University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Thesis, Dissertations, Student Creative Activity, and Scholarship

Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE)

4-11-2007

Preparing Students for Lives of Responsible Citizenship: A Higher Education Civic Blueprint for the State of New Jersey

Andrew P. Frederick
Princeton University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedt

Part of the Service Learning Commons

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Frederick, Andrew P., "Preparing Students for Lives of Responsible Citizenship: A Higher Education Civic Blueprint for the State of New Jersey" (2007). *Thesis, Dissertations, Student Creative Activity, and Scholarship*. 52.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedt/52

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Thesis, Dissertations, Student Creative Activity, and Scholarship by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

UNO LIBRARIES
LIBRARY.UNOMAHA.EDU

PREPARING STUDENTS FOR LIVES OF RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP: A HIGHER EDUCATION CIVIC BLUEPRINT FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

by

Andrew P. Frederick

04/11/2007

A Senior Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

77416

In memory of Charlie Bray '55 and the entire Project 55 family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The inspiration for this thesis has come from a variety of important people in my life, but none more important than my mom and dad; their unending love and support have given me the strength, courage, and compassion to do good works. I can think of no better exemplar of the ideals put forth in this paper than my dad whose extensive involvement and leadership in the local community have made it a better place in which to live. If the term "citizen-business owner" existed, my dad would embody it.

At Princeton, I have encountered no better teacher and no greater person than Professor Stanley N. Katz. In February 2007, a conference was held in honor of his life as "Teacher, Scholar, and Citizen." While there could be no more fitting title to such a conference, I prefer to think of him as teacher, mentor, and friend. After three classes and a thesis under his supervision, his influence upon me has been profound. Ten fellow students and I are forever indebted to him for graciously accepting a double teaching load so that we could have our student-initiated seminar "The Just University?"—a course which has greatly aided my thesis work.

The journey that has culminated in this thesis began my freshmen year at Princeton as a member of the Student Task Force on Civic Values, a group of undergraduates organized by Princeton Project 55 and charged with developing recommendations for how Princeton could more effectively prepare its students for lives of responsible citizenship. Through this experience I met Charlie Bray '55, a tireless warrior for a better, more civically attuned Princeton. Charlie took me under his wing and inspired and directed me in my efforts to lead the Task Force. He was Princeton's civic engagement "rock star."

Countless conversations over the past four years have shaped my understanding of what responsible citizenship means. In particular, I am grateful to Kiki Jamieson, Elsie Sheidler, and Phil Martin at the Pace Center, Dave Brown at the Student Volunteers Council, and Lindsay Michelotti, Katherine Hande, Stephanie Greenberg, Nora Samuelson and Kim Hendler at Project 55. I am also indebted to my friends and colleagues of the Civic Values Task Force, and to my roommates and other friends for challenging my ideas and sharing theirs during many late night discussions.

I thank those individuals, and there are many of them, at Rutgers University, the College of New Jersey, and Raritan Valley Community College who invited me to their campuses and shared their inspiring stories of trying to educate students for citizenship. At Rutgers, these people include: Randi Chmielewski, Maurice Elias, Beth Leech, Elizabeth Matto, Amy Michaels, Yvette Murray, Isabel Nazario, Theresa O'Neill, Michael Shafer, Lea Stewart, and Jon Van Til; at the College of New Jersey: Heather Camp, Pat Donohue, Barbara Gitenstein, Beth Paul, Dave Prensky, and Nino Scarpati; and at Raritan Valley: Jan Buttler, Casey Crabill, Lori Moog, Dana Nelson, Jerry Ryan, and Susan Williams. I would also like to thank Erin McGrath and Christen Foell of the Bonner Foundation for their help as well as Jeanne Oswald of the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education.

