

Social Work 501 B: Poverty and Inequality Winter 2016

Christopher Cambron
ccambron@uw.edu
SSW 018 (PhD Student Offices)

This course is a critical analysis of poverty and inequality, with an analytic and descriptive focus on measurement, processes of production and perpetuation, and public policy responses. It examines competing perspectives on the causes of poverty and inequality, the role of policy, and socioeconomic dimensions of stratification, including race, ethnicity, class, gender, immigration status, disability, age, sexual orientation and family structure.

This course builds upon historical and critical analysis content covered in the "Intellectual and Historical Foundations of Professional Social Work Practice" and links to policy advocacy and policy analysis material covered in policy practice sessions in the "Macro practice" sequence. Together, these courses offer a foundation in the historical, political, economic, and philosophical context of U.S. social welfare policy, familiarize students with current policy controversies, build skills in policy analysis and advocacy, and help students critically analyze competing perspectives on poverty and inequality, in preparation for socially just social work practice.

Course goals: To enable students to critically examine the dimensions, causes, consequences and perpetuation of poverty and inequality in the U.S.; to understand the role of policy in producing, maintaining, and alleviating poverty and inequality; and to offer a theoretical and analytic foundation for promoting social and economic justice.

Core Competencies

This course targets the following SSW foundation competencies and related practice behaviors:

Competency #3: Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

3a. Use critical thinking to distinguish, evaluate, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, practice wisdom, and client/constituent experience.

3b.-e. Critically analyze models of b.) assessment, c.) prevention, d.) intervention, and e.) evaluation, especially in relation to their cultural relevance and applicability and their promotion of social justice.

Competency #4: Engage diversity and difference in practice.

4a. Recognize and articulate the ways in which social and cultural structures—including history, institutions, and values—oppress some identity groups while enhancing the privilege and power of dominant groups.

Competency #5: Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

5a. Understand and articulate the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and approaches to advancing social justice and human rights.

5b. Advocate for and engage in practices that address disparities and inequalities and advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Competency #6: Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.

6c.-d. Use c.) qualitative and d.) quantitative research evidence to inform practice.

Competency #8: Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.

8a.-b. Use critical understanding of the history and current form of US social welfare and social service policies (e.g., institutions, governance, and financing) to a.) formulate policies and strategies that advance social and economic justice and b.) formulate policies and strategies that improve social service delivery.

Competency #9: Respond to contexts that shape practice.

9a. Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide culturally relevant services

Course Requirements and Grading

Readings: Our major text is *Poverty in America* by John Iceland (2013, University of California Press). Other readings are listed below and on our class website. Readings may be added or substituted during the quarter. Readings for most weeks are organized in two parts. The main readings are required for all seminar participants; they provide an overview of relevant concepts, current information on poverty and inequality, and alternative perspectives on the topic. Additional readings explore related topics in more depth. On most weeks students will select at least one additional reading to prepare for class. This will broaden our collective knowledge for class discussions and help you identify and explore potential paper topics. Optional readings are available for students who wish to explore selected issues in more depth.

Paper assignments: A series of written assignments will integrate class concepts and readings through analysis of a substantive area of research around poverty and inequality. Major assignments will be accompanied by assessment rubrics. Work submitted should be the student's original writing created in response to the assignment in question.

Written work should follow format guidelines on in the *SSW Guidelines for Student Papers*. Use a standard 12 point font (such as Garamond, Times or Arial, *not* Courier), double-space lines, and staple multiple-page assignments in the upper left-hand corner. Because of the time-frame of the course, the instructor may not have adequate time to comment on assignments turned in past the due date and students will not be able to reflect on comments. Late assignments will automatically lose one half point (0.5 on a 4.0 scale) per day.

Policy on plagiarism: The student conduct code of the University of Washington requires students to practice "high standards of academic and professional honesty and integrity." In addition, the School of Social Work's academic standards specify that students may be dismissed for "academic cheating, lying, or plagiarism." Students who are suspected of cheating or plagiarism will be confronted directly by the instructor, who will inform the program director and the assistant dean for student affairs. Instructors will not award credit for work that has been plagiarized. The instructor, director and director of student services will determine if the student's actions warrant disciplinary action, which may include probation or dismissal. Your program manual contains a more detailed explanation of plagiarism and suggestions for avoiding it.

