Online and Blended Social Work Education in Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia: Negotiating the Tensions

Sophie Goldingay, David Hodgson, Jennifer Boddy, Sharlene Nipperess and Lynelle Watts

Sophie Goldingay – School of Health and Social Development, Deakin University
David Hodgson – School of Occupational Therapy, Social Work and Speech Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University
Jennifer Boddy – School of Human Services and Social Work, Griffith University
Sharlene Nipperess – School of Global Urban and Social Studies, RMIT University
Lynelle Watts – School of Occupational Therapy, Social Work and Speech Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University

Address for Correspondence:
sophie.goldingay@deakin.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Online and digital learning is rapidly expanding and driving demand for digital innovation in social work education in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand. Internal and external accreditation standards are grappling with what this means for social work education. In addition, educators are experimenting with innovative online methods with promising results, including online skills education and placement preparation. This has called on social work educators to design and develop online and digital curricula pedagogies and innovations, which are responsive to internal and external drivers that are evidence-based, and which are underpinned by social justice principles of access and equity. Nevertheless, the digital divide may compromise important principles such as access and equity. This paper explores some of the current debates and tensions within social work online education in Australia and New Zealand and makes suggestions for the profession moving forward.

Keywords: *Social work education; Online learning; Social work skills; Field education; Digital divide*

THE CONTEXT OF DIGITAL AND ONLINE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA AND AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

A perennial problem for practice educators in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand in social work is how to prepare students to be competent, ethical, critical and yet flexible professionals (Agllias, 2010; Beddoe, 2018; Beddoe, Hay, Maidment, Ballantyne, & Walker, 2018; Wilson & Kelly, 2010). The increasing complexity of social work practice, coupled with diminishing resources worldwide in social service delivery, has meant that social service agencies' active involvement in ensuring social work students' competency gaps are addressed is unsustainable (Phillips et al., 2018). Consequently, digital technologies have contributed to the preparation for social work practice using practice simulations (Vandsburger, Duncan-Daston, Akerson, & Dillon, 2010) and digital storytelling (Christiansen, 2011; Goldingay, Epstein, & Taylor, 2018), building on other disciplines such as nursing and medicine (see for example, Hogg & Miller, 2016; Dickinson, Hopton, & Pilling, 2016). Nevertheless, an ongoing problem is how to define and regulate quality and standards of social work education by the many providers operating in this space. This is particularly so due to ongoing debates about what preparation means, with ongoing tensions between employers' expectations and social work academics' values about what should be prioritised in social work education (Morley & Dunstan, 2013). Alongside these tensions, both in Australia and New Zealand, is the digital divide which limits access to digital technologies.

Social work and social work education do not have a lengthy history in Australia or New Zealand. In Australia, it was not until 1940 that university social work education commenced with the establishment of the social work program at the University of Sydney (Agbim & Ozanne, 2007). The Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) was established in 1946, which originally included all states except Tasmania (AASW, 2019b). There are now 30 providers of qualifying social work programs across Australia—29 public universities and one private provider, with the Australian Catholic University offering programs in three separate states. Courses range from four-year bachelor programs to a diverse range of double degrees, through to two-year master's qualifying programs.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, 17 providers of social work education were registered in 2015 (Beddoe et al., 2018). Social work education in the university setting in New Zealand began in 1947 at Victoria University in Wellington, reproducing the British model of casework and social administration. The New Zealand Association of Social Workers (NZASW) was established in 1964. Between 1973 and 1986, further programs were established, and the New Zealand Social Work Training Council set basic minimum accreditation standards, although these caused controversy amongst stakeholders (Nash & Munford, 2001). In addition, relations between universities and employers weakened due to questions about the goodness of fit between what employers and agencies wanted social workers to be trained in and what was taught at university (Nash & Munford, 2001). Nevertheless, New Zealand has been successful in instigating registration of social workers via the Social Work Registration Act (2003), with mandatory registration and protection of title coming into force in 2018 (Beddoe et al., 2018). Furthermore, social work education in New Zealand is underpinned by a bi-cultural approach that recognises the history and impact of Western colonisation and includes the voices and experiences of Māori people and Indigenous knowledges in informing health and social welfare policies and practices (Beddoe, 2018).

Thus, in both Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand, historically and today, tensions have been high in relation to how to produce graduates who can cope with the *real world*. At the heart of the tensions are questions regarding the real world from whose perspective? The local or the global? Individual or societal? Agency mandate or social work values? In New Zealand, the Social Work Registration Act (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2019), aimed to improve accountability and therefore the standing of the social work profession following pervasive critique of social workers (Beddoe, 2018; Hunt, 2017; Hunt, Staniforth, & Beddoe, 2019), and defined the minimum qualifications for social work practice. Registration for all practising social workers is expected to be mandatory by 2020, but questions remain whether this will strengthen the professionalisation of social work in Aotearoa New Zealand to better meet community needs (Hunt et al., 2019). In response to contestation around what preparation means, a three-year project was launched entitled *Enhancing Readiness to Practice*. This project included a taxonomy of terms in social work education, curriculum mapping, surveys and focus groups with supervisors and providers of qualifying social work degrees, and production of a Professional Capabilities Framework. Findings included students' varying feelings of confidence or self-doubt, and practitioners' observation that graduates perceived their confidence dropped after a couple of years in practice due to the climate and resourcing in agencies and the complexity of challenges facing client groups (Beddoe et al., 2018). Practitioners and students did not raise the issue of how confidence related to competence, however, nor was it explored in relation to the impact of this on their clients' and their own wellbeing.

