

A NATIONAL CALL TO ACTION

A CRUCIBLE MOMENT

College Learning & Democracy's Future



The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

A NATIONAL CALL TO ACTION

A CRUCIBLE MOMENT

College Learning & Democracy's Future



The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

This project has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the US Department of Education under contract number ED-OPE-10-C-0078. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the US Government.

This publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise—without constraint.



1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009

Suggested Citation:

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. 2012. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

ISBN 978-0-9827850-5-8

To download a copy of this report, see www.aacu.org/civiclearning/crucible. To order additional copies of this publication, visit www.aacu.org, email pub_desk@aacu.org, or call 202.387.3760.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	
Martha Kanter and Eduardo Ochoa, US Department of Education	v
<i>For Democracy's Future: Five Essential Actions from the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement.</i>	vi
<i>The Catalysts for Producing A Crucible Moment and Its National Call to Action.</i>	vii
National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Members	ix
Acknowledgments	xi
I. Why Education for Democratic Citizenship Matters	1
II. Crucible Moments of Civic Learning: Then and Now	17
III. Education for Democracy in the Twenty-First Century: A National Call to Action	25
IV. Trailblazers for Civic Learning: From Periphery to Pervasiveness	41
V. A Foundation Partially Laid: Pathways to Democratic Engagement.	51
VI. Conclusion	69
References	71
Appendix A: Civic Investment Plan Templates	81
Appendix B: Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Project Staff	87
Appendix C: Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement National Roundtables: Participant List.	89
Appendix D: Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement National Roundtables: Participating Organizations	97

FOREWORD

“A socially cohesive and economically vibrant US democracy... require[s] informed, engaged, open-minded, and socially responsible people committed to the common good and practiced in ‘doing’ democracy... . Civic learning needs to be an integral component of every level of education, from grade school through graduate school, across all fields of study.”

Excerpt from *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*

The overarching education goal for the Obama administration is to once again lead the world in the proportion of college graduates by 2020. In this context, we hope this report sparks a national conversation and call to action about how institutions of higher learning can embrace and act on their long-standing mission to educate students for informed, engaged citizenship—an essential quality for all graduates. The completion of postsecondary education and the acquisition of twenty-first-century critical thinking skills in the liberal arts and sciences are an economic necessity as well as a social imperative. To fulfill America’s promise in our global society, our education system at all levels, from early learning through higher education, must serve our nation both as its economic engine and its wellspring for democracy.

This report from the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement finds that civic learning and learning in traditional academic disciplines are complementary, rather than competitive. The report points to research findings that suggest that students who participate in civic learning opportunities are more likely to

- persist in college and complete their degrees;
- obtain skills prized by employers; and
- develop habits of social responsibility and civic participation.


We would like to see further research explore these connections.

In the months ahead, the US Department of Education will analyze the recommendations advanced in *A Crucible Moment* and identify actions we can take. For now, we want to express our gratitude to the National Task Force, and the many individuals and organizations who contributed to this ambitious project, for their work and their commitment to educating students as citizens for the twenty-first century. Together we must advance a civic learning and democratic engagement agenda worthy of our great nation.

Sincerely,



Martha Kanter
Under Secretary
US Department of Education



Eduardo Ochoa
Assistant Secretary for
Postsecondary Education
US Department of Education

For Democracy's Future: Five Essential Actions

From The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

- 1. Reclaim and reinvest in the fundamental civic and democratic mission** of schools and of all sectors within higher education.
- 2. Enlarge the current national narrative that erases civic aims and civic literacy** as educational priorities contributing to social, intellectual, and economic capital.
- 3. Advance a contemporary, comprehensive framework for civic learning—embracing US and global interdependence—** that includes historic and modern understandings of democratic values, capacities to engage diverse perspectives and people, and commitment to collective civic problem solving.
- 4. Capitalize upon the interdependent responsibilities of K–12 and higher education** to foster progressively higher levels of civic knowledge, skills, examined values, and action as expectations for every student.
- 5. Expand the number of robust, generative civic partnerships and alliances, locally, nationally, and globally** to address common problems, empower people to act, strengthen communities and nations, and generate new frontiers of knowledge.

See Chapter III for the entire set of recommendations in the National Call to Action.

THE CATALYSTS FOR PRODUCING A CRUCIBLE MOMENT AND ITS NATIONAL CALL TO ACTION

A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future was written at the invitation of the US Department of Education, which awarded a contract to the Global Perspective Institute, Inc. (GPI) and a subcontract to the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) to lead a national dialogue that would result in recommendations about strengthening students' civic learning and democratic engagement as a core component of college study. GPI and AAC&U then formed a National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, whose members collectively have been involved in virtually all aspects of the civic renewal effort that is already underway in many parts of higher education. Our work was ably led by GPI President Larry A. Braskamp and AAC&U Senior Vice President Caryn McTighe Musil, who organized and guided the year-long national dialogue and analysis through which *A Crucible Moment* was framed.

The charge given us as a National Task Force was to assess the current state of education for democracy in higher education and produce a report with a National Call to Action and specific steps through which multiple stakeholders can make college students' civic learning and democratic engagement a pervasively embraced educational priority and a resource for democracy. We were invited, in effect, to complement our society's strong commitment to increased college-going and completion with an equally strong and multi-front effort to ensure that postsecondary study contributes significantly to college students' preparation as informed, engaged, and globally knowledgeable citizens.

The US Department of Education was an involved partner in this entire effort, with key staff attending and attentive at national roundtables, and offering feedback on successive drafts of *A Crucible Moment*. Yet department leaders also made it clear that this should be a report from the higher education community to the nation, not a brief framed by the department. Guided by an intensive multi-month dialogue with advisers from all parts of higher education and civil society, we shaped the analysis and National Call to Action presented in these pages. Caryn McTighe Musil served as the scribe and lead author for the Task Force.

A final report required under the contract was submitted to the Department of Education in October 2011 and posted on its website in December 2011. Following that submission, *A Crucible Moment* was revised and edited for publication and dissemination in 2012.


The arguments and recommendations made in *A Crucible Moment* were strongly influenced by the following work, which also was supported by the contract from the US Department of Education:

1. A series of five National Roundtables was held between December 2010 and March 2011 involving 134 people representing 61 community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities; 26 civic organizations; 9 private and government funding agencies; 15 higher education associations; and 12 disciplinary societies. Participants in these National Roundtables helped assess the strengths and limitations of current efforts to engage college students in civic learning and made invaluable contributions to the arguments and recommendations presented in *A Crucible Moment*.
2. An initial commissioned background paper was written in October 2010 by Nancy Thomas of The Democracy Imperative on the current landscape for civic learning in higher education. This background paper helped focus the dialogue and debate in the initial National Roundtables and served as a crucial point of departure for the work of crafting the present publication.
3. A review of the literature on educational practices that are correlated with students' gains in civic learning and democratic action was prepared by Ashley Finley, senior director for assessment and research at AAC&U. That analysis is available on the project website (www.civiclearning.org) and on AAC&U's website (www.aacu.org/civic_learning).

The analysis and recommendations offered in *A Crucible Moment* also benefitted from research being conducted on students' civic gains in college by several university and college research centers. Ashley Finley's forthcoming synthesis of findings from these ongoing research studies was made available to the National Task Force in advance of its formal publication in early 2012, and is reflected at several points in *A Crucible Moment*.

Everyone involved in the year of national dialogue behind *A Crucible Moment* intends this report to serve as a National Call to Action that will underscore higher education's essential civic mission and make civic learning a key component of every college student's course of study. We submit this report to serve as a catalyst for action. It represents a collective set of recommendations and requires a collective mustering of coordinated community actions so that colleges, community colleges, and universities can offer the nation the full resources we need to restore and expand our depleted civic capital and fully serve the democracy upon which our common future depends.

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Members



Derek Barker, Program Officer, Kettering Foundation, and author of *Tragedy and Citizenship: Conflict, Reconciliation, and Democratic Politics from Haemon to Hegel*



Richard Guarasci, President of Wagner College, and political science scholar whose leadership has led to Wagner's award-winning civic programs



Donald W. Harward, President Emeritus of Bates College, and Director of the national civic initiative Bringing Theory to Practice




Sylvia Hurtado, Professor and Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, where she researches student educational outcomes, campus climates, and diversity in higher education



Eric Liu, founder of The Guiding Lights Network and co-author (with Nick Hanauer) of *The True Patriot* and *The Gardens of Democracy: A New American Story of Citizenship, the Economy, and the Role of Government*




Gale Muller, Vice Chairman of Worldwide Research and Development for Gallup, where he has overseen research on the voices of citizens in more than 130 countries



Brian Murphy, President of De Anza College since 2004, where he spearheaded the creation of De Anza's Institute for Community and Civic Engagement




Eboo Patel, Founder and Executive Director of Interfaith Youth Core (IFYC) and author of the award-winning book *Acts of Faith: The Story of an American Muslim, the Struggle for the Soul of a Generation*



Carol Geary Schneider, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, which promotes liberal education as a resource for economic creativity and democratic vitality



David Scobey, Executive Dean of The New School and founder of the University of Michigan Arts of Citizenship Program to foster the role of the arts, humanities, and design in civic life



Kathleen Maas Weigert, Carolyn Farrell, BVM, Professor of Women and Leadership, and Assistant to the Provost for Social Justice Initiatives at Loyola University Chicago

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As members of the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, we are honored to have had the opportunity to work with so many additional leaders in civic learning and democratic engagement to produce this national report, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*.

We are indebted in particular to the 134 National Roundtable participants who invested their time to come to Washington, DC, for one of five day-long discussions where they helped frame *A Crucible Moment's* analysis and recommendations for the next generation of civic work. As committed and innovative educators for democracy in many contexts, they have helped lay the foundations for civic learning and democratic engagement that are described in Chapters IV and V. They were wise and passionate advisers on what still needs to be done before civic learning can become an expected outcome for every student, and before democratic engagement and civic problem solving with widely diverse people can become everyday occurrences on and off campus.

We also express deep appreciation to our colleagues in the US Department of Education who spearheaded the call for elevating civic learning and democratic engagement in the experiences of college students—whatever and wherever they are studying. Department of Education leaders have been stalwart partners in this project and clear about their determination to take seriously the recommendations made to them in the National Call to Action. Their support will help us fulfill the recommendations outlined in Chapter III.

We also want to acknowledge the leadership that Larry A. Braskamp, president of the Global Perspective Institute, Inc., has given to this initiative. Bringing decades of scholarly and administrative engagement with civic and global learning to the table, he embraced and managed the fast-paced work behind the writing of this report with unflagging commitment, administrative skill, and intellectual vigor.

He was aided in his role by his co-leader in overseeing the project, Caryn McTighe Musil, senior vice president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and by the AAC&U staff who so enhanced the work behind this report: the excellent thinking and organizational skills of Nancy O'Neill, the attentiveness to detail of Van Luu, and the resourcefulness and research of Eleanor Hall. We are indebted as well for the editorial oversight of Shelley Johnson Carey and additional editing by Gordon Geise, Debra Humphreys, Wilson Peden, and David Tritelli.

The Task Force also expresses its warm appreciation to Caryn McTighe Musil for her extraordinary work as scribe for the National Task Force and all who advised us. Listening attentively to—and reviewing extensive summaries of—all the roundtable dialogues, and drawing from her own decades of leadership on this topic as well, she gave voice to this “next generation” vision for the Task Force by serving as the lead author of *A Crucible Moment*. We thank her for her commitment and her accomplishment in crafting our collective “National Call to Action.”

Finally, we want to express our deep gratitude to Donald W. Harward, director of the Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP) project and another member of the National Task Force. Drawing on gifts from the Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation and the S. Engelhard Center, BTtoP provided a substantial gift to support the publication and dissemination of *A Crucible Moment*.

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

Each generation must work to preserve the fundamental values and principles of its heritage... to narrow the gap between the ideals of this nation and the reality of the daily lives of its people; and to more fully realize the potential of our constitutional, democratic republic. We can emerge from this civic recession, but to do so will require a full-scale national investment from every level of government and every sector of society.

Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director, Center for Civic Education

I. WHY EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP MATTERS

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America

Did you... suppose Democracy was only for elections, for politics, and for a party name? I say Democracy is only of use there that it may pass on and come to its flower and fruits in manners, in the highest forms of interaction between men, and their beliefs—in Religion, Literature, colleges, and schools—Democracy in all public and private life....

Walt Whitman, *Democratic Vistas* (2010)

Events “are moving us toward what cannot be,” warns David Mathews, president of the Kettering Foundation, “a citizenless democracy” (London 2010, iv). The oxymoronic phrase is chilling. Mathews points to numerous trends in public life that “sideline citizens”: recasting people’s roles from producers of public goods to consumers of material ones, gerrymandering districts and thus exacerbating the deep divides that already shape our politics, diminishing opportunities for civic alliances, and replacing what ought to be thoughtful deliberation about public issues with incivility and hyper-polarization. The US Census Bureau’s most recent population survey captures citizen passivity in its finding that only 10 percent of citizens contacted a public official between November 2009 and November 2010 (US Census Bureau 2010).

Such troubling phenomena are not necessarily news. A decade ago, Robert Putnam in *Bowling Alone* (2000) argued that there was a decline in social capital, especially in “bridging capital,” which he defined as the capacity to work across differences. Withdrawal into comfortable enclaves and wariness of others who appear different persist. Meanwhile, public confidence in the nation’s political institutions spirals downward: a *New York Times*/CBS News poll on September 16, 2011, revealed that only 12 percent of American approve of the way Congress is handling its job (Kopicki 2011). In 2007, a conference titled “Civic Disengagement in our Democracy” provided evidence that “among the 172 world democracies the United States ranks 139th in voter participation.” Conference leaders also warned that there was a “decline in both the quantity and quality of civic education” (McCormick Tribune Foundation 2007, 6–7). These assessments echo an earlier warning from the 1998 National Commission on Civic Renewal, chaired by William Bennett and Sam Nunn, which asserted, “In a time that cries out for civic action, we are in danger of becoming a nation of spectators” (1998, 12).

A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future calls for investing on a massive scale in higher education's capacity to renew this nation's social, intellectual, and civic capital.

In response to these and other dangerous trends, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future* calls for investing on a massive scale in higher education's capacity to renew this nation's social, intellectual, and civic capital.

As a democracy, the United States depends on a knowledgeable, public-spirited, and engaged population. Education plays a fundamental role in building civic vitality, and in the twenty-first century, higher education has a distinctive role to play in the renewal of US democracy. Although the Bennett-Nunn commission overlooked higher education as a potential source of civic renewal, this report argues that colleges and universities are among the nation's most valuable laboratories for civic learning and democratic engagement.

The beneficiaries of investing in such learning are not just students or higher education itself; the more civic-oriented that colleges and universities become, the greater their overall capacity to spur local and global economic vitality, social and political well-being, and collective action to address public problems. Today, however, a robust approach to civic learning is provided to only a minority of students, limiting higher education's potential civic impact. Too few postsecondary institutions offer programs that prepare students to engage the questions Americans face as a global democratic power.

A Crucible Moment calls on the higher education community—its constituents and stakeholders—to embrace civic learning and democratic engagement as an undisputed educational priority for all of higher education, public and private, two-year and four-year. While all parts of the higher education enterprise need to build civic capital for our society, the focus of this report is on undergraduate education. Such engagement will require constructing environments where education for democracy and civic responsibility is pervasive, not partial; central, not peripheral.

David Mathews describes democracy as depending on an ecosystem, not only of legislative bodies and executive agencies, but also of civic alliances, social norms, and deliberative practices that empower people to work together in what Elinor Ostrom calls the “coproduction” of public goods (London 2010, iv). Every sector and every person can contribute to this civic enterprise, including the K–12 education sector, where education for democracy and civic responsibility needs to be a bedrock expectation.

A Crucible Moment explores how higher education can serve—for this generation of students and for the nation's globally situated democracy—as one of the defining sites for learning and practicing democratic and civic responsibilities. Since it is now considered necessary preparation for today's economy, postsecondary education has a new and unparalleled opportunity to engage the majority of Americans with the challenges we face as a diverse democracy. Moreover, today's US college campuses, physical and virtual, bring together a wider range of students—across class and color, religion and gender, nationality and age—than ever before in our history. As such, two-year and four-year colleges and universities offer an intellectual and public commons where it is possible not only to theorize about what education for democratic citizenship might require in a diverse society, but also to rehearse that citizenship daily in the fertile, roiling context of pedagogic inquiry and hands-on experiences.

Toward a More Comprehensive Definition of Civic Learning in the Twenty-First Century

With its focus on higher education as a site for citizenship, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future* uses the dual terms of “civic learning” and “democratic engagement” to emphasize the civic significance of preparing students with knowledge and for action. Today’s education for democracy needs to be informed by deep engagement with the values of liberty, equality, individual worth, open mindedness, and the willingness to collaborate with people of differing views and backgrounds toward common solutions for the public good. Anne Colby and her colleagues capture the complexity of civic learning and democratic engagement when they define democracy as “fundamentally a practice of shared responsibility for a common future. It is the always unfinished task of making social choices and working toward public goals that shapes our lives and the lives of others” (Colby et al. 2007, 25). Moreover, as historian Diane Ravitch observes, “a society that is racially and ethnically diverse requires, more than other societies, a conscious effort to build shared values and ideals among its citizenry” (Ravitch 2000, 466).

The multifaceted dimensions of civic learning and democratic engagement necessary in today’s United States are suggested in figure 1 (next page), which maps a contemporary definition of civic and democratic learning, underscoring the breadth and scope of preparation for knowledgeable citizenship that a highly diverse and globally engaged democracy requires. This newly broadened schema of civic learning expands the historical definition of civics that stressed familiarity with the various branches of government and acquaintance with basic information about US history. This knowledge is still essential, but no longer sufficient. Americans need to understand how their political system works and how to influence it, certainly, but they also need to understand the cultural and global contexts in which democracy is both deeply valued and deeply contested. Moreover, full civic literacies cannot be garnered only by studying books; democratic knowledge and capabilities also are honed through hands-on, face-to-face, active engagement in the midst of differing perspectives about how to address common problems that affect the well-being of the nation and the world.

The framing offered in figure 1 is suggestive, not definitive; much more work is required to better clarify component elements of civic and democratic learning in this global century. In Chapter III, we call for a new commitment to undertake that work. Nonetheless, the four listed categories of *knowledge*, *skills*, *values*, and *collective action* are widely shared—if sometimes differently emphasized—among civic educators and practitioners. Similarly, in many analyses of civic learning (such as those cited in this report’s list of references), the learning outcomes within those four categories appear—albeit with slight variance in language—with remarkable consistency. This contemporary schema of civic knowledge thus represents a formidable yet exhilarating educational agenda that invites educators, scholars, and policy-makers to creatively and centrally locate education for civic learning and democratic engagement at the heart of our nation’s educational systems, from elementary school through college and beyond.

“A society that is racially and ethnically diverse requires, more than other societies, a conscious effort to build shared values and ideals among its citizenry” (Ravitch 2000).

FIGURE 1: A Framework for Twenty-First-Century Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

Knowledge	Skills	Collective Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarity with key democratic texts and universal democratic principles, and with selected debates—in US and other societies—concerning their applications • Historical and sociological understanding of several democratic movements, both US and abroad • Understanding one’s sources of identity and their influence on civic values, assumptions, and responsibilities to a wider public • Knowledge of the diverse cultures, histories, values, and contestations that have shaped US and other world societies • Exposure to multiple religious traditions and to alternative views about the relation between religion and government • Knowledge of the political systems that frame constitutional democracies and of political levers for influencing change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical inquiry, analysis, and reasoning • Quantitative reasoning • Gathering and evaluating multiple sources of evidence • Seeking, engaging, and being informed by multiple perspectives • Written, oral, and multi-media communication • Deliberation and bridge building across differences • Collaborative decision making • Ability to communicate in multiple languages <p>Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect for freedom and human dignity • Empathy • Open-mindedness • Tolerance • Justice • Equality • Ethical integrity • Responsibility to a larger good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of knowledge, skills, and examined values to inform actions taken in concert with other people • Moral discernment and behavior • Navigation of political systems and processes, both formal and informal • Public problem solving with diverse partners • Compromise, civility, and mutual respect

By investing strategically to educate students fully along the four-part civic continuum, higher education can ignite a widespread civic renewal in America. When deep learning about complex questions with public consequence is coupled with college students’ energies and commitments, democratic culture is reinvigorated. Despite the label of disengagement often pinned to their T-shirts by others, evidence suggests a majority of the current generation of young people care deeply about public issues. True, many are alienated by uncritically partisan debate among the politicians and the polity, by corporate influence over policy making, and by inefficient government processes; yet, a significant portion of college students are interested in community service that leads to systemic social and political change. They also want to have more meaningful opportunities to discuss and address public issues (Kiesa et al. 2007). In reshaping the college experience, we need to capitalize on the yearning, the inclination, and the commitments of such students.

In a 2009 survey of entering college students undertaken by UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), 35.8 percent responded that “becoming a community leader” was “essential” or “very important” and reported showing more commitment to treating each other as equal citizens

when compared with older generations (Pryor et al. 2009, 40). Moreover, students in ever-increasing numbers are flocking to civic engagement opportunities in college—often spurred by volunteer work in the year before entering college. In the same survey, 85.3 percent of entering first-year students reported that they “performed volunteer work” “frequently” or “occasionally” as high school seniors (Pryor et al. 2009, 11). Participation in service is high in the college years as well: according to 2010 HERI data on college seniors, 8 in 10 seniors reported being engaged in some form of community service during college (DeAngelo, pers. comm.).

In a national survey using the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI), which was conducted by the University of Michigan’s Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, data from twenty-four thousand students at twenty-three diverse colleges, universities, community colleges, and military academies indicate that students want their colleges to foster a stronger institutional emphasis on contributing to the larger community. Moreover, the longer the students stay in college, the wider the gap becomes between their endorsement of social responsibility as a goal of college and their assessment of whether the institution provides opportunities for growth in this area (see fig. 2; Dey et al. 2009).

Students’ assessment of whether their campus valued and promoted contributing to the larger community declined from first to senior year. In addition, while 44.8 percent of first-year students strongly agreed that their campus actively promoted awareness of US social, political, and economic issues, only 34.3 percent of seniors strongly agreed with this statement. There was an even more striking discrepancy in the global arena: among first-year students, 43.3 percent strongly agreed that their campus actively promoted awareness of global social, political, and economic issues, but only half that amount—22.9 percent—of seniors strongly agreed with this statement (Dey et al. 2009, 4–8).


As *A Crucible Moment* emphasizes, community service is not necessarily the same as democratic engagement with others across differences to collectively solve public problems. Nor does service always establish a reciprocal partnership or lead to an analysis of systemic causes of a given issue. But service can be, and often is, the first step toward a more fully developed set

The longer the students stay in college, the wider the gap becomes between their endorsement of social responsibility as a goal of the college and their assessment of whether the institution provides opportunities for growth in this area.

FIGURE 2: Student Views on the Importance of Contributing to the Larger Community

Percentages of students who strongly agree that contributing to community “should be” a major focus of college and “is” a major focus of college, by year in school.

Source: Data from Dey et al. (2009).



Ten Indicators of Anemic US Civic Health

Full references for indicators can be found in this report on the page numbers in parentheses.

1. US ranked 139th in voter participation of 172 world democracies in 2007 (1).
2. Only 10 percent of citizens contacted a public official in 2009–10 (1).
3. Only 24 percent of graduating high school seniors scored at the proficient or advanced level in civics in 2010, fewer than in 2006 or in 1998 (7).
4. Less than one-half of 12th graders reported studying international topics as part of a civics education (7).
5. Half of the states no longer require civics education for high school graduation (6).
6. Among 14,000 college seniors surveyed in 2006 and 2007, the average score on a civic literacy exam was just over 50 percent, an “F” (7).
7. Opportunities to develop civic skills in high school through community service, school government, or service clubs are available disproportionately to wealthier students (6).
8. Just over one-third of college faculty surveyed in 2007 strongly agreed that their campus actively promotes awareness of US or global social, political, and economic issues (63).
9. A similar percentage (35.8 percent) of college students surveyed strongly agreed that faculty publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens (41).
10. One-third of college students surveyed strongly agreed that their college education resulted in increased civic capacities (41).

of civic capacities and commitments—not the least of which is working with others to co-create more vibrant communities to address significant national needs and to promote economic and social stability. Chapter V highlights some colleges and universities that are leading the design of educational experiences to help students along the civic continuum. The challenge for colleges and universities in the next decade is to make such opportunities pervasive, rather than random, across the institution.

Symptoms of a Civic Malaise

Unfortunately, the commitment to foster foundational knowledge about US democracy or to expand civic capacities to shape a better world in concert with others has been pushed off the priority list in K–12 schools. Nor is it yet an expectation for every college student. Like the ocean at low tide, even the most nominal gestures toward civic education have begun to recede from the K–12 curriculum. While some state higher education commissions have pushed for civic matters, these efforts usually focus on promoting community service outside the classroom or on increasing the number of voting citizens. Both are laudable goals, but even together they are insufficient to offset the civic erosion we are experiencing.

The times call for visionary leadership that locates education for democracy as a focal point of educational study, reflection, and practice. This moment in history also calls on us to embrace a comprehensive and contemporary vision for civic learning that includes knowledge, skills, values, and the capacity to work with others on civic and societal challenges. Investing in these forms of learning will increase the number of informed, thoughtful, and public-minded citizens and better prepare them to contribute to public life.

The gravitation pull, however, is in exactly the opposite direction—to democracy’s peril. As former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor observed in 2010, “Half of the states no longer make [civics] a requirement to get out of high school,” which she describes as “a remarkable withdrawal from the very purpose we had originally for public school.”

Secondary schools typically require only three years of history and social studies (combined) to address the entire spectrum of US history, world and Western history, global cultures and challenges, democratic ideals and institutions, and the social and political systems that frame our world. With such compressed time devoted to these topics, students learn too little about them. In the most recent national test of history competence, only 12 percent of US seniors performed at or above the proficient level (NCES 2011a). Similarly, the Southern Poverty Law Center’s report assigned thirty-five states an F grade because the history standards in their states “require little or no mention” of the civil rights movement (Dillon 2011), which is the most powerful example in the twentieth century of a transformative, broad-based, intergenerational, and interracial social movement for full democratic citizenship. Furthermore, researchers have found that opportunities to work directly on civic issues in high school through community service, school government, or service clubs are disproportionately available to wealthier students (CIRCLE 2010).

Notably, despite all the energy devoted to the development of “Common Core Standards” by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, the standards released in 2010 do not address the content knowledge students need for democratic citizenship or global participation (Common Core Standards Initiative 2010a, 2010b). At the federal level, the Department of Education’s March 2010 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) *Blueprint for Reform* calls for “a complete education” that includes not only literacy, mathematics, science, and technology but also history, civics, foreign languages, the arts, and other subjects. Yet even here, the report makes clear that public reporting of student achievement in this more ambitious conception of twenty-first-century school learning is left to the discretion of the states (US Department of Education 2010).

And so we find ourselves in the midst of what Charles N. Quigley (2011), executive director of the Center for Civic Education, calls a “civic recession.” The US Department of Education’s 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in civics for K–12 education underscores one facet of that disturbing reality (see sidebar). NAEP examines fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade competencies in five basic civic concepts: civic life, the American political system, principles of democracy, world affairs, and the roles of citizens (NCES 2011b). The assessment gauges not the mere recitation of facts but students’ ability to identify and describe concepts, explain and analyze them, and evaluate and defend a position.

The most recent results were abysmal. Comparing the 2010 average scores for each grade level against those from 2006 and 1998 shows no significant change in average score for eighth graders, and an actual decline for twelfth graders. Fewer high school seniors scored at the proficient or advanced level than in 2006, and a higher percentage scored below basic levels. The only heartening finding was that the average score for fourth graders was 3 points higher in 2010 than in 2006. The national deficit in civic knowledge is disturbing and of long duration.

With so many students now enrolling in higher education, we might hope that postsecondary study would repair these omissions and build the kinds of civic knowledge a global democracy needs. But here, too, studies consistently find the opposite to be true. Over two years, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute administered a sixty-item civic literacy exam to approximately twenty-eight thousand students—half freshmen and half seniors—at fifty colleges nationwide. Across both years, the average score for both freshmen and seniors was just over 50 percent (Intercollegiate Studies Institute 2007). It is no surprise, then, that most Americans cannot name the liberties protected in the Bill of Rights (Romano 2011). Many cannot name the vice president of the United States, their senators, or their state representatives. Perhaps most discouraging of all, if political talk shows and town hall meetings are any indication, civil discourse and taking seriously the perspectives of others remain largely unpracticed arts.

Our nation finds itself in a befuddling juxtaposition of realities. We have the highest access to voting rights in our history, yet we struggle to muster half of eligible voters to exercise their rights. Despite a public that remains largely disengaged with electoral politics, Gallup’s poll on civic health reveals that

Civics 2010: Findings from the Nation’s Report Card

- Twenty-four percent of graduating high school seniors scored at the proficient or advanced levels for civics, while 36 percent scored below the basic level.
- Less than one-half of 12th graders reported studying international topics as part of a civics education, and two-thirds reported learning about certain important areas of domestic civic knowledge including the US Constitution, Congress, the court system, or elections and voting. All of these figures reflect decreases from 1998 levels.
- Racial gaps in student performance continue to be substantial: a 29-point gap exists between the average scores of white and African American high school seniors, and a 19-point gap exists between white and Hispanic high school seniors.

Source: Data from NCES (2011b).

Americans contribute more time and money to those in need than citizens of any other nation (English 2011). There is, evidently, not a shortage of individual acts of generosity, but rather of civic knowledge and action.

Laying the Civic Groundwork in College

In response to the troubling state of civic health in the United States, colleges and universities have been leading the way toward democratic renewal over the last two decades. Though little heralded by many commenting on the nation's anemic civic statistics, hundreds of trailblazing colleges and universities have been building innovative forms of civic learning for students and establishing transformative partnerships with the wider community at home and abroad. In these programs, citizens, faculty, and students work together on a host of public problems, ranging from education and poverty to health and sustainability. By teaching students to address real-world issues in concert with others, some colleges are helping students move from civic knowledge to civic action, thus better preparing them to serve their communities and the nation as informed, active citizens when they graduate.

Distinguished civic scholar and leader Tom Ehrlich describes this civic reform movement: "Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and nonpolitical processes" (Ehrlich 2000, vi).

While the civic reform movement in higher education has affected almost all campuses, its influence is partial rather than pervasive. Civic learning and democratic engagement remain optional rather than expected for almost all students. As this report explains in Chapters IV and V, efforts to elevate civic learning that are already in place in postsecondary education can and should be vastly expanded to integrate higher levels of knowledge, competencies, and commitments regardless of students' areas of study. Moreover, this emergent kind of civic engagement needs to be better aligned with civic pathways established in K-12.

Still, higher education's investments in education for democracy are sufficiently advanced that researchers now report positive impacts on civic learning and democratic engagement for those college students who avail themselves of their institutions' civic offerings (Vogelgesang and Astin 2000; Colby et al. 2003; Jacoby and Associates 2009). We know that the more students do engage their civic opportunities in college, the greater their growth along many civic dimensions. As this report explains in more detail, we also know that such involvement positively correlates with increased retention and completion rates (Brownell and Swaner 2010; Campus Compact 2008; Cress et al. 2010). This is promising news indeed for a nation where far too many students leave college without completing a degree.

Civic learning and democratic engagement remain optional rather than expected for almost all students.

Higher Education: More than Workforce Training

Two-year and four-year colleges and universities have traditionally prepared students for citizenship and for economic life, and they must continue to do so—now more than ever. The democracy-enhancing flood of first-generation students to college has led appropriately to expectations that an associate or bachelor’s degree will secure a wider range of occupational choices and higher salaries. As the authors of *Connecting Workforce Development and Civic Engagement: Higher Education as Public Good and Private Gain* argue, workforce development and civic engagement “need not be separate or competing missions” but “can be complementary visions” (Battistoni and Longo 2005, 7).

Many business leaders understand that education for the modern workforce should not displace education for citizenship. Charles Kolb, president of the nonpartisan, business-led Committee on Economic Development, argues, “In addition to the obvious labor-force needs, having more Americans with higher levels of postsecondary achievement is vital to our civic health. The heart of a vibrant democracy is educated, engaged citizens who are able to make choices for themselves, their families, their communities, and their country. In this respect, the success of American postsecondary education is critical to the success of American democracy” (2011, 16).

In stark contrast to the both/and approach that Kolb (and this report) embrace, a troubling chorus of public pronouncements from outside higher education has reduced expectations for a college education to job preparation alone. Dominating the policy discussions are demands that college curricula and research cater to “labor market needs” and to “industry availability.” Still others call for an increase in “degree outputs”—much as they might ask a factory to produce more cars or coats.