Participation: Students are expected to attend all classes, do the assigned reading in advance of class, and participate in class discussions and exercises. Course format will include lecture, class discussion and small group discussion. We will be engaging with difficult issues that are likely to challenge our prior beliefs and opinions. It is our joint responsibility to maintain a classroom climate that tolerates diverse perspectives and treats all class participants with respect and dignity.

Participation and preparation are evaluated in class. If you must miss class, please notify your instructor before class if possible.

The quality of learning in this class will depend to a large extent on the quality of our classroom discussions and exercises. Students are expected to complete required readings for each class and to actively contribute to class discussions. Class participation will be graded based on the following format for discussion groups:

- (1) students will be assigned to discussion groups that will meet in class to discuss the main points/themes of the current weekly required readings and additional readings selected by each student;
- (2) groups will be given discussion questions and exercises designed to apply and integrate concepts in the readings, using poster board paper to illustrate their work;
- (3) we will reconvene as a full class and each group will be responsible for leading a full group discussion at least once during the quarter, presenting their work, posing additional questions that surface during their discussion, and facilitating a full class discussion;

For grading purposes, all groups will submit their poster board paper to the instructor at the end of class and all group members will receive credit. Students who miss class in which discussion groups meet can earn credit by turning in a 3 page reflection paper on the readings for that week.

Students are expected to engage in this small group exercise at least **five times** during the course of the winter quarter. Dates for student led discussion groups are listed in syllabus.

Grading: Numeric grades of 0-4.0 will be given according the following scale:

A/A-	4.0-3.5	Mastery of subject content, demonstration of critical analysis, creativity and/or complexity in completion of the assignment. The difference between an A and an A- is based on the degree to which these skills are demonstrated.
B+	3.4-3.1	Mastery of subject content beyond expected competency, but lacking in additional critical analysis, creativity, or complexity.
B	3.0-2.9	Mastery of subject content at level of expected competency; meets course expectations.
B-	2.8-2.7	Less than adequate competency, but demonstrates student learning and potential for mastery of subject content.
NC	2.6 or below	Significant areas need improvement to meet course expectations. Grades of 2.6 or below cannot be applied toward graduate degrees.

Assignments and activities are weighted as follows:

Participation: Discussion Groups & In Class	30
Preliminary writing assignments	25
Final paper	40
Peer presentation of key data and findings	5
TOTAL	100

WHAT IF I NEED ACCOMODATIONS?

Access and Academic Accommodations

At the SSW we are committed to ensuring access to classes, course material, and learning opportunities for students with disabilities. Your experience in this class is important to us, and it is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law. If you experience barriers based on a disability or temporary health condition, please seek a meeting with DRS to discuss and address them. If you have already established accommodations with DRS, please communicate your approved accommodations to your instructor at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course.

Disability Resources for Students (DRS) offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s) and DRS. If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (this can include but not limited to; mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 206-543-8924 or uwdrs@uw.edu or disability.uw.edu

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The student conduct code of the University of Washington requires students to practice "high standards of academic and professional honesty and integrity." In addition, the School of Social Work's academic standards specify that students may be dismissed for "academic cheating, lying, or plagiarism." Students who are suspected of cheating or

plagiarism will be confronted directly by the instructor, who will inform the program director and the assistant dean for student affairs. Instructors will not award credit for work that has been plagiarized. The instructor, director and director of student services will determine if the student's actions warrant disciplinary action, which may include probation or dismissal. Your program manual contains a fuller explanation of plagiarism and suggestions for avoiding it.

Winter 2016 Preliminary Course Summary*

Week	Class Date	Topic	Assignments & Activities
1	Jan 5	Introduction: Poverty and inequality	Self-sufficiency standard (SSS) (in class) Bring news articles to class
2	Jan 12	Poverty measurement, magnitude, and dynamics	(A1) Submit paper topic via Canvas by Monday, Jan 18
3	Jan 19	Inequality, stratification, and marginalization	Bring completed SSS to class Group 1 leads discussion
4	Jan 26	Caring, gender and family structure	Group 2 leads discussion Bring hard copy draft (A1) to class for Peer paper feedback groups
5	Feb 2	Labor markets and employment <i>Guest speaker: Hilary Wething</i>	(A2) Submit Part I draft via Canvas by Friday, Feb 5
6	Feb 9	Race, ethnicity, and nativity	Group 3 leads discussion
7	Feb 16	Place, poverty, inequality	Bring hard copy of (A2) and draft of A3 to class for peer paper feedback groups
8	Feb 23	American policies	Group 4 leads discussion (A3) Submit Part II via Canvas by Friday, Feb 26
9	Mar 1	American Policies / Future directions <i>Guest speaker: Rebecca Rebbe</i>	Group 5 leads discussion A4) Submit key findings via Canvas by Sunday, Mar 6
10	Mar 8	Integration and wrap up	Peer presentation of (A4) in class
Submit final paper (A5) via Canvas by Monday March 14			

