

CHAPTER ONE

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN TODAY'S HIGHER EDUCATION

An Overview

Barbara Jacoby

This chapter begins by addressing the inherent challenges in defining civic engagement and proposes a working definition. It continues with a brief history of civic engagement in higher education. Finally, it offers an overview of contemporary initiatives. While acknowledging that the term *civic engagement* can be applied to both individuals and institutions, it is important to state up front that this book is about *educating students for civic engagement*. This, therefore, is the focus of the definition of civic engagement, the history and the overview contained in this chapter, and the practices described in the following chapters. Although they are not covered in detail here, institutional civic engagement with communities, both local and global, and recognition of engaged scholarship in the faculty reward system provide an essential context for the purpose of educating students for civic engagement. Chapter 13 highlights the role of these institutional factors.

DEFINING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

There is widespread recognition that defining civic engagement presents formidable challenges. In fact, there are probably as many definitions of civic engagement as there are scholars and practitioners who are concerned with it. Civic engagement is a

complex and polyonymous concept. In addition, scholars and practitioners use a multiplicity of terms to name it, including social capital, citizenship, democratic participation/citizenship/practice, public work/public problem solving, political engagement, community engagement, social responsibility, social justice, civic professionalism, public agency, community building, civic or public leadership, development of public intellectuals, and preservation and expansion of the commons (Battistoni, 2002; Levine, 2007).

CHALLENGES OF DEFINING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

As John Saltmarsh (2005) notes: “A lack of clarity about what is meant by the term ‘civic engagement’ is evident when, at almost any gathering convened for the purpose of furthering civic engagement in higher education, questions inevitably arise about what is meant by civic engagement and about how it relates to civic education, service learning, democratic education, political engagement, civics, education for citizenship, or moral education. Moreover, the lack of clarity fuels a latent confusion about how to operationalize a civic engagement agenda on campus” (p. 2). Saltmarsh’s dilemma is quite real for me because I am frequently asked by colleague educators, “What *is* civic engagement, anyway?” Another typical comment is “We do not have a definition of civic engagement here at XYZ University, but we are in the process of putting together a center for civic engagement.” Others have wondered, is civic engagement a content area, a process for skill development, or a lifestyle? Is it a program, a pedagogy, or a philosophy? Can it be all of these? Peter Levine (2007) muses that civic engagement’s lack of definition may to some extent account for its popularity: “It is a Rorschach blot within which anyone can find her own priorities” (p. 1).

Other scholars have suggested further difficulties in defining civic engagement. Among these is the concern of political partisanship. Battistoni (2002) elucidates the nature of the ideological barrier to the language of civic engagement or citizenship education: “Faculty on the left complain that citizenship education tends to convey images of patriotic flag-waving. More conservative faculty see civic engagement as masking a leftist, activist agenda”

(p. 10). These troublesome misconceptions are shared by many others besides faculty, both inside and outside the academy. Levine agrees that the definition of civic engagement is “extremely value laden and controversial” because it is impossible to define civic engagement without a clear understanding of what is a good society and what it would take to make our society better (personal communication, March 6, 2007). The issue of the relationship of civic engagement to social justice is often raised as well. Is the purpose of civic engagement to create a socially just world? Like the concepts of “a good society” and “the common good,” the term *social justice* is confounded because what constitutes justice to one person may be dramatically different from what another construes it to be.

Another common issue is that students and educators alike wonder whether community service and civic engagement are the same thing. Several colleges and universities have renamed their community service or service-learning offices “civic engagement” but have not changed the programs or services they offer. This interchangeability of terminology, as well as the avoidance of defining civic engagement, are reinforced by the comprehensive *Review of Service Learning Research* prepared by Jaime Lester and Margaret Salle (2006), under the direction of Adrianna Kezar, at the University of Southern California and in collaboration with that university’s Civic Engagement Initiative. Their review lists thirty-three recent studies, only three of which include a definition of civic engagement.

WORKING DEFINITION OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

There is widespread agreement that definitions of civic engagement for the purpose of educating students to become civically engaged citizens, scholars, and leaders are broad and multifaceted. Knowledge and skills are acknowledged to be necessary but not sufficient. Values, motivation, and commitment are also required. In *College Learning for the New Global Century*, the Association of American Colleges and Universities states, “In a democracy that is diverse, globally engaged, and dependent on citizen responsibilities, all students need an informed concern for the larger good because nothing less will renew our fractured and

diminished commons” (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise, 2007, p. 13). To further complicate matters, Barry Checkoway, in “Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University” (2001), elaborates: “Education for citizenship becomes more complex in a diverse democratic society in which communities are not ‘monocultural,’ consisting of people who share the same social and cultural characteristics, but ‘multicultural,’ with significant differences among groups. For democracy to function successfully in the future, students must be prepared to understand their own identities, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences in the transition to a more diverse society” (p. 127).