The National Governors Association’s report *Degrees for What Jobs? Raising Expectations for Universities and Colleges in a Global Economy* serves as only one example of a policy discourse that focuses higher education directly and solely on jobs. The report openly challenges higher education’s historic commitment to provide students with a broad liberal arts education (Sparks and Waits 2011). US higher education, of course, has proudly owned liberal education as a form of college learning that prepares citizens for the responsibilities of freedom. Rejecting the value of what has differentiated US higher education and made it an intellectual powerhouse and an economic driver, the report describes higher education’s function and future funding as dependent singly on promoting “economic goals,” “workforce preparation,” and “competitive advantage” (3).

Knowledgeable citizenship—US and global—surely requires a grounding in history, US and world cultures, the humanities, and the social and natural sciences. It also requires what Martha Nussbaum has called cultivation of a “narrative imagination”: the capacity to enter into worldviews and experiences different from one’s own. These capacities are not incorporated into many career and technical programs—but they certainly can be (Nussbaum 1998).

The call for educational reform cast only as a matter of workforce preparation mistakenly adopts a nineteenth-century industrial model for complex twenty-first-century needs. Reframing the public purpose of higher

Many business leaders understand that education for the modern workforce should not displace education for citizenship.

Since the majority of these students do not transfer beyond the community college, it is all the more important that civic learning be integrated into the curriculum, including career training programs.

education in such instrumental ways will have grave consequences for America's intellectual, social, and economic capital. Such recommendations suggest colleges are no longer expected to educate leaders or citizens, only workers who will not be called to invest in lifelong learning, but only in industry-specific job training.

Calling for colleges and universities to prepare students for careers and citizenship, rather than only the former, is especially important for students in community colleges. Forty-three percent of first-time undergraduates enroll in this sector, including approximately 50 percent of African American, Latino, and Native American undergraduates (AACC 2011). Since the majority of these students do not transfer beyond the community college, it is all the more important that civic learning be integrated into the curriculum, including career training programs.

Why must the United States require its educational system to educate for citizenship as well as careers? Public schooling and ever-expanding access to postsecondary education have been distinguishing characteristics of our democratic nation. Higher education in a robust, diverse, and democratic country needs to cultivate in each of its graduates an open and curious mind, critical acumen, public voice, ethical and moral judgment, and the commitment to act collectively in public to achieve shared purposes. In stark contrast, higher education in a restrictive, undemocratic country needs only to cultivate obedient and productive workers. As *A Nation of Spectators* astutely asserted, "We believe that economic productivity is important but must not be confused with civic health" (National Commission on Civic Renewal 1998, 7).

The National Task Force wants to stress that educating students for purposeful work in a dynamic, complex economy is more than ever an essential goal of higher education. However, we reject a zero-sum choice between the fullest preparation for economic success and education for citizenship. *A Crucible Moment* outlines a path that prepares students for *both* knowledgeable citizenship and economic opportunity. As employers themselves make clear, the United States should not be forced to choose between preparing students for informed democratic citizenship and preparing students for successful college completion and career opportunities.

Public leaders who believe that the "economic agenda" of higher education is reducible to workforce training also fail to understand that there is a civic dimension to every field of study, including career and technical fields, as well as to every workplace. Industries and services have ethical and social responsibilities of their own, and, in a democracy, citizens and community partners routinely weigh in on such questions. Workers at all levels need to anticipate the civic implications of their choices and actions. The nation—and the world—have experienced disastrous results when civic consequences are ignored and only economic profit is considered, as the subprime mortgage crisis and the bundling of toxic loans have dramatically illustrated.

Happily, there are some signature employment models that braid together high standards of work and civic responsibility. For example, more than seven hundred companies worldwide have produced corporate social responsibility reports in accordance with guidelines published by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which include environmental health, human rights, fair labor

practices, product responsibility, economic sustainability, and community engagement dimensions (As You Sow 2011; GRI 2011). Likewise, Siemens AG organizes its corporate citizenship activities in support of the UN Millennium Development Goals and the principles of the UN Global Compact. This framework includes mobilizing employees to donate time to worthy causes through the company's Caring Hands Program and recognizing teams of employee volunteers who undertake outstanding and innovative community service projects (Siemens 2011). Similarly, the Timberland Company employs an "Earthkeepers philosophy" that guides product development, social and environmental performance in the supply chain, energy use, and community engagement. Community engagement is organized through the company's twenty-year-old Path of Service program, which offers employees paid time to serve in their local communities (Swartz 2011).

Even if they are not commonplace, in colleges today there are some nascent models that embed questions about civic responsibilities within career preparation and that therefore point to the next level needed in campus civic work. California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB), for example, defines civic literacy as the "knowledge, skills and attitudes that students need to work effectively in a diverse society to create more just and equitable workplaces, communities and social institutions" (Pollack 2011, 8). In addition to a general service-learning course, CSUMB students must complete a second such course rooted in their major. Every business student, for example, takes a Community Economic Development course that includes fifty hours of service to a community organization. Importantly, the overriding question that these students explore is, "How can businesses balance the 'triple bottom lines' of profit, people, and planet?" (Pollack 2011, 9). Similarly, for students in the School of Information Technology and Communications Design, the service-learning course is constructed around the guiding questions, "How has digital technology accentuated or alleviated historical inequalities in our community, and what is my responsibility for addressing the digital divide as a future IT professional?" (Pollack 2011, 9).

To strip out such probing civic questions from *either* higher education *or* the workplace is to contribute to the creation of the citizenless democracy that David Mathews so dreaded. A healthy democracy demands that civic dimensions in thinking and in working be cultivated, not ignored or suppressed.

In addition to serving as an engine of economic development, higher education is a crucial incubator for fostering democratic voice, thought, and action. The shared capacities needed both in the modern workplace and in diverse democratic societies include effective listening and oral communication, creative/critical thinking and problem solving, the ability to work effectively in diverse groups, agency and collaborative decision making, ethical analyses of complex issues, and intercultural understanding and perspective taking.

Drawn from employer surveys about desirable skills sets in new employees, figure 3 depicts the areas that employers wish higher education would emphasize more. The list closely parallels the framework of essential learning outcomes now widely agreed upon for college graduates (AAC&U


[Some] colleges today... embed questions about civic responsibilities within career preparation and... point to the next level [of curriculum change]...

Narrow training is bad preparation for the economy as well as for democracy.

2011). Identified in Chapter III as important stakeholders in education for democracy, employers can become influential allies in defining the more complex capabilities needed in today’s workplace that so many policy makers overlook. They have repeatedly testified that twenty-first-century employees need training in history, global cultures, intercultural literacy, ethical judgment, and civic engagement. Technical skills are important, but employers underscore that for today’s economy, technical skills are not enough (Hart Research Associates 2010; Peter D. Hart Research Associates 2006, 2008). Former Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine (2011) has pointed out that students’ weak grasp of history actually threatens America’s economy as well as its freedom. Narrow training is bad preparation for the economy as well as for democracy.

FIGURE 3:
Civic Learning Outcomes and Workforce Expectations

Percentages of employers who want colleges to “Place more emphasis” on essential learning outcomes



Source: Data from Hart Research Associates, 2010.

Civic Learning and College Completion

Along with urging a tighter connection between labor market needs and the college curriculum, policy leaders have also focused with new determination on raising the rates of college completion. The nation’s economic future and social integration rest on achieving this critical national goal. However, suggesting that an institution must choose between graduation rates or education for citizenship is as erroneous as suggesting that an institution must choose between jobs or education for citizenship. In fact, student participation in service learning, which is just one of a number of civic pedagogies, but one whose impact has been widely researched, has been shown in numerous studies to correlate with outcomes that contribute to increased retention and completion rates (Astin and Sax 1998; Gallini and Moely 2003; Vogelgesang et al. 2002; Nigro and Farnsworth 2009; Brownell and Swaner 2010). As a 2010 Campus Compact study, *A Promising Connection: Increasing College Access and Success through Civic Engagement* asserts, “College students who participate in civic engagement learning activities not only earn higher grade point averages but also have higher retention rates and are more likely to complete their college degree” (Cress et al. 2010, 1). One study in

the report elaborates by distinguishing the importance of offering more intensive service-learning opportunities. State Campus Compact offices of Northern New England conducted a study at seventeen colleges and universities which found that “students who engaged in more intensive service-learning experiences scored higher on all five measures [retention, academic challenge, academic engagement, interpersonal engagement, and community engagement] than did students who engaged in less intensive service-learning experiences” (6).

A smaller, single-institution study at Kapi’olani Community College examined persistence among 660 students who completed service-learning assignments in 2010–11. Director of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness Robert W. Franco noted, “The course success and fall-to-spring persistence rates of the 660 students were 20 percent higher than for all students. These results replicate similar findings for more than six hundred students completing service-learning assignments in 2009–10. Service-learning students demonstrated learning gains in applying course concepts to community contexts, communicating to diverse audiences, recognizing and responding to community problems, and clarifying personal, academic, and career goals” (Robert W. Franco, pers. comm.).

Similar studies have shown service learning’s positive impact on other factors correlated with retention and completion rates, including career development (Eyler et al. 2001), satisfaction with college (Astin and Sax 1998; Berson and Younkin 1998), and deepening students’ connections with faculty (Astin and Sax 1998; Gray et al. 1998; Eyler and Giles 1999). It is well established that students’ closeness with faculty is a key factor in increasing college success (Astin 1993) and persistence (Pascarella and Terenzini 2005). Unfortunately, for most college students, service learning remains optional rather than expected. More than three-quarters of community college students report never having taken a course that included service learning (CCCSE 2011), and nearly half (48.6 percent) of students completing a bachelor’s degree report never having taken a course that included service learning (Franke et al. 2010).

It is time to bring two national priorities—career preparation and increased access and completion rates—together in a more comprehensive vision with a third national priority: fostering informed, engaged, responsible citizens.

Positioning Democratic Renewal as Paramount

Despite the cited clear evidence that civic learning in college is compatible with preparation for the modern workforce and improved graduation rates, the dominant external policy discourse about higher education “reform” is silent on education for democracy. Does the civic mission of higher education in our increasingly multicultural democracy need to be scuttled to achieve better jobs for students or higher graduation rates? It does not. And it must not.

It is time to bring two national priorities—career preparation and increased access and completion rates—together in a more comprehensive vision with a third national priority: fostering informed, engaged, responsible citizens. Higher education is a space where that triad of priorities can cohere and flourish.

A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future argues that a socially cohesive and economically vibrant US democracy and a viable, just global community require informed, engaged, open-minded, and socially responsible people committed to the common good and practiced in “doing”

A socially cohesive and economically vibrant US democracy and a viable, just global community require informed, engaged, open-minded, and socially responsible people committed to the common good and practiced in “doing” democracy.

democracy. In a divided and unequal world, education—from K–12 through college and beyond—can open up opportunities to develop each person’s full talents, equip graduates to contribute to economic recovery and innovation, and cultivate responsibility to a larger common good. Achieving that goal will require that civic learning and democratic engagement be not sidelined but central. Civic learning needs to be an integral component of every level of education, from grade school through graduate school, across all fields of study.

We are not suggesting that colleges implement a single required civics course. That would hardly be sufficient. Rather, we are calling on colleges and universities to adopt far more ambitious standards that can be measured over time to indicate whether institutions and their students are becoming more civic-minded. This report therefore urges every college and university to foster a **civic ethos** that governs campus life, make **civic literacy** a goal for every graduate, integrate **civic inquiry** within majors and general education, and advance **civic action** as lifelong practice (see fig. 4 for specific indicators in each of the four areas). In so doing, we seek a more comprehensive vision to guide the twenty-first-century formulation of education for democratic citizenship on college and university campuses. As this report suggests, investing in this broader vision promises to cultivate more informed, engaged, and responsible citizens while also contributing to economic vitality, more equitable and flourishing communities, and the overall civic health of the nation.

The Call to Action outlined in Chapter III is designed to make civic learning and democratic engagement—US and global—an animating national priority. It recommends building a foundation for responsible citizenship by making such learning an expectation for all students, whether in schools, colleges, community colleges, or universities. Everyone has a role to play in building the knowledge, skills, values, and civic actions that all students need. The recommendations in Chapter III, derived from a broad base of civic educators, identify some of the multiple courses of collective, coordinated actions that can be undertaken by a broad coalition if we hope to transform civic learning and democratic engagement from aspiration to everyday practice.

The National Call to Action seeks to restore education for democratic engagement to its intended high standing and charts a direction for doing so—a direction that keeps sharply in view both the reality of global interdependence and the yearning for greater freedom and self-direction expressed by peoples around the world. Above all, it argues for ensuring that all college students devote time and effort to the kinds of “real-world” challenges that every society confronts, and where civic knowledge and judgment must shape public choices.

FIGURE 4: What Would a Civic-Minded Campus Look Like?

CIVIC ETHOS governing campus life

The infusion of democratic values into the customs and habits of everyday practices, structures, and interactions; the defining character of the institution and those in it that emphasizes open-mindedness, civility, the worth of each person, ethical behaviors, and concern for the well-being of others; a spirit of public-mindedness that influences the goals of the institution and its engagement with local and global communities.

CIVIC LITERACY as a goal for every student

The cultivation of foundational knowledge about fundamental principles and debates about democracy expressed over time, both within the United States and in other countries; familiarity with several key historical struggles, campaigns, and social movements undertaken to achieve the full promise of democracy; the ability to think critically about complex issues and to seek and evaluate information about issues that have public consequences.

CIVIC INQUIRY integrated within the majors and general education

The practice of inquiring about the civic dimensions and public consequences of a subject of study; the exploration of the impact of choices on different constituencies and entities, including the planet; the deliberate consideration of differing points of views; the ability to describe and analyze civic intellectual debates within one's major or areas of study.

CIVIC ACTION as lifelong practice

The capacity and commitment both to participate constructively with diverse others and to work collectively to address common problems; the practice of working in a pluralistic society and world to improve the quality of people's lives and the sustainability of the planet; the ability to analyze systems in order to plan and engage in public action; the moral and political courage to take risks to achieve a greater public good.

II. CRUCIBLE MOMENTS OF CIVIC LEARNING: THEN AND NOW

[I]n order to navigate our global interdependence, we need processes where we all think through our own responsibilities toward other fellow humans and discuss our answers with our peers. A conversation about a global civics is indeed needed, and university campuses are ideal venues for these conversations to start... we should not wait any longer to start it.

Martti Ahtisaari, (quoted in Altinay 2010)

The Wingspread [college] students believe that their community experiences [through service learning] encourage them to develop a larger, more inclusive social imagination[,]... a sense of how to advocate beyond their own desires[,] and... the value of subordinating themselves to a larger purpose.

Sarah Long, *The New Student Politics*

The sense of urgency that propels many poorly conceived remedies for the challenges facing the United States—the economic recession, the changes in US world power, and the fraying of the social fabric—is certainly understandable. Our nation is indeed at a crucible moment when the intense heat from multiple forces both tests and threatens the country’s resilience. Just as the smelting crucible alters materials from one form to another, so this crucible moment in the United States is fraught with transformative possibilities. If we hope to reinvent and reinvigorate higher education, our economy, and our democracy, it is imperative to take bold and creative action.

In other such crucible moments, both the nation and higher education have acted with intrepid, visionary courage. Today we need to do so again.

At the crucible founding of our republic, for example—marred as it was by its embrace of slavery—both Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin articulated eloquently how essential an educated citizenry was to the fledgling democracy’s taking root. Franklin, who helped found several schools for African Americans, believed higher education should be available to ordinary citizens and not just the elite, arguing that college should cultivate “an inclination joined with the ability to serve mankind, one’s country, friends and family” (quoted in Isaacson 2003, 147). Before the Revolutionary War, Franklin helped to found what became the University of Pennsylvania after the new republic was established, and Jefferson founded the University of Virginia in 1819. Both men sought to establish institutions committed to public and practical arts that they believed were necessary learning to secure the fragile emerging democracy.

Following the end of the Civil War—another crucible moment which at last legally abolished slavery but left the nation bitterly riven even as peace was declared—higher education became one means through which the economy could be expanded and rebuilt, more people could have access to college, and education for active citizenship could be fostered in populations long denied such opportunities. Thus land-grant colleges and universities were established

with the Morrill Act of 1862, many colleges and universities for African Americans were founded, and a score of women's colleges were created.

But perhaps the crucible moment most relevant to today's situation occurred after World War II, when President Truman established the President's Commission on Higher Education, chaired by American Council on Education President George F. Zook. The commission included twenty-eight members, primarily college and university presidents along with a handful of public citizens. At that historic juncture, the economy was recovering from the Great Depression, the world was exhausted by the slaughter of war, unequal access to higher education undercut the nation's claim to democratic commitments, and the grisly horror of bigotry and hatred as state policy was visible for all to see.

The commission's primary achievement was a six-volume report, revealingly titled *Higher Education for American Democracy*, that remapped federal and state policies, redrew the contours of higher education, recommended the establishment of an expansive and free community college system, and set a bold vision for the nation. Rather than couching its arguments in the purely economic terms that characterize the dominant blueprints for higher education today, the Truman Commission foregrounded democracy as the force for driving higher education's transformation and leadership, and with it, the nation's course toward justice for all (see fig. 5). The commission ended its first volume with the very clarion call that *A Crucible Moment* picks up nearly seven decades later: "The first and most essential charge upon higher education is that at all levels and in all its fields of specialization, it shall be the carrier of democratic values, ideals, and process" (President's Commission on Higher Education 1947a, 102).

This was not a naive rhetorical statement then, nor should it be today. The commission admitted with clear-eyed honesty how higher education had failed democracy by denying most citizens the opportunity to go to college. They also understood what was at stake: "Only an informed, thoughtful, tolerant people can maintain and develop a free society" (1947b, 3).

From the 1940s on, the heretofore isolationist United States found itself in a new global role as the leader of the "free" world. The boundaries of the global map had been redrawn, and the United States was at the center of the redesign. It could no longer retreat behind its borders. The commission thus embraced democracy's principles in a newly global context: "*E Pluribus Unum—From many persons one nation, and from many peoples one world—indivisible, with liberty and justice for all*" (italics in the original; 1947a, 102). As history of education scholar Philo Hutcheson observed, "Policymakers, especially but hardly exclusively those in education, argued that all levels of education were critical components in creating both a better nation and a better world" (2007, 4).

Because the commission described discrimination as "an undemocratic practice" (1947b, 25), its report challenged higher education to become a means to address the largest threat to the nation's new role as leader of the free world: the racial discrimination and subjugation that were hallmarks of the country in 1947. In that year, all but a handful of the nation's colleges and universities were racially segregated—by law in one geographic region, and by practice in other parts of the country. "No more in mind than body,"

Rather than couching its arguments in the purely economic terms that characterize the dominant blueprints for higher education today, the Truman Commission foregrounded democracy... (see fig. 5)

FIGURE 5. Goals for Higher Education, 1947

“The President’s Commission on Higher Education has attempted to select, from among the principal goals for higher education, those which should come first in our time. They are to bring to all the people of the Nation:

- Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.
- Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.
- Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs.

“Education is by far the biggest and the most hopeful of the Nation’s enterprises. Long ago our people recognized that education for all is not only democracy’s obligation but its necessity. Education is the foundation of democratic liberties. Without an educated citizenry alert to preserve and extend freedom, it would not long endure.”

Source: President’s Commission on Higher Education (1947a).

the Commission wrote, “can this nation or any endure half slave, half free. Education that liberates and ennobles must be equally available to all. Justice to the individual demands this; the safety and the progress of the nation depend upon it” (1947a, 101).

Over the next decades, driven by social movements from within and without its boundaries, higher education eventually became the multiracial, multicultural site for democracy it is today. Both it and the nation were transformed in the process.

A Crucible Moment likewise calls for transformations necessary for this generation. A daunting one is to eliminate persistent inequalities, especially those in the United States determined by income and race, in order to secure the country’s economic and civic future. But the academy must also be a vehicle for tackling other pressing issues—growing global economic inequalities, climate change and environmental degradation, lack of access to quality health care, economic volatility, and more. To do that requires expanding students’ capacities to be civic problem-solvers using all their powers of intellect and inventiveness.

Sixty-five years after the Truman Commission, the nation faces a different national and global dynamic than in the aftermath of World War II. *A Crucible Moment* casts its National Call to Action in the context of five trends that shape this historic juncture.

Increase in Democratic Nations: In 1950, just over 25 percent of countries in the world could be characterized as electoral democracies (Diamond 2011). In 2010, 59 percent of countries could be characterized in this way (Puddington 2011). Moreover, “in 1975 the number of countries that were ‘not free’ exceeded those that were ‘free’ by 50 percent, [but] by 2007 twice as many countries were ‘free’ as were ‘not free’ (Goldstone 2010, 1). According to an official statement released by the Arab Network for the Study of Democracy, the Arab Spring of 2011 brought people in seven countries to the streets united by three notions: freedom, dignity, and justice (Lee 2011). These shifts offer significant opportunities for revitalizing all democracies,

both old and new, as modern democracies learn collectively how to recalibrate democratic processes to meet the new demands of a globalized age.

Intensified Global Competition: After World War II, the United States competed only with the Soviet Union for global domination as other nations were busy either putting their devastated economies back in order or developing them. Today, powerful new economies exist on every continent. The European Union is challenging US economic domination, and there is a decided tilt toward the Asian markets of China, India, and Japan. In this globalized world, the budgets of many multinational companies are larger than those of many countries, and they are not bound in their practices by any one nation.

Dangerous Economic Inequalities: While the United States had been moving toward a diamond-shaped economy with a larger middle class, recent years have seen an increased gulf between rich and poor across US households. Economist Edward N. Wolff notes, for example, that between 2007 and mid-2009 there was “a fairly steep rise in wealth inequality [where] the share of the top 1 percent advanced from 34.6 to 37.1 percent, that of the top 5 percent from 61.8 to 65 percent, and that of the top quintile from 85 to 87.7 percent, while that of second quintile fell from 10.9 to 10 percent, that of the middle quintile from 4 to 3.1 percent, and that of the bottom two quintiles from 0.2 to -0.8 percent” (Wolff 2010, 33). In sum, as of 2009, nearly 90 percent of wealth was concentrated among the top 20 percent of US households, while just over 10 percent of wealth was spread across the remaining 80 percent. One result of this hyper-consolidation of wealth is that for the first time in US history, the younger generation is not on a trajectory to achieve their parents’ economic level. These same economic inequalities are even more dramatic in a global context. According to former UN Humanitarian Relief Coordinator Jan Egeland. “The richest individuals are richer than several of the poorest nations combined—a few billionaires are richer than the poorest two billion people” (<http://ucatlasc.ucsc.edu/income.php>). Economist Branko Milanovic (2000) has found that the ratio of the average income of the top 5 percent of the world’s population to the bottom 5 percent increased from 78 to 1 in 1988 to 114 to 1 in 1993. In the case of sub-Saharan Africa, a whole region has been left behind: it will account for almost one-third of world poverty in 2015, up from one-fifth in 1990 (United Nations Development Programme 2007).

Demographic Diversity: The United States is “the most religiously diverse nation on earth” (Eck 2002, 4), and is more racially diverse than ever. By 2045 communities of color will constitute at least 50 percent nationwide (Roberts 2008), as is already the case in some states. Immigrants now make up 12.5 percent of the US population (Gryn and Larsen 2010). Intensified immigration and refugee populations swirling around the entire globe have resulted in similarly dramatic demographic shifts on almost every continent. Having the capacity to draw on core democratic processes to negotiate the increased diversity will secure a stable future.

Technological Advances: In 1945, televisions were a rarity and many sections of the country were just getting telephone lines and electricity. The impact of computers and information technology today is reminiscent of the transformation wrought by the Industrial Age: all facets of everyday living

are affected, from communication to health care, from industry to energy, and from educational pedagogies to democratic practices. The Internet—particularly the development of social media to organize groups of people around commonly shared values—influences democratic engagement and activism, as dramatically illustrated by the 2011 Arab Spring and the 2008 US presidential election.

While the historical dynamics that shaped the Truman Commission’s findings may differ from today’s political and social environment, a number of stubborn problems that existed then continue to erode the foundation of our democracy. The most pressing of these are **unequal access** to college and **economic lethargy**.

Although access has increased dramatically, unequal access continues to plague democracy’s ability to thrive. Students are underprepared for college because of what writer and educator Jonathan Kozol (1991) refers to as “the savage inequalities” of the nation’s K–12 system. The poorer the young person, the less likely he or she will go to college. Yet SAT scores, which directly correlate with income, continue to determine many students’ qualifications to attend college. Failure to graduate from high school shuts off college as an option for nearly 30 percent of our nation’s young people; researchers James Heckman and Paul LaFontaine (2007) note that high school graduation rates have leveled or declined over four decades, and the “majority/minority graduation rate differentials are substantial and have not converged over the past 35 years.”

In a new foreword to *The Drama of Diversity and Democracy: Higher Education and American Commitments*, Ramón A. Gutiérrez illustrates Latinos’ attrition along the educational pipeline in the United States. While they are the fastest growing racial minority, surpassing the percentage of African Americans, education is not providing a democratic pathway to economic independence or social mobility. Drawing on research by Armida Ornelas and Daniel Solórzano, Gutiérrez explains that “of every one hundred Latinos who enroll in elementary school, fifty-three will drop out,” and of the forty-seven who graduate from high school, “only twenty-six will pursue some form of postsecondary education” and “only eight will graduate with baccalaureate degrees” (Gutiérrez 2011, xvi).

In the face of troubling discrepancies among racial and socioeconomic groups, there is some good news in the longer term regarding the nation’s increasing college graduation rates. In 1940, only 24 percent of the population 25 years and older had completed high school, and just under 5 percent held a bachelor’s degree (Bauman and Graf 2003). Seventy years later, those numbers have progressed dramatically. “Of the 3.2 million youth age 16 to 24 who graduated from high school between January and October 2010, about 2.2 million (68.1 percent) were enrolled in college in October 2010” (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011). Overall college graduation rates have also improved: the *Digest of Education Statistics 2010*, for example, reports that for those seeking the bachelor’s degree, the rate of graduation within four years has reached 36.4 percent. Within six years, it jumps to 57.2 percent. For those seeking an associate’s degree, the graduation rate within six years is 27.5 percent (Snyder and Dillow 2011).

Although access has increased dramatically, unequal access continues to plague democracy’s ability to thrive.

According to the 2011 *Education at a Glance* report completed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the labor force in the United States is among the world's top five most highly educated. However, OECD's report explains, "The US is the only country where attainment levels among those just entering the labor market (25–34 year-olds) do not exceed those about to leave the labor market (55–64 year-olds)." As a result, "among 25–34 year-olds, the US ranks 15th among 34 OECD countries in tertiary attainment" (OECD 2011, 2). In other words, the educational attainment level in the United States has remained relatively flat while other countries have rapidly increased and surpassed us. An attainment rate that qualified the United States to be near the top of the world several decades ago is not a guarantee of retaining world leadership educationally.

Neither graduation rates nor attainment rates that were sufficient in the past are satisfactory today, when two-thirds of future jobs will require some type of postsecondary credential. There is a strong link between educational level and preparedness for a newly demanding workplace, just as there is a strong link between educational level and other civic indicators, including voting. A high-quality education, workforce preparation, and civic engagement are inextricably linked. A college education—who has access to it, and who completes the degree—affects personal ambitions, the economy, and civic participation.

After World War II, the United States invested in higher education as a vehicle to jump-start economic expansion. The community college sector in particular was dramatically expanded to provide people with new access to college and new technical skills. In today's economy, higher education is once again viewed as a way graduates can achieve greater economic mobility and our lethargic economy can be stimulated.

In 1947, with the world in shambles, new structures, alliances, and programs were created in an attempt to avert future catastrophic wars, to reconstruct multiple economies, and to establish common principles of justice and equality. As the Truman Commission demonstrates, political and educational leaders agreed that higher education was needed to educate students for international understanding and cooperation to secure a sustainable future. Although today's world is more globally integrated financially, culturally, and demographically, it is also fraught with civil and regional wars, clashing values, and environmental challenges wrought by rapacious consumption and carelessness. Citizens who have never examined any of these issues will be left vulnerable in the face of their long-term consequences. How to achieve sustainability—understood in its broadest definition as including strong communities, economic viability, and a healthy planet—is the democratic conundrum of the day. If it is not solved, everyone's future well-being will be in jeopardy.

Meanwhile, students' economic options are heavily influenced by two long-term trends: the requirement of a college credential for the twenty-first-century employment market, and the inadequacy of federal and state funds that could make higher education more widely available. After World War II, the majority of jobs in the United States did not require a college degree, yet many—especially in unionized fields—offered a middle-class living wage and

A high-quality education, workforce preparation, and civic engagement are inextricably linked. A college education—who has access to it, and who completes the degree—affects personal ambitions, the economy, and civic participation.

benefits. Today, a college degree is the credential that a high school diploma once was.

According to a 2010 report, *Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2018*, of the 46.8 million new and replacement job openings in 2018, 34 percent will require a bachelor's degree or better, while 30 percent will require at least some college or a two-year associate's degree. (Carnevale, Smith, and Strohl 2010, 110). As the report's authors describe this societal sea change, "... postsecondary education or training has become the threshold requirement for access to middle-class status and earnings in good times and bad. It is no longer the preferred pathway to middle-class jobs—it is, increasingly, the only pathway" (110).

This higher educational bar is imposed as colleges and universities continue to cope with the effects of the recession and budget deficits at both state and federal levels. Higher education is often the vehicle that states use to balance their budgets. The sector does well in good times and is hit harder in lean ones. According to a 2011 report issued by the National Conference of State Legislatures, total state support for higher education institutions fell by 1.5 percent in FY 2009. Without federal funding from the American Reinvestment and Renewal Act (ARRA), this decline would have been 3.4 percent. In 2010, twenty-three states decreased state support of public higher education institutions, even after receiving ARRA funds. Eight of these states reported drops in higher education funding exceeding 5 percent (National Conference of State Legislatures 2011).

These compounding factors produce our crucible moment today. The country, the economy, and the world demand a different kind of expertise than was required of graduates after World War II. The kind of graduates we need at this moment in history need to possess a strong propensity for wading into an intensely interdependent, pluralist world. They need to be agile, creative problem solvers who draw their knowledge from multiple perspectives both domestic and global, who approach the world with empathy, and who are ready to act with others to improve the quality of life for all. Another name for these graduates is democratic citizens.

The country, the economy, and the world now demand a different kind of expertise.

III. EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: A NATIONAL CALL TO ACTION

*I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states...
Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in
an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.
Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.*

Martin Luther King Jr., "Letter from Birmingham Jail"

*I strongly agree with the Chilean sociologist Eugenio Tironi that the answer
to the question "What kind of education do we need?" is to be found in the
answer to the question "What kind of society do we want?"... If human
beings hope to maintain and develop a particular type of society, they must
develop and maintain the particular type of education system conducive to it.*

Ira Harkavy, Introductory Address, University of Oslo

In the face of the constellation of forces described in the previous chapter, this crucible moment in US history might look daunting. Certain lessons from the Truman Commission, however, should spur people to action, not paralysis. Despite the ravages of World War II and the resultant worldwide economic devastation, the Commission was ambitious in its scope, calling for bold leadership and investment of public funds and reaffirming the public mission of higher education as a reservoir for progress for the nation and the world. That same visionary leadership is necessary today.

The Truman Commission also imagined long-term, systemic change—within both higher education and the nation at large—as an answer to the dire challenges of the day. In a revolutionary stand, the Commission named racial segregation, inequality of any kind, and intolerance as impediments to economic advancement and affronts to democratic values. This twenty-first-century juncture likewise demands deep structural reforms in higher education and the broader society. As Charles Quigley's (2011) epigraph to this report states, "Each generation must work ... to narrow the gap between the ideals of this nation and the reality of the daily lives of its people."

Today, colleges and universities must once again serve as "the carrier[s] of democratic values, ideals, and process," but for a new age confronting new challenges (President's Commission on Higher Education 1947a). Putting civic learning at the core rather than the periphery of primary, secondary, and postsecondary education can have far-reaching positive consequences for the country and the economy. It can be a powerful counterforce to the civic deficit and a means of replenishing civic capital. That restored capital, in turn, can function as a self-renewing resource for strengthening democracy and re-establishing vitality, opportunity, and development broadly across the socioeconomic spectrum and even beyond national borders. As Martin Luther King Jr. (2011) accurately noted, we are all "tied in a single garment of destiny."

If indeed we seek a democratic society in which the public welfare matters as much as the individual's welfare, and in which global welfare matters along with national welfare, then education must play its influential part to bring such a society into being.