*Specific readings, timing of topics, and assignment due dates are subject to change and adjustment as needed in order to help students meet course objectives. Expect updates throughout the quarter.

** Unless otherwise announced, assignments should be turned in via the class website by 11:59pm.

Final Paper Assignment – UPDATED 1/22/16

<p>A1 JAN 18</p>	<p>No more than <u>2 double-spaced pages</u>, describe the inequality or poverty-related condition you will investigate this quarter.</p> <p><u>Motivate your topic</u>: Tell us what is the empirical question, why it’s important, and what data will you use to describe it. Include a graph of these data if you like (you will be making one for A2)</p>
<p>A2 FEB 5</p>	<p>No more than <u>4 double-spaced pages</u> and include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief introduction outlining the purpose and key points of the paper, • A concise statement of the inequality or condition to be investigated, • A discussion of relevant context and definitions of important concepts, • An original table or graph using data from your research showing the comparison, • A discussion of what it reveals. <p><u>Support all statements of fact with references to academic, governmental or reputable non-governmental sources of information</u>. Use language that clearly documents the situation without eliciting emotion or action. Let the facts speak for themselves.</p>
<p>A3 FEB 26</p>	<p>Explanations for why poverty or inequalities exist may draw on <u>individual or structural arguments</u>. Such explanations inform and justify policy responses. The second part of the paper asks for <u>two explanatory frameworks</u> for the inequality or poverty-related condition examined in Part I and theory-informed implications for policy. Analysis drawn from readings for this course, the Intellectual Foundations (Hub) course, or external sources may be useful in developing this argument. Show the relevance and potentially useful implications from each perspective and avoid “straw person” comparisons in which one perspective is obviously flawed.</p> <p>Approximately <u>4 to 6 double-spaced pages</u> and include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief summary of two explanatory frameworks (<u>1 individual, 1 structural</u>), referencing scholars who developed and/or applied the perspective to issues of poverty and inequality; • A discussion of the relevance of the two frameworks for explaining the inequality or condition demonstrated by your research and their relationship to one another (e.g., competing, complementary or alternative explanations); • A more detailed application of each perspective to your research finding; and <p>A discussion of the implications of each for policy: What policy goals would be implied by each perspective? How might these be achieved? (i.e., what types of benefits, services, conditions? Who would be eligible and on what basis? etc.)</p>
<p>A4 MAR 6</p>	<p>Imagine you have been selected by a policy group you work with to present information to a local or state policy maker. You have only a few short minutes to describe your issue, why they should care, and one option of what they can do. Anticipate at least one question they might have for you. Leave them with a <u>1 page policy brief</u> as a reminder of your conversation.</p> <p>For class, prepare a <u>maximum 5 minute summary</u> of your research this quarter to present to the class, along with a 1 page handout to be distributed in class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the inequality or disparity you examined, including one key figure (graph or table) that captures the essential issue. • Motivate your topic - tell us why it is important or we should care, who is impacted? • What should we do about it? Provide one policy idea that is a direct outgrowth of one of the explanatory frameworks you used in A3.
<p>A5 MAR 14</p>	<p>The final product should be <u>no less than 9 pages of text</u> excluding references and the cover page. The <u>maximum page limit is 15 pages</u> for all parts included. Use a standard 12 point font (such as Times Roman or Arial), double-space the text, use 1 inch margins. Follow APA style and format guidelines as found in the <i>SSW Guidelines for Student Papers</i>.</p> <p>Integrate all parts of A2 and A3. Make sure your paper flows. Also include a <u>minimum 1 page</u> social justice analysis of each policy implication.</p>