In a report for the Ford Foundation, Steven Lawry, Daniel L. Laurison, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen (2006) acknowledge that, in recent years, “the concept of civic engagement has been subject to a profusion of sometimes overlapping, sometimes competing attempts at a greater definition” and conclude that “civic engagement has become the rubric under which faculty, administrators and students think about, argue about and attempt to implement a variety of visions of higher education in service to society” (p. 12). The Ford Foundation’s report focuses on civic engagement initiatives aimed at students, as does this volume. In it, the authors acknowledge that “there is near consensus that an essential part of civic engagement is feeling responsible to part of something beyond individual interests” (Lawry et al., 2006, p. 13).

Most programs they studied want students to develop a sense of involvement, investment, or responsibility with regard to some group or context. Such civic values are characterized in multiple ways, ranging from generally caring about one’s community, to committing to making the world a better place, to believing that voting is an important duty (Lawry et al., 2006). The report also states that knowledge and skills are critical building blocks for civic engagement. Being informed and knowledgeable about local, national, and world affairs is necessary, as is an understanding of the workings of democratic processes (Lawry et al., 2006). Lawry et al. further report that the kinds of actions that constitute civic engagement are construed quite broadly and often cover a wide range of possibilities, with community service the most

often advocated type of civic engagement, with political participation next, and with activism or advocacy promoted the least frequently. Levine (2007) concurs that civic engagement, while “rarely defined in a coherent sentence or paragraph . . . is often operationalized as a list of variables” (p. 1). The work of the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement has measured civic engagement along nineteen core indicators in three categories: community participation, political engagement, and political voice (Levine, 2007).

The working definition of civic engagement for the purposes of this book is a slight variation of the definition created and embraced by the Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership at the University of Maryland. Civic engagement is defined as “acting upon a heightened sense of responsibility to one’s communities. This includes a wide range of activities, including developing civic sensitivity, participation in building civil society, and benefiting the common good. Civic engagement encompasses the notions of global citizenship and interdependence. Through civic engagement, individuals—as citizens of their communities, their nations, and the world—are empowered as agents of positive social change for a more democratic world” (Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership, 2005).

Civic engagement involves one or more of the following:

- Learning from others, self, and environment to develop informed perspectives on social issues
- Valuing diversity and building bridges across difference
- Behaving, and working through controversy, with civility
- Taking an active role in the political process
- Participating actively in public life, public problem solving, and community service
- Assuming leadership and membership roles in organizations
- Developing empathy, ethics, values, and sense of social responsibility
- Promoting social justice locally and globally (Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership, 2005)

While other terms are used to denote civic engagement, I have chosen to use *civic engagement* as the most common and most inclusive term. It does not bear the exclusionary connotation of citizenship, which also refers to a government-determined legal

status. It offers a “big tent” that allows individuals and initiatives representing a range of perspectives to gather beneath it for the purpose of creating a cohesive whole that advances responsibility for the common good.

However, it is important that each institution choose the term, definition, and approach that best suits its unique mission, culture, and traditions. Faith-based institutions often gravitate to a social justice focus, while historically black institutions, community colleges, and urban universities may prefer a definition grounded in community partnerships or public problem solving. Others, including some Ivy League universities, emphasize citizenship or public service.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

American higher education has always included among its core mission the preparation of effective citizens: “As long as there have been colleges and universities in this country, there has been a commitment at the heart of the curriculum to preparation for what we might call civic engagement” (Lawry et al., 2006, p. 7). Since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, one of the articulated purposes of higher education in this country has been the preparation of graduates for active involvement in community life (Smith, 1994). Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, two of the greatest thinkers of the Revolutionary period, put considerable energy into reforming higher education to be even more responsive to the needs of citizens in the emerging nation: “They considered informed and responsible participation, at least by qualified men, essential to the success of the democratic experiment” (Lawry et al., 2006, p. 7). Colonial colleges taught the classics and emphasized piety until politically sensitive presidents like Yale’s Ezra Stiles encouraged students to debate issues related to independence (Kezar, Chambers, and Burkhardt, 2005).

Following the Revolutionary War, the focus of higher education slowly began to shift from the preparation of the individual to the building of a new nation (Boyer, 1994). In Jefferson’s time, state legislatures first chartered universities to educate national

leaders. In 1862, the passage of the Land-Grant Act created institutions that inextricably linked public higher education and the concept of civic engagement, as it specifically relates to agriculture and industry.

Arguably, John Dewey was the single most influential advocate for the civic role of higher education, particularly in the liberal arts. In *Democracy and Education*, he wrote that the liberal arts experience should consist of “three essential elements: it should engage students in the surrounding community; it should be focused on problems to be solved rather than academic discipline; and it should collaboratively involve students and faculty” (as cited in Lawry et al., 2006, p. 7). Unfortunately, in the first half of the twentieth century, there were few national or institutional initiatives in response to Dewey’s call (Stanton and Wagner, 2006).