Similarly, in Australia, social work education has experienced significant change over recent years reflecting broader changes in the tertiary education sector. Student numbers have increased and there has been a significant increase in international students (Cooper, 2007; Norton, Cherastidtham, & Mackey, 2018). Globalisation and internationalisation have seen universities extending their reach beyond Australia, and increasingly, Australian social work is being taught in a range of international contexts. Higher education is changing to respond to these and other imperatives and questions about the content and purpose of social work curriculum become even more salient in preparing graduates for social work practice in international contexts, posing dilemmas for those tasked with regulating social work curriculum standards.

Despite these complexities and competing forces, moves to register the social work profession have not been supported in Australia. Instead, the AASW formulated a set of guidelines for the purposes of conducting accreditation reviews, generally on a five-yearly basis. These guidelines are outlined in the Australian Social Work Education Accreditation Standards (ASWEAS) (AASW, 2012). The ASWEAS traditionally undergo regular review via consultation processes conducted by the AASW with stakeholders including employers and students. At the time of writing, the results of the most recent review were rejected by the Council of Heads of Schools of Social Work (ACHSSW) and the accreditation standards reverted back to the 2012/2015 standards. The ACHSSW has put forward to the AASW that they were in the best position to guide the standards due to their expertise although, at the time of writing, it is not clear if this was agreed upon. As agreement on the best way forward has been stalled, the most current standards utilised for accreditation are those from 2012, revised in 2015 (AASW, 2019a), thus now being out of date and potentially out of step with the thinking of educators and practising social workers and their employers.

One of the tensions arising from this debate over accreditation standards, which has led to this impasse, is the general movement away from an input model of accreditation (what programs must provide to students) to one that focusses on outcomes for graduates and an emphasis on learning outcomes (PhillipsKPA, 2017). Professional accreditation bodies in other disciplines have moved away from a focus on curriculum content, staff–student ratios and library resources and instead have turned their attention to learning outcomes and the knowledge and skills graduates should be able to demonstrate (PhillipsKPA, 2017). The ASWEAS process has been slow to engage with this paradigm shift as the current requirements still emphasise an input and resources model. This has meant that the profession has been slow to engage with the trend of digital technology within higher education generally. Further, this emphasis on content and resources has hampered programs from innovating in blended, online and distance education. At the same time, universities, other HEP institutions and other allied health disciplines are moving swiftly to capitalise on new digital communications technology. Nowhere in Australia is this tension between inputs versus learning outcomes been more evident than in debates about face-to-face requirements for social work programs providing distance education.

Currently in Australia, ASWEAS dictate that social work courses must provide the input of face-to-face interaction within their flexible or off-campus delivery options. A similar situation occurs in New Zealand with the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) mandating distance programs to also deliver compulsory in-person, face-to-face content. Both the SWRB and the ASWEAS specify and define what is considered face-to-face (compulsory classroom teaching where students are present in person) and how much time programs are required to deliver to students. Furthermore, the ASWEAS suggest that the purpose of this face-to-face component should be for the instruction of social work skill development.

Despite the AASW mandating face-to-face, in-person attendance in social work education, one of the key changes that has occurred in the last decade is the significant increase in off-campus study. While many would think of higher education as primarily on-campus and face-to-face in a classroom, Australia has a long history of offering programs off-campus. The University of Queensland, for example, established a Department of Correspondence in 1911 (Latchem, 2018) demonstrating that off-campus study has been a feature of higher education for some time. Alongside this, the delivery of online and technology enhanced or mediated higher education courses, including social work, has increased dramatically around the world (Davis, Greenaway, Moore, & Cooper, 2019; Levin, Fulginiti, & Moore, 2018; Reamer, 2019). The rapid adoption of online studies is relatively recent due to improved educational technology via the internet and the increase in demand for postgraduate study from students who often have significant work, family or other responsibilities (Cooper, 2007; Norton et al., 2018). Changes in prioritising access to education in the name of equity and inclusion have also been influential.

According to Norton et al. (2018) approximately 20% of domestic students in Australia now study off-campus in online format, which is a marked increase from approximately 12% in 1989. Mature-age students and postgraduate students prefer off-campus study while school leavers overwhelmingly prefer on-campus study. At the same time, multi-modal study (a mix of online and on-campus) has rapidly increased from approximately

2% in 1989 to 13% in 2016. Combined, a third of students have a significant proportion of their study away from their campus (Norton et al., 2018).