If indeed we seek a democratic society in which the public welfare matters as much as the individual's welfare, and in which global welfare matters along with national welfare, then education must play its influential part to bring such a society into being. As Ira Harkavy (2011) asserts in the epigraph to this chapter, that will require a commitment to “develop and maintain the particular type of education system conducive to it.” *A Crucible Moment* posits that the nature of that particular type of education must be determined at the local institutional level in order to construct civic-minded colleges and universities. In Chapter I we argued that such campuses are distinguished by a **civic ethos** governing campus life; **civic literacy** as a goal for every graduate; **civic inquiry** integrated within majors, general education, and technical training; and informed **civic action** in concert with others as lifelong practice.

If Chapter I established the urgency of reinvesting in education for democracy and civic responsibility and Chapter II demonstrated that ambitious action was possible in the face of earlier difficult historical eras, this chapter comprises a National Call to Action: recommendations that can begin to erase the current civic learning shortfall. These recommendations are meant to shift and enhance the national dialogue about civic learning and democratic engagement and to mobilize constituents to take action. Everyone has a role and everyone must act, with participation and deliberation across differences as vibrant democracies require.

We invite each constituent group to use this report and its National Call to Action as a guideline to chart a course of action—tailoring, for example, the strategies and tasks to be accomplished, the entities responsible for each effort, the partners to be engaged, the timeline for action, and other particulars—that would most effectively respond in the exigencies of this crucible moment. We encourage readers to expand and refine this report's recommendations and make them locally relevant by institution, region, issue, and demographics. In Appendix A, we provide a mechanism for doing so in the form of tools to help each participating entity develop its own **Civic Investment Plan**. Readers are encouraged to work collectively within self-designated spheres to develop a plan for exactly what they can and will do to make civic learning and democratic engagement a meaningful national priority.

The Strategy Propelling the National Call to Action

As described in the opening pages of this report, the National Call to Action is the product of a broad coalition of people. The idea for bringing such a group together began with the US Department of Education, which commissioned the report, funded it, and nurtured it. From the beginning, the department acknowledged the widespread civic engagement movement that has been working for decades both on and off campus. The design for the project deliberately drew from that expertise and charged leaders in civic renewal efforts to envision the next frontiers of civic learning and democratic engagement in higher education.

Assuming that the best solutions would be generated by people responsible for moving from a set of recommendations to purposeful action, the department charged the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement with making recommendations—to the government

and to higher education—that were informed by the expertise and experience of the leaders and essential partners of the civic renewal movement already underway. A staunch partner in promoting civic learning and democratic engagement throughout the process, the department nonetheless made clear that *A Crucible Moment* was to be the Task Force’s report not the department’s, prepared in dialogue with a very broad community of advisers.

Those advisers who were participants in five different national roundtables, and whose names are listed in Appendix C are civic practitioners, scholars, and administrators. They generated what became an evolving set of specific recommendations included in this chapter. The National Task Force continued to refine the recommendations in subsequent drafts. There was consensus among participants that a successful Call to Action would require multiple leaders collaborating from varying constituencies both within and beyond higher education and within and beyond government agencies. The broad swath of recommendations that emerged reflects that consensus.

Participants in the national roundtables agreed on another matter: although the charge was to focus on undergraduate higher education, every roundtable discussion inevitably commented upon the robust civic continuum whose origins need to be established in K–12. Acknowledging that reality, we therefore preface the Call to Action for colleges and universities with a discussion of this understood interdependency.

K–12: The Initial Pathway to Civic Knowledge and Responsibility

K–12 education is the cornerstone for both functioning democracies and college readiness. As Ira Harkavy (2011) said in his address at the international conference “Reimagining Democratic Societies,” “no effective democratic schooling system, no democratic society. Higher education has the potential to powerfully contribute to the democratic transformation of schools, communities, and societies.” Despite all the investment in improving the level of schooling in the United States, particularly over the past quarter century, far too little attention has been paid to education for democracy in public schools. In their foreword to the report *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*, former Justice Sandra Day O’Connor and former Congressman Lee Hamilton note, “Knowledge of our system of governance and our rights and responsibilities as citizens is not passed along through the gene pool. Each generation of Americans must be taught these basics” (2011, 5).

The arguments for the civic purpose of K–12 education and the arguments for the civic mission of higher education are similar. Education for democratic engagement is even more urgent than it has ever been, given America’s current diverse populace and global interdependencies. Revealingly, the definition of civic learning put forth in *Guardian of Democracy* encompasses a continuum across educational levels—in both pedagogy and curricula—that is consistent with an enlarged definition of civic literacies cited in Chapter I of this report, the framework for twenty-first-century civic learning provided in figure 1, and the examples of campus practices featured in Chapter V.

“Knowledge of our system of governance and our rights and responsibilities as citizens is not passed along through the gene pool. Each generation of Americans must be taught these basics” (O’Connor and Hamilton 2011).

The Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools therefore argues there should be three C's driving reform in K-12 education: college, career, and citizenship.

Research in 2009 about civic learning in K–12 by Judith Torney-Purta and Britt S. Wilkenfeld echoes findings in higher education. Torney-Purta and Wilkenfeld suggest, for example, that the educational outcomes proceeding from well-constructed civics curricula overlap with the knowledge and skills needed in the workplace. Similarly, their research finds that engaged pedagogies in K–12 that accelerate empowered, student-centered learning also enhance both constructive civic/political participation skills and parallel skills of collaboration, so valuable in the workplace. Finally, they find that classrooms that are civically oriented across multiple kinds of subjects also contribute to students' motivation to do well and, therefore, to the likelihood that students will stay in school.

The Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools therefore argues there should be *three C's* driving reform in K–12 education: **college, career, and citizenship** (see www.civicmissionofschoools.org). Unfortunately, the current public discourse—driven by multiple public, business, and governmental sectors—focuses disproportionately on the first two. The 2011 Educational Testing Services report *The Mission of High School* voices this concern in a chapter called “A Narrowing of Purpose and Curriculum?” Diane Ravitch is quoted about the grievous consequences to democracy's health of not setting high expectations across an array of subjects in schools but instead focusing on only a few subjects that are narrowly judged in high stakes testing: “A society that turns its back on the teaching of history encourages mass amnesia, leaving the public ignorant of the important events and ideas of the human past and eroding the civic intelligence needed for the future. A democratic society that fails to teach the younger generation the principles of self-government puts these principles at risk” (Barton and Coley 2011, 25–26).

The omission of civic goals for education occurs even in the face of evidence that civic engagement contributes to academic success. As reported by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), “Longitudinal studies show that young people who serve their community and join civic associations succeed in school and in life better than their peers who do not engage” (Levine 2011, 15). Parallel findings across K–12 and postsecondary education suggest that (1) comprehensive civic goals need to be included in standards to be assessed at state and national levels; (2) civic development for teachers in schools needs to be supported; and (3) schools of education need to integrate civic learning and democratic engagement into the curricula that prepare our nation's teachers.

Recognizing the need for a reinvestment in civic learning, thoughtful K–12 educators and leaders have developed a framework that accords with the vision and argument of this report (see particularly the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools 2011a, 2011b, www.civicmissionofschoools.org/site/resources/civiccompetencies.html, and *Guardians of Democracy*). The timing is right, then, to form sturdy bridges to civic learning and democratic engagement across students' lifelong learning trajectories. Without K–12 education laying the foundations for civic responsibility and developing students' understandings of democracy's history and principles, any hopes of raising national civic literacy and civic agency are likely to be undermined, both for college students and, even more so, for high school graduates who may never enroll in college.

Six practices have been proven effective in promoting civic learning at the primary and secondary school levels. Significantly and not coincidentally, these practices are associated with keeping students in school: (1) instruction in the subject matter of democracy itself; (2) discussion of current events and controversial subjects; (3) service learning; (4) extracurricular activities; (5) student participation in school governance; and (6) simulations of democratic processes (Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools 2011a, 6–7).

Although *A Crucible Moment* focuses on how to make civic learning and action an expected capability of every college graduate, K–12 and postsecondary education must serve as each other’s civic safeguards. As the participants in the national roundtables recommended, intentionally and mutually beneficial partnerships across these educational sectors can achieve those goals by co-creating a civic learning and democratic engagement continuum, by promoting teacher and faculty development opportunities, and by banding together to push back against the aforementioned narrowing of curricula in schools and in higher education. Finally, school/campus partnerships provide perhaps the best and most accessible means for college students to recognize the profound inequalities of our nation’s school system and communities, to understand the complex structural causes of such inequities, and, in concert with community partners, to begin to devise effective remedies.

Higher Education: Connecting College Learning and Democracy’s Future

This National Call to Action challenges higher education and all its stakeholders to focus with new intentionality on the role that education should play in helping all students prepare for their roles as citizens in this globally engaged and extraordinarily diverse democracy. The higher education community can certainly take a key leadership role in making civic learning a renewed priority for K–12 education. But there is more to civic learning and democratic engagement for twenty-first-century contexts than the schools alone can address. The framework outlined in Chapter I (see fig. 1) calls for higher education to play a significant educational role as well. The knowledge, skills, and experiences students need for responsible citizenship should be part of each student’s general education program. But civic inquiry and collaborative problem solving also need to be included in students’ major programs, including programs that prepare graduates for immediate entry into careers. Reordering current educational priorities and building new levels of civic knowledge and engagement will require unprecedented, widely coordinated, and collective commitments to action. No single entity can effect change at the level and scale required. Leadership will be essential from multiple groups, including K–20 educators, educational associations, civic associations, religious organizations, business, community members, nonprofits, government agencies, unions, and youth. The first step for all concerned is to recognize the erosion of the national investment in civic learning and democratic engagement—and the dire consequences of that disinvestment. The second step is to mobilize the will and the commitment to reverse the downward spiral.

For Democracy's Future: Five Essential Actions

To reframe the way we prepare Americans for civic responsibility, the National Call to Action presented in this chapter presents five overarching actions aimed at addressing the current civic deficit and ensuring that we provide all students with the kind of education that will prepare them to take active responsibility both for the quality of our communities and for the future—US and global—of our democracy.

These five essential actions need to be held as shared commitments across multiple sectors and actors:

1. **Reclaim and reinvest in the fundamental civic and democratic mission** of schools and of all sectors within higher education.
2. **Enlarge the current national narrative that erases civic aims and civic literacy** as educational priorities contributing to social, intellectual, and economic capital.
3. **Advance a contemporary, comprehensive framework for civic learning—embracing US and global interdependence**—that includes historic and modern understandings of democratic values, capacities to engage diverse perspectives and people, and commitment to collective civic problem solving.
4. **Capitalize upon the interdependent responsibilities of K–12 and higher education** to foster progressively higher levels of civic knowledge, skills, examined values, and action as expectations for every student.
5. **Expand the number of robust, generative civic partnerships and alliances locally, nationally, and globally** to address common problems, empower people to act, strengthen communities and nations, and generate new frontiers of knowledge.

In order to achieve a systemic realignment both within an institution and across sectors, the National Call to Action requires leadership from—and offers specific recommendation for—four primary constituent groups: (1) two-year and four-year colleges and universities; (2) policy and educational leaders responsible for educational quality; (3) federal, state, and local governments; and (4) a broad coalition of communities with a key stake in democracy's future. If these multiple stakeholders take action in a collective and coordinated way, US democracy will be strengthened through a reinvigoration of the quality of learning, the commitment to the well-being of others, and civic responsibilities exercised in workplaces.

We call on community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities to assume creative and courageous leadership as they continue to build civic-minded institutions.

The Role of Higher Education as Intellectual Incubator and Socially Responsible Partner

The central work of advancing civic learning and democratic engagement in higher education must, of course, be done by **faculty members** across disciplines, by **student affairs professionals** across divisions, and by **administrators** in every school and at every level. The fourth prominent group of actors are the **students** themselves. The collective work of these groups should be guided by a shared sense that civic knowledge and democratic engagement, in concert with others and in the face of contestation, are absolutely vital to the quality of intellectual inquiry itself, to this nation's future, and to preparation for life in a diverse world.

Higher education has particular contributions to make—and corresponding obligations—in terms of understanding the depth, complexity, and competing versions of what “civic” actually means and entails. Specifically, higher education must in this next generation of civic learning investments build a broader theory of knowledge about democracy and democratic principles for an age marked as it is by multiplicity and division. Colleges and universities need to provide far more enabling environments than are now in place through which students can expand their critical abilities to make judgments about issues and actions, their powers to investigate and analyze, and their wisdom and passion to seek justice with keener insight into how to determine what is just, for whom, and under what circumstances.

To prevent civic learning and democratic engagement from being sidelined by contending forces that consider it discretionary, we call on community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities to assume creative and courageous leadership as they continue to build civic-minded institutions. We recommend four defined area of endeavor (ethos, literacy, inquiry, and action) to ensure all students and the public benefit from higher education's civic investment.

1. Foster a civic ethos across all parts of campus and educational culture

- Establish a commitment to public-mindedness and a concern for the well-being of others as defining institutional characteristics, and explicitly articulate that commitment via consequential public documents and speeches: mission statements, viewbooks, alumni publications, convocation and graduation addresses, and first-year orientation events.
- Ensure that the full range of civic-learning dimensions described in this report—including civic action—are incorporated into every student's experience, and commit to advancing existing civic work to new levels by attending to pervasiveness, scale, frequency, and impact.
- Capitalize on students' civic leadership and experience while further empowering them through rigorous study, engaged pedagogies, and opportunities to grapple with the pressing public problems of the day.

Key Recommendations for Higher Education

1. Foster a civic ethos across all parts of campus and educational culture
2. Make civic literacy a core expectation for all students
3. Practice civic inquiry across all fields of study
4. Advance civic action through transformative partnerships, at home and abroad

- Reward faculty, staff, and students for research, scholarship, and engagement that expand civic knowledge and that promote committed investment in the common good.
- Delineate multiple educational pathways in the curriculum and cocurriculum—appropriate to institutional mission and fields of study—that incorporate civic questions, pedagogies, and practices for all students.

2. Make civic literacy a core expectation for all students

- Make a comprehensive and contemporary framework for civic learning and democratic engagement an overarching expectation for every student in general education programs, majors, and technical training.
- Articulate the specific elements of civic learning to be addressed in general education and major courses so students can differentiate and design a coherent plan of study for developing the full range of necessary civic skills and knowledge.
- Create culminating experiences in which advanced students integrate what they have learned across the full civic continuum by addressing complex public problems in collaboration with others.
- Deploy across the curriculum and cocurriculum, at increasingly advanced levels, powerful civic pedagogies such as intergroup and deliberative dialogue, service learning, and collective civic problem solving—each of which requires attentiveness to local and/or global diversity.
- Monitor progress in students’ civic development and support research on the correlation between students’ engagement in civic learning and other priorities, including persistence, completion, and preparation for further study and careers.

3. Practice civic inquiry across all fields of study

- Define within departments, programs, and disciplines the public purposes of their respective fields, the civic inquiries most urgent to explore, and the best way to infuse civic learning outcomes progressively across the major.
- Identify expected levels of civic achievement within fields, and design creative ways for students to demonstrate cumulative proficiencies.
- Expect students to map their capacity to make civic inquiries a part of their intellectual biography over the course of their studies and to reflect on and demonstrate their cumulative learning through general education, their majors, and their out-of-class civic experiences.
- Incorporate civic inquiries that include global knowledge and engagement across diverse groups within and among countries as a context for expanding knowledge about citizenship, social responsibility, and collective public problem solving.

4. Advance civic action through transformative partnerships at home and abroad

- Model institutional citizenship by employing democratic processes and practices—e.g., reciprocity, mutual respect, co-creation of aims and actions—to construct local and global generative partnerships that are scaled up to address urgent issues and that offer sites where all partners can participate actively as citizens in shaping their worlds.
- Design new models for creatively pooling resources—social, economic, cultural—and for empowering collective democratic action as a means to improve the overall quality of people’s lives.
- Use collaborative, generative partnerships to determine new lines of research for faculty, to identify sources of expertise located in communities, and to provide additional arenas where knowledge and action for the public good can be integrated.

Multiple incentives may be employed for embracing the public purpose and civic involvement of an institution; we encourage each college and university to construct its own Civic Investment Plan to fully articulate how its institutional strategies will reinforce its civic mission. Learning outcomes can and should be explicitly defined by how they contribute to civic capacities (see Appendix A). Student affairs professionals can provide more arenas for students to develop their public-oriented leadership. Students already deeply enmeshed in social justice and civic transformational activities can be publicly upheld as contributing to a campus civic ethos, just as athletes are praised for sustaining school spirit. Faculty can be offered reduced course loads when designing community-intensive collaborative projects around which to build courses and research.

Similarly, students can make a civic commitments portfolio part of their culminating project before graduation in which they reflect on what they have learned and how they aspire to carry civic literacy and civic action into their workplaces and communities. Alumni offices and institutional researchers can track students at selected intervals to learn more about the impact of college on students’ civic and political participation. Alumni events can feature civic issues when graduates reconvene, and alumni can be tied into ongoing civic networks in the cities and towns where they live.

All sectors within higher education can and should make education for democratic citizenship a shared enterprise for the twenty-first century, but colleges and universities cannot and should not presume to do it alone. Higher education will need to create strategic civic partnerships with a range of other entities: community and civic organizations, businesses, hospitals, K–12 schools, policy leaders, local, state, and federal governments, and global partners. Such partnerships, if taken seriously, will likely reconfigure academic inquiry, pedagogy, and scholarship.

As these and similar recommendations are enacted for purposeful and progressively sequenced designs for civic learning and democratic engagement, it will be important to assess progress to inform ongoing reforms and identify further areas of research. The field has already generated an impressive body of research, but it is uneven across topics. We invite readers to review a

We encourage each college and university to construct its own Civic Investment Plan.

Key Recommendations for Educational and Policy Leaders

1. Make civic learning for democratic engagement an expected component of program integrity and quality standards at all levels
2. Make demonstrated achievement in civic learning—US and global—an integral part of quality assurance and public accountability at all levels

report commissioned by this project that contributes to what is already known about the impact of civic engagement on students. The report, *Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement: A Review of the Literature on Civic Engagement in Post-Secondary Education*, (Finley 2011), is available at www.civiclearning.org. See the sidebar on page 35 for recommendations from the national roundtables regarding priorities for future research and assessment.

The Role of Educational and Policy Leaders in Making Civic Learning an Integral and Expected Part of Educational Quality

In the period following World War II, educational leaders took seriously the role that higher education should play in building democratic knowledge and capacity. The Truman Commission recommended that general studies in the arts and sciences be directly tied to the challenges of democracy. The authors of the highly influential *Harvard Redbook* took a similar tack, outlining the role of general education in a free society (Harvard University 1945).

In practice, however, decisions about whether and how to foreground civic and democratic knowledge and learning were left to the discretion of individual colleges and universities and, frequently, in the purview of those responsible for specific programs of study. While most educators rightly believe that fostering critical thinking skills is an important part of preparing graduates for civil society, preparation for democracy in the broader sense addressed in these pages—literacy, inquiry, and democratic engagement in US and global contexts—has remained elective rather than expected. As a result, civic learning and preparation for democracy have largely been left out of quality frameworks and standards—at all levels of program review and quality assurance.

It is time to make education for democracy a core quality commitment, clearly and explicitly. We therefore call on policy and educational leaders responsible for quality at all levels to ensure institutional commitment, capacity, and effectiveness in preparing students as knowledgeable citizens ready to contribute to a democratic and globally engaged polity.

1. Make civic learning for democratic engagement an expected component of program integrity and quality standards at all levels

- Review and strengthen the federal standards that govern accreditation to ensure that preparation for democratic citizenship becomes integral rather than optional in educational institutions.
- Review state and/or state system learning outcomes and program standards for postsecondary study to ensure all students will be prepared for democratic participation and for knowledgeable involvement in the global community.
- Review academic standards for regional, national, and specialized accreditation to ensure they address preparation for democratic participation and global community, in ways appropriate to educational mission.

- Review educational goals and learning outcomes at the campus and program levels to ensure students are prepared for informed democratic participation and global community in ways appropriate to institutional mission and particular subjects of study.
- Monitor educational practice across the curriculum and cocurriculum to ensure every program provides meaningful opportunities for students to advance in civic learning and global engagement.

2. Make demonstrated achievement in civic learning—US and global—an integral part of quality assurance and public accountability at all levels

- Engage scholars and educational leaders in developing indicators and reporting frameworks for student achievement that include civic learning.
- Include civic learning in US and global contexts as expected student learning outcomes in public reporting frameworks—national, state or state system, and campus-specific.
- Create and support an ongoing, integrated research program—involving scholars from different disciplines and views—to build deeper understanding of practices and policies that foster civic learning and democratic engagement in US and global contexts.
- Disaggregate the data on participation in civic learning programs and pedagogies to ensure students from all backgrounds are participating.
- Make national reporting on students’ gains in civic knowledge, skills, and engagement a signature for US education and a point of widely shared pride.

The Role of Federal, State, and Municipal Governments as Public Advocates and Partners for the Common Good

We turn now to the US Department of Education, which initiated the National Call to Action, to the Federal Government as a whole, and to state and local governments that collectively wield power to make civic learning a national priority and a catalytic commitment across all parts of higher education—and beyond.

Virtually in chorus, the many civic educators and leaders who joined in this analysis through national roundtables affirmed that federal, state, and local governments can and should play a key role in moving civic learning from being incidental to being expected of all college graduates. It takes a community to sustain a democracy. It is important to engage government at multiple levels and multiple agencies to work in concerted partnership with each other and with educators; campus leaders; students; policymakers; and local, state, and regional business and community leaders. In this important public role, the thrust should be to create a far more supportive and enabling public climate for revitalizing and reaffirming higher education’s civic mission.

In this spirit, we recommend that the US Department of Education and other federal agencies, such as the National Endowments for the Arts and for

Priorities for Future Research

- Disseminate more widely existing assessment tools for measuring students’ civic learning and effective practices in democratic engagement
- Amass and publicize evidence that shows how civic learning, civic agency, and democratic engagement result in increased retention and college success; design additional studies to probe this linkage
- Support scholars doing research on civic learning and engage students in the process
- Use the Civic Investment Plan matrix to identify specific research projects that could be initiated at one’s own institution
- Establish standards in civic learning to serve as guidelines for measuring and reporting progress
- Sponsor and support further research on the impact of programs and partnerships that foster civic learning and democratic engagement on learning outcomes and student development
- Include additional research questions in routinely administered higher education surveys to explore how learning environments can enhance key civic competencies
- Develop national civic indicators and report on levels of civic and democratic knowledge, skills, values, and action achieved by high school and college graduates

Key Recommendations for Federal, State, and Municipal Governments

1. Champion civic learning explicitly and repeatedly as a fundamental US priority and a component of all educational programs
2. Strategically refocus existing funding streams to spur civic learning and practice
3. Create financial incentives for students to facilitate their access to college while expanding their civic capacities
4. Tie funding for educational reform and research initiatives to evidence that the funded initiatives will build civic learning and democratic engagement
5. Report on the levels of civic and democratic learning, set national and state goals for student achievement in civic learning, and make such outcomes a measurable expectation of school and degree-granting institutions.

the Humanities; the National Science Foundation; the US Departments of Labor, Justice, State, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development; and the Corporation for National and Community Service—to name only a few—work together with the higher education community and civic organizations, state and local governments and other state systems, and with other policy leaders and influencers, to assume leadership at all levels in the following five key arenas:

1. **Champion civic learning explicitly and repeatedly in its fullest democracy-enhancing dimensions as a fundamental US priority and a component of all educational programs, including those that relate to job training and workforce development**
 - Incorporate promotion of civic learning and democratic engagement in the US Department of Education mission statement as well as those of state education departments.
 - Expand the current national narrative about educational reform by describing how civic learning and public problem solving contribute to sustaining economic vitality, strong communities, and the development of intellectual, social, and political capital.
 - Echo in publications, speeches, and media the comprehensive call from the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools' triple C's—College, Career, and Citizenship—for both K–12 and postsecondary education.
 - Stress evidence that engaging students in large public issues and hands-on action with communities correlates with outcomes that contribute to retention and graduation rates.
 - Serve as public advocates for contemporary understandings of what civic learning in a diverse US democracy and a global century now requires in terms of leadership, intercultural knowledge, collective public action, and democratic justice.
 - Designate high-profile civic ambassadors from business, nonprofits, media and arts, the public sector, religious communities, and other constituencies across political parties to champion this robust civic message.
 - Identify symbolic ways to broadcast the richer understanding of civic learning charted in the Chapter I of this report to the broader public through high-profile public events.
2. **Strategically refocus existing funding streams to spur—from school through college and beyond—civic learning and practice in the curriculum, cocurriculum, and experiential education**
 - Find creative, strategic ways to provide financial support, even in a difficult period of shrinking governmental funds and infrastructures, for civic-oriented practices, programs, and pedagogies at two-year and four-year colleges and universities.
 - Convene a Civic Interagency Policy Alliance—first through the leadership of the US Department of Education, then imitated by

state and local governments—to launch a civic audit to find funding opportunities across agencies to heighten civic competencies and democratic commitments.

- Direct existing or new federal, state, or local dollars to entwine multiple purposes, especially increasing graduation rates, promoting civic learning and democratic engagement, and preparing students for work in a constantly evolving market.
- Expand the mission of the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) to address curriculum development for civic learning in US and global contexts so that CNCS can be a more powerful resource for making civic learning part of the expected, rather than the elective, curriculum.

3. Create financial incentives for students, including first-generation students and those studying in career and occupational fields, to facilitate their access to college while expanding their civic capacities as part of their education

- Examine current federal programs (such as TRIO and Gear Up) and state funding streams designed to increase access and success to and through college, and investigate how to profitably adapt them to foster expanded civic capacities and hands-on public problem solving.
- Encourage colleges and universities whose locations allow expansion to go well beyond the current federal government requirement that at least 7 percent of Federal Work-Study monies fund student jobs in community-based placements.
- Evaluate the feasibility of establishing a Civic Action Corps at our nation's colleges and universities that functions like ROTC, with scholarships, focused courses, and expectations for public service after graduation as a mechanism for combining access, citizenship, and meaningful public service careers.
- Increase public awareness of Income-Based Repayment and Public Service Loan Forgiveness policies—which can significantly reduce the cost of higher education—to encourage students to enroll in college and pursue careers in the public service sector.

4. Tie funding for educational reform and research initiatives—at all levels—to evidence that the funded initiatives will build civic learning and democratic engagement, both US and global

- Integrate civic expectations in calls for funding opportunities, and expect grantees to report on the civic impact of their funded initiatives.
- Review the impact of the shift in funding expectations by examining the final reports from the grantees.

5. Report regularly on the levels of civic and democratic learning, set national and state goals for student achievement in civic learning, and make such outcomes a measurable expectation of schools and postsecondary education in public, private, and for-profit degree-granting institutions

- Set clear expectations at the federal and state levels for improvement in students' civic learning and democratic engagement, with the same emphasis with which benchmarks for graduation rates have been advocated.
- The US Department of Education should report to the nation annually on the levels of civic learning and skills achieved, and states should report on local levels annually by drawing on multiple data sources.
- Support higher education researchers to develop a national framework of civic indicators across knowledge, skills, values, and collective action.
- Report at state and federal levels on the synthesized higher education research that measures progress along a spectrum of civic indicators.

Other Key Stakeholders in Promoting Civic Learning for a Diverse Democracy in a Global Century

The national roundtables that shaped this report included key people representing other entities that interact with, influence, and in some cases are the intellectual lifeblood of colleges and universities. All attendees eagerly participated in formulating the National Call to Action, both as a whole and with respect to the part their own groups could play in elevating education for democracy and civic responsibility as a priority for every college student. We therefore charge these stakeholders below to formulate a civic agenda for their groups and to create their own Civic Investment Plans. We offer the recommendations cited below and developed by participants at the national roundtables, as merely a starting point for further action.

K–12 Systems

1. Work with traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs to ensure newly credentialed K–12 teachers receive the necessary training to advance civic knowledge, skills, values, and action at whatever level they will teach and across differing subject areas.
2. Build on the work of the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools and other civic school reform groups to maintain and evolve an understanding of the kinds of civic learning demanded by the increasingly diverse and globally linked democracy; draw from the Campaign's well-articulated set of civic competencies.
3. Expand curricular opportunities and adopt pedagogies shown by research to enhance civic competencies.
4. Coordinate with higher education, parents, policy makers, and other locally influential groups to form strong alliances that will chart students' growth in civics and history using state accountability

data systems; secure necessary funding to support civic learning in schools; and elevate civic learning to the prominence it deserves.

Higher Education Associations

1. Convene representatives of higher education associations on a regular basis, increasing the visibility and influence of national leadership to promote civic learning and democratic engagement.
2. Accentuate education for democracy in a diverse US society and globe within publications, conferences, projects, and institutes.
3. Encourage member institutions within the differing higher education sectors to track the access of different student populations to opportunities for enhancing civic learning and democratic engagement.
4. Establish new mechanisms at the national and institutional level for strategic planning and collaboration across K–16 to create civic pathways for students.

Disciplinary Associations

1. Define and advance new civic and democratic arenas of investigation within academic fields, and make such learning a focus of conferences, publications, and awards.
2. Support public scholarship and sponsor professional development for faculty to enhance their civic literacy and pedagogical expertise, thus highlighting the implications of civic responsibility in their courses, programs, and scholarship.
3. Convene a democracy collaborative across disciplinary associations that can be featured at multiple disciplinary association meetings to investigate civic questions deeply rooted in disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields of inquiry.

Civic Organizations and Community Leaders

1. Strengthen ties between higher education and civic organizations to reinvigorate democratic practices, advance collaborative governance, promote dialogue and deliberation, and encourage collaborative community problem solving.
2. Define clearly for colleges and universities the community's needs, priorities, and expectations for campus-community partnerships; integrate those perspectives into students' community-based civic learning experiences.
3. Emphasize the connections between workforce competencies and civic and democratic competencies.
4. Ally with campus leaders who are striving to enlarge the civic horizons and capabilities of their students, and assert the value to higher education of the special expertise civic organizations and community leaders contribute to civic learning and democratic engagement.

Employers

1. Articulate for the public the civic dimensions of the workplace that are essential for innovation, productivity, and success.
2. Include key civic and ethical competencies as requirements for hiring.
3. Offer ongoing educational opportunities in work environments to continue to develop and practice civic democratic skills.
4. Conduct business-education roundtables focused on the intersection of civic learning, employment, and economic development.

Foundations and Philanthropic Entities

1. Use the public stature and influence of philanthropy to raise the visibility and importance of civic learning and democratic engagement as a national priority.
2. Invest in strengthening the national movement to elevate civic learning and democratic engagement as urgent priorities.
3. Convene federal agencies, private foundations, and other key stakeholders to coordinate strategies and identify multiple funding streams to support next-level civic work; expand institutional capacity to sustain it.
4. Promote cross-fertilization and collaborations among the multiple entities funded.

We hope to encourage readers to believe they can act in concert with others to close the civic achievement gap, reinvigorate our democracy, and help all people develop the capacities to work together to create stronger communities, a more vibrant economy, and a shared democratic commitment to “promote the general Welfare” at home or abroad.

We close this chapter with an invitation to all constituents and stakeholders to act, in both the short term and the long term, and singly as well as in collaboration with others. As this report has emphasized throughout, strengthening our democracy and the lives of its citizens will require a large-scale, collective effort. There is a role for everyone, and everyone is needed. To spur that effort, we have created a series of tools to prompt action. We urge colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations alike to create their own Civic Investment Plans. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, we have provided some tools for getting started in Appendix A.

In Appendix A, readers will find a Civic Investment Plan for colleges and universities along with one for organizational groups. For use with the former, we have also created a Civic Institutional Matrix to function as a resource for initiating an asset/gap analysis of the civic-mindedness of your institution. We hope these tools will become part of a larger national repository of existing and new instruments to facilitate thoughtful deliberations about how to create locally appropriate, strategically designed civic action plans.

Above all, we hope to encourage readers to believe they can act in concert with others to close the civic achievement gap, reinvigorate our democracy, and help all people develop the capacities to work together to create stronger communities, a more vibrant economy, and a shared democratic commitment to promote the general welfare at home or abroad.

IV. TRAILBLAZERS FOR CIVIC LEARNING: FROM PERIPHERY TO PERVASIVENESS

I've... made it a personal mission to ensure that professors and administrators embrace the civic mission. Administrators often talk about creating better citizens, but the mission never filters down to students.

Rachel Karess, student, Indiana University

Democracy can survive only as strong democracy, secured not by great leaders but by competent, responsible citizens.... And citizens are certainly not born, but made as a consequence of civic education and political engagement in a free polity.