Even though educating students for responsible citizenship was not a priority for higher education in the early and middle years of the last century, when the economy collapsed and caused the Great Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt recruited outstanding scholars to serve as consultants. During World War II, research universities worked closely with the federal government to create solutions to new problems. In the wake of the war, two important partnerships between the federal government and higher education were founded: the GI Bill and the National Science Foundation. Once the Soviet Union launched *Sputnik* in 1957, higher education formed yet another partnership with the federal government to advance national interests by improving education in primary and secondary schools: the National Defense Education Act. Boyer (1994) points out that “the very title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 clearly linked higher education to the security of our country” (p. 48).

With the launch of the Peace Corps in 1961 and Volunteers in Service to America in 1965, college student involvement in community service came to the fore on the national scene. Despite the lack of broad and concerted national initiatives before the 1960s, there had been a long history of college student community service that includes the YMCA, 4-H, the Scouting movement, fraternities and sororities, and many programs sponsored by campus ministries (Jacoby, 1996). Simultaneously, a small, loosely connected group of pioneers of a pedagogy they called “service-learning”

began to combine community service with academic study (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz, 1999). Many campus-based service programs were started in the 1960s and 1970s, along with several regional and consortium programs. In 1978, the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (as of 1994, the National Society for Experiential Education) was formed by fusing separate groups for field experience education and service internships.

Also, in the 1980s, Americans were alarmed by growing concern over the apathy of citizens in general and of college students in particular. In *Habits of the Heart*, Robert Bellah, Richard M. Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton (1985) argued that Americans had become more individualistic and less concerned with the common good. Far-reaching thinkers like Richard Morrill (1982) challenged fellow academicians to focus their energies squarely on education for civic engagement that combines knowledge and action, “the empowerment of persons and the cultivation of minds” (p. 365). Campus Compact was formed in 1985 by college and university presidents who pledged to encourage and support education in service of civic responsibility. Campus Compact presently has more than eleven hundred presidents as members and remains dedicated to both institutional and individual civic engagement in higher education. Through the support of the National Society for Experiential Education, Campus Compact, and the student-driven Campus Outreach Opportunity League, community service and service-learning grew dramatically on college campuses through the 1980s and 1990s.

The passage of the National and Community Service Act in 1990, which was signed into law by President George H. W. Bush, authorized a new independent federal agency, the Commission on National and Community Service. The commission provided support for service and service-learning programs for school-aged youth and college students, along with national service demonstration models. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, under the Bill Clinton administration, created the Corporation for National and Community Service, which administers several programs to mobilize Americans into service. These include Senior Corps, AmeriCorps, USA Freedom Corps, and Learn and Serve America. The latter three programs have since

provided substantial technical and financial support to service, service-learning, and civic engagement in higher education (Corporation for National and Community Service, n.d.).

As service-learning soared to prominence on college campuses of all types, it has been integrated into academic courses and majors as well as into initiatives such as living-learning programs, course-based learning communities, new student orientation, leadership development, and multicultural education. We have more research about its effects, more models and principles to guide its practice, and more support from private and public sources. We know from national and institutional research that service-learning done well combines service with academic content and reflection to serve as a powerful introduction to developing an understanding of the root causes of social problems and where to begin to find solutions (Jacoby, 2003). In addition, viewing service-learning in terms of civic engagement enables educators to “make room in [their] practices and in [their] curriculum for conversations where students name for themselves what it is they are doing and its connections to community, citizenship, and democratic politics” (Morton and Battistoni, 1995, p. 18). Chapter 10 further discusses the relationship between service-learning and civic engagement.

The 1990s also saw a dramatic increase in efforts to bring college and university resources to bear on both broad social issues and local problems, giving rise to terms such as “the engaged campus” and “universities as citizens.” The concept of college and university outreach is as old as American higher education itself. It took firm root with the creation of the land-grant universities in the nineteenth century and the subsequent launch of the Wisconsin Idea early in the twentieth century. More recently, campus-community engagement has thrived, inspired by the trailblazing work at institutions like the University of Pennsylvania, Portland State University, and Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut (Butin, 2007; Harkavy, 1992; Harkavy and Puckett, 1994). Numerous campus-community partnerships were initiated through funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of University Partnerships and subsequent Community Outreach Partnership Center (Soska and Johnson Butterfield, 2004). Through service-learning and other

engaged pedagogies, campus-community partnerships provide myriad opportunities for student civic engagement.

In 1990, Boyer redefined scholarship, which went a long way to open up the idea of what counts as scholarly work in the academy (Zlotkowski, 2005). He “also provided much of the intellectual scaffolding needed to create new ties between the academy and society in general” (Zlotkowski, 2005, p. 148). According to Boyer (1990), the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of higher education institutions to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. He urged scholars to ask, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as to institutions? Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?” (p. 21). Many scholars have echoed and elaborated on Boyer’s call for engaged scholarship to be valued and rewarded by the academy to the same extent as “pure,” or traditional, research and have noted the challenges of achieving recognition for engaged scholarship in the faculty reward system (Gibson, 2006; O’Meara, 1997; O’Meara and Rice, 2005).