Of the 30 providers of social work education in Australia, 12 offer *distance education*, the descriptor used by the AASW to describe programs that offer social work programs that are offered off-campus essentially online (AASW, 2019a). Some of these providers have a long history of distance education (see Crisp, 2018), others are relatively new to online delivery. But, as Fiona McDermott (2019, p. 1) saliently notes in her introduction to the themed issue of *Australian Social Work* on social work education, "diverse teaching approaches—online, on-campus, distance—are the norm rather than the exception". In New Zealand, there are two main providers of distance education—Massey University and the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand—although a small number offer units or year levels in online modes. Massey University is the only university in New Zealand offering a degree by distance education and is the longest-serving four-year Bachelor of Social Work degree in New Zealand (Massey University, 2019).

TEACHING CORE SOCIAL WORK SKILLS ONLINE

One of the vexed issues in social work distance education is how to teach core social work skills online, particularly communication, interactive and assessment skills. It should be pointed out, however, that the notion of skills goes much broader to also include critical thinking, judgement, decision-making and emotional awareness and use of self, among others. Critics of online delivery argue that these skills are best taught, developed and assessed in traditional face-to-face settings (Groshong et al., 2013). Others argue that core social work skills can be taught online effectively, providing certain conditions of best practice online curriculum design and teaching and learning are met (Cummings, Chaffin, & Milam, 2019; Goldingay & Boddy, 2017; Goldingay, Epstein, & Taylor, 2018; Goldingay & Land, 2014; Phillips et al., 2018; Siebert & Spaulding-Givens, 2006). Relatedly, several social service providers now deliver counselling online, further justifying the use of digital technologies to enable students to practise in effective and ethical ways (Goldingay & Boddy, 2017; Hunt, 2002; Reamer, 2019).

Jones (2015) reports that foundational communication, intervention and assessment skills can be taught online, but teaching therapeutic and counselling skills is more challenging. This contrasts with Phillips' 2018 study that found students who learnt skills online performed better than those taught face-to-face across a wide range of competencies including cultural competency, evidence-based practice, professionalism, ethics, thinking and judgement and practice skills to name a few (Phillips et al., 2018). However, as Jones notes, the curriculum and use of technology to teach skills online must be rigorous and carefully designed to maximise the effective use of technology, a point also illustrated by Siebert and Spaulding-Givens in their detailed exposition of an online skills unit (2006).

The debates, challenges and potentials of teaching social work skills online have begun to be systematically examined in the research literature in the context of broader research into the effectiveness of online social work education more generally. There is a substantial body of research comparing educational outcomes of online and traditional face-to-face social

work education finding no significant difference between them (e.g., Cummings, Chaffin, & Cockerham, 2015; Siebert, Siebert, & Spaulding-Givens, 2006; Siebert & Spaulding-Givens, 2006; Wretman & Macy, 2016). While much social work skills education in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere still relies on a face-to-face learning environment to teach social work skills, there is an emergence of evidence-based examples of social work skills taught wholly online. A systematic review of the evidence into the effectiveness or otherwise of online social work education in the United States concluded that "the findings overwhelmingly support the hypothesis that technology-based methods yield outcomes on par with those found among traditional, classroom-based lecture methods" (Wretman & Macy, 2016, p. 415). Moreover, a very recent study comparing online to face-to-face social work learning outcomes in the United States compared skills outcomes (as measured by field evaluation) and knowledge (as measured by exam scores) and found that those that studied online had higher skills scores but those who studied face-to-face had higher knowledge scores. They also found that those who studied online reported higher rates of preparedness for practice (Cummings et al., 2019).

Despite this, there are still concerns about quality, academic integrity and digital privacy that warrant attention (Reamer, 2013a, 2019). Furthermore, student isolation and disconnection amidst competing demands on time such as paid employment present a persistent challenge for distance educators (Hemy, McAuliffe, & Fowler, 2018). As pointed out by Crisp (2018), it is too simplistic to generalise from the evidence that all online modes of delivery are equivalent to face-to-face environments. Like most things, it turns on the quality and development of the online offering to meet pedagogical goals in a planned and systematic way.

For example, some innovations in social work have begun to make use of video case studies and interactive multi-media. Pack (2016) reports on a series of multi-media child-protection case studies involving paid actors used to develop and assess student's discretionary decision-making skills in child protection. Similarly, Goldingay, Epstein et al. (2018) developed and filmed a digital story and acted case study that students interact with online by demonstrating the application of theory and assessment skills. Elsewhere, Washburn and Zhou (2018) reviewed and evaluated two popular simulated learning tools for enhancing online social work skills education: Virtual Patient, and Second Life. Both simulation tools utilise 3D avatar technology to teach social work skills and the development of values and emotional awareness. Like the work by Pack (2016) and Goldingay Epstein and Taylor, these simulation tools allow for repeated exposure, safe experimentation, convenient access, and experiences that may not be provided by classroom or placement experiences (Washburn & Zhou, 2018).