Grading Rubric for Final Paper

Demographic description

Demographic information lacking, incorrect or fails to describe basic elements of the situation.	Key demographic issues defined, situation described using demographic details from reputable sources.	Demographic definitions and description of key dimensions clearly link to theory and policy. Facts documented using appropriate sources and discussion of potential errors as needed.
--	---	---

Theory, policy and social justice

Lack of analysis. Under-developed theories, vague policy discussion, lack of fit between theory and policy. Unsupported or under-reasoned opinions.	Two specific and distinct theories described, applied and linked to relevant policies. Policies described. Social justice implications considered.	Theories and policies thoughtfully described, linked, compared or contrasted and critiqued on basis of specific social justice concepts. Documentation as needed.
---	--	---

Incorporation of concepts from class lectures and reading

Unrelated to course topics, unable to distinguish major course ideas.	References made to readings when topics match. Greater use of class concepts would have strengthened paper.	Used course concepts thoughtfully to strengthen and address complexities of argument.
---	---	---

Clarity of argument

Paper focused on one central idea, but thesis is unclear. Parts of paper (sentences, paragraphs, sections) not related to key ideas.	Paper focused on one central argument. Paper structure clear and consistent with argument.	Central argument clearly stated and supported including consideration of complexities. Paper structure—paragraphs, sub-headings, organization—reinforce argument.
--	--	---

Quality of editing

Errors in citation, grammar, spelling, punctuation, syntax or tone impeded reading.	A few writing errors, awkward syntax, or discernable APA errors. Tone generally appropriate.	Excellent editing for APA citation style, grammar, spelling, punctuation and syntax. Tone supports purpose.
---	--	---

Readings by week

Readings should be completed and contemplated before class. Please bring copies of the readings or detailed notes to class. Readings other than the Iceland text are available on our course website.

Week 1 (JANUARY 5)

Introduction: Poverty and inequality

REQUIRED READING

- * Iceland, chapter 1
- * O'Hara, Mary. 2014. Poverty and class: the latest themes to enter the US banned-book debate. *The Guardian* (October 21). <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/oct/21/us-adds-poverty-to-dangerous-reading-lists>

Self-selected news articles

OPTIONAL READING

- Scott, Janny and David Leonhardt. 2005. "Shadowy lines that still divide." *New York Times*. (May 15).
- Porter, Eduardo. 2013. "America's sinking middle class." *New York Times* (September 18).

Week 2 (JANUARY 12)

Poverty measurement, magnitude and trends

REQUIRED READING

- * Iceland, chapters 2-3
- * US Census. 2014. Infographic: How Census Measures Poverty. Accessed September 15, 2014 at http://www.census.gov/library/infographics/poverty_measure-how.html
- * DeNavas-Walt, Carmen and Bernadette D. Proctor, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-252, *Income and Poverty in the United States: 2014*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 2014. Accessed September 25, 2014 at <http://census.gov/library/publications/2015/demo/p60-252.html>
(skim p. 1-20 and read "Income in the United States" Highlights (p. 5 and Figure 1) and "Poverty in the United States" Highlights (p. 12 and Figure 4).
- * Rector, R. and R. Sheffield. 2011. Air conditioning, cable TV, and an Xbox: What is poverty in the United States today? (Backgrounder paper no. 2575, pp. 23). Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

AND one or more of the following

- Watch "Interpreting demographic information" lecture by Jennifer Romich, posted on course website.
- Cramer, Reid. 2003. The misleading way we count the poor: Alternatives to our antiquated poverty measure should consider assets. Issue brief #3. Washington, DC, New America Foundation.
- Hacker, Jacob. (2010). Understanding Economic Insecurity. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Communities & Banking. Downloaded 9/27/15
http://www.bostonfed.org/commdev/c&b/2011/fall/Hacker_economic_insecurity.pdf

McKernan, S., C. Ratcliffe, and S.R. Cellini. 2009. Transition in and out of poverty (*Understanding Poverty Fact Sheet* no. 1, pp.2). Washington, DC, The Urban Institute.

OPTIONAL READING

Pettit, R. 2009. Summary of “Enumerating inequality: The Constitution, The Census Bureau, and the criminal justice system.” *Poverty Flash 2009-10*. West Coast Poverty Center.