The late 1990s saw a rise in the prominence of the concept of civic engagement, together with “a blossoming of intellectual and institutional concern with the issue” (Lawry et al., 2006, p. 8). It was in 1995 that Robert D. Putnam’s article “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital” won a wide audience by arguing that social capital has eroded in the United States. Putnam (1995) documented the decline of our “longstanding traditions of civic engagement” and lamented, “Whatever happened to civic engagement?” (pp. 65–67). He struck a chord.

The rise of service-learning, engaged scholarship, and campus-community partnerships spurred by Putnam’s lament about American society and by clarion calls for higher education to rededicate itself to its public mission (Boyte and Hollander, 1999; Kezar et al., 2005) led to the development of a movement in the past ten or so years to restore preparing students for civic engagement to the forefront of higher education. This movement, as its proponents would call it, is not only national but also international in scope. The following section briefly outlines the contemporary landscape of the movement for civic engagement in higher education.

MAJOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

As Scott London (2001) notes: “A new movement is taking shape in American higher education, one aimed at education for democracy, nurturing community, and promoting civic participation. Across the country, colleges, universities, and academic associations are striving to make civic engagement an integral part of the way they do their work” (p. 17). There is no doubt that major civic engagement initiatives are in place and growing across higher education. Higher education associations of all sizes and membership bases have embraced civic engagement and included it in their missions, as have foundations, research organizations, and individual institutions. This section provides an overview of some of these to highlight their breadth and depth.

CAMPUS COMPACT

Campus Compact’s mission (n.d.) is to advance the public purpose of colleges and universities “by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility.” As previously mentioned, the organization’s civic engagement work encompasses both institutional engagement with communities and educating students for responsible citizenship. Of particular note in regard to the latter, Campus Compact published in 2006 two volumes that focus on mobilizing students to be effective leaders for change while enhancing their academic and civic learning: *Raise Your Voice: A Student Guide to Positive Social Change* (Cone, Kiesa, and Longo) and *Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership* (Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams). Campus Compact’s network of state compacts, currently in thirty-four states, provide leadership at the local, state, and regional levels to mobilize resources and provide support for member institutions. The state compacts have been instrumental in leading national efforts on cutting-edge practices. For example, two regional colloquiums, one in the West

and one in the upper Midwest, have explored issues related to civic engagement in graduate education (O'Meara, 2007).

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Liberal education, civic engagement, and diversity are at the hub of the extensive work of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), which includes publications, projects, and conferences. The organization advocates “a philosophy of education that empowers individuals, liberates the mind, and cultivates social responsibility” (AAC&U, 2002, p. x). AAC&U (n.d.) views civic engagement as “an essential principle in today’s discussions of higher learning.” In 2007, AAC&U unveiled its essential learning outcomes in a report entitled *College Learning for the New Global Century*: knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, intellectual and practical skills, personal and social responsibility, and integrative learning. The outcome for personal and social responsibility includes civic knowledge and engagement, both local and global, together with intercultural knowledge and competence, ethical reasoning and action, and foundations and skills for lifelong learning (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise, 2007). Chapter 3 of this volume describes the Civic Learning Spiral developed by AAC&U’s Civic Engagement Working Group (Musil et al., in press).

The Bringing Theory to Practice Project (BTtoP) is an independent national effort funded by the Charles Engelhard Foundation that functions in partnership with AAC&U to enable colleges and universities “to build capacity for institutionalizing forms of engaged learning and to understand their relation to outcomes affecting the well-being and civic development of students” (Bringing Theory to Practice, 2007, p. 1). The project originated out of concerns for rising levels of academic disengagement among college students, abuse of alcohol and drugs, and civic disengagement “increasing to levels which are alarming and may jeopardize the scope and quality of a democratic society” (Bringing Theory to Practice, 2007, p. 3). Through grants, national conferences, and publications, BTtoP seeks to encourage the development and practice of innovative, engaged learning strategies to address these concerns.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY PROJECT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In 2003, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the *New York Times* joined forces to launch the American Democracy Project for the purpose of preparing “the next generation of active, engaged citizens for our democracy” (C. Orphan, personal communication, October 10, 2007). Initially more than 130 university presidents responded to the call for participation. By 2007, there were 228 participating institutions. Initiatives of the American Democracy Project focus on global competencies, stewardship of public lands, political engagement, jury duty as an essential element of democracy, deliberative polling, and measurement of institutional performance in civic engagement (C. Orphan, personal communication, October 10, 2007). Intended for faculty of all disciplines, the American Democracy Project published its *Toolkit for Teaching in a Democratic Academy* to encourage them to transform their courses into democratic classrooms (Meade and Weaver, 2004). The toolkit provides a range of practical techniques for faculty that are designed to enable students to gain civic skills by taking responsibility for their learning and participating actively in the classroom community. The democratic classroom is further discussed in chapter 5.