Benjamin Barber, *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*

The foundational work has already begun for reinvesting in education for democracy and civic responsibility in their twenty-first-century global context. But opportunities for civic learning and democratic engagement remain optional rather than expected on most campuses, and peripheral to the perceived “real” academic mission of too many others. Civic learning is still too often random rather than progressively mapped by the institution for its students. Academic professionals spearheading civic investments too frequently go unrewarded, and in some cases, are even penalized for their invention and commitment. Progress has been made in civic learning and democratic engagement, but not enough.

A study conducted for AAC&U by the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan found that, of twenty-four thousand college students surveyed, only one-third felt strongly that their civic awareness had expanded in college, that the campus had helped them learn the skills needed to effectively change society for the better, or that their commitment to improve society had grown. Likewise, only slightly more than one-third felt strongly that faculty publicly advocated the need for students to become active and involved citizens (Dey et al. 2009). Reaching the other two-thirds of students should be the benchmark set for 2020.

The Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education, in investigating the progress students are making across various learning outcomes, offers similarly clear evidence that higher education has to rethink its curriculum, pedagogy, and educational experiences to foster higher levels of college learning. Its longitudinal examination of student learning over four years indicates that in six of eleven learning outcomes measured, the majority of students experienced either “no growth or a decline” (this and other Wabash National Study statistics are summarized in Finley 2012). Regarding students’ level of commitment to socially responsible leadership, for example, data reveal moderate to high growth in 52 percent of students, small growth in 13 percent, and no growth or decline in 35 percent. Growth in students’

Of twenty-four thousand college students surveyed, only one-third felt strongly that their civic awareness had expanded in college, that the campus had helped them learn the skills needed to effectively change society for the better, or that their commitment to improve society had grown.

Fewer than 40 percent of students engage in any of several key practices correlated with gains on civic learning outcomes, and fewer than 20 percent participate in three or more at a high level.... [But] for students who do engage in multiple key practices at high levels over time, there is a greater level of growth in several... civic learning measures.

valuation of political and social involvement is lower: moderate to high growth posts 35 percent, with small growth at 7 percent and no growth or decline at 58 percent. Openness to diversity and challenge, a critical dimension of civic learning and democratic engagement, is lower still: moderate to high growth is reported in only 31 percent of students, small growth in 8 percent, and no growth or decline in 61 percent.

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) findings on other aspects of civic learning indicate that seniors' self-rating on understanding the problems facing their communities had strongly increased throughout college for only 24.9 percent of students. Knowledge of people from different races/cultures fared only slightly better, with 27.1 percent of college seniors reporting "much stronger knowledge" (Finley 2012).

The most revealing news in the Wabash National Study is that fewer than 40 percent of students engage in any of several key practices correlated with gains on civic learning outcomes, and fewer than 20 percent participate in three or more at a high level (O'Neill, forthcoming).

The positive news in this picture is that, for students who do engage in multiple key practices at high levels over time, there is a greater level of growth in several of the civic learning measures reported above. This suggests that good practices are in place but are not required and that, even when civic-minded forms of learning are available, too few students opt to take advantage of these opportunities. It also suggests how important it is for students' intellectual and civic development to identify and widely publicize campus opportunities for civic learning and their availability and location within curricular and cocurricular experiences.

While continuing reforms will be necessary if colleges and universities are to be a significant venue for citizenship development, there is no need to start constructing civic-minded campuses from scratch. There already is, as Chapter V demonstrates, a robust array of emergent curricular models, tested pedagogies, and innovative campus life programs; and an accumulating body of evidence points to the positive impact of these new forms of education for democracy, on multiple levels and on various constituencies. Typically, however, these nascent civic learning programs and resources are (1) not deliberately orchestrated in a developmental arc; (2) not pervasive across students' experiences; or (3) not expected of every graduate. Correcting these omissions would transform higher education into a far more powerful national resource for strengthening democracy, communities, and lifelong citizen engagement.

Figure 6 illustrates some ways the academy can move from partial transformation to pervasive civic and democratic learning and practices.

In order to advance from partial to fully integrated education for democracy, it is instructive to consider how earlier civic transformations were triggered. Transformations were stimulated by powerful external social movements, internal educational reforms, federal and state incentives, burgeoning civic-oriented nonprofits across the political spectrum, and philanthropic funding. These innovations have been carried forward by civic-minded students and by students who have only recently achieved wider

FIGURE 6. From Partial to Pervasive: Constructing More Advanced Levels of Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement in Higher Education

Partial foundation laid...	Civic learning is pervasive...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning is optional for some students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning is expected for all students, regardless of field or area of study
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning is a one-time experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning is infused across students' educational experiences over time in a developmental arc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching critical thinking does not consider real-world contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching critical thinking also occurs in relation to issues of public significance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning is individually oriented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning also fosters collaboration with diverse people and groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning focuses on external engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning also asks students to reflect on their own social identity and location as well as those of others
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in some disciplines and certificate programs raise civic questions in relation to their field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in all disciplines and certificate programs raise civic questions in relation to their field
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based scholarship is accepted in some departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based scholarship is positively viewed in all departments and influences the hiring and promotion of faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning practices in the curriculum and cocurriculum are parallel but not integrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic learning practices in the curriculum and cocurriculum are coordinated and connected through partnerships between academic and student affairs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement is one-directional, with colleges and universities providing expertise to the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement is reciprocal, with colleges/universities and communities working together to identify assets and solve public problems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and vision statements do not explicitly address civic responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and vision statements explicitly address civic responsibility

access to higher education; by faculty newly invested in public scholarship and in student-engaged pedagogies; by student affairs staff promoting student leadership and social responsibility; by senior administrative leaders, including presidents, who have embraced the inherent civic mission of a college education; and by community leaders and groups, both local and global, who have organized to address a range of public issues that held their communities back and who have helped colleges and universities understand what reciprocal partnerships mean. The task of advancing to the next level in the coming decade will require efforts no less emphatic and multifaceted.

This chapter, therefore, reflects briefly upon the decades-deep history of civic-minded reform in higher education and describes campus actors and their roles in an ever-widening circle of civic advocates. Following this exploration, Chapter V takes the reader onto campuses and into communities where advanced educational practices work to foster a pervasive civic ethos, expand civic capabilities, and invest in creating strong communities.

The partial foundation for wide-scale civic learning and democratic engagement has been laid by a group of trailblazing campus-based actors who share a passionate commitment to wed intellectual inquiry and expertise to a sense of social responsibility for the welfare of others and of the planet.

The Trailblazers: Fashioning Civic-Minded Institutions

The partial foundation for wide-scale civic learning and democratic engagement has been laid by a group of trailblazing campus-based actors who share a passionate commitment to wed intellectual inquiry and expertise to a sense of social responsibility for the welfare of others and of the planet. Innovative, collaborative, and action-oriented, these actors are primed to elevate civic learning as an essential component of a college degree and a force for building stronger local and global communities. But such trailblazers are still the exception on most campuses: a lone voice in a department, a single program in student affairs, a cluster of presidents often at risk for the very civic leadership they espouse. Mobilizing broad masses of people beyond just trailblazers is critical if the civic deficit is to be erased. As the following sections illustrate—and as the Civic Investment Plan can help each institution explore and quantify—there is a role for everyone to play, at every level in academe.

Student-driven: Our trailblazer cast begins with students whose initial demands that their education address big questions and complex unsolved social problems have effected real change in their institutions. Despite the common perception of students as self-focused and disengaged, an influential minority has consistently been a leavening agent in education for civic responsibility and democracy for decades.

According to HERI research, today's college students are the most engaged in community-based partnership and social change of any generation. To reiterate an earlier point, HERI reports that 85.3 percent of first-year students responded "frequently" or "occasionally" when asked whether they "performed volunteer work" as high school seniors (Pryor et al. 2009). While volunteerism is but one piece of the civic learning continuum, it is a disposition that can be cultivated into fuller civic agency and an enhanced understanding of how existing structures can be changed to better serve the nation and the world. The immediate antecedents for the current students were, in fact, the first generation of students to be finally admitted to college once the patterns of discrimination so deplored by the Truman Commission were dismantled, nearly forty years after the Commission's 1947 report was issued.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which officially outlawed most discrimination against racial minorities and women, marked the beginning of the end of racial segregation and gender discrimination in American higher education. Equitable access took several more decades to advance and is still a work in progress. However, the increase of African Americans and other formerly excluded groups in our nation's colleges and universities engendered challenges to what had previously been largely unquestioned assumptions about history, literature, democracy, justice, cultural norms, and the ultimate purposes of a college education.

Women coming to college in ever increasing numbers joined suit across class, color, age, and sexual identity in demanding more from their curriculum, their faculty, and campus life, and in seeking broader public purposes to which their knowledge could be applied. Today, women dominate service learning.

With the demographic shift, the curriculum shifted as well. New, often interdisciplinary, academic programs emerged.

A quarter of a century after the 1947 Truman Commission report, the campus did not so much go out into the community as the community came onto the campus—as college students. The expansion of community colleges accelerated the demographic shift. With a much more representative student body, the climate and concerns on campuses altered. Today’s students are a heterogeneous mix —racially, religiously, ethnically, and socioeconomically—much of which comprises first-generation students and new immigrants. Most of these students already define themselves as citizens of multiple communities; thus, they bring to campuses a consciousness of the larger interdependencies that characterize modern life.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, a formative wedge of socially-minded students were a determining force in the establishment of volunteer service centers that now are commonplace on nearly every campus. “The manner in which we engage in our democracy goes beyond, well beyond, the traditional measurements that statisticians like to measure us by, most notably voting,” ruminated a group of students at a Wingspread civic engagement conference in 2001 (Long 2002, 9). “Many of us at Wingspread perceive service as alternative politics, as a method of pursuing change in a democratic society” (2), they explained. While admitting their disillusionment with conventional national politics, they affirmed, “we have more interest in local politics and global politics,” which “often involve issues that are of special concern to us” (1).

Some of this student political engagement is reflected in the myriad clubs and activities where students organize on issues that matter deeply to them: sharp rises in tuition, racial justice, sweatshop labor practices, climate change, abortion, human rights, poverty, hunger, and human trafficking. Some join nationally with other college students to influence public policy and learn how to lobby their Congressional, state, and municipal representatives.

Three examples suggest the range of civic learning and real political engagement that a range of students practice. **The One Campaign** works with the general public and college students to encourage Congress to allocate at least 1 percent of the GDP to alleviate global poverty (www.one.org). **The Interfaith Youth Corps**, founded in 2002, is building a youth movement that believes “faith can be a bridge of cooperation, strengthening our civil society and promoting the common good” (www.ifyc.org). Their Interfaith Youth Institute and Better Together Campaign fostered youth-led events in more than 200 campuses last year. The **Energy Action Coalition**, co-founded by Billy Parish when he was a Yale student, brought twelve thousand students to Washington for its Power Shift 2009—and thousands more in 2011—to learn how to shape legislation and lobby Congress (www.energyactioncoalition.org). Many student activists committed to sustainability (to focus on only one issue among dozens) are doing their social change civic work locally: securing environmental studies majors; green financial investments; and coalitions with presidents, facilities managers, and boards of trustees who have signed on to honor the American College & University Presidents’ Campus Climate Commitment (<http://presidentsclimatecommitment.org>).

Bonner Foundation Model for Civic Development

- Pre-College Level: **Expectation**
Ethic of care as core value for engagement and service
- First-Year Level: **Exploration**
Involvement in a variety of service projects
- Second-Year Level: **Experience**
Focus on a set of issues, neighborhood, and/or agency
- Third-Year Level: **Example**
Emerge as leader of peers and begin to manage discrete projects
- Fourth-Year Level: **Excellence**
Continue as project leader or in specialist capacity

Common Commitments for Cocurricular and Curricular Experiences

- Civic engagement
- Social justice
- Community building
- Diversity
- International perspective
- Spiritual exploration

Hoy and Meisel 2008

Using disciplinary and interdisciplinary lenses, faculty committed to civic-minded scholarship provide the means to deepen students' knowledge, investigate lines of inquiry, and expand civic skills through public engagement.

Faculty driven: Like students, faculty members across all sectors of higher education have been drivers of the transformation toward education for democracy and social responsibility. Philosopher Elizabeth Minnich describes them as establishing “a new academy” located (often literally) “on the periphery” in “slightly shabby houses now owned by the university... [and] often hard to distinguish from the community that relinquished them” (AAC&U 1995, 2). Signs on the front lawn announce these “new academy” themes: Center for Collaborative Learning, Women’s Studies, African American Studies, Environmental Studies, American Indian Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, Deaf Studies, Institute for Technology and Values, Multicultural Studies, Science and the Humanities Programs, Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, Continuing Education Center.

Summarizing Minnich’s argument, one scholar in the same 1995 volume says “this new academy... welcomes rather than avoids critical and creative engagement with wider communities. It endorses and produces scholarship that seeks not just to know the world but to work toward a better world... pioneering ways of thinking, learning, and teaching that provide models for engaging differences constructively, rather than divisively” (Schneider 1995, vii).

Faculty members have assumed leadership in channeling the volunteer energy of students into opportunities to explore important issues. Using disciplinary and interdisciplinary lenses, faculty committed to civic-minded scholarship provide the means to deepen students’ knowledge, investigate lines of inquiry, and expand civic skills through public engagement. Service learning has become the term to describe a wide variety of community-based learning and research experiences that are embedded within courses and carry academic credit.

Recent HERI data suggest the timing is propitious for seizing on the increasingly widespread faculty interest in education for personal and social responsibility. In one indicator of a core capacity necessary for civic learning, 82.5 percent of faculty in 2007–8 said teaching tolerance and respect for different beliefs was very important or essential; 72.4 percent said the same for engaging students in civil discourse around controversial issues. Between the 2004–5 HERI faculty survey and the 2007–8 survey, a huge increase—of 19.1 percent, from 36.4 percent to 55.5 percent—emerged in faculty response to the question about instilling a commitment to community service. Enhancing students’ knowledge and appreciation of other racial/ethnic groups jumped from 57.6 percent to 75.2 percent, while helping students develop personal values climbed from 50.8 percent to 66.1 percent (DeAngelo et al. 2009).

These shifting faculty priorities reflect a larger trend: civic-oriented scholarship infused with diversity and global perspectives is emerging as part of the fast-growing academic field of public scholarship. The integration of civic, global, and diversity lenses on public questions is also becoming more prominent in pedagogies designed to have students apply their knowledge to real-world problems. Such pedagogies are typically grounded in messy real-world settings where students don’t just theorize how to tackle stubborn, complex public problems, they actually figure them out with others through hands-on experiences. This approach by faculty is transforming the routine experience of, say, an introduction to chemistry course, an American history

course, or an upper-level nursing course. But again, these faculty members are still exceptional; in the next phase, institutions need systematically to reward faculty for such new forms of public scholarship and learning.

There are also existing national civic networks that should be tapped and expanded for leadership in mobilizing the next generation of investment in civic learning. The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), one of many faculty-oriented civic networks, comprises scholars and directors of civic centers at research universities (<http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities>). Typically involving smaller institutions, the nonprofit Project Pericles sustains a network of colleges and universities committed to including “social responsibility and participatory citizenship as essential elements of their educational programs” in courses, campus life, and communities (<http://www.projectpericles.org>). Imagining America (www.imaginingamerica.org) defines its mission as “animating and strengthening the public and civic purposes of humanities, arts, and design through mutually beneficial campus-community partnerships that advance democratic scholarship and practice.” (See Appendix D for more information on each organization.)

Characterized by the use of active learning pedagogies in courses, these civic-oriented faculty members are often practitioners of what AAC&U has termed the Principles of Excellence. As such, they can be leaders for the next expansive generation of civic work on campus because they

- teach the arts of inquiry and innovation;
- engage the Big Questions;
- connect knowledge with choices and action;
- foster civic, intercultural, and ethical learning; and
- assess students’ ability to apply learning to complex problems (AAC&U 2007, 60).

Staff driven: The professionals who first responded to student demands for centers and programs that served the larger community were not faculty but student affairs staff. Student life professionals continue to be perceived by students as mentors guiding students’ development as whole, rounded people attuned to others’ needs and not simply their own. Even where such staff are not explicitly so assigned, students often turn to student affairs professionals to provide educational environments where they can practice self-development, self-governance, and attentiveness to others on multiple levels. Because such practices are essential aspects of democratic citizenship writ on everyday life, these trailblazing student affairs staff are especially poised to promote a campus-wide civic ethos.

Social responsibility has always been as much a cornerstone of student affairs as it has of democratic citizenship. Student affairs staff focus on dimensions central to civic learning: How do groups of people live responsibly with one another, internalize bedrock consensus values that offer a moral compass to behavior, and establish rules and policies to guide expectations and consequences when rules/policies are violated?

Student affairs staff serve as the midwives of academic integrity, student honor codes, student government, student newspapers, student clubs, and student resident assistants. They are first in line to institute procedures to

Student affairs staff focus on dimensions central to civic learning: How do groups of people live responsibly with one another, internalize bedrock consensus values that offer a moral compass to behavior, and establish rules and policies to guide expectations and consequences when rules/policies are violated?

resolve issues that disrupt the equilibrium and core values of a community— e.g., sexual assault, cheating, acts of bigotry, theft, destroying campus property, and drunkenness. They also often lead the campus volunteer centers that organize students to partner in service projects with local and/or global communities. They oversee student support centers empowering newcomers in higher education to succeed. They frequently manage campus sustainability efforts, organize intercultural programming in partnership with student groups, lead programs that send students abroad, and shepherd international students on campus. Leadership from these trailblazers helps transform a campus into more genuinely and radically intercultural spaces of engagement.

Insights of such staff will need to be tapped more fully in the next generation of civic work, and their contributions more widely recognized. Student affairs professionals have prodigious civic skills that can be deployed to expand students' civic capacities. Their leadership is crucial in any collective effort to make civic responsibility understood as the ethos and daily practice of the campus.

Institution driven: Presidents are often critical figures who shape the civic ethos of a campus and embody its core mission. They are the visible symbols of an institution and, as such, often define their institution's orientation to both internal and external publics. Do they engage with multiple kinds of community groups or just local donors? Do they provide leadership only for campus issues or to solve pressing local issues like inadequate K–12 schools, insufficient housing, crime, and economic development? Is the campus off-limits to the neighborhood, or does the president initiate programs that turn it into a shared public space?

As the institutional leader, a president also has the power to sign public documents that affirm his/her institution's stand for explicit values and commitments. Presidents have used this authority to join with others in collective civic pronouncement such as Campus Compact's *Presidents' Declaration on the Fourth of July*, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U's) *American Democracy Project*, the *Presidents' Climate Commitment*, and the AAC&U Presidents' *Call to Action to Educate for Personal and Social Responsibility*.

The power of presidents and their institutions to develop influential national networks by working in larger institutional collaborations is exemplified by *The Democracy Commitment*. This recently launched network of community colleges, which seeks not only presidential endorsement but institutional involvement across all levels, describes its aims thus:

The Democracy Commitment will provide a national platform for the development and expansion of programs and projects aiming at engaging community college students in civic learning and democratic practice. Our goal is that every graduate of an American community college shall have had an education in democracy. This includes all our students, whether they aim to transfer to university, earn an associate degree, or obtain a certificate (2011).

“Our goal is that every graduate of an American community college shall have had an education in democracy. This includes all our students, whether they aim to transfer to university, earn an associate degree, or obtain a certificate” (The Democracy Commitment 2011).

As the Democracy Commitment and AASCU's American Democracy Project (with which the Democracy Commitment is affiliated) both understand, institutional leadership derives from more than the office of the president. It comes from every level and division. Its effectiveness relies on everyone contributing to civic literacy and to civic agency. While most institutions focus on being good stewards of their localities, others define their place in regional or national terms, modeling citizenship by investigating large consequential issues like agriculture, energy, health, or environmental sustainability. Still others model what a good global institutional citizen looks like through partnerships for international research, development, and education.

Thus have trailblazers from these four important campus constituents jointly laid the foundation for what a civic-minded institution looks and acts like in the twenty-first century. Thanks to their leadership efforts, higher education is now poised for a second generation of engagement that can move civic enterprises from the periphery to the center as an expected part of every student's college experience.

But trailblazers cannot do it alone. To advance such an ambitious agenda, they need support from others who also have a key stake in the future of democracy, higher education, and economic and social development. Disciplinary societies can applaud, publish, and promote public scholarship and engaged pedagogies; philanthropic groups can fund projects, research, and collaborations; higher education associations can lift up the leadership, creativity, and civic commitments of the trailblazers among their members; quality assurance specialists can measure their achievements; civic organizations and community groups can partner with them to define and co-create collaborative projects; and government agencies at the local, state, and federal levels can fund, recognize, and partner with them.

The power of external partners will be necessary if significant and lasting progress is to be made in this next phase. Institutions have already been encouraged to create civic-minded institutions by the decision of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education in 2006 to create a new Community Engagement Classification. Institutions had the opportunity to apply again in 2008, and most recently, in 2010. Thus far, a total of 311 two-year and four-year institutions have achieved the designation. Carnegie invites colleges and universities to submit evidence of how they meet standards of community outreach and partnership as well as curricular engagement. The Foundation examines documentation about mission, culture, leadership, resources, and practices. The process thus establishes national measures that are already useful for benchmarking progress and will be all the more so during the coming generation of civic work.

Public and private foundations have certainly fueled civic innovations and will be needed in the coming decades. A privately funded, independent initiative, Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP) shows the catalytic impact of strategic funding, a broad civic scope, and building a community of practice (see www.aacu.org/bringing_theory). Launched a decade ago, BTtoP represents the most consistent funding for, focus on, and exploration of the civic mission of both private and public higher education in this century.

Trailblazers... [have] jointly laid the foundation for what a civic-minded institution looks and acts like in the twenty-first century. Thanks to their leadership efforts, higher education is now poised for a second generation of engagement that can move civic enterprises from the periphery to the center as an expected part of every student's college experience.

More than three hundred colleges and universities have been involved in various aspects of the project, and nearly one hundred have received grant support. At the center of its concerns is the interrelatedness of the three core purposes of liberal education: advancing knowledge and understanding; promoting the well-being and actualization of the learner; and acting responsibly toward the surrounding community in all its diversity. To explore this interrelationship, BTtoP has commissioned a series of research monographs, journal articles, and books; funded campus-based research assessing student development; hosted conferences; supported innovative campus civic programs and student-led conferences; and convened think tanks. Throughout, it has been a nurturing influence conceptually as well as financially. Importantly, over the years it has also seeded a network of practitioners and scholars who continue to sustain progress.

It is through the collective power of multiple entities inside and outside higher education that there is hope of achieving a more capacious and transformative expression and practice of civic learning and democratic engagement. John Dewey understood the connection when he said, “Democracy needs to be born anew every generation, and education is the midwife” (Dewey 2008, 139). And former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan understood that democracy is not simply sustained by a set of eloquent aspirations but requires as well a capacity for generating collective action: “What the people want is very simple. They want an America as good as its promise” (Jordan 2011). Together we can make it so.

*“Democracy needs to be born
anew every generation, and
education is the midwife”
(Dewey 2008, 139).*

V. A FOUNDATION PARTIALLY LAID: PATHWAYS TO DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT

The first and most essential charge upon higher education is that at all levels and in all fields of specialization, it shall be the carrier of democratic values, ideals, and processes.

Higher Education for American Democracy

The way we run our classrooms and the way we connect those classrooms to our communities can have a lot to say about whether our teaching and learning practices are advancing a more diverse, socially just, and democratic culture.

*José Z. Calderón, Race, Poverty, and Social Justice:
Multidisciplinary Perspectives through Service Learning*

Where Chapter IV highlighted the trailblazers driving the civic transformations of two-year and four-year colleges and universities, we turn now to concrete examples of the fruits of their labor. While the foundations for civic learning and democratic engagement have been partially laid, this report challenges readers to advance that crucial educational and democratic work to the next level. And while the leaders featured in Chapter IV show what it means to nurture a **civic ethos** on campus, this chapter offers concrete illustrations of programs, pedagogies, and partnerships that make **civic literacy** a core expectation for all students, that engage **civic inquiry** across multiple fields of study, and that advance **civic action** through transformative partnerships. The following pages illustrate, in short, what it would mean to fully enact the recommendations for higher education that this Task Force, on behalf of a wide array of advisers, set forth in Chapter III.

First, we examine how civic literacy and civic inquiry can be embedded within curricular pathways in both general education and specialized fields of study, with the aim of creating a developmental arc mapped in designs for students' cumulative civic learning over time. The potential for reinforcing curricular expectations for civic learning might be strengthened by the proposed Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), that is described in this chapter. The DQP includes civic learning as one of five expected learning areas at three key levels: associate's, bachelor's, and master's degree. Moving from curriculum designs that make civic learning expected rather than optional, the chapter then showcases three of the most promising civic pedagogies: (1) intergroup and deliberative dialogue, (2) service learning, and (3) collective civic problem solving. Finally, we explore a singularly promising means of overcoming the national civic shortfall and building civic capital: the emergence of transformative and civic-minded campus-community partnerships. In a still exceptional design, a handful of two-year and four-year colleges and universities have developed ambitious generative partnerships and alliances between higher education, communities, governments, and other key stakeholders—partnerships constructed to address locally specific

Tulane University

Tulane University guides students' commitment to public service by including a two-part public service general education graduation requirement. Students

- Complete an introductory service-learning course by the end of their sophomore year;
- Complete one additional public service-approved program as a junior or senior with one of the following:
 - Service learning course (at 300-level or above)
 - Academic service-learning internship
 - Public service research project (faculty sponsored)
 - Public service honors thesis project
 - Public service-based international study abroad program
 - Capstone course with public service component

Source: <http://tulane.edu/cps/about/graduation-requirement.cfm>

but nationally and globally intertwining problems. As the recommendations in Chapter III underscore, the National Task Force sees the expansion of such reciprocal partnerships as a critical next step in making higher education a catalyst and resource for the renewal of democracy.

Curricular Civic Pathways: Moving Civic Learning from the Margins to the Core

In 2002, a civic working group appointed by AAC&U was charged to gather K–12 teachers, heads of nonprofit civic organizations, and representatives from higher education to gauge what transparent, coherent curricular pathways were in place in K–16 that offered students progressively more sophisticated levels of civic understanding and civic skills. None were to be found. What did emerge, however, were pockets of innovation that were not yet always connected to one another but that held the promise of possibility. Similarly, in the examples below, no institution has put all the pieces together to formulate civic pathways for all students, but some institutions have paved some better-lit thoroughfares.

As one scholar-practitioner describes this moment, “Over the past decade, spurred by critique within the [civic renewal] movement itself, many academic institutions have launched ambitious centers and community-learning initiatives, committed to more sustained, intellectually rigorous, and socially transformative work. This second wave of engagement has tended to reframe the discourse of community service into one of collaboration and citizenship, to reconnect community work with systemic issues of policy, power, and justice, and to work for change not only in individual courses, but at the level of the curriculum and the campus as a whole” (Scobey 2010, 191).

These trailblazers demonstrate that it is possible to map more explicit, intentional, and developmental curricular designs. Through them, students move along multiple experiences in progressively challenging ways which can reverse the current poor showing on civic learning outcomes while also replenishing our nation’s civic capital.

1. Civic literacy as a core expectation for all students in general education programs

With growing consensus across colleges and universities about essential learning outcomes (Hart Research Associates 2009), institutions have agreed that personal and social responsibility should be one of the four central outcomes of college learning. In research conducted by University of Michigan scholars for AAC&U, 93 percent of students and 97 percent of campus professionals strongly or somewhat agreed that personal and social responsibility should be a major focus of their institutions (Dey et al. 2009). While increasing this focus is understood to be an institution-wide goal, many campuses first turn to their general education curricula as a vehicle for deepening students’ civic knowledge, skills, values, and capacities for collective action.

Some institutions, like Franklin Pierce University, for example, include public deliberation and sustained dialogue as an integral part of first-year seminars. Others, like Tulane University (see sidebar on previous page), have opted for a two-stage developmental arc requiring both an introductory and an upper-level component. Tulane’s model is notable for the variety of ways that students can engage in community-based learning beyond service alone.

Other institutions, like Portland State University (see sidebar), also scaffold civic learning progressively across a vertical general education curriculum. In a similar institutional example, St. Edward’s University introduces students to the struggles for justice in the United States, followed by a parallel pair of required courses about global issues and social responsibility. Their general education curriculum culminates in a senior-level course in which students become civic problem solvers by addressing a social issue in a capstone experience.

2. Civic inquiry integrated into the major or central field of study

One of higher education’s most critical purposes is educating democratic citizens who will be both prepared and inspired to ensure the continued vitality of our republic. Unfortunately, higher education itself sometimes contributes to suppressing this kind of learning, research, and action. For example, a group of college students from twenty-two states who gathered in 2001 to discuss civic engagement said their institutions encouraged them to defer social responsibility until they were secure in their careers (Long 2002).

Too often, institutions shy away from asking departmental majors to address overarching learning outcomes. Still, departments themselves should not be excused from playing an appropriate role in educating students for civic responsibility and democratic engagement; without their participation, little progress can be made in deploying higher education institutions as sites for citizenship and incubators for new knowledge. Every disciplinary and interdisciplinary major should examine the civic questions, dilemmas, and public purposes of its field. This is the next frontier for civic learning. Pointing the way, Worcester Polytechnic Institute has authored a powerful project-based curricular design that affects all majors (see sidebar on page 54) and asks students to consider the civic consequences of choices they make as professionals.

A ground-breaking book, *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, explores the range of ways different disciplines can illuminate civic questions and help students develop a stronger civic lens. As Mary Huber and Pat Hutchings assert in their introduction, “To be sure, there are some who think citizenship best—and exclusively—addressed as a subject for study in appropriate political science or history courses. ... But for those who see preparation for citizenship as a *goal* of undergraduate education, the possibilities for where it can be taught expand” (Huber and Hutchings 2010, ix).

The volume explores a range of fields, from math to communication, from political science to literature, from environmental history to diversity. The authors show how different disciplines can explore distinct civic issues like political voice in a political science course, the ethical and moral dimensions of a world citizen in a Holocaust literature course, the civic “response-ability” in a communication course, or the practical civic consequences of numeracy in a math course.

Portland State University

Portland State University has developed a curricular pathway to enhance communication skills, invoke critical thinking, cultivate social and ethical responsibility, and foster understandings of the diverse nature of human experience.

- Freshman Inquiry—
Exploration: A year-long sequence exposes students to interdisciplinary themes designed to employ multiple perspectives.
- Sophomore Inquiry—
Communication: Students enhance communication skills through dialogue, research presentation, and composition. The human experience, social and moral responsibility, and critical thinking are central foci.
- Upper Division Cluster—
Individualization: Students take a grouping of courses to further build upon skills gained in previous segments, and to explore topics of special interest to them.
- Senior Capstone—
Cooperation: As a culminating project, students from a variety of majors work in teams, collaborating with faculty and community leaders to address a community issue important to them as engaged and informed learners.

Source: <http://pdx.edu/unst>

Worcester Polytechnic Institute

WPI students engage in project-based learning throughout their course of study. First-year students enroll in the Great Problems Seminar (GPS). This two-course introduction focuses on global themes, societal problems, and human needs. Five seminars center around Educating the World, Feeding the World, Healing the World, Powering the World, and Grand Challenges, which focuses on engineering and sustainable development. Students are introduced to a broad sweep of scholarship and then work in small groups to define a specific problem, research its dimensions, offer a public strategy for addressing their chosen issue, and presents results.

During junior year, students complete an Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP), which challenges them to address a problem that lies at the intersection of science or technology with social issues and human needs. The IQP is done under the guidance of one or more faculty, usually in teams of two to four students. The objective is to enable WPI graduates to understand, as citizens and as professionals, how their careers will affect the larger society. About 60 percent of all IQPs occur abroad.

In their senior year, students complete a Major Qualifying Project (MQP), which asks them to synthesize previous study to solve problems or perform tasks in the major field with confidence, and communicate the results effectively.

Source: www.wpi.edu/academics/Depts/IGSD/iqp.html and www.wpi.edu/academics/Undergraduate/FirstYear/gps.html

What the disciplinary examples hold in common, the co-editors argue, is commitment to inculcating a sense of civic agency in students in a pluralistic polity. They explain, "...our definition of education for citizenship encompasses both the political and the personal: the very reasons for individuals to be politically informed and active are inextricably linked with their sense of empathy, ethical consciousness, and capacity to engage in dialogue with others" (Smith et al. 2010, 5).

Adopting institution-wide goals for civic learning and democratic engagement can function instructively as an intellectual and educational guide for departments. Assessing student progress toward achieving overall institutional learning goals can also function as an incentive to engage departments in education for democracy. University of Alabama at Birmingham has charted its civic pathways through student affairs, general education, and the major to give special emphasis to ethical reasoning, diversity, and civic responsibility (see sidebar on page 55).