Akee, R.K.Q. and J.B. Taylor. 2014. Summary of “Social and Economic Change on American Indian Reservations.” Sarasota, FL: Taylor Policy Group, Inc.

Badgett, L., L. Durson, A. Schneebaum. 2013. New Patterns of Poverty in the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Community. Los Angeles: Williams Institute, UCLA. Report (June).

(Optional background for the Badgett et al) Gates, Gary. 2011. How Many People are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender? Los Angeles: Williams Institute, UCLA. Report (April).

U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. “Facts for Features: Anniversary of Americans with Disabilities Act.” Report

CB14-FF.15 (May 28). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Week 3 (JANUARY 19) Inequality, stratification and marginalization

Discussion group 1: self-sufficiency standard

REQUIRED READING

* Iceland, chapter 4 and chapter 5 (read pages 79-88; skim remaining sections).

* Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2012). *The Price of Inequality*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapter 1 “America’s 1 Percent Problem.”

* Massey, D. S. 2007. Chapter 1 “How stratification works.” *Categorically Unequal*. New York: Russell Sage.

* [watch before class] Wilkerson, Richard. 2011. “How economic inequality harms societies.” TED talk. http://www.ted.com/talks/richard_wilkinson.html

AND one or more of the following

Autor, David H. (2014) “Skills, education, and the rise of earnings inequality among the ‘other 99 percent’.” *Science* 344: 6168 (p. 838-851).

Alzer, Anna and Currie, Janet (2014) “The intergenerational transmission of inequality: Maternal disadvantage and health at birth.” *Science* 344: 6168 (p. 856-861).

Krugman, P. 2002. For richer: How the permissive capitalism of the boom destroyed American equality. *The New York Times Magazine*, 9 pages. (October 20).

Sullivan, Laura, Meschede, Tatjana, Dietrich, Lars and Shapiro, Thomas. (2015) *The Racial Wealth Gap: Why Policy Matters*. Washington D.C: Demos.

OPTIONAL READING

Schiller, B. 2004. Inequality. *The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination* (9th ed). Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Kawachi, I., R. G. Wilkinson, et al. 1999. "Introduction" p. xi – xxxiv. *The Society and Population Health Reader*. New York, the New Press.

Piketty, T. and E. Saez. 2014. Inequality in the long run. *Science* 344: 6168 (p. 838-843).

Week 4 (JANUARY 26) Caring, gender, and family structure

Peer paper groups: Exploring explanatory frameworks for your topics: bring copy of A1 draft

Discussion group 2: Considering explanatory frameworks from the literature

REQUIRED READING

* Iceland, chapter 5 (pp 88 to end)

* DeParle, J. 2012. "Two classes, divided by 'I do.'" *New York Times* (July 15).

* McLanahan, S., & Percheski, C. 2008. Family structure and the reproduction of inequalities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 257-276.

* [watch before class] Mass Incarceration, Visualized

<http://www.theatlantic.com/video/index/404890/prison-inherited-trait/>

AND one or more of the following

Bender-Baird, K. 2011. "Introduction" (P. 1 through footnote 42 on p. 7 only) from *Transgender Employment Experiences*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Coates, T.N. 2015. "The Black Family in the Age of Mass Incarceration." *The Atlantic* (October 2015).

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/10/the-black-family-in-the-age-of-mass-incarceration/403246/>

Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) 20015. "Poverty and opportunity." In *The Status of Women in the States 2015*. Washington D.C.: author.

Pyles, Loretta. 2006. Toward Safety for Low-Income Battered Women: Promoting Economic Justice Strategies. *Families in Society*, 87(1):63-70.

Scott, Ellen K. and Leymon, Ann Shirley. 2013. Making Ends Meet During the Great Recession: How Child Care Subsidies Matter to Low-Wage Women. *Journal of Poverty*, 17(63-85).

Gornick, J. C. & Meyers, M. K. (2008). Creating Gender Egalitarian Societies: An Agenda for Reform. *Politics and Society* 36(3): 313-349.

OPTIONAL READING

Browse "Parents and Children" and "Meeting Basic Needs" sections of

<http://childrenschances.org/global-maps/>

Nawyn, Stephanie J. and Gjakaj, Linda. 2014. The Magnifying Effects of Privilege: Earnings Inequalities at the Intersection of Gender, Race and Nativity. *Feminist Formations*, 26(2):85-106.