ASSOCIATIONS SUPPORTING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

From both the pedagogical and community partnership standpoints, community colleges and the associations that support them are deeply involved in civic engagement. According to three national surveys by the American Association of Community Colleges (2006), nearly 60 percent of community colleges offer service-learning in their curricular programs. The association's national project, Community Colleges Broadening Horizons through Service Learning, provides an information clearinghouse, publications, training and technical assistance, and model programs to increase the number, quality, and sustainability of service-learning programs in its member institutions. The project is funded by the Corporation for National and Community Service. The association's publication *A Practical Guide for Integrating Civic*

Responsibility into the Curriculum (2006) is widely used and available online (see http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Projects_Partnerships/Current/HorizonsServiceLearningProject/Publications/CR_guide_2nd.pdf).

The Community College National Center for Community Engagement also offers a wide range of resources and services, such as course syllabi, funding opportunities, conferences, program models, publications, awards, and training and technical assistance. It also publishes the online *Journal for Civic Commitment* (see <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal>). In addition, Campus Compact's resources include some developed specifically for community colleges.

DISCIPLINARY ASSOCIATIONS

Disciplinary associations in a variety of fields have been embracing Boyer's concept of the scholarship of engagement and focusing on educating students for civic engagement. Among these are the Association of American Geographers, the American Chemical Society, the American Psychological Association, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Sociological Association, the American Political Science Association, and the National Communication Association (Zlotkowski, 2005). Similarly, sector-based associations provide resources to related groups of disciplines. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (n.d.) has members from a wide range of health professions and emphasizes the improvement of "health professional education, civic responsibility and the overall health of communities." Imagining America is a national consortium of higher education and cultural institutions dedicated to supporting the civic work of university artists, humanists, and designers. Like Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), Imagining America provides resources to facilitate engaged scholarship, teaching, and community-based programs (Zlotkowski, 2005). Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER) was initiated in 2001 by AAC&U with funding from the National Science Foundation. SENCER supports the improvement of undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education by connecting learning to critical civic questions. Unlike CCPH and

Imagining America, SENCER (<http://www.sencer.net/About/projectoverview.cfm>) focuses less on community partnerships and more on curriculum and faculty development to make science more real, accessible, and civically important to college students who are not science majors. Resources published by Campus Compact and the now-defunct American Association for Higher Education support discipline-based service-learning and civic engagement as well as the creation of “engaged departments” and can be found at <http://www.styluspub.com/Books/BookDetail.aspx?productID=117889> and http://www.compact.org/publications/detail/engaged_department_toolkit.

OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

Through its nonpartisan National Campus Voter Registration Project, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (see <http://www.naicu.edu>) helps member institutions conduct both voter education programs and campaigns to register students and employees. The Council of Independent Colleges’ Engaging Communities and Campuses program created the Effective Practices Exchange, a rich online source of both conceptual and practical resources (see http://www.cic.edu/projects_services/epe).

The Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (see <http://henceonline.org/about>) was founded in 2006 in “response to the growing need to deepen, consolidate, and advance the literature, research, practice, policy, and advocacy for community engagement as a core element of higher education’s role in society.” The organization’s membership includes a wide range of associations and individual institutions committed to working individually and together to advance civic and community engagement across higher education.

Several smaller higher education organizations whose membership consists of institutions of a particular type have a special interest in civic engagement. Project Pericles, an organization founded in 2001 by philanthropist Eugene M. Lang, has the specific goal of promoting civic engagement among college students. Each of the twenty-two colleges and universities participating in the project has found novel ways to connect traditional academic learning with social issues (Project Pericles, 2006).

Two additional examples are the Associated New American Colleges (see <http://www.anac.org>)—whose mission combines liberal arts, professional studies, and civic engagement—and The Research University Civic Engagement Network, a group of Carnegie Foundation–defined very high research institutions that work together to strengthen and advance civic and community engagement at research universities and nationally (see http://www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities).

FOUNDATIONS

Foundations, which can significantly influence the direction of higher education through the programs they initiate and support, are also evidencing great interest in civic engagement. In 2002, the Kellogg Foundation sponsored a series of national dialogues among more than two hundred campus and community leaders to define and further commitment and public support for a multifaceted civic mission for higher education. The report of the National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good (formerly the Kellogg Forum) that followed the dialogues identifies an agenda for higher education institutions and practical steps toward reengaging students, including promoting student activism and leadership, making community-based learning integral to the curriculum, fostering a campus culture of dialogue and debate, and encouraging continued commitment to public service and social responsibility after graduation by providing a range of public service and nonprofit career choices (National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good, 2003).