Although there is evidence of new digital approaches in online teaching and learning, numerous complicating factors warrant attention. Levin et al. (2018) point out that, although there is an extensive research demonstrating the effectiveness and student satisfaction of online and distance social work education, many educators remain sceptical and frequently judge online and distance delivery of social work education as inferior to face-to-face and traditional delivery modes (see for example, Sawrikar, Lenette, McDonald, & Fowler, 2015). The reasons behind this judgement are many and varied, but educator perceptions of online teaching can be negatively influenced by: a lack of leadership and stakeholder engagement in curriculum development; workload concerns; a lack of interest and preparedness for

online teaching and learning; and, concerns about the way technology mediates relationship building (Levin et al., 2018). These issues are not insurmountable, and can be ameliorated by: supporting academic staff with developing technical and online teaching competence; creating an engaging pedagogy that supports students to feel socially and intellectually connected; judicious and planned use of technology within a coherent curriculum; a supportive and technologically agile institutional context (Davis et al., 2019); adequate workload with small and manageable online class sizes (Pelech et al., 2013); and, a team and collaborative approach to curriculum development (Maple, Jarrott, & Kuyini, 2013).

In summary, although still a contested debate, the literature reports good evidence for the effectiveness and benefits of online social work education, and there are emerging examples of innovations that showcase approaches to methods that contribute to online social work skills education. In the United States, accrediting bodies set clear guidelines to ensure online education is achieving its aims of preparing social workers for practice in the digital age (Reamer, 2019). As pointed out, these innovations and the rigour and quality needed for online social work education cannot occur in a vacuum. A broader context that supports a planned, coherent and thoughtful use of technology is necessary to ensure that the learning outcomes and goals of social work education are met.

USING ONLINE AND DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES TO PREPARE FOR FIELD EDUCATION

While much of the discussion so far has been around substituting classroom face-to-face instruction with online learning experiences, social work in Australia and New Zealand still require a significant number of hours of unpaid placement experiences in agency settings as part of their training. Field education is essentially a face-to-face learning environment. The notion of safe and repeated experimentation and exposure is an important process in learning to be a social worker. This is important due to the potential for harm—to both students and to service users during this training. Being exposed gradually to practice may help avoid triggering mental health problems such as anxiety (Philips et al., 2018), depression or PTSD, or setting in motion resulting cognitive challenges from these conditions.

In addition, a further unexplored aspect of field education training is exposure to harmful power dynamics occurring in placement workspaces. The deleterious effects of workplace bullying on health and mental health have been well documented but the impact on students has not received as much attention. Nevertheless, a recent study of Australian nursing students showed 50.1% had been bullied while on placement (Budden, Birks, Cant, Bagley, & Park, 2017), while a large study of radiography students showed 62.9% of students had been bullied on placement (Society of Radiographers, 2016). Issues such as occupational violence from colleagues and service users are particularly salient for social work students, due to their relatively powerless positioning in being a student coupled with the sometimes-marginalised role of social work in multidisciplinary teams (van Heughten, 2009). Thus, Virtual Clinics and other immersive simulation programs can enable students to obtain skills in recognising and managing these challenging workplace situations before placement, to prepare for and prevent harm that may arise in placement settings.

Service users may also be prevented from harm when students in training are using simulations or virtual learning experiences. This is particularly the case for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service users and communities. For example, the impact of colonialism, including genocide and the Stolen Generation in Australia, has meant it is more difficult for social work students to have an opportunity to be immersed in the cultural practices of an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander nation or be assessed on their ability to work in culturally safe and appropriate ways. Recent studies have demonstrated the enormous detrimental impact that placing Aboriginal children in non-Aboriginal families can have. One of the reasons identified by Government departments for not placing Aboriginal children with kin is inconsistent involvement of, and support for, Aboriginal people and organisations in child protection decision-making (Arney, Iannos, Chong, McDougall, & Parkinson, 2015). Contributing to this is a poor identification and assessment of carers, due to inconsistencies in practitioners' knowledge and skill and a need for a shift in attitudes and understanding of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander family structures and worldviews (Arney et al., 2015). Thus, many social workers and social work students may not follow their own agency's policy guidelines, causing further harm to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander communities (Arney et al., 2015). This may be because new and experienced social work practitioners are underprepared for culturally competent practice.

To work towards addressing this, Goldingay, Satour et al. (2018) created a virtual learning space alongside Traditional Custodians and digital designers, which gives an insight into the importance of culture and connection to land and family for Aboriginal children and their families. Students are placed in the role of social worker and are assessed on their ability to follow guidelines such as the complete DHHS procedures in decolonising ways that maximise self-determination for Aboriginal children, their families and communities (Goldingay, Satour, et al., 2018).