Pearce, D. 1999. Welfare is not for women: Why the war on poverty cannot conquer the feminization of poverty. In L Gordon E., *Women, the State and Welfare*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, p. 265-271 (Page numbers unclear - read up to the "The War on Poverty's Approach to Poverty").

Romich, J. et al. 2014. Summary of “Implementation and early outcomes of the City of Seattle Paid Sick and Safe Time Ordinance.” Seattle, WA: Office of City Auditor.

Ybarra, Marci. 2013. Implications of Paid Family Leave for Welfare Participants. *Social Work Research*, 37(4): 375-387.

Week 5 (FEBRUARY 2) Labor markets and employment

REQUIRED READINGS

- * Iceland, chapter 6
- * Egan, T. 2005. “No degree and no way back to the middle” *New York Times*. (May 24). (reprinted as Chapter 7 in *Class Matters*.)
- * Blank, R. 2009. “Economic change and the structure of opportunity for less-skilled workers.” From Cancian, M. and Danziger, S. ed. *Changing Poverty, Changing Policies*. New York: Russell Sage.
- * [listen to before class] To the Best of Our Knowledge, “Temporary and Part-Time: The Rise of a New Precarious Workforce” <http://www.ttbook.org/book/rise-precarious-employment>
- * Hanauer, N. 2015. “The Capitalist’s Case for a \$15 Minimum Wage”. Bloomberg View. <http://www.bloombergvie.com/articles/2013-06-19/the-capitalist-s-case-for-a-15-minimum-wage>

AND one or more of the following

- Bernhardt, Annette. 2012. The Role of Labor Market Regulation in Rebuilding Economic Opportunity in the United States. *Work and Occupations*, 39(4): 354-375.
- Heckman, James. 2008. The Case for Investing in Disadvantaged Young Children. In *Big Ideas for Children*, Washington D.C.: First Focus.
- Shaefer, H. Luke. 2010. Nonstandard Work and Economic Crisis: What Changes Should We Expect? *Journal of Poverty*, 14:17-32.
- Sykes, Jennifer, Kriz, Katrin, Edin, Kathryn, and Halpern-Meekin. 2015. Dignity and Dreams: What the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) Means to Low Income Families. *American Sociological Review*, 80(2): 243-267.

OPTIONAL READINGS

- Benach, J., Vives, A., Amble, M., Vanroelen, C., Tarafa, G., and Muntaner, C. 2014. Precarious Employment: Understanding an Emerging Social Determinant of Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 35:229-53.
- Piketty, T. 2014. “Introduction” *Capital in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Okun, A. M. 1975. Ch. 2. “The case for the market.” *Equality and Efficiency*. Washington, The Brookings Institution: 32-64.

Week 6 (FEBRUARY 9) Race, ethnicity and nativity

Discussion Group 3: apply Reskin’s model of a race discrimination system to the “Disproportionate Risk of Driving While Black”

REQUIRED READING

- * Reskin, B. 2012. The race discrimination system. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38:17–35.
- * Wilson, William Julius. 2010. Why Both Social Structure and Culture Matter in a Holistic Analysis of Inner City Poverty. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 629:200-219.
- * Western, B., & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration & social inequality. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 8-19.
- * LaFraniere, Sharon and Lehen, Andrew W. The Disproportionate Risk of Driving While Black. New York Times, October 24 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/25/us/racial-disparity-traffic-stops-driving-black.html?_r=1

OPTIONAL READING

Abrego, L.J., Gonzalez, R. 2010. “Blocked Paths, Uncertain Futures: The Postsecondary Education and Labor Market Prospects of Undocumented Latino Youth” *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 15(1-2): 144-157.

Coates, T-N. 2014. “The case for reparations.” *The Atlantic*. June. P. 55-71.

Lui, M., Robles, B. J., Leondar-Wright, B., Brewer, R. M., & Adamson, R. 2006. Land rich, dirt poor: Challenges to asset building in Native America. *The Color of Wealth*. NY: New Press. p. 29-72.

Week 7 (FEBRUARY 16) Place and poverty

Peer group feedback: Bring copy of A2 to class.