Since the early 1990s, the Kettering Foundation has been working to strengthen democracy. The primary question it addresses is “What does it take to make democracy work as it should?” (see <http://www.kettering.org>). As such, it has a strong interest in higher education’s role in preparing college students for democratic citizenship. While it does not make grants, it partners with organizations with similar interests and produces excellent publications that promote the civic mission of higher education, including *Connections* and the *Higher Education Exchange*, both available free in print and online through Kettering’s Web site.

The Bonner Foundation’s Bonner Scholars Program supports four-year community service scholarships for students attending

twenty-seven colleges and universities. Bonner programs at approximately fifty additional institutions provide a range of civic engagement opportunities. The foundation's Web site also offers substantial resources for planning and implementing civic engagement programs (see <http://www.bonner.org>).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has done substantial work in both educating students for civic engagement and encouraging institutional civic responsibility. In 2003, the foundation and Jossey-Bass published *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens). This volume provides examples of how different types of institutions are preparing their students to be thoughtful, committed, and responsible citizens. Following *Educating Citizens*, Carnegie initiated the Political Engagement Project, which examines and assesses the impact of twenty-one undergraduate courses and cocurricular programs designed to foster informed political engagement. The project and its implications are described in *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Political Engagement* (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold, 2007).

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION

When the Carnegie Foundation redesigned its classification system for higher education institutions, in 2006, it released a new elective classification for community engagement. Community engagement describes "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007). The classification includes three categories: curricular engagement, outreach and partnerships, and a combination of the first two. Of most relevance to the topic of this book, curricular engagement recognizes institutions "where teaching, learning and scholarship engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007).

In the area of accreditation of higher education institutions, the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission

includes an accreditation criterion for engagement and service. The commission asserts, "If colleges and universities have erred in the past century, it has been in marginalizing the importance of their engagement in serving the common good" (North Central Association, Higher Learning Commission, 2003, p. 56). It is expected that other regional accrediting associations will follow North Central's lead in establishing criteria regarding civic engagement and assessing institutions based on those criteria.

RESEARCH ON CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

In this decade, a growing body of research and literature informs the development of civic engagement efforts on college campuses. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE) conducts and funds research specifically on the civic and political engagement of Americans between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five. CIRCLE's Web site (<http://www.civicyouth.org>) provides a wealth of useful resources on a range of topics regarding college and noncollege youth, including demographics, voting, community participation, attitudes and beliefs, and civic education. Campus Compact, the Higher Education Research Institute, and the Corporation for National and Community Service conduct annual surveys of college students that provide valuable information on their civic engagement. The Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University and Harvard University's Institute of Politics also conduct studies on multiple aspects of youth civic engagement. The International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement was launched in 2005 to support the development and dissemination of research that promotes civic engagement across the educational spectrum (see <http://www.researchslce.org>). Chapter 2 further discusses research on college student civic engagement.

In addition, several studies address the issues of college students' lack of civic knowledge and skills. The Intercollegiate Studies Institute reports that a majority of college graduates are no better off than when they arrived in terms of acquiring the knowledge necessary for informed democracy and global citizenship. Entitled *Failing Our Students, Failing America: Holding Colleges Accountable for*

Teaching America's History and Institutions, the report states that senior scores are actually lower than freshman scores at some of the nation's most prestigious institutions (see <http://www.americancivilliteracy.org>). Equally sobering are the results of the 2004 study conducted by AAC&U that asked college juniors and college-bound high school juniors to pick the college outcomes they considered most and least important. In each of the six groups of students who participated in the study, "civic engagement and leadership" was selected by students as the least or second-least important college learning outcome. The students overwhelmingly believed that college was a time to prepare for a job and take responsibility for themselves and their own obligations (Humphreys and Davenport, 2005).

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS

In addition to well-established efforts at such institutions as the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Minnesota, Portland State University, and Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, the first decade of the twenty-first century has witnessed several individual institutions create major initiatives to advance civic engagement in undergraduate education, in some cases with the support of foundations. The Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service (n.d.) at Tufts University is a university-wide initiative founded in 2000 to make the values and skills of active citizenship a hallmark of a Tufts education. The goal of the UCLA in LA initiative of the University of California at Los Angeles is to nurture and develop partnerships between community groups and the university to improve the quality of life for local residents, mainly in the areas of children, youth, and families; economic development; and arts and culture. The Center for Community Learning, the undergraduate curricular arm of the initiative, offers courses, internships with a civic engagement focus, and a civic engagement minor (UCLA in LA, 2007). With the support of the Duke Foundation and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Duke University launched DukeEngage in 2007, a new program that provides full funding and faculty and administrative support to all undergraduates "who want to stretch beyond the classroom by tackling societal issues at home and abroad, and, in turn, learning from those real-world experiences" (DukeEngage, n.d.). The Office of the

Vice Chancellor for Public Service was created at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2007 to build and strengthen relationships between the university and communities across the state. Its programs and activities include identifying and addressing the state's most pressing needs, encouraging faculty members' engaged scholarship, and supporting student civic engagement and service work (L. Robbins, personal communication, November 28, 2007). A wide range of institutional initiatives of varying sizes, scopes, and desired outcomes are profiled throughout the remaining chapters of this volume.

INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES

Following eight years of work to define concepts, policies, and strategies to promote good practice in the area of education for democratic citizenship, the Council of Europe declared 2005 as the European Year of Citizenship through Education. In 2006, it released *Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights and Civic Responsibility*, a statement by higher education leaders and policy makers that affirms their commitment to "democratic principles and practice; [their] conviction that higher education has an essential role in furthering democratic culture; and [their] responsibility to educate each successive generation to renew and develop the attitudes, values and skills needed for this to become a reality."

Also, in 2005, Tufts University sponsored its fourth international conference at its center in Talloires, France. This one focused on strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education. It produced a declaration in which the signatories, presidents of universities around the world, agreed to expand civic engagement and social responsibility programs; foster partnerships between universities, communities, schools, and government; and create institutional frameworks for the encouragement, reward, and recognition of good practice (Talloires Network, 2005).

In addition to a number of American associations, a wide range of international higher education organizations partnered with Tufts and the Council of Europe in these ongoing efforts,

including Innovations in Civic Participation; Association of Commonwealth Universities; the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy; and the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education.

THE CIVIC RENEWAL MOVEMENT

Scholars are heralding the emergence of a civic renewal movement to revitalize democracy in the United States over the past decade (Sirianni and Friedland, 2005). Alternatively called the “democracy movement,” “community-building movement,” “civil-society movement,” or “communities movement,” it entails “investing in civic skills and organizational capacities for public problem solving on a wide scale and designing policy at every level of the federal system to enhance the ability of citizens to do the everyday work of the republic” (Sirianni and Friedland, 2005, p. 1). Carmen Sirianni and Lewis A. Friedland (2005) describe several approaches that fall under the umbrella of the civic renewal movement, including community organizing and development, civic environmentalism, the engaged campus, community youth development and K–12 civic education, healthy communities, and public journalism and civic communications. In their view, the civic renewal movement attempts to “weave these various movements and innovations into a larger tapestry that can enable democratic work to become broader and deeper, as well as more complementary and sustainable” (p. 4).

If, in fact, civic engagement in higher education is part of a broad civic renewal movement, there is hope that it will provide the rising tide that will raise all boats, effectively creating a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. Indeed, Sirianni and Friedland hope that the various aspects of the movement will nourish one another. In the case of higher education, robust civic education in K–12 schools and in communities would encourage and support collegiate civic engagement efforts. Likewise, providing substantive opportunities for college students to learn about and practice civic engagement will prepare them to take on the deeper problems in the professions, education, government, and in all areas of our civic infrastructure (Sirianni and Friedland, 2005).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided an overview of educating students for civic engagement in contemporary higher education. It reviewed the difficulties in defining civic engagement and put forth a working definition. Following a brief history of civic engagement in higher education, it highlighted major current initiatives in associations, foundations, and higher education institutions. It offered perspectives from research, international efforts, and the broad civic renewal movement. The remaining chapters of this book address the challenges confronting civic engagement in higher education. These include defining what students need to know and be able to do as civically engaged citizens, scholars, and leaders on the local, national, and global levels and changing the practices of higher education to move civic engagement from the margins to the center of the curriculum and the cocurriculum. The chapter authors explore how educators can integrate opportunities for students to learn about and practice civic engagement across the college experience and, at the same time, to make vital contributions to the public good.

References

- American Association of Community Colleges. "Horizons Service Learning Project." http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Projects_Partnerships/Current/HorizonsServiceLearningProject/HorizonsServiceLearningProject.htm, 2006.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. "Resources on Civic Engagement." <http://www.aacu.org/resources/civicengagement>, n.d.
- Battistoni, R. *Civic Engagement across the Curriculum*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2002.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S. M. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Boyer, E. L. "Creating the New American College." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 9, 1994, p. 48.

- Boyte, H., and Hollander, E. *Wingspread Declaration on the Civic Responsibilities of Research Universities*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 1999.
- Bringing Theory to Practice. "Request for Proposals: Engaged Learning, Student Well-Being, and Student Civic Development." http://www.aacu.org/bringing_theory/documents/BTP_RFP_2007.pdf, 2007.
- Butin, D. "Focusing Our Aim: Strengthening Faculty Commitment to Community Engagement." *Change*, November/December 2007, 34–37.
- Campus Compact. "About Us." <http://www.compact.org/about>, n.d.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "Community Engagement Elective Classification." <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=1213>, 2007.
- Checkoway, B. "Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University." *Journal of Higher Education*, 2001, 72(2), 125–147.
- Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership. "About Us: Definitions." <http://www.terpimpact.umd.edu/content2.asp?cid=7&sid=41>, November 2007.
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., and Corngold, J. *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Political Engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., and Stephens, J. *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. "Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: Transforming Communities & Higher Education." <http://www.futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>, n.d.
- Cone, R. E., Kiesa, A., and Longo, N. V. *Raise Your Voice: A Student Guide to Positive Social Change*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006.
- Corporation for National and Community Service. "Our History and Legislation." http://www.nationalservice.org/about/role_impact/history.asp, n.d.
- Council of Europe. "Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights and Civic Responsibility." <http://dc.ecml.at/index.asp?Page=Declaration>, 2006.
- DukeEngage. "Duke University Launches \$30 Million Initiative to Make Civic Engagement an Integral Part of Undergraduate Education." <http://www.dukenews.duke.edu/engage/release.html>, n.d.
- Gibson, C. M. *New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement*. Medford, MA: Tufts University and Campus Compact, 2006.