The most recent innovation in online interactive learning experiences in social work are virtual clinics and immersive simulations. While still in their infancy in social work, similar developments have occurred in professions such as nursing (Botma, 2014) occupational therapy (Imms et al., 2017) and psychology (Graj, Sheen, Dudley, Sutherland-Smith, & McGillivray, 2018) where there are immersive simulation experiences as part of the curriculum that enable exposure to complex and emotionally taxing practice situations. Similarly, other disciplines have explored the use of virtual reality to develop empathy in students (Bertrand, Guegan, Robieux, McCall, & Zenasni, 2018). These new developments pave the way for further thinking about how to prepare students for practicum and early graduate practice in ways that have previously not been possible.

THE DIGITAL DIVIDE

Twenty-first century learning technologies developed in other disciplines have the potential to address the gap in social work and support students to receive graduated exposure through immersive and simulated learning. Virtual experiences can occur in classroom situations or in cloud/online situations (with support built around it, such as supervision). These examples and the evidence behind them offer promising directions in teaching social work skills online. However, such technological innovations need to be situated in a supportive

context. Creating the conditions for effective design and delivery of online social work education is essential, and this means moving beyond individual interest and competence in online teaching.

One of the most important considerations in expanding the use of technology in training of social workers is to recognise that not everyone has equal access to technology, whether due to generational factors, income, location or time. The digital divide traditionally refers to inequalities in access to, and use of, the internet and information and communication technologies. Over time, the definition of the digital divide has widened to recognise that it not only refers to a lack of access to technology, but also a lack of *skills* needed to use technology, as well as limited insight into the outcomes or benefits of technology use (Scheerder, van Deursen, & van Dijk, 2017). Thus, the digital divide now also includes recognition of "digital capability" (Attewell, 2001), "digital outcomes" (Wei, Teo, Chan, & Tan, 2011), and "digital disengagement" (Olphert & Damodaran, 2013). Sociodemographic, economic and geographic factors—such as poverty, lower education levels, older age, unemployment, poor broadband speeds, and to a lesser extent gender and ethnicity—commonly influence the digital divide (Serrano-Cinca, Muñoz-Soro, & Brusca, 2018). Such a divide can lead to, inter alia, social exclusion (see for example, Alam & Imran, 2015), affecting people's access to and maintenance of job opportunities (Krueger, Stone, & Lukaszewski, 2018), eHealth literacy (Neter & Brainin, 2012), and access to education (Hill & Lawton, 2018).

Universities are in a unique position to counter the impacts of the digital divide. According to Hill and Lawton (2018), "the impact [of the digital divide] on access and formal learning provides both an opportunity and a moral obligation for universities" (p. 603). Consequently, many universities have focused on enhancing access to, and the quality of, online education. This has meant that universities have expected to see enrolment growth, improved learning and teaching outcomes and processes, wider access to university, and lower costs for delivering and undertaking education (Garrett, 2017). However, there is considerable debate as to whether these expectations have been fulfilled. Online learning is often understood as being flexible (Parker & Wassef, 2010). It can help prepare graduates for emerging digital practice (Goldingay & Boddy, 2017) and it can be tailored to promote specific skill development (Larreamendy-Joerns & Leinhardt, 2006). However, the move to online and blended learning has not been without criticism. Some have argued that it has moved away from a learner-centred approach, overlooking the importance of the process of learning (Sawrikar et al., 2015) and instead focusing on efficiency and economic benefits (Boisselle, 2014; Smith & Jeffery, 2013).

These debates extend to social work and human services education. It is commonly acknowledged that online education increases access and opportunities for education for students living in remote areas and that students can engage in education irrespective of their ability to physically attend a university campus or ability to learn in face-to-face group settings (Goldingay & Boddy, 2017; Kurzman, 2013; Pelech et al., 2013). It may also help women who are undertaking care work in the home and people who are not currently in education, employment or training, all of whom are frequent users of the internet, to complete tertiary study (Serrano-Cinca et al., 2018). This is important if social work

educators are to fulfil their commitment to social justice (Reamer, 2013b). Further, as Sawrikar et al. (2015) have noted, "good social workers come from all walks of life including working families, single parents, remote dwellers and others, and so all should have the opportunity to participate" (p. 345). However, access to the internet and reasonable broadband speeds is not universal (Riddlesden & Singleton, 2014), thus disadvantaging those most affected by the digital divide (Reamer, 2013b).

Consequently, universities—along with schools of social work and human services—need to implement strategies to overcome the digital divide and ensure that access to education is available for all. Strategies must focus on promoting people's digital capabilities, engagement, and benefits, so that students not only have the necessary skills to use the digital learning tools effectively, but also are engaged and see the benefits of doing so (Scheerder et al., 2017). Social work educators need to be mindful of the existing digital divide while at the same time harnessing strategies to promote digital inclusion so that those who may have difficulty attending a university can still participate in education.