REQUIRED READING

- * Reardon, Sean F, Fox, Lindsay, Townsend, & Joseph. (n.d.). Neighborhood Income Composition by Household Race and Income, 1990–2009. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 660(1), 78-97.
- * Freeman, L. (2011). Chapter 3: There Goes the Hood. *There Goes the Hood Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. p. 59-94
- * Stoll, M. 2008. Race, place and poverty revisited. In A.C. Lin & D. R. Harris (eds.), *The Colors of Poverty* (pp. 293-322). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

AND one or more of the following

Kneebone, E. and Berube, A. 2013. *Confronting Suburban Poverty in America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Selections.

Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. N.d. Quil Ceda Village / The Tulalip Tribes (Tulalip, WA). Honoring Nations case study, 2003 awardee. HPAIED.

Hair, N et al. (2015). Association of Child Poverty, Brain Development, and Academic Attainment. *JAMA Pediatr*. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475

Week 8 (FEBRUARY 23) American policies

Discussion Group 4: Backwards mapping from policy to explanatory assumptions

Peer Feedback: Bring draft A3: explanatory frameworks

REQUIRED READINGS

Iceland, chapter 7

Giffords, E.D. and Garber, K. R. 2014. "Contemporary responses to poverty." From *New Perspectives on Poverty*. (p.36-59). Chicago, IL: Lyceum.

Skocpol, T. 1991. "Targeting within universalism: Politically viable policies to combat poverty in the United States." In Jencks, C. & Peterson, P.E. (eds.) *The Urban Underclass* (pp 411-436). Washington, DC: Brookings.

Piven, F. F. and R. A. Cloward. 1993. Relief, labor and civil disorder: An overview. *Regulating The Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. New York, Vintage Books: 3-42. (read for background)

AND one or more of the following ** are these point of view or empirical?

Rector, R. and P. Fagan, 1996. How welfare harms kids. Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* 1084. June 5, 1996. pp. 1-11.

Currie, J. 2006. Welfare vs. "Making work pay." *The Invisible Safety Net*. (p. 11-32) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

OPTIONAL READINGS

Bardach, E. 2005. "Things governments do." From *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*. (p. 123-131) Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Week 9 (MARCH 1) Future directions

Discussion group 5: What roles can social workers play in the future?

REQUIRED READINGS

*Blank, R. (2003). Selecting Among Anti-Poverty Policies: Can an Economist be Both Critical and Caring? *Review of Social Economy* (4).

*Romich, J. L., Simmelink, J., & Holt, S. D. 2007. When working harder does not pay: Low-income working families, tax liabilities, and benefit reductions. *Families in Society*, 88(3), 418-426.

*Dominelli, Lena. (2013). Environmental justice at the heart of social work: Greening the profession. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 22:431-439.

OPTIONAL READINGS

Duncan, G.J., Huston, A., Weisner, T. 2008. Selections from *Higher ground: New Hope for the working poor and their children*. New York: Russell Sage.

Bos, J. M., Duncan, G. J., Gennetian, L., & Hill, H. 2007. *New Hope: Fulfilling America's Promise to "Make Work Pay"*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Beatty, Abigail and Foster, Dionne. (2015). *The Determinants of Equity*. Seattle: King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget

Vallestero, Nichole Keenan and Greewich, Howard (2014) *Economic and Equity Outcomes of a \$15/hr Minimum Wage in Seattle*. Seattle: Puget Sound Sage.

Abramovitz, M., & Morgen, S. 2006. *Taxes are a Woman's Issue*. Selection.

Romich, J.L. Review: *Taxes are a Woman's Issue*. *Affilia, a Journal of Women and Social Work*.

Standing, Guy. (2012). The Precariat: From Denizens to Citizens? *Polity*, 44(4): 588-608.

Alkon, Alison Hope. (2014). Food Justice and the Challenge to Neoliberalism. *Gastronomica*, 14(2): 27-40.

Week 10 (MARCH 8)**Integration and wrap-up**

Class Activity: Key finding presentations

REQUIRED READINGS

* Iceland, Conclusion

* Meyers, Marcia K. (2014). Are we asking the wrong questions about poverty? *Social Service Review* 88(4).

OPTIONAL READINGS

Rank, M.R. 2014. "Why poverty and inequality undermine justice in America." In Reisch, M. *International Handbook of Social Justice*. p. 436-447. New York: Routledge.

Folbre, N. 2001. Ch. 9 "Dancing in the dark" *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York, New Press.