- Harkavy, I. "The University and Social Sciences in the Social Order: An Historical Overview and 'Where Do We Go from Here?'" *Virginia Social Science Journal*, 1992, 27, 1–25.
- Harkavy, I., and Puckett, J. L. "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University." *Social Service Review*, 1994, 68(3), 299–321.
- Humphreys, D., and Davenport, A. "What Really Matters in College: How Students View and Value Liberal Education." *Liberal Education*, Summer/Fall 2005, 1–6.
- Jacoby, B. "Service-Learning in Today's Higher Education." In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Jacoby, B. "Fundamentals of Service-Learning Partnerships." In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building Partnerships for Service-Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University. "About Tisch College." <http://activecitizen.tufts.edu/?pid=1>, n.d.
- Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., and Burkhardt, J. C. *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Lawry, S., Laurison, D. L., and VanAntwerpen, J. *Liberal Education and Civic Engagement: A Project of the Ford Foundation's Knowledge, Creativity and Freedom Program*. <http://www.fordfound.org/elibrary/documents/5029/toc.cfm>, 2006.
- Lester, J., and Salle, M. "Review of Service-Learning Research." Los Angeles: University of Southern California Civic Engagement Initiative, 2006.
- Levine, P. *The Future of American Democracy: Developing the Next Generation of American Citizens*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 2007.
- London, S. *Higher Education and Public Life: Restoring the Bond*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation, 2001.
- Meade, E., and Weaver, S. (Eds.). *Toolkit for Teaching in a Democratic Academy*. Allentown, PA: Cedar Crest College, 2004.
- Morrill, R. L. "Educating for Democratic Values." *Liberal Education*, 1982, 68(4), 365–376.
- Morton, K., and Battistoni, R. "Service and Citizenship: Are They Connected?" *Wingspread Journal*, 1995, 17, 17–19.
- Musil, C. M., Wathington, H., Battistoni, R., Calderón, J., Trementozzi, M., Fluker, W. E., et al. *The Civic Learning Spiral: Education for Participation in a Diverse Democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, in press.

- National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good. *Higher Education for the Public Good*. Ann Arbor, MI: National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good, 2003.
- National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise. *College Learning for the New Global Century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007.
- North Central Association, Higher Learning Commission. *Handbook of Accreditation* (3rd ed.). Chicago: North Central Association, 2003.
- O'Meara, K. *Rewarding Faculty Professional Service*. (Working Paper No. 19). Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 1997.
- O'Meara, K. *Graduate Education and Civic Engagement*. Boston: New England Research Center for Higher Education, February 2007.
- O'Meara, K., and Rice, R. E. *Faculty Rewards Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Project Pericles. "Project Pericles: Claiming the Legacy of Pericles." <http://projectpericles.org/?q=node/7>, 2006.
- Putnam, R. D. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy*, 1995, 6(1), 65–78.
- Saltmarsh, J. "The Civic Promise of Service Learning." *Liberal Education*, 2005, 91(2), 50–55.
- Sirianni, C., and Friedland, L. A. *The Civic Renewal Movement: Community Building and Democracy in the U.S.* Dayton, OH: Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 2005.
- Smith, M. W. "Issues in Integrating Service-Learning into the Higher Education Curriculum." In Youth Service America (Ed.), *Effective Learning, Effective Teaching, Effective Service*. Washington, DC: Youth Service America, 1994.
- Soska, T. M., and Johnson Butterfield, A. K. *University-Community Partnerships: Universities in Civic Engagement*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, 2004.
- Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E., Jr., and Cruz, N. I. *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
- Stanton, T. K., and Wagner, J. *Educating for Democratic Citizenship: Renewing the Civic Mission of Graduate and Professional Education at Research Universities*. San Francisco: California Campus Compact, 2006.
- Talloeires Network. "The Talloeires Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education." <http://www.tufts.edu/talloeiresnetwork/?pid=17&c=7>, 2005.
- UCLA in LA. "Center for Community Learning." <http://www.ugedducation.ucla.edu/communitylearning>, 2007.

- Zlotkowski, E. "The Disciplines and the Public Good." In A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, and J. C. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Zlotkowski, E., Longo, N. V., and Williams, J. R. *Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006.