Wagner College, an institution that has already won national recognition for integrating civic learning across its general education program and most recently cocurricular life, has also begun to define what it calls "civic professionalism" as a goal for majors. Through external funding, faculty development opportunities, campus-community partnerships, and leadership from departments, civic professionalism has been incorporated into a cluster of departments. The University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee focused attention on its pre-professional schools and created interdisciplinary global courses like Global Management, Global Security, Global Cities, and Global Communication. All integrate service-learning requirements, study abroad, foreign language, and overseas internships.

The foundations laid thus far illustrate the power of intentional institutional designs, of reaching all students, and of distinguishing specific civic outcomes that result from deliberately crafted curricular architecture. The major challenge in the next generation is to make such curricular experiences commonplace and expected rather than rare and notable.

Civic Learning and the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)

Faculty and campus leaders who seek to make civic learning expected rather than optional for all students now have a new resource to test, amend, and, conceivably, strengthen. In 2011, the Lumina Foundation for Education commissioned and released for beta testing a proposed Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP). The DQP outlines five kinds of learning that should be included and integrated in any college degree at the associate's, bachelor's, or master's level: (1) broad integrative knowledge, (2) specialized knowledge, (3) specific intellectual skills, (4) applied learning, and (5) civic learning. At each degree level, students are expected to show that they can integrate and apply all five kinds of learning in addressing complex problems, challenges, and projects, including civic ones.

The recommended areas of **broad integrative knowledge** in the DQP include global, intercultural, and civic democratic learning. The recommended **intellectual skills** are comparable to those outlined in Chapter I of this report and include "engaging diverse perspectives." The 2011 beta version of the

DQP says that, at all degree levels, students need to acquire the knowledge required for responsible citizenship both from their formal studies (the knowledge and skills described above) and from community-based learning, and demonstrate their ability to integrate both kinds of learning in analyzing and addressing significant public problems and questions. The DQP offers numerous examples of ways that students can demonstrate their achievement of integrative civic competencies.

Many countries around the world have already adopted “degree frameworks” that codify the kinds and levels of learning that college ought to represent. The authors of this American version believe, however, that the United States is unique in providing a degree framework that makes demonstrated achievement of civic learning a key component of postsecondary studies.

With grant support from Lumina, several accreditors, higher education associations, disciplinary societies, and individual campuses will be testing the DQP framework over the next three to four years—applying it to curriculum renewal and testing ways to foster and document students’ demonstrated achievement of competencies.

As the campus work illustrated in this chapter makes clear, there is much more to civic learning and democratic engagement than any summative degree framework can show. Still, the DQP represents a step forward for civic learning by lifting it up to new prominence and connecting it to all parts of students’ learning, including community-based learning. If the DQP takes hold, civic learning in the twenty-first century can take on far more vibrant forms than twentieth century educational leaders ever achieved. For more information on the DQP, visit http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf.

Powerful Pedagogies that Promote Civic Learning

In addition to designing curricular pathways through general education and through a student’s major or technical specialized field of study, how civic issues are taught and in what venues delineate yet another arena for enhancing civic literacy, inquiry, and collective action. Three civic pedagogies have emerged as particularly effective: (1) intergroup and deliberative dialogue, (2) service learning, and (3) collective civic problem solving.

1. Intergroup and Deliberative Dialogue

Two distinct but closely aligned pedagogies—intergroup and deliberative dialogue—are each longstanding and recognized pedagogies that educate for democracy. They can be found within both the curriculum and the cocurriculum and enacted both on and off campus. These pedagogies can serve as a learning-centered design for a course, a widely adaptable dialogic approach, and a mode of collaborative civic problem solving. These two pedagogies also address head-on an essential skill in a diverse democracy: the capacity to deliberate productively and respectfully with others who hold

University of Alabama at Birmingham

Capstone Courses in the Major Include Discipline-Specific Competency in Ethics and Civic Responsibility

UAB’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) outlines a shared vision for every UAB graduate, regardless of his or her field of study. This QEP includes ethics and civic responsibility, described as “the ability to make informed, ethical decisions and be prepared for responsible citizenship in the community, nation, and world.”

Every program at UAB has developed or is in the process of developing a senior capstone course or experience. The capstone provides a summative opportunity for students to apply what they have learned to an original project and/or real-life application. This might involve such components as collaborative projects, internships, service learning, fieldwork, independent research, community outreach, and/or thesis writing. In every case, capstone courses include a set of well-defined learning outcomes, significant writing, and integration of discipline-specific competencies in quantitative literacy and in ethics and civic responsibility.

Capstone development is supported through a series of “Conversation on Capstones Workshops,” which provide opportunities for administrators, faculty, and staff to exchange best practices and discuss challenges in developing and/or revising capstone courses and experiences.

Sources: <http://main.uab.edu/Sites/DOE/QEP/44503> and <http://main.uab.edu/Sites/DOE/QEP/45086/>

California State University, Chico

California State University, Chico has designed a First-Year Experience curricular program that culminates in an annual town hall meeting. The program was initiated as a way to build civic literacy in entering students. The first-year program challenges entering students to research an issue of public importance and share their findings in a public forum through presentations and group dialogue. Students are paired with external consultants who advise them in ways to become more deeply involved with their selected issue after the Town Hall is over.

Initially housed within an introductory composition course, the program later transitioned to the political science department, which supports the program in the introductory course on politics and government. Both courses are required components of the general education curriculum, and reach all students.

Source: www.csuchico.edu/fye/thm/csuc_town_hall_meeting.shtml

different views, in order to deepen mutual understandings and, in the best of cases, to agree on a shared set of actions.

Research indicates that 95 percent of Americans believe that civility is important in politics, which is why so many worry that nastiness and polarization are on the rise (Shea et al. 2010). The civic literacy necessary in a heterogeneous contemporary world where contestation seems the norm is substantial, which is why practices that help refine skills in soliciting multiple viewpoints, negotiating and compromising, and organizing across differences for democratic ends are so valuable. The classroom and campus life are perfect laboratories for developing and practicing the democratic skills of perspective taking and engagement. Those skills are also the very heart of intellectual inquiry. Through courses that emphasize deliberation, students can learn to listen and speak respectfully; analyze dissenting views without vilifying the speaker; manage conflict; analyze, deliberate, and advocate for particular solutions; and seek compromises and consensus (Hess 2009).

Twenty years ago, the University of Michigan was one of the seedbeds of intergroup dialogue programs, which are now offered at numerous campuses across the country. They are specifically designed to bring together small groups of students from diverse backgrounds in a semester-long academic course to learn discussion skills, the impact of social inequalities, and ways to work together. In their book *Intergroup Dialogue*, David Schoem and Sylvia Hurtado explain that, “in a sense, intergroup dialogue is a *diverse* twenty-first-century version of the *homogeneous* nineteenth-century town hall meeting: sleeves rolled up, talking directly, honestly, and sometimes quite harshly about the most difficult and pressing topics of the day, and then moving forward together with solutions to strengthen the community and the nation” (2001, 4).

Studies have demonstrated that the more students are able to engage in diverse interactions on campus, inside and outside the classroom, the more likely they are to confront notions of prejudice, take seriously views different from their own, and embrace social justice (ASHE 2006). In a study involving fifty-two parallel field experiments using the Michigan intergroup model, researchers found a significant impact on twenty of twenty-four measures; those outcomes were still present a year later (Gurin, Nagda, and Sorensen 2011). The intergroup dialogues helped students collaborate across differences, think more complexly about others and about larger social issues, and actively commit to working with others to shape the world to be more just (51).

California State University, Chico, draws on a deliberation model rather than an intergroup one in their Town Hall Meeting (THM) First-Year Experience program (see sidebar). THM seeks to foster students’ sense of agency in promoting the well-being of the community around them as well as their own well-being. Research begun in 2010 surveying seniors who had participated in the THM program as freshmen reveals a positive effect on civic attitudes and retention rates for participants in the program compared to non-participants (http://www.aacu.org/bringing_theory/documents/RetrievalConferenceSummaries.pdf).

Wake Forest University (WFU) offers another example of a program specifically constructed to use deliberative democracy skills to develop

students' self-efficacy and political engagement skills. WFU's Democracy Fellows program involved a cohort of students participating in a multi-year fellowship program for democratic learning that charted students' civic development over time. The program began with a first-year seminar in Deliberative Democracy and continued through practices and experiences of deliberation in years two and three. In their fourth year, students determined on their own how best to apply their knowledge as Democracy Fellows to issues that concerned them on campus and beyond.

In their book *Speaking of Politics: Preparing College Students for Democratic Citizenship through Deliberative Dialogue* (2007), Katy J. Harriger and Jill J. McMillan studied the impact of the program on preparing students for democratic engagement. They found that, by senior year, the Democracy Fellows had "a more communal sense of citizenship, a set of democratic skills that other students did not have, a greater democratic sensibility about what it meant to be a citizen in a democratic society, and a stronger sense of their own voice in campus governance" (120). These "more robust democratic dispositions" are characterized by "the promotion of the general welfare, recognition of the common humanity of each person, respecting and protecting rights, taking responsibility for one's participation, and supporting democratic principles and practices" (143).

The other arena for deliberative dialogue is campus life. Sustained Dialogue programs, which are almost always student led, bring groups together weekly for an entire semester to discuss an issue of common concern. These programs have taken root on dozens of campuses and are further fostered by the national Sustained Dialogue Campus Network office (see www.sdcampusnetwork.org). Sharing many traits with Sustained Dialogue programs, the Olive Tree Initiative is an interfaith dialogue program developed by students at the University of California, Irvine. It has been adopted by other UC campuses and demonstrates the dialogic and political impact of this civic pedagogy that stresses engaging multiple and competing perspectives from a broad range of positions (see sidebar).

Many student affairs professionals incorporate deliberative dialogue into routine training for leaders in residential life and student organizations. They also weave it through many campus activities, often beginning with small-group interactive circles during freshman orientation and carrying through a host of other activities.

As colleges and universities increasingly define their sphere to include communities beyond their immediate geographic boundaries as sites for citizenship and democratic engagement, many have created centers and programs designed to engage students with a broader public. As higher education moves beyond the campus borders to engage more widely with others, a number of national civic organizations can serve as valuable partners because of their established leadership in democracy-building and their special expertise in deliberative dialogues. Leaders from several of these groups contributed to the national roundtables that informed this report, including Everyday Democracy, the Kettering Foundation, the National Issues Forum Institute, *AmericaSpeaks*, The Democracy Imperative, the Public Conversations Project, the Guiding Lights Network, and Public

University of California, Irvine

Founded by a group of Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Druze, and non-religious UCI students in 2007, the Olive Tree Initiative promotes dialogue across multiple perspectives about the conflict in the Middle East. To deepen their knowledge, students travel each year to the region to engage directly in conversation with community leaders, religious authorities, activists, academics, and politicians to explore differing perspectives.

During a given year, the students organize up to seventy forums both on and off campus. Their April 2009 three-day UC Student Leadership Summit resulted in the Olive Tree Initiative being adopted by other UC campuses.

Source: www.olivetreeinitiative.org/uci

The public deliberation so central to these centers requires many skills identified as essential outcomes of both a college education and democratic practice: “listening deeply to other points of view, exploring new ideas and perspectives, searching for points of agreement and bringing unexamined assumptions into the open” (London 2010).

Agenda (for more about these groups, see Appendix D). The civic capital these efforts offer is of inestimable value. Building strong alliances between external civic organizations and colleges and universities promises to be a significant frontier where part of the next generation of civic work can be cultivated.

The Kettering Foundation both supports and studies some of these emerging centers that have arisen in the hybrid space between the campus and the larger community. According to a recent Kettering study of a network of fifty such centers, 85 percent are housed on college campuses. The work of these centers is primarily “carried out in public squares, community centers, and neighborhood associations, not behind campus walls” with a focus on “identifying collective problems, developing a sense of common purpose, and working together to solve them” (London 2010, 3–6). The public deliberation so central to these centers requires many skills identified as essential outcomes of both a college education and democratic practice: “listening deeply to other points of view, exploring new ideas and perspectives, searching for points of agreement and bringing unexamined assumptions into the open” (14).

In one example from the Kettering study, the New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce University used an inclusive form of public deliberation to seek positive solutions to tensions that arose about the historic legacy of the town in the face of explosive growth and commercial expansion. In this instance, students became involved through “problem-based service learning.” Similarly, the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy at Kansas State University partners with many entities to inject the public voice into policy decisions about issues such as immigration, land-use reform, health care, and energy policy. The Citizen Leadership Institute at Gulf Coast Community College has used its deliberative strategies to bring its diverse community together to discuss various redistricting scenarios and develop recommendations to present to state legislators.

2. Service Learning

Without question, service learning, in its many manifestations, has been the dominant curricular vehicle for promoting different dimensions of civic learning and engagement with larger communities.

Service learning has been described by higher education researchers as a “teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities” (Engberg and Fox 2011, 88). Innovative faculty members coupled the students’ disposition to serve others with course offerings that provided a deeper knowledge base and required reflection. As Gregory Jay explains, “What makes service learning different from volunteering is its explicit academic component: like any test, paper, or research project, the service-learning experience must be integral to the syllabus and advance the student’s knowledge of the course content” (Jay 2008, 255). John Saltmarsh further particularizes the goal for high-level service learning by saying it ideally is “rooted in respect for community-based knowledge, grounded in experiential and reflective modes of teaching and

learning, aimed at active participation in American democracy, and aligned with institutional change efforts to improve student learning” (Saltmarsh 2005, 53).

Efforts in service learning have been led primarily by faculty and spurred by presidential leadership and organizational allies. One of the most visible and influential national organizations that has been advocating service learning is Campus Compact. Founded by a handful of presidents in 1985, Campus Compact now has more than 1,100 members, a national office in Boston, and three dozen state offices (see Appendix D). The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), which unfortunately no longer exists, became one of the other key catalysts for expanding civic work, especially service learning. AAHE both highlighted service learning in its national meetings and magazines and produced a groundbreaking set of still-relevant service-learning disciplinary volumes, edited by Edward Zlotkowski (2006), in which faculty describe how service learning can be integrated within differing disciplinary contexts and courses.

In 2003, in partnership with the *New York Times*, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) launched the American Democracy Project (ADP), which has helped fill the AAHE vacuum for the more than 220 colleges and universities involved (see Appendix D). ADP’s goal is to “produce graduates who are committed to being active, involved citizens in their communities” (see www.aascu.org/programs/ADP). Training students to become “Stewards of Place,” ADP has evolved into an influential network that sponsors national and regional meetings, promotes institutional civic audits, offers assessment tools, and spurs both curriculum reform and community engagement.

Service learning has taken root in two-year colleges as well. According to survey findings gathered by the American Association of Community Colleges between 1995 and 2003, “faculty at nearly 60 percent of all community colleges offer service learning,” thus opening up this powerful pedagogy and high-impact practice to 45 percent of the nation’s first-time entering college students (Prentice, Robinson, and McPhee 2003). The Maricopa Community Colleges’ Center for Civic Participation (CCP) is organized to “increase awareness about policy issues, civic involvement, and how government works,” and “to increase involvement of Maricopa students, faculty, staff, and the community in civic life at all levels” (see www.maricopa.edu/civic/aboutus.html). CCP has a special focus on enriching public discourse and promoting civic participation as it partners with civic, governmental, educational, business, and community-based organizations.

The last two decades have seen an impressive expansion of service-learning courses. While service learning has grown, reaching nearly 60 percent of graduating college seniors (Finley 2012), the percentage needs to climb significantly if all students are to benefit from this powerful, proven pedagogy. In a positive turn of events, some of these service-learning courses are now required for every student on campuses like California State University, Monterey Bay, and Tulane University. But the vast majority of courses are still random electives that students encounter in no particular order or time sequencing.

While service learning has grown, reaching nearly 60 percent of graduating college seniors, the percentage needs to climb significantly if all students are to benefit from this powerful, proven pedagogy... But the vast majority of courses are still random electives that students encounter in no particular order or time sequencing.

As the service-learning movement has evolved, many proponents are defining greater nuances between *kinds* of service experience, *levels* of student responsibility, *scale* of issues addressed, learning *outcomes* sought, and the *impact* of engagement on community partners. The differentiation was driven by a concern for both academic rigor and community empowerment. In 2003, Caryn McTighe Musil sought to capture the phases of the emerging service-learning landscape as it began to differentiate among various program designs, to identify the knowledge needed, and to clarify the impact on the community (see fig. 7 below).

Service learning has shown positive effects on learning outcomes associated with “complexity of understanding, problem analysis, critical thinking, and cognitive development” (Eyler et al. 2001, 4). It has also had significant impact on students’ intrapersonal and social development including “personal efficacy, personal identity, spiritual growth, and moral development” (1). Further studies show positive outcomes associated with “cultural awareness, tolerance for diversity, altruistic attitudes, moral development, sensitivity and reasoning, and self-esteem” (Finley 2012). The study by

FIGURE 7: The Faces/Phases of Citizenship

FACE/PHASE	COMMUNITY IS...	CIVIC SCOPE	LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE	BENEFITS...
Exclusionary	only your own	civic disengagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one vantage point (yours) • monocultural 	one party
Oblivious	a resource to mine	civic detachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • observational skills • largely monocultural 	one party
Naive	a resource to engage	civic amnesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no history • no vantage point • acultural 	random people
Charitable	a resource that needs assistance	civic altruism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • awareness of deprivations • affective kindness and respect • multicultural, but yours is still the norm center 	the givers’ feelings, the sufferers’ immediate needs
Reciprocal	a resource to empower and be empowered by	civic engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legacies of inequalities • values of partnering • intercultural competencies • arts of democracy • multiple vantage points • multicultural 	society as a whole in the present
Generative	an interdependent resource filled with possibilities	civic prosperity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • struggles for democracy • interconnectedness • analysis of interlocking systems • intercultural competencies • arts of democracy • multiple interactive vantage points • multicultural 	everyone now and in the future

Source: Adapted from Musil 2003.

Engberg and Fox (2011) links involvement in service learning to global perspective taking with positive relationships across cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains.

Other studies link service learning with civic learning outcomes that demonstrate efficacy: increasing students' sense of social responsibility and citizenship skills such as religious and racial tolerance, prosocial decision making, and exploring the intersections between identity and privilege (Eyler et al. 2001; Lechuga et al. 2009); the ability to work well with others; leadership and communication skills; and, importantly, a sense of being able to effect change in their community (Gallini and Moely 2003; Rockquemore and Schaffer 2000).

In the next generation's development of service learning—in terms of achieving greater impact within higher education itself—center directors, faculty, students, and community leaders should correlate the different service-learning courses with specific outcomes; create introductory, milestone, and cumulative levels for service-learning projects; and make differentiation transparent to students and faculty alike. Likewise, center directors, faculty, student affairs professionals, and students should coordinate regularly to mirror the newly clarified course distinctions with a similarly progressive and differentiated set of civic outcomes within student life programs. Finally, academic administrators and faculty should adopt promotion and tenure criteria that recognize the scholarly and pedagogical value of investments in service learning and other pedagogies that foster civic development.

While service-learning research initially focused on its impact on students, there is now an emerging body of literature on its impact on the community. Similarly, service-learning programs have amassed greater understandings about how to establish more democratic, participatory, and reciprocal partnerships. This aspect of community-based learning is influencing the scope and design of the frontier work expressed in transformative partnerships and alliances discussed later in this chapter.

3. Collective Civic Problem Solving

The third civic pedagogy we highlight is collective civic problem solving. Though a burgeoning arena of practice and scholarship, it has not had time to produce the rich body of evidence about its impact on students and communities that service learning has accumulated. Civic problem solving certainly builds on the foundations that dialogue and service learning have already laid; yet it seeks to delineate a new conceptual framework for civic work. Saltmarsh and Hartley describe the context in which civic problem solving is taking root. They themselves call for moving from a civic-engagement framework to a democratic-engagement paradigm. They assert that a democratic-engagement paradigm leads to a focus on purpose and process rather than activity and place. They explain:

Democratic engagement locates the university within an ecosystem of knowledge production, requiring interaction with other knowledge producers outside the university for the creation of new problem solving knowledge through a multidirectional flow of knowledge and

Other studies link service learning with civic learning outcomes that demonstrate efficacy: increasing students' sense of social responsibility and citizenship skills such as religious and racial tolerance, prosocial decision making, and exploring the intersections between identity and privilege; the ability to work well with others; leadership and communication skills; and, importantly, a sense of being able to effect change in their community.

expertise. In this paradigm, students learn cooperative and creative problem solving within learning environments in which faculty, students, and individuals from the community work and deliberate together... Civic engagement in the democratic-centered paradigm is intentionally political in that students learn about democracy by acting democratically (2011, 21).

How this translates into actual programs, courses, and activities is demonstrated by a number of concrete examples reported in *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement* (2007) by Anne Colby, Elizabeth Beaumont, Thomas Ehrlich, and Josh Corngold. Like many who believe that not only self-efficacy but also political efficacy are important, Colby et al. recommend that higher education invest in the political development of the nation's fourteen million college students. "It is important for pluralist democracy... that as many people as possible possess a set of capacities that are intrinsically valuable and also support responsible citizenship by helping them thoughtfully evaluate political choices and effectively contribute to political outcomes" (6).

The programs described in *Educating for Democracy* range from one semester courses to full multicourse programs to courses linked to living-learning residential programs. Rick Battistoni, for instance, uses democratic pedagogies that promote "learning democracy by doing democracy" in his course *Ancients and Moderns: Democratic Theory and Practice* at Providence College (Colby et al. 2007, 299). Students create models of a perfectly democratic and perfectly undemocratic classroom and keep a "democratic theory journal"; they can also opt for a Democracy in Action project where they work in groups to organize themselves democratically and implement a democratic action plan (299).

Alma Blount describes the Service Opportunities in Leadership program at Duke University, which is composed of a two-semester interdisciplinary program: first, a course on service leadership and social change, then a summer internship where students work "on social and political change projects for organizations across the country and abroad" (Colby et al. 2007, 300). On their return, students participate in a policy research seminar culminating with a "Social Issue Investigation Portfolio" that includes an essay on a problem from their summer placement, an interview with a practitioner, and a policy recommendation paper (300).

At the University of Maryland, College Park, Sue Briggs describes CIVICUS, a program that involves a two-year interdisciplinary living-learning program with five courses and activities within residence halls. The program collaborates across several colleges, residential life, and the library with foci on citizenship, leadership, community service, and community building in a diverse society. Students become CIVICUS associates and live, study, and plan service activities together; take five courses, including Leadership in a Multicultural Society; and complete a capstone course that involves an internship or a "discovery"/research project (Colby et al. 2007, 300–301).

Northern Arizona University (NAU), while not one of the fourteen institutions participating in the Political Engagement Project at the heart of *Educating for Democracy*, employs the same problem solving, action-

focused pedagogy for its Community Re-engagement for Arizona Families, Transitions, and Sustainability (CRAFTS) program. CRAFTS “aims to nurture public scholarship through collaborative research and action with diverse community partners in the NAU region and beyond” (Coles and Scarnati 2011, 35). Creating problem-oriented programs like NAU’s would counteract a study finding that just over one-third of faculty strongly agreed that their campus actively promoted awareness of US or global social, political, and economic issues (Dey et al. 2009). CRAFTS spans a range of courses, but its most intense focus is on first-year seminars organized topically on issues such as water, immigration, indigenous environmental justice, and global human rights. What distinguishes CRAFTS are its Action Research Teams (ARTs). These research teams typically engage a community partner, combine knowledge from the classroom with knowledge from local communities, and include a mentoring component; some are even linked to residential learning communities.

Third-year student Nina Porter did her first ARTs project in a first-year seminar, and was transformed by it; she is now in her third year of involvement in a community-based ART. As she explains, the problem-based project “has taught me not only about the community’s power, but also about my own agency as a political actor... and ... by connecting with others I can effect real, immediate change. I have found that democracy means continually acting *as* a community, *for* the community, rather than simply casting a vote at election time” (Porter 2011, 16). In her case, ARTs also influenced her choice of major and stirred ambitions to attend graduate school.

Civic problem solving pedagogies are highly varied and still emerging, as the given examples illustrate. One of their many faces is typically found in US diversity courses and programs, while another is found in global courses and programs and experiential study abroad programs. As this chapter demonstrates, US diversity and global issues, contexts, and problems are already a leitmotif in existing civic pedagogies and should inform the next generation of civic work. Both global and diversity work often focus on big questions, perspective taking, and learning across differences, which is why the interface with civic problem solving pedagogies is relatively seamless.

Civic problem solving pedagogies overall are closely aligned with a widespread effort across all parts of higher education to involve students more extensively in “real-world” learning, where problem solving can be practiced regularly through such experiences as internships, practicums, study abroad, and community-based research and projects. As noted earlier, employers are in favor of a greater emphasis by higher education on helping students develop problem solving and applied learning skills (Peter D. Hart Research Associates 2008; Hart Research Associates 2010). These civic pedagogies, then, are part of a larger and long-term trend toward better integration of academic and applied learning, and toward giving college students many opportunities to expand and demonstrate capacities they will need both in civic contexts and at work.

“[The problem-based project] has taught me not only about the community’s power, but also about my own agency as a political actor... I have found that democracy means continually acting as a community, for the community, rather than simply casting a vote at election time” (Porter 2011).

Advancing Collaborative, Generative Civic Partnerships and Alliances

As this chapter illustrates, there are foundations already laid upon which to build the next generation of civic work that seeks to make civic learning and democratic engagement an expected outcome for every student. Some of these foundations have been established in inventive, intentional curricular designs within general education, the major, and other areas of specialized or technical study. Other efforts have taken root in campus life. Still others are embedded in civic pedagogies like intergroup and deliberative dialogue, service learning, and collective civic problem solving, enacted both within and beyond the classroom. To close this chapter on practice, we turn finally to one more notable foundation partially laid: collaborative, generative civic partnerships and alliances.

Many campuses have a long list of civic partners, which suggests the nascent form of what could evolve in the coming decade. The most common types of partnerships found among the list in the Faces/Phases of Citizenship (see fig. 7, p. 60) fall into two categories: (1) charitable ones, characterized by civic altruism, and (2) reciprocal ones, characterized by civic engagement. An even more ambitious category of civic partnerships and alliances is a third kind: (3) a generative partnership, characterized by mutual efforts to define and build civic prosperity. Some practitioners use language like social entrepreneurship, democratic civic engagement, public engagement, or public work to describe this new edge of practice.

One of the best known champions of social entrepreneurship is the nonprofit Ashoka, which defines itself as a network of “innovators for the public” known for “investing in solutions for our world’s toughest problems” (<http://ashoka.org>; see also Appendix D). Ashoka traditionally has allied entrepreneurial individuals with community groups and businesses; in 2008, its Ashoka U program added colleges and universities into the mix, linking higher education and the citizen sector. Their goal is to promote social entrepreneurship programs and projects on campuses and link students to the wider world where they are challenged “to solve social problems at the root-cause and systemic level using innovative, sustainable, scalable, and measurable approaches” (<http://ashokau.org>).

Whatever the language adopted, where generative partnerships exist, the impact on communities can be transformative, on public scholarship far-reaching, and on student learning empowering. Interdependency, innovation, multiple perspectives, and a commitment to a long-range investment in the public good define the partnership’s core values; higher education no longer sees itself as going out into the community, but as part of the community, whether that community is local, national, or global.

These partnerships create new public space for democratic engagement. The academy and the community are required to eschew their traditional boundaries in order to forge a new alliance with each other. The new space becomes, in effect, a public square for democratic co-creation. But the co-creation is enacted in participatory, inclusive, complicated ways that reflect democracy at its best and most challenging. Multiplicity of voices and

Where generative partnerships exist... interdependency, innovation, multiple perspectives, and a commitment to a long-range investment in the public good define the partnership’s core values; higher education no longer sees itself as going out into the community, but as part of the community, whether that community is local, national, or global.

perspectives becomes the norm; defining common purposes, needs, and processes is understood as a shared and contested goal. The partners are bound to one another because they are addressing large, systemic, public problems to, as the US Constitution puts it, “promote the general Welfare.” And they are doing so through inventive, constructive, and mutually agreed upon solutions.

In this newly defined territory, economic, educational, political, historic, cultural, and social issues converge. The new space becomes the crucible through which everything familiar is transformed into something beyond its original, individual shape. In the public space of generative partnerships, democratic values can be tested and civic skills honed; participants challenged to work collectively across differences; and civic aspirations transmuted into collective civic action.

Of particular significance to higher education, this terrain offers the landscape most likely to transform the current academic norms about what counts as scholarship, about what sorts of expertise are acknowledged, about how to measure academic achievement, and about what the content and pedagogy of the curriculum should be. The conventional classroom suddenly has a new wing for integrated learning and applied research. The means of measuring student learning is no longer seat time alone but also civic time. Scholars find themselves in a different kind of laboratory where cutting-edge, often interdisciplinary investigations can occur. Institutions discover themselves in partnerships that challenge them to rethink how to both allocate and generate resources. Communities are not fragmented entities but are redefined as also part of a larger whole. At the nexus of this generative process is the civic, intellectual, economic, and social challenge of reimagining and shaping a shared future.

There are many forms that these partnerships can take. Some organize around a large public issue like the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), a nonprofit entity comprising colleges and universities, community-based organizations, health care delivery systems, student service organizations, and foundations and government (see <http://ccph.info>). CCPH seeks to “leverage the knowledge, wisdom and experience in communities and in academic institutions to solve pressing health, social, environmental and economic challenges” and to “build the capacity of communities and academic institutions to engage each other in partnerships that balance power, share resources, and work towards systems change.” CCPH accomplishes this in part by “mobilizing knowledge, providing training and technical assistance, conducting research, building coalitions and advocating for supportive policies” (CCPH 2011).

Another group of institutions involved in cultivating more powerful and generative partnerships between higher education and communities has formed what is called the Anchor Institutions Task Force. It now numbers more than one hundred higher education institutions and is led by the University of Pennsylvania and advised by Marga Incorporated (www.marganic.com/initiatives/aitf). Anchor Institutions describe themselves as being driven by the core values of collaboration and partnership, equity and social justice, democracy and democratic practice, and commitment to place and community. They work closely with the Department of Housing

In the public space of generative partnerships, democratic values can be tested and civic skills honed; participants challenged to work collectively across differences; and civic aspirations transmuted into collective civic action.

Syracuse University

The multiple partners in a wide-scale civic investment venture in Syracuse, New York, established a 501(c)(3) organization with a network of community members and organizations to manage a series of wide-ranging projects.

The West Side Initiative works in a racially diverse, working-class industrial neighborhood to renovate old warehouses into multipurpose facilities that offer space for green technology enterprises, culinary centers, and artist residencies and studios.

Architecture students work with community members to design affordable, green houses, keep long-term residents in the neighborhood, and attract new residents.

The South Side Initiative works with predominantly African American residents to develop a digital library of public memory in order to conserve the familial and cultural history of the community, which dates back to the nineteenth century.

A city-wide investment was launched to improve the K–12 schools, expand art education through a mobile classroom, and provide health care and greater literacy to families of K–12 students.

Sources: www.syr.edu/about/vision.html and www.syr.edu/suanchorinstitution/index.html

and Urban Development, other government entities, businesses, and private philanthropists.

Located principally in urban metropolitan areas in the United States, they invest their economic, political, cultural, and intellectual capital to build stronger communities. Layered partnerships of many kinds, long-term strategies, sophisticated analyses of the deep roots of stubborn problems, and creative, multi-pronged solutions characterize their community engagement. *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads*, by Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb (2010), offers an appraisal of what this potentially transformative reconception of higher education has accomplished thus far, and what new roads still need to be taken.

Often, these institutions stimulate local economies and serve as a cultural resource for the community and as one of the chief employers within their locality. Colleges and universities find themselves at the table with hospitals, large businesses, and governments that are playing comparable, complementary anchoring roles in a given community. They understand that the success and vitality of the institution is linked to the economic, social, and civic health of the surrounding community.

Embracing their role as anchor institutions, these campuses have created formidable partnerships to address shared public problems. Miami Dade College, for example, employs an open-door admissions policy that provides access to education for all community members from multicultural Miami, and is home to one of the largest literacy tutoring programs in the nation. Widener College has helped initiate economic development projects and created a charter elementary school on its campus as it works collectively with community partners to address their needs in Chester, Pennsylvania, one of the poorest cities in the nation. Similarly, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis has built strong K–12 partnerships based on a community school model. One of the early pioneers and continued national leaders, the University of Pennsylvania, in a project spearheaded by the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, has invested in long-time commitments and partnerships in West Philadelphia. They have focused on urban revitalization, community development, and deep engagement through various professional and undergraduate schools to extend the boundaries of Penn's classrooms and research into the K–12 school system and to transform lives in that neighboring community.