CONCLUSION

Many longstanding tensions in social work are influencing important debates and decisions around the governance of social work education in Australia and New Zealand. Despite this, efforts have been made by members in the profession to continue to improve students' experience of social work education. These include efforts to improve readiness to practice and improve access to a range of digital learning mediums, through efforts in innovation and research, and ongoing advocacy within institutions. This has called on social work educators to design and develop online and digital curricula pedagogies and innovations that are responsive to internal and external drivers, are evidence-based, and are underpinned by social justice principles of access and equity. It would be useful for social work educators to continue to offer and evaluate innovative approaches to education, including online mediums, for both skills-development and placement preparation, and minimising of risk to students and service users, while also being mindful of the digital divide which may compromise access and equity for some students. It is also important for accrediting or registration bodies in Australia and New Zealand to remain up to date with the latest research and developments, including international trends towards graduate outcomes as opposed to program inputs. This will help the profession to keep across the rapid improvements in online education and reflect this in accreditation and registration standards. As the twenty-first century advances, openness to work with, accept, respect, and negotiate within the unavoidable tensions for the various educational perspectives is key to moving forward in a way that benefits the profession, students and service users and their communities.

References

Agbim, K., & Ozanne, E. (2007). Social work educators in a changing higher education context: Looking back and looking forward 1982–2005. *Australian Social Work, 60*(1), 68–82. doi:10.1080/03124070601166729

Agllias, K. (2010). Student to practitioner: A study of preparedness for social work practice. *Australian Social Work, 63*(3), 345–360. doi:10.1080/0312407X/2010.498522

Alam, K., & Imran, S. (2015). The digital divide and social inclusion among refugee migrants. *Information Technology & People, 2*8, 344–365. doi:10.1108/ITP-04-2014-0083

Arney, F., Iannos, M., Chong, A., McDougall, S., & Parkinson, S. (2015). *Enhancing the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle: Policy and practice considerations* (CFCA Paper No. 34). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies. Retrieved from aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/enhancing-implementation-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-child

Attewell, P. (2001). The first and second digital divides. *Sociology of Education, 74*(3), 242–259.

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2012). *Australian social work education and accreditation standards (ASWEAS) 2012 V1.4*. Retrieved from https://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/3550

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2019a). *AASW accredited courses*. Retrieved from https://www.aasw.asn.au/careers-study/accredited-courses

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2019b). *Social work milestones*. Retrieved from https://www.aasw.asn.au/about-aasw/aasw-milestones

Beddoe, L. (2018). Social work education in Aotearoa New Zealand: Building a profession. *Practice, 30*(4), 305–320. doi:10.1080/09503153.2018.1478955

Beddoe, L., Hay, K., Maidment, J., Ballantyne, N., & Walker, S. (2018). Readiness to practice social work in Aotearoa New Zealand: Perceptions of students and educators. *Social Work Education, 37*(8), 955–967. doi:10.1080/02615479.2018.1497152

Bertrand, P., Guegan, J., Robieux, L., McCall, C. A., & Zenasni, F. (2018). Learning empathy through virtual reality: Multiple strategies for training empathy-related abilities using body ownership illusions in embodied virtual reality. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 5*(26). doi:10.3389/frobt.2018.00026

Boisselle, L. N. (2014). *Online-learning and its utility to higher education in the Anglophone Caribbean*. SAGE Open, 1–14. doi:10.1177/2158244014555118

Botma, Y. (2014). Nursing student's perceptions on how immersive simulation promotes theory–practice integration. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences, 1*, 1-5. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2014.04.001

Budden, L. M., Birks, M., Cant, R., Bagley, T., & Park, T. (2017). Australian nursing students experience of bullying and/or harassment during clinical placement. *Collegian, 24*(2), 125–133. doi: 10.1016/j.colegn.2015.11.004

Christiansen, A. (2011). Storytelling and professional learning: A phenomenographic study of students' experience of patient digital stories in nurse education. *Nurse Education Today, 31*(3), 289–293.

Cooper, L. (2007). Backing Australia's future: Teaching and learning in social work. *Australian Social Work, 60*(1), 94–106. doi:10.1080/03124070601166745

Crisp, B. R. (2018). From distance to online education: Two decades of remaining responsive by one university social work programme. *Social Work Education, 37*(6), 718–730. doi:10.1080/02615479.2018.1444157

Cummings, S. M., Chaffin, K. M., & Cockerham, C. (2015). Comparative analysis of an online and a traditional MSW program: Educational outcomes. *Journal of Social Work Education, 51*(1), 109–120. doi:10.1080/10437797.2015.977170

Cummings, S. M., Chaffin, K. M., & Milam, A. (2019). Comparison of an online and a traditional MSSW program: A 5-Year Study. *Journal of Social Work Education,* 1–12. doi:10.1080/10437797.2018.1508391

Davis, C., Greenaway, R., Moore, M., & Cooper, L. (2019). Online teaching in social work education: Understanding the challenges. *Australian Social Work, 72*(1), 34–46. doi:10.1080/0312407X.2018.1524918

Dickinson, T., Hopton, J., & Pilling, M. (2016). An evaluation of nursing students' perceptions on the efficacy of high fidelity clinical simulation to enhance their confidence, understanding and competence in managing psychiatric emergencies. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 25*(9–10), 1476–1478.

