentation that will illustrate the work in groups, progress notes, treatment plans, review of goals and objectives being met and screening
13. I am aware of the publication of the Hispanic translated version, and I am thinking of working on the French translated version for a wider dissemination of the text.
14. cannot provide a number as requested in item C - "few" is my response
15. Survey was a great idea!

Compilation of Respondent comments regarding workshops, panels, future review and standards revision:

1. Present a workshop/dialogue at the conference; ask local chapters to spend time and give attention to the Standards in the form of one or more meetings in which dialogue occurs; e mail the Standards on the e mail list to all members to bring their attention to them; ask one or a few members to present their perspective on the usefulness of the Standards in their work at the symposium or a local chapter meeting.
2. Have 2 meetings a year with people who were responsible for writing the standards as a panel and educators students and professionals an opportunity after a presentation from each person on the panel; and time for questions from the floor by those attending the day.
3. Ask group work faculty to have their students use the standards in at least one application assignment and critique the value of each standard. Questions like the ones in this survey could be used as part of the assignment and completed online.
4. These standards and norms should ideally be part of a social group work educational process. That being said, there will be group facilitators who may come from diverse disciplines and it would be helpful for them to have a universal set of standards and expectations for practice with groups.
5. One way would be by sponsoring workshops to make them come alive
6. To be more useful, a short example of each standard would illustrate the main idea.
7. I think all standards should be reviewed every 5 years. A committee should be made up of faculty, professionals in group practice, MSW students who have worked in the field as undergraduates, LCSW and people who do groups with teens juvenile justice & addiction. In this way their would be a broad evaluation; and discussion to see what practices work & what practices & sections need to be changed to be more effective for practices & clients.
8. I think more examples need to be used after the sections especially for students studying social work with groups. When studying for my MSW many students were apprehensive about the clinical year group section of the clinical year even though there was a group practice course. In the social work MSW level I think there should be 2 group practice courses one before you study the DSM4 and the second group course spring semester of the last courses before the end of the degree.

9. Under 3 (a) I have had class discussion regarding the need for specificity of property damage (i.e. slashing a tire vs. tearing a coat sleeve). The actions to be taken are identified as "and/or" which gives the group counselor the discretion to decide the proper action.
10. To be cross culturally and cross nationally relevant the standards would have to have (a) have working groups that represented and spoke for specific groups within the parameters of AASWG, and (b) would have to be provided space to present and maintain standards that are specific to the cultural needs of that said group. In fact, I would think that the AASWG would sponsor various group specific standards of practice. Again to focus on the standards at this level, with solid empirical research supporting those standards, would be of great added value.
11. I think there is always room to see the standards reworked; as people conduct more social work with group practice specialties. As people who are educators or write the documents for standards time changes specialty areas of practice as well as theorist in the social work field of study & practice.

For additional information about this Report, questions and further discussion please contact:

Carol S. Cohen, Associate Professor
Adelphi University School of Social Work
Garden City, NY, US
(cohen5@adelphi.edu)

Amy Olshever, Manager, Social Work
Visiting Nurse Service of NY/Hospice Care
New York City, NY, US
(olshever@verizon.net)