One of the anchor institutions, Syracuse University, has launched in central New York an exemplary, ambitious, and generative set of partnerships (see sidebar). The collaborations embody the kind of democratic civic engagement called for in Saltmarsh and Hartley's volume, which describes the Syracuse partnership thus: "The scope, ambition, and commitment to remapping education for social responsibility at Syracuse offers one of the clearest road maps to what deep institutional transformation might look like when a civic vision is informed by social justice values and a keen sense of the differential experiences of democracy across multiple groups" (2011, 260).

As a research university, Syracuse opted to name its campus-based initiative Scholarship in Action, which it describes as "draw[ing] upon [the] institution's traditional and emerging strengths [and] connecting our academic

excellence to ideas, problems, and professions in the world as we engage pressing issues of our time” (Syracuse University 2011). The university’s senate also unanimously passed new guidelines to consider public scholarship in tenure and promotion decisions. Such actions emphasize that academic expertise can be a means of promoting the common good and need not be seen as in conflict with those ends.

The 501(c)(3) nonprofit that Syracuse University helped establish as a coordinating organization for the accumulating range of partners and community-based projects is significant in marking the nature of this ambitious civic enterprise. The university has opted for a democratic posture as merely one in a collective of many partners. Syracuse’s partnership also represents a long-term commitment to civic prosperity, while combining preparation for college, careers, and citizenship.

This chapter has sought to describe how the civic entrepreneurial reforms in higher education over the past two decades have laid the foundation for the next generation of commitments to educate for democracy. The foundation is there. The tools are laid out. The students are eager to lend a hand in addressing urgent social, economic, and political questions of the day that have public consequences. If we want a vigorous, participatory, and pluralist functioning democracy, the power to create the enabling educational environment “conducive to those ends” is available. It is time to act upon those transformative possibilities.

If we want a vigorous, participatory, and pluralist functioning democracy, the power to create the enabling educational environment “conducive to those ends” is available. It is time to act upon those transformative possibilities.

VI. CONCLUSION

Writing ability is not optional for college graduates; science literacy is not optional for college graduates. Why is civic learning optional?

National Roundtable Participant, January 13, 2011

Democracy is the defining characteristic of our country and should be the most profound commitment we have as a society. But democratic hopes and visions also drive social, economic, and political movements across the globe, in ways that daily confront US leaders and citizens with difficult choices about priorities, resources, commitments, responsibility, war, peace, and the quest for just societies. And, whether global partners espouse democracy or not, the core challenge of global interdependence is to engage in problem solving together, across differences of many kinds, to overcome the daunting challenges—economic, environmental, political, and humanitarian—that confront the people of every society, whatever their political framework.

To be an American means to take responsibility for democratic purposes, practices, vitality, and viability. But unlike liberty, civic knowledge and capability are not bestowed at birth. They are hard won, through education at all levels and through taking seriously the perspectives of others. Democratic insight and competence are always in the making, always incomplete. Therefore, civic learning needs to be an integral component of every level of education, from grammar school through graduate school, across all fields of study. It should also be an important part of our informal educational practices for young people and adults, woven into every community and region in the nation.

A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future insists that we dare not be passive about increasing our nation's civic capacity any more than we are passive about revitalizing its economy. Colleges and universities need to expand education for democracy so it reaches all students in ever more challenging ways. Campuses can be critical sites for honing students' civic knowledge, skills, values, and actions, and for preparing them for lives of public purpose as well as employment. Advancing reciprocal partnerships with communities both locally and globally promises to invigorate the research, teaching, and learning agendas for higher education while strengthening communities. Creative alliances with public-minded nonprofit agencies, governmental agencies, and businesses can replenish civic capital.

We therefore invite all stakeholders in America's future to join together to become civic agents of a new promissory note at this crucible moment: to use higher education and the pathways to it as "the carrier of democratic values, ideals, and processes." As Charles Quigley's epigraph for this report says, "Each generation must work to preserve the fundamental values and principles of its heritage... to narrow the gap between the ideals of this nation and the reality of the daily lives of its people; and to more fully realize the potential of our constitutional, democratic republic." This is the crucible moment as the United States faces major challenges at home and abroad. Let us pledge to make it a transformative one that advances democratic values of liberty, justice, domestic tranquility, and the general welfare of the people and the planet.

We therefore invite all stakeholders in America's future to join together to become civic agents of a new promissory note at this crucible moment: to use higher education and the pathways to it as "the carrier of democratic values, ideals, and processes."

REFERENCES

- AACC (American Association of Community Colleges). 2011. "2011 Community College Fast Facts." American Association of Community Colleges. Accessed December 15. <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/FactSheet2011.pdf>.
- AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). 1995. *Liberal Learning and Arts of Connection for the New Academy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- . 2007. *College Learning for the New Global Century: A Report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- . 2011. *The LEAP Vision for Learning: Outcomes, Practices, Impact, and Employers' Views*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities). 2011. "About ADP." Accessed December 19. <http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP>.
- Altinay, Hakan. 2010. "The Case for Global Civics." Global Economy and Development Working Paper No. 38, Brookings, Washington, DC. http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2010/03_global_civics_altinay/03_global_civics_altinay.pdf.
- ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education). 2006. "Research on Outcomes and Processes of Intergroup Dialogue." *Higher Education Report* 32 (4): 59–73.
- Astin, Alexander W. 1993. *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, Alexander W., and Linda J. Sax. 1998. "How Undergraduates Are Affected by Service Participation." *Journal of College Student Development* 39 (3): 251–63.
- As You Sow. 2011. "Corporate Social Responsibility." Accessed September 29. <http://asyousow.org/csr/>.
- Augustine, Norm. 2011. "The Education Our Economy Needs." *Wall Street Journal*, September 21, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904265504576568351324914730.html>.
- Axelroth, Rita, and Steve Drubb. 2010. *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads*. College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative.
- Barber, Benjamin. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barton, Paul E., and Richard J. Coley. 2011. *The Mission of the High School: A New Consensus of the Purposes of Public Education?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Battistoni, Richard M., and Nicholas V. Longo. 2005. *Connecting Workforce Development and Civic Engagement: Higher Education as Public Good and Private Gain*. Danvers, MA: Public Policy Institute, North Shore Community College.

- Bauman, Kurt J., and Nikki L. Graf. 2003. "Educational Attainment: 2000." Census 2000 Brief C2KBR-24. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- Berson, Judith S., and William F. Younkin. 1998. "Doing Well by Doing Good: A Study of the Effects of a Service-Learning Experience on Student Success." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Higher Education, Miami, FL, November.
- Brownell, Jayne E., and Lynn E. Swaner. 2010. *Five High-Impact Practices: Research on Learning Outcomes, Completion, and Quality*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011. "College Enrollment and Work Activity of 2010 High School Graduates." News release USDL-11-0462, US Department of Labor, Washington, DC. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/hsgec.pdf>.
- Calderón, José Z. 2007. Introduction to *Race, Poverty, and Social Justice: Multidisciplinary Perspectives through Service Learning*, edited by José Z. Calderón, xxi–xxv. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools. 2011a. *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*. Silver Spring, MD: Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools.
- . 2011b. "Civic Content Knowledge." Accessed December 18. <http://www.civicmissionofschools.org/site/resources/civiccompetencies.html>.
- Campus Compact. 2008. "How Can Engaged Campuses Improve Student Success in College?" *Building Engaged Campuses*, research brief no. 1. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Carnevale, Anthony P., Nicole Smith, and Jeff Strohl. 2010. *Help Wanted: Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2018*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.
- CCCSE (Center for Community College Student Engagement). 2011. "Key Findings: Active and Collaborative Learning." Community College Survey of Student Engagement. Accessed November 9. http://www.ccsse.org/survey/bench_active.cfm.
- CCP (Center for Civic Participation). 2011. "About Us." Maricopa Community College. Accessed December 19. <http://www.maricopa.edu/civic/aboutus.html>.
- CCPH (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health). 2011. "Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: Transforming Communities and Higher Education." Accessed December 19. <http://ccph.info>.
- CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement). 2010. "Civic Skills and Federal Policy." *CIRCLE Fact Sheet*, April. Medford, MA: Tufts University.
- Clayton-Pedersen, Alma R., Sharon Parker, Daryl G. Smith, José F. Moreno, and Daniel Hiroyuki Teraguchi. 2007. *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Colby, Anne, Elizabeth Beaumont, Thomas Ehrlich, and Josh Corngold. 2007. *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Colby, Anne, Thomas Ehrlich, Elizabeth Beaumont, and Jason Stephens. 2003. *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coles, Romand, and Blase Scarnati. 2011. "Supporting Students through Community Connections." *Diversity & Democracy* 14 (3): 15.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. 2010a. *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*. http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf.
- . 2010b. *Common Core State Standards for Mathematics*. http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf.
- Cress, Christine M., Cathy Burack, Dwight E. Giles Jr., Julie Elkins, and Margaret Carnes Stevens. 2010. *A Promising Connection: Increasing College Access and Success through Civic Engagement*. Boston: Campus Compact.
- DeAngelo, Linda, Sylvia Hurtado, John H. Pryor, Kimberly R. Kelly, and José Luis Santos. 2009. *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2007-2008 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California–Los Angeles.
- Democracy Commitment. 2011. "Declaration." DeAnza College. Accessed December 15. <http://www.deanza.edu/communityengagement/democracycommitment/declaration.html>.
- Dewey, John. 2008. "The Need of an Industrial Education in an Industrial Democracy." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, Volume 10, 1899–1924: Essays on Philosophy and Education, 1916–1917*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston, 137–43. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dey, Eric L., Cassie L. Barnhardt, Mary Antonaros, Molly C. Ott, and Matthew A. Hopsapple. 2009. *Civic Responsibility: What Is the Campus Climate for Learning?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Diamond, Larry. 2000. "A Report Card on Democracy." *Hoover Digest*, no. 3.
- Dillon, Sam. 2011. "Students' Knowledge of Civil Rights History Has Deteriorated, Study Finds." *New York Times*, September 28. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/28/education/28civil.html?_r=1.
- Eck, Diana L. 2002. *A New Religious America: How a "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Egeland, Jan. 2011. "The Changing Face of Displacement in the 21st Century." The Nansen Lecture presented at the Harvard Club, New York City, June.
- Ehrlich, Thomas. 2000. *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Engberg, Mark E., and Katherine Fox. 2011. "Exploring the Relationship between Undergraduate Service-Learning Experiences and Global Perspective-Taking." *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 48 (1): 85–105.
- English, Cynthia. 2011. "Civic Engagement Highest in Developed Countries." Gallup. Accessed September 30. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/145589/civic-engagement-highest-developed-countries.aspx>.
- Eyler, Janet, and Dwight E. Giles Jr. 1999. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Eyler, Janet S., Dwight E. Giles Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray. 2001. *At A Glance: What We Know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College Students, Faculty, Institutions and Communities, 1993–2000*. 3rd ed. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Finley, Ashley. 2011. “Civic Learning and Democratic Engagements: A Review of the Literature on Civic Engagement in Post-Secondary Education.” Paper prepared for the US Department of Education as part of Contract: ED-OPE-10-C-0078, May 24, http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/LiteratureReview_CivicEngagement_Finley_July2011.pdf.
- . 2012. *Making Progress? What We Know about the Achievement of Liberal Education Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Franke, Ray, Sylvia Ruiz, Jessica Sharkness, Linda DeAngelo, and John Pryor. 2010. *Findings from the 2009 Administration of the College Senior Survey (CSS): National Aggregates*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California–Los Angeles.
- Gallini, Sarah M., and Barbara E. Moely. 2003. “Service-Learning and Engagement, Academic Challenge, and Retention.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10 (1): 5–14.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 2010. “Representational Models and Democratic Transitions in Fragile and Post-Conflict States.” World Development Report 2011, Background Paper, World Bank, September 18, <http://wdr2011.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Representational%20Models%2018%20Sept%20%28Goldstone%29.pdf>.
- Gray, Maryann J., Elizabeth H. Ondaatje, Ronald Fricker, Nancy Campbell, Kathy Rosenblatt, Sandra Geschwind, Charles A. Goldman, Tessa Kaganoff, Abby Robyn, Melora Sundt, Lori Vogelgesang, and Stephen P. Klein. 1998. *Coupling Service and Learning in Higher Education: The Final Report of the Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- GRI (Global Reporting Initiative). 2011. *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*. Version 3.1. Accessed September 29. <https://www.globalreporting.org/resourcelibrary/G3.1-Quick-Reference-Sheet.pdf>.
- Gryn, Thomas A., and Luke J. Larsen. 2010. “Nativity Status and Citizenship in the United States: 2009.” *American Community Survey Briefs*, October, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acsbr09-16.pdf>.
- Gurin, Patricia, Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda, and Nicholas Sorensen. 2011. “Intergroup Dialogue: Education for a Broad Conception of Civic Engagement.” *Liberal Education* 97 (2): 46–51.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. 2011. “The Promise of Our Democracy.” Foreword to *The Drama of Diversity and Democracy: Higher Education and American Commitments*, by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, xiii–xxi. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Harkavy, Ira. 2011. Introductory address to “Reimagining Democratic Societies,” an international conference organized by the Council of Europe; the US Steering Committee of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy; the

- University of Oslo; and the European Wergeland Centre. Oslo, Norway, June, http://www.margainc.com/files_images/general/Global_Forum_6-27-113%283%29.pdf.
- Harriger, Katy J., and Jill J. McMillan. 2007. *Speaking of Politics: Preparing College Students for Democratic Citizenship through Deliberative Dialogue*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Hart Research Associates. 2009. *Trends and Emerging Practices in General Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- . 2010. *Raising the Bar: Employers' Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Harvard University, Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. 1945. *General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heckman, James J., and Paul A. LaFontaine. 2007. "The American High School Graduation Rate: Trends and Levels." NBER Working Paper No. 13670, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13670.pdf>.
- Hess, Diana E. 2009. *Controversy in the Classroom: The Democratic Power of Discussion*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoy, Ariane, and Wayne Meisel. 2008. *Civic Engagement at the Center: Building Democracy through Integrated Cocurricular and Curricular Experiences*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Huber, Mary Taylor, and Pat Hutchings. "Civic Learning: Intersections and Interactions." Foreword to *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, edited by Michael B. Smith, Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein, ix–xiii. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hutcheson, Philo A. 2007. "Higher Education and Justice in the Democracy: The Impact of the 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the History of Education Society, Cleveland, OH, October.
- Intercollegiate Studies Institute, National Civic Literacy Board. 2007. *Failing Our Students, Failing America: Holding Colleges Accountable for Teaching America's History and Institutions*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute. http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/2007/summary_summary.html.
- Isaacson, Walter. 2003. *Benjamin Franklin: An American Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates. 2009. *Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jay, Gregory. 2008. "Service Learning, Multiculturalism, and the Pedagogies of Difference." *Pedagogy* 8 (2): 255–81.
- Jordan, Barbara. 2011. "Harvard University Commencement Address, June 16." The Barbara Jordan Forum. Accessed October 1. <http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/barbarajordanforum/quotes.php>.
- Kiesa, Abby, Alexander P. Orłowski, Peter Levine, Deborah Both, Emily Hoban Kirby, Mark Hugo Lopez, and Karlo Barrios Marcelo. 2007.

- Millennials Talk Politics: A Study of College Student Political Engagement*. College Park, MD: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. 2011. "Letter from Birmingham Jail." The Martin Luther King, Jr., Research and Education Institute. Accessed December 15. http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/index.php/resources/article/annotated_letter_from_birmingham.
- Kolb, Charles. 2011. "Reforming American Higher Education: Implications for a Vibrant Work Force and a Healthy Democracy." *Change* 43 (5): 14–16.
- Kopicki, Allison. 2011. "Approval of Congress Matches Record Low." *The Caucus: The Politics and Government Blog of The Times*, January 16. <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/09/16/approval-of-congress-matches-record-low>.
- Kozol, Jonathan. 1991. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York: Crown.
- Lechuga, Vincente M., Laura Norman Clerc, and Abigail K. Howell. 2009. "Power, Privilege, and Learning: Facilitating Encountered Situations to Promote Social Justice." *Journal of College Student Development* 50 (2): 229–44.
- Lee, Amy. 2011. "The Year in Review." *Connections: The Kettering Foundation's Annual Newsletter*, 38–42.
- Levine, Peter. 2011. "What Do We Know about Civic Engagement?" *Liberal Education* 97 (2): 12–19.
- London, Scott. 2010. *Doing Democracy: How a Network of Grassroots Organizations Is Strengthening Community, Building Capacity, and Shaping a New Kind of Civic Education*. Washington, DC: Kettering Foundation.
- Long, Sarah E. 2002. *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Lumina Foundation for Education. 2011. *The Degree Qualifications Profile*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education, http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf.
- McCormick Tribune Foundation. 2007. *Civic Disengagement in Our Democracy*. Chicago: McCormack Tribune Foundation.
- Milanovic, Branko. 2000. "True World Income Distribution, 1988 and 1993: First Calculation based on Household Surveys Alone." Policy Research Working Paper 2244, World Bank, Washington, DC. <http://129.3.20.41/eps/hew/papers/0305/0305002.pdf>.
- Musil, Caryn McTighe. 2003. "Educating for Citizenship." *Peer Review* 5 (3): 4–8.
- National Commission on Civic Renewal. 1998. *A Nation of Spectators: How Civic Disengagement Weakens America and What We Can Do About It*. College Park, MD: National Commission on Civic Renewal.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. 2011. *State Funding for Higher Education in FY 2009 and FY 2010*. Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures.

- NCES (National Center for Education Statistics). 2011a. *The Nation's Report Card: U.S. History 2010*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.
- . 2011b. *The Nation's Report Card: Civics 2010*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.
- Nigro, Georgia, and Nathan Farnsworth. 2009. *The Effects of Service-Learning on Retention: A Report to the Northern New England Campus Compact*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1998. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- O'Connor, Sandra Day. 2010. Interview by Jeffrey Brown, *PBS NewsHour*, PBS, October 13. http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/law/july-dec10/oconnor_10-13.html.
- O'Connor, Sandra Day, and Lee Hamilton. 2011. "Message from Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools Co-Chairs." Foreword to *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*, by the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, 5. Silver Spring, MD: Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2011. *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- O'Neill, Nancy. *Forthcoming. Practices That Matter: Educating Students for Personal and Social Responsibility*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Pascarella, Ernest T., and Patrick T. Terenzini. 2005. *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peter D. Hart Research Associates. 2006. *How Should Colleges Prepare Students to Succeed in Today's Global Economy?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- . 2008. *How Should Colleges Assess and Improve Student Learning? Employers' Views on the Accountability Challenge*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Pollack, Seth. 2011. "Civic Literacy across the Curriculum." *Diversity & Democracy* 14 (3): 8–9.
- Porter, Nina. 2011. "Connecting with Community Power." *Diversity & Democracy* 14 (3): 16.
- Prentice, Mary, Gail Robinson, and Sara McPhee. 2003. *Service Learning in Community Colleges: 2003 National Survey Results*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. 1947a. *Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I, Establishing the Goals*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . 1947b. *Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. II, Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Pryor, John H., Sylvia Hurtado, Linda DeAngelo, Laura Palucki Blake, and Serge Tran. 2009. *The American Freshman: National Norms Fall 2009*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California–Los Angeles.

- Puddington, Arch. 2011. *Freedom in the World 2011: The Authoritarian Challenge to Democracy*. Washington, DC: Freedom House.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Quigley, Charles N. 2011. "Statement on the Nation's Report Card: NAEP 2010 Civics." National Assessment Governing Board. Accessed December 15. <http://www.nagb.org/civics/statement-quigley.pdf>.
- Ravitch, Diane. 2000. *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- . 2007. "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2): 137–74.
- Roberts, Sam. 2008. "In a Generation, Minorities May Be the U.S. Majority." *New York Times*, August 13. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/14/washington/14census.html>.
- Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, and Regan Harwell Schaffer. 2000. "Toward a Theory of Engagement: A Cognitive Mapping of Service-Learning Experiences." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 7 (1): 14–24.
- Romano, Andrew. 2011. "How Dumb Are We?" *Newsweek*, March 20. <http://www.newsweek.com/2011/03/20/how-dumb-are-we.html>.
- Saltmarsh, John. 2005. "The Civic Promise of Service Learning." *Liberal Education* 91 (2): 50–55.
- Saltmarsh, John, and Matthew Hartley. 2011. *"To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Schneider, Carol. 1995. Foreword to *Liberal Learning and the Arts of Connection* for the New Academy, by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, vii–x. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Schoem, David, and Sylvia Hurtado. 2001. *Intergroup Dialogue: Deliberative Democracy in School, College, Community, and Workplace*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Scobey, David. 2010. "Across: The Heterogeneity of Civic Education." In *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, edited by Michael B. Smith, Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein, 185–98. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Shea, Daniel M., Melissa S. Kovacs, Maya Brod, Katherine Janocsko, Matt Lacombe, and Richard Shafranek. 2010. *Nastiness, Name-calling, and Negativity: The Allegheny College Survey of Civility and Compromise in American Politics*. Meadville, PA: Allegheny College.
- Siemens. 2011. "The Siemens Caring Hands Program." Siemens Corporation. Accessed September 29. http://www.usa.siemens.com/en/about_us/corporate_responsibility/caring_hands.htm
- Smith, Michael B., Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein. 2010. Introduction to *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, edited by Michael B. Smith, Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein, 1–12. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Snyder, Thomas D., and Sally A. Dillow. 2011. *Digest of Education Statistics 2010*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.
- Sparks, Erin, and Mary Jo Waits. 2011. *Degrees for What Jobs? Raising Expectations for Universities and Colleges in a Global Economy*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association, Center for Best Practices.
- Swartz, Jeff. 2011. "Executive Commitment." Timberland. Accessed September 29. <http://responsibility.timberland.com/executive-commitment/>.
- Syracuse University. 2011. "Chancellor's Leadership Projects." Accessed December 19. <http://blog.syracuse.com/news/2009/03/ChancellorsLeadershipProjects.pdf>.
- Torney-Purta, Judith, and Britt S. Wilkenfeld. 2009. *Paths to 21st Century Competencies Through Civic Education Classrooms: An Analysis of Survey Results from Ninth-Graders*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association Division for Public Education.
- United Nations Development Programme. 2007. *Human Development Report 2007/2008*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- US Census Bureau. 2010. "Current Population Survey, November 2010: Civic Engagement Supplement File," <http://www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsnov10c.pdf>.
- US Department of Education. 2010. *A Blueprint for Reform: The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- Vogelgesang, Lori J., and Alexander W. Astin. 2000. "Comparing the Effects of Community Service and Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 7 (1): 25–34.
- Vogelgesang, Lori J., Elaine K. Ikeda, Shannon K. Gilmartin, and Jennifer R. Keup. 2002. "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Learning from the Research." In *Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility*, edited by Edward A. Zlotkowski, 15–26. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Weber, Lori. 2011. "California State University, Chico." *Engaged Learning, Civic Engagement, and Psychosocial Well-Being of College Students, by Bringing Theory to Practice*. Washington, DC, June. http://www.aacu.org/bringing_theory/documents/RetrievalConferenceSummaries.pdf.
- Whitman, Walt. 2010. *Democratic Vistas*. Edited by Ed Folsom. Original edition in facsimile. Iowa City IA: University of Iowa Press.
- Wolff, Edward N. 2010. "Recent Trends in Household Wealth in the United States: Rising Debt and the Middle-Class Squeeze—an Update to 2007." Working paper no. 589, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY. http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp_589.pdf.
- Zlotkowski, Edward, ed. 2006. *Service-Learning in the Disciplines*. 21 vols. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

APPENDIX A: CIVIC INVESTMENT PLAN TEMPLATES

This appendix contains two templates, one for colleges and universities and one for organizations and groups outside of higher education. The templates are designed to help leaders participate vigorously and visibly in the National Call to Action that is at the center of the *Crucible Moment* report.

Civic Investment Plan Template for Colleges and Universities

This is an invitation to take part in a larger national effort to elevate civic learning and democratic engagement as an animating priority for the nation and an expected part of every college student's academic and campus life experience. Phase I is designed to prompt short-term planning and easily implemented actions. Phase II is designed to generate a more in-depth, longer-term approach. The accompanying *Civic Institutional Matrix* is designed to help you capture your campus's overall commitment to civic learning and democratic engagement across several domains of institutional functioning and campus culture. We encourage you to ultimately complete both phases of assessment and action, particularly to address gaps identified through your use of the matrix.

Phase I: Quick assessment and potential actions

- What single recommendation in the National Call to Action might your institution claim as its own and work to implement in the coming year? What collaborations have to be established to accomplish that?
- What is already in place as signature civic enterprises with positive outcomes at your institution? How might you make those available and attractive to more students? How might they be layered with one or two other civic outcomes across the curriculum or in campus life?
- What two actions might your institution take to make an existing community partnership more reciprocal, democratic, or influential? And what two actions could you take to be sure those partnerships result in positive benefit to the community participants?
- What two high-profile events might be instituted that would publicly demonstrate that your institution values education for democracy and civic responsibility?
- In scanning the range of potential stakeholders committed to strengthening democracy and civic responsibility, what persons or entities might you newly engage?
- What single activity, program, or practice might your institution undertake in the next year to acknowledge students' civic and democratic leadership?
- What is one way your institution can foster civic responsibility through your existing global or international programs?
- How might you publicize a signature civic program at your institution in the coming year?

Phase II: In-depth assessment and long-term action

- Work in collaborative teams at your institution to collectively complete the attached *Civic Institutional Matrix* to broadly assess the assets and gaps along the four dimensions of a civic-minded institution and along the various domains of your institution. Specific guidelines for approaching the matrix mapping are included.
- Add any domains that are not yet listed, but which are important to include at your institution. Then create an action plan that builds on the assets and begins to close the identified gaps.
- Involve students, faculty, student affairs staff, administrators, community partners, or other important constituents in the discussion of the *Civic Institutional Matrix*.
- Inventory the data sets you already possess and compare them with your qualitative matrix findings through deliberative discussions with colleagues. What discrepancies stand out? What additional research or information might you need, and how might you produce it?
- How pervasive are your civic learning opportunities for students and how comprehensively do they include the full range of outcomes across the civic continuum of knowledge, values, skills, and action?
- Determine what structures are in place to mobilize sustained action in pursuit of your institution's goal of educating for democracy and civic responsibility. Determine which structures need to be developed to accomplish your goal.
- Select three or four large public problems that you can address at your institution given its mission, location, history, constituents, and academic strengths. Plan how your institution will work with external partners to create effective ways to address the identified problems. Determine how you might address those problems throughout the curriculum, cocurriculum, and engagement with local and global communities.

Civic Institutional Matrix: Assessing Assets and Gaps in a Civic-Minded Institution

Overview

This *Civic Institutional Matrix* is designed to help you map your institution's overall commitment to civic learning and democratic engagement, on and off campus, whether locally or globally situated. We invite campus leaders to form a team of key stakeholders to complete the matrix together on behalf of their institutions. We recommend identifying stakeholders who are diverse both positionally within the institution and in terms of perspectives and backgrounds. Overall, the group's sphere of influence should be broad, reaching across the curriculum, cocurriculum, and beyond the campus borders, and should meaningfully involve students and community partners. As you work together to fill in the matrix, think of yourselves as your institution's cartographers, mapping how your institution evidences its core values related to civic learning and democratic engagement.

MATRIX ELEMENTS

The matrix included here consists of a 4 x 6 grid reflecting essential dimensions of a civic-minded institution and key domains of institutional functioning and culture. For a more detailed matrix broken out by each of the four dimensions of civic-mindedness, visit www.civiclearning.org.

Horizontal Axis: Four Dimensions of a Civic-Minded Institution

As team members fill in the matrix, we invite you to review the descriptions of the four dimensions of a civic-minded institution—civic ethos, civic literacy, civic inquiry, and civic action—and to expand upon and refine these descriptions. As a group, you may also want to identify other important dimensions that are pertinent for your institution.

Vertical Axis: Domains of Institutional Functioning and Culture

The matrix identifies six domains. You might find it more strategic and relevant to formulate other domains such as scholarly activities, evaluation and assessment, or policies and procedures. Mapping civic learning and democratic engagement across these domains should help you determine where your institution has assets and gaps.

Rating Box: The Degree of Pervasiveness of Campus Efforts

The matrix asks you to consider two mutually reinforcing aspects of institutional pervasiveness—breadth and depth. Breadth describes the degree to which efforts are present and connected throughout the institution. Depth captures the degree to which efforts are embedded vs. superficial. Significant breadth and depth would be demonstrated by effective, sustainable, and comprehensive institutionalization of programs, policies, and procedures that support civic learning and democratic engagement.

COMPLETING THE MATRIX

As a group, map your institution's commitment to civic learning and democratic engagement. Use sources of knowledge readily available: the experience of team members, information in catalogues and on your institution's website, existing institutional data, etc. Use the space in the boxes provided to summarize and highlight programs, policies, and initiatives that fall into specific **domains of institutional functioning and culture and dimensions of civic learning and democratic engagement** (e.g., major-specific capstone courses that raise civic questions related to the discipline would be listed under the domain of majors and under Dimension 3: Civic Inquiry). The rating boxes allow you to indicate the degree of pervasiveness for each domain across the four dimensions. Use the following scale to fill in these boxes: **Low (L)** = little breadth and depth (i.e., isolated and surface-level efforts to implement civic learning and democratic engagement); **Medium (M)** = some breadth and/or some depth; and **High (H)** = strong breadth and strong depth (i.e., integrated and embedded efforts to foster civic learning and democratic engagement).

ASSET-GAP ANALYSIS (SEPARATE FROM THIS FORM)

When your matrix is completed, examine both the **assets** (patterns of clearly established programs and policies) and the **gaps** (areas where civic learning and democratic engagement are missing). As a group, ask yourselves what made your assets possible. What caused gaps to occur? From there, begin to develop an action plan to build on your assets and close your gaps, using Civic Investment Plan questions if useful.

Civic Institutional Matrix: Assessing Assets and Gaps in a Civic-Minded Institution

Use this matrix to summarize the scope of your institution's efforts to educate for civic learning and democratic engagement

Dimensions of a Civic-Minded Institution

Degree of pervasiveness Indicate "L" (Low), "M" (Medium), or "H" (High)		DIMENSION 1:	DIMENSION 2:	DIMENSION 3:	DIMENSION 4:
		Civic Ethos	Civic Literacy	Civic Inquiry	Civic Action
Domains of Institutional Functioning and Culture	Mission, Leadership, & Advocacy				
	General Education				
	Majors				
	Student & Campus Life				
	Community-based Experiences				
	Reward Structures				

This matrix was inspired by the institutionalization rubric found in *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change* (Clayton-Pederson et al. 2007) and more fully developed in the Personal and Social Responsibility Institutional Matrix (www.aacu.org/core_commitments/documents/PSR_Institutional_Matrix.pdf). For a more detailed matrix broken out by dimension of civic-mindedness, visit www.civiclearning.org.

Civic Investment Plan Template for Organizations and Groups

This is an invitation to take part in a larger national effort to elevate civic learning and democratic engagement as an animating priority for the nation and an expected part of every college student's academic and campus life experience. This template is designed for organizations and groups that are not colleges or universities.

Potential actions

- What single recommendation in the National Call to Action might your organization or group claim as its own and work to implement in the coming year?
- What collaborations with higher education institutions or other stakeholders have to be established to accomplish that?
- What two ways might you publicize this commitment as you begin to take action?
- What is already in place as a signature civic program of yours that would be strengthened by the engagement of a college or university in your vicinity? How might you initiate that potential reciprocal collaboration?
- What two practices or programs might your organization or group initiate in partnership with a college or university in your area to strengthen some aspect of their civic work?
- What two high-profile events might be instituted in the coming year that would underscore the importance of reversing the civic deficit?
- In scanning the range of potential stakeholders needed to strengthen democracy and civic responsibility, what other external stakeholders might you reach out to? In order to accomplish what desired goals?

APPENDIX B: CIVIC LEARNING AND DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT PROJECT STAFF

Larry A. Braskamp, Project Director, and President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.

Caryn McTighe Musil, Project Director, and Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Nancy O’Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Eleanor Hall, Program Associate, Association of American Colleges and Universities

National Roundtables on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement

Organized to inform this report, the following five gatherings were held over a four-month period. Although each deliberately sought feedback from the differing constituencies named below, most of the meetings, except for the one with college and university presidents, had cross-pollination from multiple groups.