Garrett, R. (2017). *Whatever happened to the promise of online learning? Wonkhe blog*. Retrieved from http://wonkhe.com/blogs/whatever-happened-to-the-promise-of-online-learning

Goldingay, S., & Boddy, J. (2017). Preparing social work graduates for digital practice: Ethical pedagogies for effective learning. *Australian Social Work, 70*(2), 209–220. doi:10.1080/0312407X.2016.1257036

Goldingay, S., Epstein, S., & Taylor, D. (2018). Simulating social work practice online with digital storytelling: Challenges and opportunities. *Social Work Education, 37*(6), 790–803. doi:10.1080/02615479.2018.1481203

Goldingay, S., & Land, C. (2014). Emotion, the 'e' in engagement in online distance education in social work. *Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Learning, 18*(1), 58–72.

Goldingay, S., Satour, J., & Eccles, C. (2018, April). *Yaneekan-werreeyt: A journey to culturally safe practice through simulated immersion for social work students*. Paper presented to the FLANZ conference, Inception to Infinity, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Graj, E., Sheen, J., Dudley, A., Sutherland-Smith, W., & McGillivray, J. (2019). Enhancing student competency in risky clinical environments: Evaluating an online education program. *Australian Psychologist, 54*(1), 68–79. doi:10.1111/ap.12364

Groshong, L., Mckenna, R., Host, K., Hadley, S., Freeman, J., Kanter, J., . . . Stephenson, D. (2013). *Report on online MSW programs*. Retrieved from https://www.clinicalsocialworkassociation.org/Resources/Documents/CSWA%20-%20Position%20Paper%20-%20Online%20MSW%20Programs%20-%20September2013.pdf

Hemy, M., McAuliffe, D., & Fowler, J. L. (2018). E-connections: Creating online mentoring in social work education. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education, 20*(2), 63–75.

Hill, C., & Lawton, W. (2018). Universities, the digital divide and global inequality. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 40*(6), 598–610. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2018.1531211

Hogg, G., & Miller, D. (2016). The effects of an enhanced simulation programme on medical students' confidence responding to clinical deterioration. *BMC Medical Education*, 16, 161. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0685-2

Hunt, S. (2002). In favour of online counselling? *Australian Social Work, 55*(4), 260–267. doi:10.1080/03124070208410984

Hunt, S. (2017). The social work regulation project in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, 29*(1), 53–64.

Hunt, S., Staniforth, B., & Beddoe, L. (2019). Establishing the qualification criteria for social worker registration in Aotearoa New Zealand: Conflict and compromise. Social Work Education, 1–14. doi:10.1080/02615479.2019.1593957

Imms, C., Chu, E. M. Y., Guinea, S., Sheppard, L., Froude, E., Carter, R., . . . Symmons, M. (2017). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of embedded simulation in occupational therapy clinical practice education: Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials, 18*(1), 345. doi:10.1186/s13063-017-2087-0

Jones, S. (2015). Benefits and challenges of online education for clinical social work: Three examples. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 43*(2), 225–235. doi:10.1007/s10615-014-0508-z

Krueger, D. C., Stone, D. L., & Lukaszewski, K. W. (2018). Age and the digital divide. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability, 13*(3), 75–84.

Kurzman, P. A. (2013). The evolution of distance learning and online education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 33*(4–5), 331–338. doi:10.1080/08841233.2013.843346

Larreamendy-Joerns, J., & Leinhardt, G. (2006). Going the distance with online education. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 567–609.

Latchem, C. (2018). Australia. In A. Qayyum & O. Zawacki-Richter (Eds.), *Open and distance education in Australia, Europe and the Americas: National perspectives in a digital age* (pp. 9–24). Singapore: Springer Open.

Levin, S., Fulginiti, A., & Moore, B. (2018). The perceived effectiveness of online social work education: Insights from a national survey of social work educators. *Social Work Education, 37*(6), 775–789. doi:10.1080/02615479.2018.1482864

Maple, M., Jarrott, H., & Kuyini, A. B. (2013). Blended learning in rural social work education: Reflections from a new Australian Bachelor of Social Work course. *Social Work Education, 32*(3), 349–364. doi:10.1080/02615479.2012.668181

Massey University. (2019). *Bachelor of Social Work*. Retrieved from http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/learning/programme-course/programme.cfm?prog_id=92512

McDermott, F. (2019). Themed issue on social work education—Part 1. *Australian Social Work, 72*(1), 1–2.

Morley, C., & Dunstan, J. (2013). Critical reflection: A response to neoliberal challenges to field education? *Social Work Education, 32*(2), 141–156. doi:10.1080/02615479.2012.730141

Nash, M., & Munford, R. (2001). Unresolved struggles: Educating social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Social Work Education, 20*(1), 21–34. doi:10.1080/02615470020028355

Neter, E., & Brainin, E. (2012). eHealth literacy: Extending the digital divide to the realm of health information. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 14*(1). doi:10.2196/jmir.1619

Norton, A., Cherastidtham, I., & Mackey, W. (2018). *Mapping Australian higher education 2018. Grattan Institute Report No. 2018-11*. Retrieved from https://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/907-Mapping-Australian-higher-education-2018.pdf

Olphert, W., & Damodaran, L. (2013). Older people and digital disengagement: A fourth digital divide? *Gerontology, 59*(6), 564–570. doi:10.1159/000353630

Pack, M. (2016). Learning to "think on our feet": Producing a new digital resource for teaching social work students about reflective decision-making in child protection practice in Australia. *Practice, 28*(3), 213–226. doi:10.1080/09503153.2015.1087490

Parker, E., & Wassef, M. E. (2010). Flexible online learning options for graduate nursing students. *Nurse Educator, 35*(6), 243–247. doi:10.1097/NNE.0b013e3181f7f177

Parliamentary Counsel Office. (2019). Social Workers Registration Act 2003. Retrieved from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2003/0017/latest/whole.html

Pelech, W., Wulff, D., Perrault, E., Ayala, J., Baynton, M., Williams, M., . . . Shankar, J. (2013). Current challenges in social work distance education: Responses from the Elluminati. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 33*(4–5), 393–407. doi:10.1080/08841233.2013.834863

PhillipsKPA. (2017). *Professional accreditation: Mapping the territory*. Retrieved from https://www.education.gov.au/mapping-professional-accreditation-australian-higher-education

Phillips, E. S., Wood, G. J., Yoo, J., Ward, K. J., Hsiao, S. C., Singh, M. I., & Morris, B. (2018). A virtual field practicum: Building core competencies prior to agency placement. *Journal of Social Work Education, 54*(4), 620–640. doi:10.1080/10437797.2018.1486651

Reamer, F. G. (2013a). Distance and online social work education: Novel ethical challenges. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 33*(4–5), 369–384. doi:10.1080/08841233.2013.828669

Reamer, F. G. (2013b). Social work in a digital age: Ethical and risk management challenges. *Social Work, 58*(2), 163–172. doi:10.1093/sw/swt003

Reamer, F. G. (2019). Social work education in a digital world: Technology standards for education and practice. *Journal of Social Work Education, 55*(3), 420–432. doi:10.1080/10437797.2019.1567412

Riddlesden, D., & Singleton, A. D. (2014). Broadband speed equity: A new digital divide? *Applied Geography, 52*, 25–33. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2014.04.008

Sawrikar, P., Lenette, C., McDonald, D., & Fowler, J. (2015). Don't silence the dinosaurs: Keeping caution alive with regard to social work distance education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 35*(4), 343–364. doi:10.1080/08841233.2015.1068262

Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of internet skills, uses and outcomes: A systematic review of the second- and third-level digital divide. *Telematics and Informatics, 34*(8), 1607–1624. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007

Serrano-Cinca, C., Muñoz-Soro, J. F., & Brusca, I. (2018). A multivariate study of Internet use and the digital divide. *Social Science Quarterly, 99*(4), 1409–1425. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12504

Siebert, D. C., & Spaulding-Givens, J. (2006). Teaching clinical social work skills entirely online: A case example. *Social Work Education, 25,* 78–91.

Siebert, D. C., Siebert, C. F., & Spaulding-Givens, J. (2006). Teaching clinical social work skills primarily online: An evaluation. *Social Work Education, 42*(2), 325–336. doi:10.1080/02615470500477953

Smith, K. M., & Jeffery, D. I. (2013). Critical pedagogies in the neoliberal university: What happens when they go digital? *The Canadian Geographer, 57*(3), 372–380. doi:10.1111/cag.12023

Society of Radiographers. (2016). *Survey into student bullying on clinical placement*. Retrieved from https://www.sor.org/sites/default/files/document-versions/student_bullying_on_clinical_placement_survey_2016_final_final_1.pdf

Vandsburger, E., Duncan-Daston, R., Akerson, E., & Dillon, T. (2010). The effects of poverty simulation, an experiential learning modality, on students' understanding of life in poverty. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 30*(3), 300–316. doi:10.1080/08841233.2010.497129

van Heugten, K. (2009). Bullying of social workers: Outcomes of a grounded study into impacts and interventions. *The British Journal of Social Work, 40*(2), 638–655. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcp003

Washburn, M., & Zhou, S. (2018). Teaching note—Technology-enhanced clinical simulations: Tools for practicing clinical skills in online social work programs. *Journal of Social Work Education, 54*(3), 554–560. doi:10.1080/10437797.2017.1404519

Wei, K.-K., Teo, H.-H., Chan, H. C., & Tan, B. C. Y. (2011). Conceptualizing and testing a social cognitive model of the digital divide. *Information System Research, 22*(11), 170–187. doi:10.1287/isre.l090.0273

Wilson, B., & Kelly, G. (2010). Evaluating the effectiveness of social work education: Preparing students for practice learning. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*, 2431–2449. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcq019

Wretman, C. J., & Macy, R. J. (2016). Technology in social work education: A systematic review. *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(4), 409–421. doi:10.1080/10437797.2016.1198293