1. December 13, 2010 Leaders of national, largely off-campus, civic organizations and students
2. January 13, 2011 Leaders of campus-based civic and political engagement centers, community representatives, and students
3. February 7, 2011 Faculty, civic scholars, and higher education researchers
4. February 18, 2011 College, community college, and university presidents
5. March 21, 2011 Public policy leaders, foundation leaders, and heads of higher education associations and disciplinary societies

APPENDIX C: CIVIC LEARNING AND DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT NATIONAL ROUNDTABLES: PARTICIPANT LIST

Roundtable 1: Leaders of national civic organizations and students

Carolyn Abdallah, Director of Community Assistance, Everyday Democracy
Alissa Brower, Service Fellow, Innovations in Civic Participation
Shelby Brown, Board Member, The Democracy Imperative
Kirk Clay, Director of Civic Engagement, National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
Jan Cohen-Cruz, Director, Imagining America
Maureen Curley, President, Campus Compact
Will Friedman, President, Public Agenda
Susan Griffin, Executive Director, National Council for the Social Studies
Jim Grossman, Executive Director, American Historical Association
Ira Harkavy, US Chair, International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic
Responsibility, and Democracy
Sandy Heierbacher, Co-Founder and Director, National Coalition for
Dialogue and Deliberation
Amy Lazarus, Executive Director, Sustained Dialogue Campus Network
Peter Levine, Director, CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on
Civic Learning and Engagement)
Ted McConnell, Executive Director, Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools
Kimberly Mealy, Director, Educational, Professional and Minority Initiatives,
American Political Science Association
Wayne Meisel, President, Bonner Foundation
Cheryl Miller, Manager, Program on American Citizenship, American
Enterprise Institute
Decker Ngongang, Vice President of Programs, Mobilize.org
Cecilia Orphan, National Manager, American Democracy Project, American
Association of State Colleges and Universities
Gail Robinson, Director of Service Learning, American Association of
Community Colleges
John Saltmarsh, Director, New England Resource Center for Higher
Education
Matt Schrimper, Intern, American Enterprise Institute
Bob Stains, Senior Vice President, Public Conversations Project
Susan Stroud, Executive Director, Innovations in Civic Participation
Nancy Thomas, Director, the Democracy Imperative, and Senior Associate,
Everyday Democracy
Terry Tollefson, Chief Strategy Officer, Facing History and Ourselves

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement
Members present:

Eboo Patel, Founder and Executive Director, Interfaith Youth Core
Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges
and Universities

Project Staff present:

Larry A. Braskamp, President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.
Caryn McTighe Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American
Colleges and Universities
Nancy O'Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American
Colleges and Universities
Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges
and Universities

Roundtable 2: Leaders of campus-based civic and political
engagement centers, community representatives, and
students

Maria Avila, Director, Center for Community-Based Learning, Occidental
College
Justin Bibb, Director, Civic Health Index, National Conference on Citizenship
Beth Blissman, Director, Bonner Center for Service and Learning, Oberlin
College
Jenna Brager, Americorps* VISTA, Maryland Campus Compact, University
of Maryland
Sean Brumfield, Executive Director, Atlanta Center for Civic Engagement,
Georgia Perimeter College
Martin Carcasson, Director, Center for Public Deliberation, Colorado State
University
Karyn Cassella, Family Strengthening Program Manager, Community of
Hope
Amy Cohen, Executive Director, Center for Civic Engagement and Public
Service, George Washington University
Lina Dostilio, Director, Office of Service Learning, Duquesne University
Andy Furco, Associate Vice President, Office for Public Engagement,
University of Minnesota
Jane Genster, Interim Executive Director, Center for Social Justice,
Georgetown University
Paola M Hernandez B., Americorps* VISTA, Maryland Campus Compact,
University of Maryland
Meg Heubeck, Director of Instruction, Center for Politics, University of
Virginia
Barbara Jacoby, Senior Scholar, Adele H. Stamp Student Union – Center for
Campus Life, University of Maryland

Gail Jessen, Director, Thayne Center for Service and Learning, Salt Lake Community College
Jan Liss, Executive Director, Project Pericles
Carolyn Lukensmeyer, President, AmericaSpeaks
Jennifer Wilson Marsh, Hotline and Affiliate Services Director, Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network
David Maurrasse, President, Anchor Institutions Task Force
Emily Morrison, Director, Human Services, George Washington University
William Muse, President, National Issues Forums Institute
Alberto Olivas, Director, Center for Civic Participation, Maricopa Community Colleges
Margaret Post, Director, Donelan Office of Community-Based Learning, College of the Holy Cross
Clement Price, Director, Institute on Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience, Rutgers University–Newark
David Procter, Director, Center for Engagement and Community Development, Kansas State University
John Reiff, Director, Community Engagement Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Maureen Roche, Director, Campus Kitchens Project, DC Central Kitchen
Andrew Seligsohn, Director of Civic Engagement, Office of the Chancellor, Rutgers University–Camden
Karen Showalter, Executive Director, Americans for Informed Democracy
Wendy Wagner, Director, Center for Leadership and Community Engagement, George Mason University
Jo Anne Zarowny, College-Wide Coordinator, Center for Community Involvement, Miami Dade College

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement
Members present:

Derek Barker, Program Officer, Kettering Foundation
Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities
David Scobey, Executive Dean, The New School

Project Staff present:

Larry A. Braskamp, President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.
Caryn McTighe Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Nancy O’Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Roundtable 3: Faculty, civic scholars, and higher education researchers

- Benjamin Barber**, Distinguished Senior Fellow at Dēmos, president of CivWorld at Dēmos
- Rick Battistoni**, Professor of Political Science and Public & Community Service Studies, Providence College
- Robert G. Bringle**, Chancellor's Professor of Psychology and Philanthropic Studies, and Executive Director, Center for Service & Learning, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
- Dan W. Butin**, Dean, School of Education, Merrimack College
- José Zapata Calderón**, Professor of Sociology and Chicano Studies, Pitzer College
- Tony Chambers**, Associate Professor of Higher Education, and Director, Centre for the Study of Students in Postsecondary Education, University of Toronto
- Mark E. Engberg**, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Loyola University Chicago
- Robert W. Franco**, Professor of Anthropology, and Director, Office for Institutional Effectiveness, Kapi'olani Community College, University of Hawaii
- Elizabeth Hollander**, Senior Fellow, Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University
- Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen**, Professor of Psychology, and Director of Faculty Development, Messiah College
- Gregory Jay**, Professor of English and Senior Director, Cultures and Communities Program, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- Mathew Johnson**, Associate Professor of Sociology and Environmental Studies, and Director, VISTA, Siena College
- Victor Kazanjian**, Dean of Intercultural Education and Religious and Spiritual Life, and Co-Director of the Peace and Justice Studies Program, Wellesley College
- Kevin Kecskes**, Associate Vice Provost for Engagement, Portland State University
- Allison Kimmich**, Executive Director, National Women's Studies Association
- Judy Krutky**, Professor, International Studies, and Director, Intercultural Education, Baldwin-Wallace College
- Paul Loeb**, Author, *Soul of a Citizen*
- Harold A. McDougall**, Professor, School of Law, Howard University
- Catherine Middlecamp**, Director, Chemistry Learning Center, and Director and Chair, Integrated Liberal Studies Program, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Tania D. Mitchell**, Associate Director for Undergraduate Studies and Director of Service Learning, Stanford University
- Kerry Ann O'Meara**, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of Maryland, College Park
- Laurie L. Patton**, Professor of Religion and Director of Faculty Development and Excellence, Emory University

Paul Petrequin, Residential Faculty, Chandler-Gilbert Community College
Seth Pollack, Professor of Service Learning, and Director, Service Learning Institute, California State University, Monterey Bay
Robert D. Reason, Associate Professor of Education and Senior Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University
R. Eugene (Gene) Rice, Senior Scholar, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Marshall Welch, Director, Catholic Institute for Lasallian Social Action, Saint Mary's College of California
Jon Wergin, Professor of Educational Studies, Antioch University

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Member present:

David Scobey, Executive Dean, The New School

Project Staff present:

Larry A. Braskamp, President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.
Caryn McTighe Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Nancy O'Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Roundtable 4: College, community college, and university presidents

Lewis M. Duncan, President, Rollins College
Bobby Fong, President, Butler University
David G. Fuller, President, Minot State University
Philip A. Glotzbach, President, Skidmore College
Mary K. Grant, President, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
Cornelius Kerwin, President, American University
Marvin Krislov, President, Oberlin College
Theodore E. Long, President, Elizabethtown College
Elaine P. Maimon, President, Governors State University
Mark Putnam, President, Central College
Brian Rosenberg, President, Macalester College
Kenneth P. Ruscio, President, Washington and Lee University
Allen L. Sessoms, President, University of the District of Columbia
Anthony S. Tricoli, President, Georgia Perimeter College
Sanford J. Ungar, President, Goucher College
Richard H. Wells, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement
Members present:

Richard Guarasci, President, Wagner College

Sylvia Hurtado, Director, Higher Education Research Institute, University of California at Los Angeles

Kathleen Maas Weigert, Carolyn Farrell, BVM, Professor of Women and Leadership, and Assistant to the Provost for Social Justice Initiatives at Loyola University Chicago

Brian Murphy, President, De Anza College

Project Staff present:

Larry A. Braskamp, President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.

Caryn McTighe Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Nancy O'Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Roundtable 5: Public policy leaders, foundation leaders,
and heads of higher education associations and disciplinary
societies

James Applegate, Vice President, Program Development, Lumina Foundation

Sarita Brown, President, Excelencia in Education

Karen Bruns, Assistant Director, Outreach and Engagement, Ohio State University Extension

Eva Caldera, Senior Advisor to the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities

Ida Chow, Executive Officer, Society for Developmental Biology

John Churchill, Secretary, Phi Beta Kappa Society

Paul Corts, President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities

Beth Cunningham, Executive Officer, American Association of Physics Teachers

Susan Dauber, Program Director, Spencer Foundation

John Dedrick, Vice President and Program Director, Kettering Foundation

Gwen Dungy, Executive Director, NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education

Paula Ellis, Vice President, Knight Foundation

Susan Elrod, Executive Director, Project Kaleidoscope

Rosemary Feal, Executive Director, Modern Language Association of America

Christopher Gates, Executive Director, Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement

Robert Hackett, President, the Bonner Foundation

Robin Hailstorks, Associate Executive Director & Director of Precollege and Undergraduate Programs, American Psychological Association

JoAnn Henderson, Executive Director, National Center for Learning and Citizenship

Mary Kirchhoff, Director, Education Division, American Chemical Society
James Leach, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities
Michèle Leaman, Change Manager (Associate Director), Ashoka: Innovators for the Public
Tom Lenox, Executive Vice President for Professional and Educational Strategic Initiatives, American Society of Civil Engineers
Elson Nash, Acting Director, Learn and Serve America, Corporation for National and Community Service
William Newell, Executive Director, Association for Integrative Studies
David Paris, Executive Director, New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Assessment
Michael Pearson, Director of Programs and Services, Mathematical Association of America
Michael Robbins, Senior Advisor for Nonprofit Partnerships, Center for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships, US Department of Education
Bernie Ronan, Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs, Maricopa Community Colleges District
Marc Roy, Vice Chair, American Conference of Academic Deans, and Provost, Goucher College
Phyllis Snyder, Vice President for Healthcare Services and Mature Worker Initiatives, Council for Adult and Experiential Learning
Margeret Vitullo, Director, Academic and Professional Affairs Program, American Sociological Association
Jane Wellman, Executive Director, National Association of System Heads

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement
Members present:

Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Gale Muller, Vice Chairman of Worldwide Research and Development, Gallup, Inc.

Project Staff present:

Larry A. Braskamp, President, Global Perspective Institute, Inc.
Caryn McTighe Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Nancy O’Neill, Director of Integrative Programs, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Eleanor Hall, Program Associate, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Van Luu, Administrative Assistant, Association of American Colleges and Universities

APPENDIX D: CIVIC LEARNING AND DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT NATIONAL ROUNDTABLES: PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Community Colleges

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu>

Founded in 1920, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) is the primary advocacy organization for the nation's 1,200 two-year, associate's degree-granting institutions and their 12 million students. AACC promotes community colleges through five strategic action areas: recognition and advocacy for community colleges; student access, learning, and success; community college leadership development; economic and workforce development; and global and intercultural education. AACC has specifically promoted the value of service learning and civic engagement to its member colleges since 1994. Sixty percent of all community colleges offer service learning in their curricular programs, with another 30 percent interested in starting service-learning initiatives.

American Association of Physics Teachers

<http://www.aapt.org>

Established in 1930, the American Association of Physics Teachers is a professional membership association of scientists dedicated to enhancing the understanding and appreciation of physics through teaching. The association is committed to providing the most current resources and up-to-date research needed to enhance a physics educator's professional development. It aims to increase outreach efforts to physics teachers, increase the diversity and number of physics teachers and students, improve the pedagogical skills and knowledge of teachers at all levels, and increase the understanding of physics learning and of ways to improve teaching effectiveness.

American Chemical Society

<http://www.acs.org>

The American Chemical Society is one of the world's leading sources of authoritative scientific information. A nonprofit organization chartered by Congress, the society is at the forefront of the evolving worldwide chemical

enterprise and the premier professional home for chemists, chemical engineers, and related professionals around the globe. The society publishes numerous scientific journals and databases, convenes major research conferences, and provides educational, policy, and career programs in chemistry. The society also plays a leadership role in educating and communicating with public policy makers and the general public about the importance of chemistry in identifying new solutions, improving public health, protecting the environment, and contributing to the economy.

American Conference of Academic Deans

<http://www.acad-edu.org>

The American Conference of Academic Deans (ACAD) provides academic leaders who share a commitment to student learning and to the ideals of liberal education with networking and professional development opportunities to support them in their work as educational leaders. ACAD has chosen to remain a "conference" of deans—small, with intimate gatherings—reflecting a continuing dedication to its founding purpose: to create both formal and informal opportunities for deans to meet, network, and offer professional support to their colleagues in their work as academic leaders. ACAD has an annual meeting that is held in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges and Universities annual meeting, a biennial meeting, cohosted by Phi Beta Kappa, and periodic workshops.

American Democracy Project

<http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP>

The American Democracy Project (ADP) is focused on higher education's role in preparing the next generation of informed, engaged citizens for our democracy. ADP involves 240 campuses and 2.3 million students. A partnership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the *New York Times*, the goal of ADP is to produce graduates who are committed to being

active, involved citizens in their communities. Since its inception, ADP has hosted nine national and fifteen regional meetings; a national assessment project; and hundreds of campus initiatives, including voter education and registration efforts, curriculum revision projects, campus audits, specific days of action and reflection (e.g., Constitution Day), speaker series, and many recognition and award programs.

American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Program on American Citizenship

<http://www.citizenship-aei.org>

The American Enterprise Institute's Program on American Citizenship is a new initiative focused on the fundamental principles and challenges of American self-government. The program brings together a diverse group of thinkers and doers to explore matters both practical and theoretical, including public schools and the cultivation of civic virtue, voting and the political process, immigration policies and integration, and the role of local communities in inculcating a strong sense of duty and citizenship. The ultimate goal of this effort is to deepen Americans' appreciation for and attachment to those principles that are necessary to keep the United States free, strong, and democratic.

The American Political Science Association

<http://www.apsanet.org>

The American Political Science Association (APSA) is the largest scholarly society for political science in the world. APSA brings together political scientists from all fields of inquiry, regions, and occupational endeavors within and outside academe to support scholarship teaching, and learning in the field. APSA focuses on promoting scholarly research and communication; diversifying the profession and representing its diversity; strengthening the professional environment for political science; and serving the public, including disseminating research and engaging with public issues. Programs and initiatives include major research journals and meetings, the annual Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science, and work by the Committee on Civic Education and Engagement.

American Psychological Association

<http://www.apa.org>

The American Psychological Association is the largest association of psychologists worldwide. The mission of the association is to advance the creation, communication, and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people's lives. The association aspires to excel as a valuable and influential organization advancing psychology as a science; as a uniting force for the discipline; as the major catalyst for the stimulation, growth, and dissemination of psychological science and practice; as a principal leader and global partner promoting psychological knowledge and methods to facilitate the resolution of personal, societal, and global challenges in diverse, multicultural, and international contexts; and as an effective champion of the application of psychology to promote human rights, health, well-being, and dignity.

American Society of Civil Engineers

<http://www.asce.org>

Founded in 1852, the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) represents more than 140,000 members of the civil engineering profession worldwide and is America's oldest national engineering society. ASCE aims to advance technology and civil engineering to enhance quality, knowledge, competitiveness, and environmental sustainability; encourage and provide tools for lifelong learning and professional development within the civil engineering community; support civil engineers as global leaders committed to serving the public good; and advocate infrastructure and environmental stewardship to protect public health and safety and improve the quality of life.

American Sociological Association

<http://www.asanet.org>

The American Sociological Association (ASA) is a nonprofit membership association dedicated to advancing sociology as a scientific discipline and profession serving the public good. With more than fourteen thousand members, ASA encompasses sociologists who are faculty members at colleges and universities, researchers, practitioners, and students. About 20 percent of members work in government, business, or nonprofit organizations. Through its executive office, ASA is well positioned to provide a unique set of services to its members and to promote the vitality, visibility, and diversity of the

discipline. Working at the national and international levels, the Association aims to articulate policy and implement programs likely to have the broadest possible impact for sociology now and in the future.

Americans for Informed Democracy

<http://www.aidemocracy.org>

Americans for Informed Democracy (AIDemocracy) is a student-founded organization that educates, cultivates, and mobilizes a network of young people in the United States to take informed action around individual and collective roles as global citizens. AIDemocracy builds and supports student leaders and organizers who understand not only the issues, but also their own power, how to organize others, and how to access decision makers. Tactics include advocacy, organizing and leadership trainings, and building a community of student leaders through regional and national meetings, participation in meetings and parallel events, and network “weaving.”

AmericaSpeaks

<http://americaspeaks.org>

The mission of *AmericaSpeaks* is to reinvigorate American democracy by engaging citizens in the public decision making that most impacts their lives. Since 1995, *AmericaSpeaks* has worked to provide citizens with a greater voice in the policy-making process and to develop new institutions that can strengthen American democracy. Since its inception, *AmericaSpeaks* has convened large-scale initiatives and brought together more than 160,000 citizens and leaders in deliberations about some of the most difficult and critical policy issues. *AmericaSpeaks* convenes thought leaders, elected officials, and advocates to discuss the state of American democracy and the kinds of changes that will create a stronger, healthier democracy.

AmeriCorps*VISTA, Maryland Campus Compact, University of Maryland

<http://mdcompact.org/ameriCorps.html>

AmeriCorps*VISTA is a federal service program that helps individuals and communities implement grassroots solutions designed to alleviate poverty. Founded as Volunteers to Service in America in 1965, the program places individuals at nonprofit organizations and public agencies that are fighting illiteracy, improving health

services, reducing unemployment, increasing housing opportunities, reducing recidivism, and expanding access to technology for those living in rural and urban areas of poverty across America. Through the Campus Compact VISTA program at the University of Maryland, participants work to alleviate poverty while developing leadership skills through community organizing, volunteer management, and community partnership development.

Anchor Institutions Task Force

<http://www.margainc.com/initiatives/aitf>

The Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) develops and disseminates knowledge to help create and advance democratic, mutually beneficial anchor institution–community partnerships. The core values of the AITF are: collaboration and partnership, equity and social justice, democracy and democratic practice, and commitment to place and community. The AITF promotes greater alignment across policy, institutions, civil society organizations (such as community-based nonprofit organizations), and private resources (such as philanthropy) in order to strengthen the ways in which anchor institutions collaborate in revitalizing communities.

Ashoka U—A Program of Ashoka: Innovators for the Public

<http://ashokau.org>, <http://www.ashoka.org>

Ashoka is a global association of the world’s leading social entrepreneurs—men and women with system-changing solutions for the world’s most urgent social problems. Ashoka develops models for collaboration and designs the infrastructure needed to advance the field of social entrepreneurship and the citizen sector. Ashoka U—Ashoka’s higher education partnership program—works to integrate social entrepreneurship into college and university life, striving to ensure that every aspect of the educational experience is a world-changing experience, and that colleges and universities become more entrepreneurial and innovative. Ashoka U envisions a world where every student develops the knowledge, skills, and confidence to effectively address social problems and drive change.

Association for Integrative Studies

<http://www.units.muohio.edu/aisorg>

The Association for Integrative Studies is the professional association devoted to interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity combines the insights of knowledge domains to produce a more comprehensive understanding of complex problems, issues, or questions ranging from comparison to fully realized integration. The association promotes the interchange of ideas among scholars, teachers, administrators, and the public regarding interdisciplinarity and integration; advocates best-practice techniques for interdisciplinary research and teaching; and sponsors the development of standards for interdisciplinary program accreditation.

Association of American Colleges and Universities

<http://www.aacu.org>

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,200 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size. AAC&U publicly champions civic learning and democratic engagement as an essential component of a contemporary liberal education and advocates both as priorities across all AAC&U initiatives. To assist campuses in creating educational environments that promote students' civic awareness, skills, and commitments, the association organizes projects, conferences, research, assessment, and four publications, including *Diversity & Democracy: Civic Learning for Shared Futures*.

Atlanta Center for Civic Engagement & Service Learning, Georgia Perimeter College

<http://www.gpc.edu/engage>

The Atlanta Center for Civic Engagement & Service Learning at Georgia Perimeter College (GPC) serves faculty, staff, students, and the greater Atlanta metropolitan area by coordinating both curricular and cocurricular service and civic activities that meet community-identified needs, while also functioning as a repository of knowledge and resources on civic engagement and service learning. Focusing on active

and responsible engagement in local, national, and global communities, the center offers superior quality programs, services, and resources that improve the lives of GPC's students, faculty, staff, and communities.

Bonner Center for Service and Learning, Oberlin College

<http://new.oberlin.edu/office/bonner-center>

The Bonner Center for Service and Learning at Oberlin College works in partnership with the surrounding community to link students with educational service opportunities. Community service, advocacy, grassroots organizing, and applied research are the norm at Oberlin, where each year more than 55 percent of undergraduate students do some form of curricular or cocurricular community service. The Bonner Center for Service and Learning encourages all students to become involved in community efforts, and develops programs that combine community involvement with intellectual and artistic pursuits, links students with community organizations in need of volunteers, and sponsors events and conferences designed to enhance college and community relationships.

Bonner Foundation

<http://www.bonner.org>

The Bonner Foundation supports antipoverty programs in the area of hunger and education. The foundation's Crisis Ministry Program concentrates its efforts in central New Jersey with support for twenty-five community-based and educational institutions combating poverty, especially in the area of hunger. The foundation also supports service-based college scholarship programs, which have been expanded to more than seventy-five schools across the country, providing "access to education, and an opportunity to serve" to more than 3,200 students annually. Since its founding in 1989, the Bonner Foundation has awarded more than \$86 million in annual grants and \$85 million in Bonner Program Endowment awards, and has led a number of federally funded higher education consortium grants.

Bringing Theory to Practice

http://www.aacu.org/bringing_theory

The Bringing Theory to Practice project encourages colleges and universities to reassert their core purposes as educational institutions, in order to advance learning and discovery, to advance the potential and well-being of each individual student, and to advance education as a public good that sustains a civic society. The project supports campus-based initiatives that demonstrate how uses of engaged forms of learning that actively involve students both within and beyond the classroom directly contribute to students' cognitive, emotional, and civic development.

Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools

<http://www.civicmissionofschoools.org>

The Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools is a coalition of 60+ organizations committed to improving the quality and quantity of civic learning in American schools. The campaign's goal is to increase and improve civic learning in grades K–12 by working for policies that implement the recommendations of the *Civic Mission of Schools* report. This includes efforts to bring about changes in national, state, and local education policy. The campaign is cochaired by former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and former Congressman Lee Hamilton.

Campus Compact

<http://www.campuscompact.org>

Campus Compact is a national coalition of more than 1,100 college and university presidents who are committed to fulfilling the civic purposes of higher education. The compact envisions colleges and universities as vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, and challenges all of higher education to make civic and community engagement an institutional priority. The compact promotes forms of community service and community-based learning that develop students' citizenship skills, helps campuses forge effective community partnerships, and provide resources and training for faculty seeking both to integrate civic and community-based learning and research into the curriculum and to advance their scholarship.

Campus Kitchens Project

<http://www.campuskitchens.org/national>

The Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) is an emerging leader in community service for students and a resource for antihunger programs in communities around the country. The project works with college campuses and student volunteers to recycle food from their cafeterias, turn these donations into nourishing meals, and deliver the meals to those who need them most. CKP partners with thirty-one high schools, colleges, and universities across America to share on-campus kitchen space, recover unused food from cafeterias, and engage students in preparing and delivering meals to those who need them. Campus Kitchens also provides nutrition education, tutoring for at-risk children, and culinary job training classes for unemployed adults, and it promotes sustainable food resources and economic development opportunities.

Catholic Institute for Lasallian Social Action, Saint Mary's College of California

<http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/cilsa>

The Catholic Institute for Lasallian Social Action (CILSA) is both an organization and a catalyst to integrate social justice into the curricular and cocurricular experiences at Saint Mary's College of California. Founded in 1999, CILSA is the academic center at Saint Mary's College for promoting a culture of service and social justice education consonant with Catholic social teaching and for integrating the three traditions of the college: Catholic, Lasallian, and Liberal Arts. The goal of CILSA is to support students, faculty, staff, campus units, and community partners as they work together to promote intellectual inquiry, student leadership and development, and actions in academic, cocurricular, and community settings in order to foster personal and social responsibility for the common good.

Center for Civic Participation, Maricopa Community Colleges

<http://www.maricopa.edu/civic>

The Maricopa Community Colleges' Center for Civic Participation seeks to enrich public life and public discourse on Maricopa campuses and in the surrounding communities. The center also serves to promote effective practices that support Maricopa's mission area related to civic responsibility. The goals of the center are to increase awareness among Maricopa students, faculty, staff, and the community regarding policy

issues, civic involvement, and how government works, and to increase the involvement of Maricopa students, faculty, staff, and the community in civic life at all levels. Maricopa is comprised of ten colleges, two skill centers, and numerous education centers in Maricopa County, Arizona, serving over 260,000 students each year.

Center for Community Based Learning, Occidental College

<http://college.oxy.edu/ccbl>

The mission of the Center for Community Based Learning (CCBL) is to institutionalize curriculum-based civic engagement. The CCBL's civic engagement approach is based on community organizing practices, and it aims at enriching student learning and commitment to social responsibility by engaging students, faculty, and off-campus leaders as cothinkers and collaborators, in order to make tangible contributions toward solving social justice-related issues. Since its creation in 2001, CCBL has provided leadership and developed resources to institutionalize community-based learning at Occidental College. To accomplish this goal, the center engages with students, faculty, other campus offices, and community partners, as well as state, national, and international networks.

Center for Community Involvement, Miami Dade College

<http://www.mdc.edu/cci>

The Center for Community Involvement aims to transform learning, strengthen democracy, and contribute meaningfully to the common good by awakening and empowering students for lifelong civic engagement. Organizationally located within academic affairs, the center is a hub and catalyst for service, civic engagement, and community-campus partnerships at Miami Dade College's eight campuses. Each year more than eight thousand students engage in academic service learning through the center, serving with hundreds of community partners throughout south Florida. Additional center programs include America Reads, student ambassadors, President's Volunteer Service Award, AmeriCorps and VISTA, among others.

Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity, Stanford University

<http://ccsre.stanford.edu>

Established in 1996, the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE) provides opportunities for teaching and research on topics of race and ethnicity from both domestic and international comparative perspectives. Drawing on the intellectual interests of over one hundred affiliated faculty, CCSRE has infused ethnic studies with a new vitality through its research and teaching divisions. The service-learning initiative of the center began in 2007 and builds on the traditions of public service and community development that already guided much of the center's intellectual activity. Service learning is a vehicle for bringing to bear the broad range of human knowledge needed to solve the complex, comprehensive, and interconnected problems of society.

Center for Engaged Democracy, Merrimack College

<http://www.merrimack.edu/academics/education/center-for-engaged-democracy>

The Center for Engaged Democracy acts as a central hub for developing, coordinating, and supporting academic programs—certificates, minors, and majors—around the country that are focused on civic and community engagement, broadly defined. Housed within Merrimack College's School of Education, the center brings together faculty, administrators, and community partners to support such academic programs through a variety of initiatives and practices: compiling existing research and documentation to support new and developing programs; sponsoring symposia, conferences, and research opportunities to build a vibrant research base and academic community; and providing a voice and space for dialogue about the value of such academic programs across higher education.

Center for Engagement and Community Development, Kansas State University

<http://www.k-state.edu/cecd>

The purpose of the Center for Engagement and Community Development is to extend and expand Kansas State University's historic mission of engagement and outreach. It provides a place where university faculty and community leaders can come together to address community challenges, meet community needs, and realize community dreams through effective scholarship-based engagement. The mission of the center is to

promote engagement across the breadth of the university campus—in teaching, research, and outreach—and to connect the vast resources of the university to the significant issues of public need facing Kansas and communities worldwide.

Center for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships

<http://www.ed.gov/edpartners>

The mission of the Center for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships at the US Department of Education is to promote student achievement by connecting schools and community-based organizations, both secular and faith-based. The center is part of the White House Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships within the Domestic Policy Council. The center is currently working on a pilot initiative to engage community-based organizations in service to support school improvement, and a presidential program to promote interfaith and community service on college campuses called the President's Interfaith and Community Service Challenge.

CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement)

<http://www.civicyouth.org>

Based at the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University, CIRCLE conducts research on the civic and political engagement of young Americans. CIRCLE provides timely analysis of youth voting, volunteering, media use, and activism, along with detailed studies of what works in civic education for K–12 students, students in higher education, and young adults without college experience. CIRCLE's special publications, such as *The Civic Mission of Schools* report (jointly published with Carnegie Corporation of New York in 2003), *Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects* (jointly published with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 2006), and Peter Levine's book *The Future of Democracy* (2007) provide literature reviews and summaries.

Center for Leadership and Community Engagement, George Mason University

<http://clce.gmu.edu>

The Center for Leadership and Community Engagement (CLCE) facilitates mutually beneficial partnerships between the George Mason University (GMU) community and community organizations. CLCE supports these evolving relationships to ensure they contribute to both community development goals and student learning objectives. Engaging students in the community can enhance academic goals as well as civic goals. CLCE allows students to engage in meaningful work that is integrated into coursework. Students must think critically about what they have learned about the community, about course topics, and what they have learned about themselves. CLCE helps ensure that GMU implements high-quality practice in the curriculum and cocurriculum by facilitating the integration of community-based learning, leadership, and academic study.

Center for Politics, University of Virginia

<http://www.centerforpolitics.org>

The Center for Politics seeks to promote the value of politics and the importance of civic engagement. Government works better when politics works better, and politics works better when citizens are informed and involved participants. Therefore, the center strives to encourage citizens toward active participation in the political process and government; to evaluate and promote the best practices in civic education for students of all ages; and to educate citizens through the center's comprehensive research, programs, and publications. The premiere program of the center is the Youth Leadership Initiative, which provides free programming and resources for fifty-thousand K–12 educators via its website, <http://www.youthleadership.net>.

Center for Public Deliberation, Colorado State University

<http://www.cpd.colostate.edu>

Housed within the communication studies department at Colorado State University, the Center for Public Deliberation (CPD) serves as an impartial resource for the northern Colorado community, dedicated to enhancing local democracy through improved public communication and community problem solving. Deliberation requires safe places for citizens to come together, good and fair information to help structure the conversation, and skilled

facilitators to guide the process; CPD seeks to provide those key ingredients. Undergraduate students participating in the CPD student associate program earn class credit while being trained as impartial deliberative practitioners and work on all aspects of projects, including background research, issue framing, convening, meeting design, facilitation, reporting, and moving from talk to action.

Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

www.csl.iupui.edu

The Center for Service and Learning (CSL) involves students, faculty, and staff in educationally meaningful service activities that mutually benefit the campus and community. The history of CSL began in 1993 with a focus on service-learning course development. Now, four offices have been established to coordinate a variety of campus-community programs: the Office of Service Learning, the Office of Community Service, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, and the Office of Community Work Study.

Center for Social Justice, Georgetown University

<http://socialjustice.georgetown.edu>

The Center for Social Justice (CSJ) promotes and integrates community-based research, teaching, and service by collaborating with diverse partners and communities locally, nationally, and globally. Guided by a mission to advance justice and the common good, CSJ organizes work involving students, faculty, and community partners in three key areas: community and public service, curriculum and pedagogy, and research. CSJ builds upon decades of direct service and civic engagement by students that respond to community needs and interests. CSJ also works with faculty and students to develop curricular offerings that incorporate social justice issues and community-based learning. Finally, CSJ facilitates research opportunities in which faculty and students partner with communities to create and advance knowledge that makes a positive difference.

Civic Health Index, National Conference on Citizenship

<http://www.ncoc.net/CHI>

America's Civic Health Index is an annual report that elevates the discussion of our nation's civic health by measuring a wide variety of civic indicators. It is an effort to educate Americans about our civic life and to motivate citizens, leaders, and policy makers to strengthen it. It is conducted nationally, as well as at state and community levels through partnerships throughout the country. Through gatherings and research, National Conference on Citizenship shares civic discoveries, energizes discussions, and stimulates new approaches that strengthen modern citizenship. The conference calls attention to what is learned, makes it applicable to partners' action planning, and helps partners take an evidence-based approach to their work.

CivWorld

<http://www.civworld.org>

CivWorld, an international project at Dēmos, is a global interdependence initiative aimed at raising awareness of the interdependent character of global society and fostering transnational and interdependent solutions to global challenges. Activities include an Interdependence Day forum and celebration, theoretical and policy research on democracy and interdependence, and advocacy. The International Program at Dēmos advances new ideas to cope with a changing world that is faced with accelerating globalization, starker inequities between nations, growing human migration, and profound security and environmental threats.

Community Engagement Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

<http://www.honors.umass.edu/cep>

The Community Engagement Program (CEP) integrates academic learning and community engagement to foster leadership development and promote a more just society. Community service-learning programs and courses place students in community service and use guided reflection as a source of learning. The service becomes an important "text" for the course in dialogue with other course readings. The CEP emphasizes collaboration among students, faculty, and community members to identify and work on the causes of social problems and to strengthen communities. CEP sponsors a five-course civic engagement and leadership development program, the Citizen Scholars

Program, and an individualized major in civic engagement (civic engagement paired with the student's special area of interest—environmental sustainability, youth development, nonprofit management, etc.).

Community of Hope

<http://www.communityofhopedc.org>

For thirty years, Community of Hope has helped improve the health and quality of life of low-income, homeless, and underserved families and individuals in the District of Columbia by providing health care, housing with supportive services, educational opportunities, and spiritual support. Community of Hope's wide-ranging programs address the array of challenges faced by homeless and low-income families with children, and provide hope and stability to low-income and homeless adults and children by promoting strong families, helping underserved residents create stable lives for themselves and promising futures for their children.

Council for Adult and Experiential Learning

<http://www.cael.org>

The Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) is a national nonprofit organization whose mission is to expand learning opportunities for adults. CAEL works to remove policy and organizational barriers to learning opportunities, identifies and disseminates effective practices, and delivers value-added services. Since its founding in 1974, CAEL has been providing colleges and universities, companies, labor organizations, and state and local governments with the tools and strategies they need for creating practical, effective lifelong learning solutions. CAEL is unique in its knowledge of adult/employee learning practices and in its ability to work as an active intermediary between colleges and universities; corporations; labor unions; and government, community, and philanthropic entities.

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities

<http://www.cccu.org>

The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities is an international association of intentionally Christian colleges and universities. Founded in 1976, the council aims to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education through various services to its members, including domestic and international travel study

programs that promote civic learning and democratic engagement for students in their host communities. The council encourages its institutions to be involved in the public square and provides professional support for their programmatic efforts for student civic learning. The council and its member institutions also promote student spiritual formation through service-learning opportunities designed to meet social justice needs as a basic civic responsibility that stems from personal Christian faith.

Cultures and Communities Program Office, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

<http://www4.uwm.edu/cc>

Learning to work across differences of cultural background and experience is a process essential to intellectual growth and lifelong learning, and ultimately to building a better world. This is the philosophy at the heart of the Cultures and Communities Program Office, which provides an administrative home for key initiatives in diversity and community engagement, including University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee's Institute for Service Learning, the Cultures and Communities Certificate, and Community University Partnership Grants.

The Democracy Commitment: An American Community College Initiative

<http://www.deanza.edu/communityengagement/democracycommitment>

The Democracy Commitment is a national initiative aimed at developing and expanding programs and projects that engage community college students in civic learning and democratic practice. The goal of the initiative is for every graduate of an American community college—whether they aim to transfer to university, achieve an associate's degree, or obtain a certificate—to have an education in democracy. Participating community colleges pledge to make a public commitment to civic education; support curricular and cocurricular programs that help students build civic skills and engage in public work; provide faculty and staff development; partner with civic, nonprofit, and governmental agencies whose primary work is the social and economic development of local communities; participate in a national clearinghouse of programs and curricula for community colleges; and develop joint programs with partner universities and higher education associations.

The Democracy Imperative

<http://www.unh.edu/democracy>

Founded in 2007 at the University of New Hampshire, the Democracy Imperative (TDI) is a national network of scholars, campus leaders, and civic leaders committed to strengthening public life and building a more just and deliberative democracy in and through higher education. A unique mix of academics and practitioners, TDI members work together to share ideas; steward and distribute knowledge; develop, validate, and disseminate promising practices; and encourage innovation. The Democracy Imperative acts as a resource and convener by sponsoring conferences, workshops, and projects, and by providing tailored institutional support to interested colleges, universities, and educational associations.

Donelan Office of Community-based Learning, College of the Holy Cross

<http://academics.holycross.edu/cbl>

The Donelan Office of Community-Based Learning develops academic courses and community learning opportunities for students. Holy Cross community-based learning projects aim to support local organizations and community initiatives. Students enrolled in a community-based learning course extend their learning outside the classroom into the community through work with nonprofit, community, and public organizations, or through an on-campus project that will benefit the Holy Cross community. Community-based learning courses can be found across the curriculum in most academic departments, concentrations, and programs of the Center for Interdisciplinary and Special Studies. The Donelan Office also supports faculty and curriculum development initiatives as well as the Community-based Learning Scholars Program, a peer learning initiative that promotes students' reflective practice.

Everyday Democracy

<http://www.everyday-democracy.org>

Everyday Democracy helps people of different backgrounds and views talk, plan, and act together in order to address a variety of public issues and to create communities that work for everyone. It places particular emphasis on the connection between complex public issues and structural racism. In the communities where Everyday Democracy provides customized assistance, it coaches local coalitions, organizations, and

community leaders, and serves as a resource to help communities build their own abilities to create change. Using innovative, participatory approaches, Everyday Democracy works with neighborhoods, cities and towns, regions, and states. Issues addressed include poverty and economic development; education reform; racial equity; early childhood development; police-community relations; and youth and neighborhood concerns.

Excelencia in Education

<http://www.edexcelencia.org>

Excelencia in Education aims to accelerate higher education success for Latino students by providing data-driven analysis of the educational status of Latino students and by promoting education policies and institutional practices that support their academic achievement. Excelencia in Education believes that using data and analysis to identify factors that influence the success of specific student populations helps establish baseline information from which to develop more effective policies, engage diverse stakeholders, and enhance the active and tactical responses needed to better serve Latino and all students.

Facing History and Ourselves

<http://www.facinghistory.org>

Facing History and Ourselves partners with school systems, universities, and education ministries to deliver resources and lessons that inspire young people to take responsibility for their world. The work is based on the premise that we need to—and can—teach civic responsibility, tolerance, and social action to young people, as a way of fostering moral adulthood. Annually, the organization reaches more than 1.9 million students through its global network of twenty-eight thousand trained facilitators who lead hundreds of seminars and workshops. At the heart of the work is the resource book *Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior*, which explores the choices that led to critical episodes in history, and how issues of identity, membership, ethics, and judgment have meaning today and in the future.

Gallup

<http://www.gallup.com>

Gallup has studied human nature and behavior for more than seventy-five years. Gallup's reputation for delivering relevant, timely, and visionary research on what people around the world think and feel is the cornerstone of the organization. Gallup employs many of the world's leading scientists in management, economics, psychology, and sociology, and its consultants assist leaders in identifying and monitoring behavioral economic indicators worldwide. Gallup consultants help organizations boost organic growth by increasing customer engagement and maximizing employee productivity through measurement tools, coursework, and strategic advisory services. Gallup's two thousand professionals deliver services at client organizations, through the Web, at Gallup University's campuses, and in more than forty offices around the world.

Global Perspective Institute

<https://gpi.central.edu>

The Global Perspective Institute was established in 2008 to study and promote global holistic human development, especially among college students. The organization houses and administers the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI), a measure of a person's global perspective. The GPI was developed with the idea that all persons—students, faculty, and staff—are on a journey of life, in which they keep asking three major questions: *How do I know?* (the cognitive domain), *Who am I?* (the intrapersonal domain), and *How do I relate to others?* (the interpersonal domain). The GPI examines these three dimensions and is now being used in more than seventy colleges, universities, and third-party study abroad organizations.

The Guiding Lights Network

<http://www.guidinglightsnetwork.com>

The Guiding Lights Network specializes in the art of the gathering, creating experiences that spark civic imagination and social change. The network brings together leaders, catalysts, and innovators in creative ways to generate new solutions to collective challenges. Its mission is to restore community and compassion through mindful mentoring, imagination, and passionate engagement in public life. Programs include Art of Citizenship Workshops as well as the Guiding Lights Weekend, which brings together hundreds of leaders and laypeople, local and national, to learn how to articulate

public values, how to exercise power in a democracy, and how to sharpen all the skills of great citizenship.

Human Services Program, George Washington University

<http://departments.columbian.gwu.edu/sociology/academics/undergraduate/bahumanservices>

With a solid grounding in social theory, and experience with issues of social justice, students in the Human Services Program at the George Washington University are prepared to conduct research, attain advocacy positions, and assume leadership roles in not-for-profit and governmental agencies. The program weaves together research, service learning (in every course), literature, and theory to foster students' knowledge, skills, and abilities. Furthermore, the program provides a spectrum of interaction with local human service organizations to appropriately prepare students to serve in and work with diverse communities in addressing community-identified needs.

Imagining America

<http://www.imaginingamerica.org>

Imagining America's mission is to animate and strengthen the public and civic purposes of humanities, arts, and design through mutually beneficial campus-community partnerships that advance democratic scholarship and practice. Imagining America's programs focus on building a national community of publicly engaged scholars and artists, researching the scope and practices of public scholarship and art, creating models of program infrastructure, making new forms of knowledge visible and audible, establishing platforms for civic conversation, carrying out strategic educational and policy initiatives, and forging regional alliances.

Innovations in Civic Participation

<http://icicp.org>

Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP) promotes sustainable development and social change through youth civic engagement, and supports the development of innovative, high-quality youth civic engagement policies and programs both in the United States and around the world. Through its activities, ICP develops ideas and models for scaling up national youth service and service learning through legislative advocacy, capacity building, research, and publications. ICP has created and continues

to strengthen an international community of practice that includes policy makers, practitioners, researchers, and others who share an interest in youth civic engagement. ICP embraces a positive view of young people that recognizes their potential to create positive and lasting social change in their communities through active engagement and service.

Institute on Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience, Rutgers University–Newark

<http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/institute-ethnicity-culture-and-modern-experience/about-institute>

The Institute on Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience serves the greater Newark metropolitan region by reaching into the community with lectures, symposia, film, performances, exhibitions, and other programs that enhance public understanding of urban life, the social construction of difference, race relations, local history, urban youth culture, and education. Through programmatic partnerships, the institute provides essential context for the good work of public institutions and sponsors the annual Marion Thompson Wright Lecture Series, which is among the nation's oldest and most distinguished scholarly series devoted to enhancing the historical literacy of a local community.

Interfaith Youth Core

www.ifyc.org

Interfaith Youth Core (IFYC) seeks to make interfaith cooperation a social norm. IFYC believes faith can be a bridge of cooperation, strengthening civil society and promoting the common good, and believes that young interfaith leaders will build these bridges. Since 2002, IFYC has worked on five continents and with over two hundred college and university campuses, training thousands in the principles of interfaith leadership, and reaching millions through the media. IFYC's strategic focus on higher education seeks to equip institutions of higher education to be leaders in the movement for interfaith cooperation. IFYC has worked with partners including the White House, the Tony Blair Faith Foundation, and the Office of Her Majesty Queen Rania of Jordan.

International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy

<http://www.internationalconsortium.org>

The International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy (IC) housed at the University of Pennsylvania was established to bring together national institutions of higher education in order to promote education for democracy as a central mission of higher education around the world. IC seeks to explain and advance the contributions of higher education to democracy on college and university campuses, their local communities, and the wider society. The consortium works in collaboration with the Council of Europe, through its Committee on Higher Education and Research, with forty-seven member countries.

Kettering Foundation

<http://www.kettering.org>

The Kettering Foundation is an independent, nonpartisan research organization rooted in the American tradition of cooperative research. The foundation explores ways that key political practices can be strengthened through innovations that emphasize active roles for citizens. The foundation seeks to identify and address the challenges to making democracy work as it should through interrelated program areas that focus on citizens, communities, and institutions. Chartered as an operating corporation, Kettering does not make grants. The foundation's staff and extensive network of associates collaborate with community organizations, government agencies, researchers, scholars, and citizens, all of whom share their experiences with the foundation.

Knight Foundation

<http://www.knightfoundation.org>

The Knight Foundation supports transformational ideas that promote quality journalism, advance media innovation, engage communities, and foster the arts. Knight believes that democracy thrives when people and communities are informed and engaged. Based on the belief that information is a core community need, Knight focuses on projects that promote informed, engaged communities and lead to transformational change. To help sustain healthy communities in a democracy, Knight fosters initiatives that develop in people a strong sense of belonging and caring; timely access to relevant information; the ability to understand that information; and the motivation,

opportunity, and skills to take sustainable action on a range of issues throughout their lives.

Leadership and Community Service Learning Program, Adele H. Stamp Student Union, University of Maryland

<http://www.thestamp.umd.edu/lcsl>

The mission of the Leadership and Community Service Learning Program (LCLS) is to promote positive social change through transformative learning and community engagement. LCLS strives to serve a greater good and believes in the universal capacity for leadership. As a steward for social change, LCLS seeks to be inclusive, promote social justice, and integrate multicultural practices and principles. LCLS's relationships, communications, and goals are informed through the ideals of transparency, congruency, integrity, and responsiveness to changing needs. LCLS engages in and promotes critical thinking by integrating a diversity of thoughts and experiences through discussion, exploration, and critical reflection.

Learn and Serve America

<http://www.learnandserve.gov>

Learn and Serve America is a program of the Corporation for National and Community Service, an independent federal agency created to connect Americans of all ages and backgrounds with opportunities to give back to their communities and their nation. Learn and Serve America supports and encourages service learning throughout the United States, and enables over one million students to make meaningful contributions to their communities while building their academic and civic skills. The program provides grant support to K–12 schools, community groups, and higher education institutions to facilitate service-learning projects; offers training and technical assistance resources to teachers, administrators, parents, schools, and community groups; and collects and disseminates research, effective practices, curricula, and program models.

Lumina Foundation for Education

<http://www.luminafoundation.org>

The Lumina Foundation for Education is the nation's largest foundation dedicated exclusively to increasing students' access to and success in postsecondary education. It has invested assets in excess of \$1 billion, making it one

of the nation's top forty private foundations. Lumina's goal is to increase the percentage of Americans who hold high-quality degrees and credentials to 60 percent by 2025. Lumina pursues this goal by identifying and supporting effective practice, encouraging effective public policy, and using its communications and convening capacity to build public will for change. Lumina has worked with many colleges, universities, peer foundations, associations, and other organizations that work to improve student access and outcomes across the nation.

Mathematical Association of America

<http://www.maa.org>

The Mathematical Association of America is the largest professional society that focuses on mathematics at the collegiate level. Association members include university, college, and high school teachers; graduate and undergraduate students; pure and applied mathematicians; computer scientists; statisticians; and many others in academia, government, business, and industry. The association supports learning in the mathematical sciences by encouraging effective curricula, teaching, and assessment at all levels. It also supports research, scholarship, and their exposition at all appropriate levels and venues, including research by undergraduates. The association also works to influence institutional and public policy through advocacy for the importance, uses, and needs of the mathematical sciences.

Mobilize.org

<http://mobilize.org>

Mobilize.org is an all-partisan organization that improves the way democracy works by investing in millennial-driven solutions. Through a series of national convenings and investments in on- and off-line community projects, Mobilize.org engages millennials (those born between the years 1976 and 1996) in identifying our society's most pressing issues and in creating long-term, sustainable solutions to address them. In 2007, Mobilize.org launched the Democracy 2.0 Campaign to call attention to the ways that the democratic process and institutions were both serving and failing to serve the interests of the millennial generation. To date, Mobilize.org has hosted ten Democracy 2.0 Summits covering topics such as financial literacy, money and politics, millennial veterans, the environment, and youth unemployment.

Modern Language Association of America

<http://www.mla.org>

Founded in 1883, the Modern Language Association (MLA) has more than thirty thousand members in one hundred countries and is one of the largest humanities organizations in the world. The MLA provides opportunities for its members to share their scholarly findings and teaching experiences with colleagues and to discuss trends in the academy. MLA members host an annual convention and smaller seminars across the country, work with related organizations, and sustain one of the finest publishing programs in the humanities. The recent publication of two major reports—the *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*; and *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*—exemplifies the MLA's role as a leader in the higher education community.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Civic Engagement Program

<http://www.naacp.org/programs/entry/civic-engagement>

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Civic Engagement Program, along with the half-million adult and youth NAACP members throughout the United States, is a frontline advocate committed to raising awareness for the political, educational, social, and economic equality of minority group citizens in the electoral process. With approximately 2,200 adult branches, youth councils, and college chapters in forty-nine states, five countries, and the District of Columbia, the NAACP is actively engaged in increasing the African American responsiveness of citizens to be fully engaged in the democratic process. Issues that the program focuses on include the census, reapportionment and redistricting, and electoral reform, among others.

NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education

<http://www.naspa.org>

NASPA is the leading association for the advancement, health, and sustainability of the student affairs profession. NASPA serves a full range of professionals who provide programs, experiences, and services that cultivate student learning and success in concert with the mission of our colleges and universities. NASPA comprises more than twelve thousand members in all fifty states, twenty-nine countries, and eight US territories. Members include vice

presidents and deans for student life and professionals working within residence life, student unions and activities, counseling, health services, career development, orientation, enrollment management, disability resources, multicultural services, and retention and assessment. Through high-quality professional development, strong policy advocacy, and substantive research to inform practice, NASPA meets the diverse needs, and invests in realizing the potential, of all its members under the guiding principles of integrity, innovation, inclusion, and inquiry.

National Center for Learning and Citizenship at the Education Commission of the States

http://www.ecs.org/html/ProjectsPartners/nclc/nclc_main.htm

The mission of the National Center for Learning and Citizenship (NCLC) is to help state and district leaders promote, support, and reward service learning and citizenship education as essential components of America's education system. NCLC identifies and analyzes policies and practices that support effective service learning and citizenship education; disseminates analyses of best practices and policy trends through issue briefs, tool kits, commissioned papers, and other publications; and convenes national, state, and local meetings and networks to share information about service learning and citizenship education. NCLC also works closely with other national, state, and local advocacy groups to contribute to a collective public voice in support of the civic mission of schools.

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation

<http://ncdd.org>

The National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation actively promotes learning and collaboration among practitioners, public leaders, scholars, and organizations involved in dialogue, deliberation, and other innovative group processes that help people tackle complex issues. It provides national and regional conferences, online programs and resources, and numerous collaborative projects that provide opportunities for members of the dialogue and deliberation community to share knowledge, collaborate, and build relationships. The coalition embraces and demonstrates the following values and principles: collaboration and active participation, openness and transparency, inclusivity, balance, curiosity and commitment to learning, action, and service to others.

National Council for the Social Studies

<http://www.socialstudies.org>

Founded in 1921, National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) is the largest association in the country devoted solely to social studies education. NCSS engages and supports educators in strengthening and advocating for social studies education and defines social studies as the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Organized into a network of more than 110 affiliated state, local, and regional councils and associated groups, the NCSS membership represents K–12 classroom teachers, college and university faculty members, curriculum designers and specialists, social studies supervisors, and leaders in the various disciplines that constitute the social studies.

National Issues Forums Institute

<http://www.nifi.org>

National Issues Forums Institute is a nonpartisan, nationwide organization that supports national issues forums through a network of locally sponsored public forums for the consideration of public policy issues. It is rooted in the simple notion that people need to come together to reason and talk—to deliberate about common problems. These forums—organized by a variety of organizations, groups, and individuals—offer citizens the opportunity to join together to deliberate, to make choices with others about ways to approach difficult issues, and to work toward creating reasoned public judgment. The forums focus on an issue such as health care, immigration, social security, or ethnic and racial tensions. They provide a way for people of diverse views and experiences to seek a shared understanding of the problem and to search for common ground for action.

National Endowment for the Humanities

<http://www.neh.gov>

Created in 1965, NEH is an independent federal agency that promotes excellence in the humanities and is one of the largest funders of humanities programs in the United States. The endowment provides grants for high-quality humanities projects in four funding areas: preserving and providing access to cultural resources, education, research, and public programs. The grants strengthen teaching and learning in the humanities in schools and colleges across the nation; facilitate research and original scholarship; provide opportunities for lifelong learning;

preserve and provide access to cultural and educational resources; and strengthen the institutional base of the humanities.

New England Resource Center for Higher Education

<http://www.nerche.org>

The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) is committed to collaborative change processes in higher education that address social justice in a diverse democracy. As a center for inquiry, research, and policy, NERCHE supports administrators, faculty, and staff across the region in becoming more effective practitioners and leaders as they navigate the complexities of institutional innovation and change. NERCHE's research projects, programs, and activities draw upon the practitioner perspective to improve practice and to inform and influence policy, moving from the local to regional and national levels. The center's work is informed by a grassroots approach to developing collaborative leadership, oriented to building diverse and inclusive communities.

New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability

<http://www.newleadershipalliance.org>

The New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability leads and supports voluntary and cooperative efforts to move the higher education community toward gathering, reporting on, and using evidence to improve student learning in American undergraduate education. The alliance envisions a self-directed, professional higher education community that produces an increasing number of college graduates with high-quality degrees in preparation for work, life, and responsible citizenship. Through the promotion of shared principles, recommended actions, and innovative initiatives, the alliance aims to shape attitudes, practices, and policies related to gathering, reporting on, and using evidence to improve student learning and to increase public confidence in the quality of undergraduate education.

National Women's Studies Association

<http://www.nwsa.org>

Established in 1977, the National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) is a professional organization dedicated to leading the fields of women's studies and gender studies, as well as their teaching, learning, research, and service wherever they be may found. NWSA members actively pursue a just world in which all persons can develop to their fullest potential—one free from ideologies, structures, or systems of privilege that oppress or exploit some for the advantage of others. NWSA is committed to a vision of education and scholarship that includes faculty, students, centers, other campus organizations, and community scholars, and the association serves its members through publications, meetings, professional development activities, and support for scholarship that transforms knowledge of women and puts that knowledge into practice.

Office of Civic Engagement, Rutgers University–Camden

<http://www.camden.rutgers.edu/about-us/community-outreach>

The goal of the Office of Civic Engagement at Rutgers–Camden is to develop strategies for integrating civic engagement into every aspect of Rutgers–Camden campus life—teaching, research, and the student experience—by building effective partnerships with public and private entities working to improve Camden and the region. The Office of Civic Engagement supports faculty and curricular development, student learning through engagement, and the creation and improvement of sustained partnerships to advance Rutgers–Camden's mission to serve the public interest.

Office of Intercultural Education, Wellesley College

<http://www.wellesley.edu/DeanStudent/Diversity/intercultural.html>

The Office of Intercultural Education (OIC) is charged with educating students for national and global citizenship through an integrated cocurricular program of intercultural education that equips students with the awareness, knowledge and skills they will need for leadership and life in a diverse and interdependent world. OIC works in partnership with the associate provost, academic director of diversity and inclusion, the director of employment, faculty, staff, and students on intercultural programming.

The Office has responsibility for the development and leadership of intercultural activities, trainings, and programs that educate and promote awareness, understanding, and appreciation of diversity and inclusion on campus as well as for increasing multicultural competency throughout the campus community.

Office for Public Engagement, University of Minnesota

<http://engagement.umn.edu>

Public engagement at the University of Minnesota is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors in order to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. The university's engagement work is facilitated across more than two hundred public engagement units and centers across the system's five campuses. Along with addressing important and challenging societal issues (domestically and internationally), public engagement enhances the university's capacity to conduct rigorous, significant research that benefits society and to offer its students a broad array of meaningful and transformational community-based learning experiences. The office is home to the International Center for Research on Community Engagement, which is composed of international research collaboratives that examine a broad range of issues pertaining to community engagement in primary, secondary, and higher education.

Office of Service-Learning, Duquesne University

<http://www.duq.edu/service-learning>

Duquesne University's Office of Service-Learning (OSL) supports faculty, students, and partners involved in community-based learning. It also supports academic facets of community-university partnerships. Because of its emphasis on students' civic development; promotion of critical reflection; and sustained, reciprocal partnerships, the OSL is recognized as a significant organizer of the university's community engagement mission. The OSL is responsible for the administration of the community engagement scholars program and the Gaultier Faculty Fellowship. At Duquesne, service learning is embedded in existing courses throughout degree programs. It is a

central and valuable learning activity, bringing to life the university's mission and identity.

Ohio State University Extension

<http://extension.osu.edu>

The Ohio State University Extension is the world's largest nonformal educational and university outreach and engagement system. Extension professionals develop and implement educational programs that integrate the needs of the local community with the research developed by faculty at land-grant universities across the country. The extension fulfills the land-grant mission of the Ohio State University (OSU) by interpreting knowledge and research so that Ohioans can use the scientifically based information to better their lives, businesses, and communities. The OSU Extension works in four major program areas: family and consumer sciences, 4-H youth development, community development, and agriculture and natural resources. These program areas—and many other special topics—are continuously being evaluated and updated to meet the changing needs and issues facing each community.

Phi Beta Kappa Society

<http://www.pbk.org>

The Phi Beta Kappa Society is the oldest and most widely known academic honors society. Founded in 1776, Phi Beta Kappa has embraced the principles of freedom of inquiry and liberty of thought and expression, as well as disciplinary rigor, breadth of intellectual perspective, cultivation of skills of deliberation and ethical reflection, pursuit of wisdom, and application of the fruits of scholarship and research in practical life. It celebrates and advocates excellence in the liberal arts and sciences by sponsoring activities to advance these studies—the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences—in higher education and in society at large.

Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement

<http://www.pacefunders.org>

The mission of Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE) is to inspire interest, understanding, and investment in civic engagement. PACE is an affinity group of the Council on Foundations and serves as a learning collaborative of grant makers doing work in the fields of civic engagement, service, and democratic theory and

practice. PACE members share the belief that broad and informed public participation is the bedrock of a free, democratic, and civil society.

Project Kaleidoscope

<http://www.pkal.org>

Since its founding in 1989, Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL) has been one of the leading advocates in the United States for building and sustaining strong undergraduate programs in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). With an extensive network of over 5,500 faculty members and administrators at more than 750 colleges and universities, PKAL has developed far-reaching influence in shaping undergraduate STEM learning environments that attract and retain undergraduate students. PKAL accomplishes its work by engaging campus faculty and leaders in funded projects, national and regional meetings, community-building activities, leadership development programs, and publications that focus on advancing what works in STEM education. PKAL merged with the Association of American Colleges and Universities in 2010.

Project Pericles

<http://www.projectpericles.org>

Project Pericles is a not-for-profit organization that encourages and facilitates commitments by colleges and universities to include social responsibility and participatory citizenship as essential elements of their educational programs. Founded in 2001 by educational philanthropist Eugene M. Lang, Project Pericles works directly with its member institutions as they individually and collaboratively develop model civic engagement programs in their classrooms, their campuses, and their communities. Signature programs include the Civic Engagement Course Program, Debating for Democracy, and the Periclean Faculty Leadership Program. Across the country, Periclean colleges and universities are each implementing their own curricular and cocurricular programs that prepare and encourage students to become active, responsible citizens.

Public Agenda

<http://www.publicagenda.org>

Since its founding in 1975, Public Agenda has worked to enhance democratic problem solving by helping leaders better understand and more effectively engage

citizens. Public Agenda pursues this through research, engagement, and communications that bridge the divisions and disconnects among leaders and publics, thereby achieving sustainable solutions to tough challenges like improving K–12 and higher education, addressing climate change, and reforming health care. By doing so, Public Agenda seeks to contribute to a democracy in which problem solving triumphs over gridlock and inertia, and where public policy reflects the deliberations and values of the citizenry.

Public Conversations Project

<http://www.publicconversations.org>

The Public Conversations Project (PCP) works in the United States and internationally to help people with profound identity, values, and religious differences to enhance the ways they relate to one another by changing the ways they speak together. PCP has fused thinking and techniques from family therapy and other disciplines into a dialogic approach that rehumanizes opponents and raises mutual understanding and regard through reflection, preparation, and intentional speaking. For more than twenty years PCP has offered teaching, consultation, conference design, and dialogue facilitation to leaders, practitioners, university faculty, students, and partisans in such major conflicts as abortion, sexual orientation, postwar living in Africa, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, among others.

Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network

<http://www.rainn.org>

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN) is the nation's largest anti-sexual violence organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual violence; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual violence, improve services to victims, and ensure that rapists are brought to justice. RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio, and print news outlets—as well as local, state, and national policy makers, law enforcement, and rape treatment professionals—on issues related to rape and sexual violence.

Service Learning Institute, California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB)

<http://service.csumb.edu>

The Service Learning Institute (SLI) serves as the home of the California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) service-learning program. Housed in the College of University Studies and Programs, the SLI serves as an instructional unit, an academic resource center, a center for developing community partnerships, and the home of an innovative student leadership program. The SLI has been recognized nationally for its work in helping students examine issues of justice, diversity, and social responsibility through service learning.

Society for Developmental Biology

<http://www.sdbonline.org>

The Society for Developmental Biology (SDB) was founded in 1939 to promote the field of developmental biology and to advance our understanding of developmental biology at all levels. The SDB fosters excellence in research and education in developmental biology and related areas and provides advice and resources on careers and information for the public on relevant topics in developmental biology. The SDB provides a communication hub for all developmental biologists. The SDB is associated with the journal *Developmental Biology* and organizes scientific meetings that focus on developmental biology and related fields. The SDB also has established programs to interface with the international community of developmental biologists, and maintains a website that covers all aspects of developmental biology.

Spencer Foundation

<http://www.spencer.org>

The Spencer Foundation believes that cultivating knowledge and new ideas about education will ultimately improve students' lives and enrich society. The foundation pursues its mission by awarding research grants and fellowships and by strengthening the connections among educational research, policy, and practice through its communications and networking activities. Established in 1962, the Spencer Foundation investigates ways in which education, broadly conceived, can be improved around the world. Founded on the belief that research is necessary to improvement in education, the foundation is committed to supporting high-quality investigation of education through its research programs

and to strengthening and renewing the educational research community through its fellowship and training programs and related activities.

Sustained Dialogue Campus Network

<http://sdcampusnetwork.org>

The Sustained Dialogue Campus Network (SDCN) develops everyday leaders who engage differences as strengths to improve their campuses, workplaces, and communities. It is an initiative of the International Institute for sustained dialogue, an organization founded in 2002 to promote the process of sustained dialogue for transforming racial, ethnic, and other deep-rooted conflicts in the United States and abroad. With fourteen member campuses and an annual participation of one thousand students and four thousand alumni, SDCN builds the capacity of students, administrators, and communities to create inclusive environments through a proven dialogue-to-action process. Participation in sustained dialogue is associated with increased academic achievement, empathy, and civic agency. Alumni—sought after by top hiring organizations—apply their awareness, commitment, and tools to create inclusive civic and professional environments.

Thayne Center for Service & Learning, Salt Lake Community College

<http://www.slcc.edu/thaynecenter>

The Thayne Center for Service & Learning at Salt Lake Community College envisions a world in which people's basic needs are met and in which the values of equality and social justice are realized. The center believes that institutions of higher education have a historic responsibility to cultivate an engaged citizenry, and is therefore dedicated to empowering students and faculty with the knowledge and skills needed to create positive change in their communities. The center's mission is to establish capacity-building relationships with community organizations, facilitate service-learning development opportunities for faculty, and coordinate service leadership programs for students who are out to change the world.

Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University

<http://activecitizen.tufts.edu>

The Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service is a national leader in civic education. Serving every student at Tufts University, Tisch College prepares young people to be lifelong active citizens and creates an enduring culture of active citizenship. By continuously developing and introducing new active citizenship programming in collaboration with Tufts schools, departments, and student groups, Tisch College builds a culture of active citizenship throughout the university. This entrepreneurial approach grows the university's capacity for engagement, and allows the college to reach every student at all of Tufts schools.

About AAC&U

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,200 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.



1818 R Street NW, Washington, DC 20009
www.aacu.org



*Association
of American
Colleges and
Universities*

1818 R Street NW, Washington, DC 20009
www.aacu.org