Lastly, my thesis experience would have been incomplete without the music and companionship of Silvio, and most importantly, without the love and support of Maria—my very own California penguin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..1

II. CHAPTER 1:
Defining Responsible Citizenship..8

III. CHAPTER 2:
Role of Higher Education in Preparing Students
for Lives of Responsible Citizenship..21

IV. CHAPTER 3:
Status of Civic Education at New Jersey
Colleges and Universities..51

Rutgers University...53

The College of New Jersey.......................................74

Raritan Valley Community College.........................85

V. CHAPTER 4:
The State's Role in Strengthening Civic Education..........................102

What the State of New Jersey Can Do...................................110

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY..125

ABSTRACT

This thesis develops a working civic education blueprint for New Jersey's public colleges and universities and proposes concrete steps the State, particularly the governor and the Commission on Higher Education, can take to support their efforts. Civic education must be strategically integrated into the campus culture, the co-curriculum, and most importantly, the curriculum if higher education institutions hope to foster an ethic of service that diffuses across campus and reaches all students. Two overriding objectives should guide higher education in its civic mission: 1) providing students with multiple pathways, both curricular and co-curricular, that support their development as citizens across their collegiate career and 2) identifying and increasing the short- and long-term capacity of community partners.

Being a responsible citizen in a democratic society demands acquiring a strong foundational understanding of American history and the political process, staying informed of current events, upholding democratic values, cultivating a habit of civic involvement, and recognizing oneself as a democratic participant and contributor to the public good. In line with this definition, responsible citizenship can be broken down into these six categories: knowledge, values, skills, engagement, identity, and sense of efficacy. Although these are mutually reinforcing elements, any pattern of engagement, formation of civic identity, and feeling of a sense of efficacy must be predicated on civic knowledge, values, and skills.

Some schools in New Jersey have made education for citizenship a cornerstone of their overarching institutional mission while others have been more neglectful, or at least less intentional, in readying students for rich civic lives. If the State of New Jersey seriously believes its public colleges and universities should be mandated to prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship, as it claims in its *Long-Range Plan for Higher Education*, then it must demand that they do more and help them in doing so.

Taking into account the presently severe New Jersey budgetary constraints, there are immediate steps that the State can take that require minimal financial investment and then others that must await a healthier state budget. A New Jersey Campus Compact should be established to perform the following functions for higher education statewide: 1) convene conferences, workshops, and meetings on civic education; 2) coordinate and promote civic engagement grant opportunities; 3) enhance the capacity of college civic engagement programs; 4) recognize outstanding public service and leadership; 5) promote public policy that would advance civic engagement efforts.

Other actions that should be taken immediately are for Governor Corzine to exert more gubernatorial leadership by calling on public colleges and universities to develop strategic plans that address their civic missions and forming a task force on K-16 civic education; the Commission on Higher Education should organize a state-wide colloquium on education for citizenship. When the monies become available, the State should fund a New Jersey Higher Education Civic Engagement Matching Grant Program and pilot a New Jersey Campus-Community Corps Program that would supplement AmeriCorps volunteers on college campuses.

INTRODUCTION

"If there is a crisis in education in the United States today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most significant responsibility of the nation's schools and colleges."

– Frank Newman, Higher Education and the American Resurgence (1985)

Frank Newman, the former president of the Education Commission of the States and co-founder of Campus Compact,[1] issued this provocative proclamation in 1985 in the Carnegie Foundation report *Higher Education and the American Resurgence* (Newman, as cited in Jacoby, 1996, p. 20). The publication of this report along with the establishment of Campus Compact brought renewed attention to colleges and universities' civic missions in the 1980s. An inundation of literature on the subject[2] over the past several decades would indicate that some of today's leading scholars and educators still agree with the sentiments espoused by Newman—colleges and universities do not take seriously their responsibility to prepare students for lifelong engagement in public life.

Others in the academy would disagree and would go so far as to say that education for citizenship is not even a responsibility of institutions of higher learning; therefore, how can colleges and universities be in a "crisis" or "failing" if they are not even responsible for this part of a young person's development? Most in the academy would not endorse this outright rejection of civic education, but at the same time they

---

[1] Campus Compact is a coalition of over 1,000 campuses across the country which works toward advancing civic engagement in general and service-learning in particular in higher education ("Campus Compact," 2007).

[2] A few examples include: Boyte & Kari's (2000) *Renewing the Democratic Spirit in American Colleges and Universities*, Ehrlich's (2000) *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, and Colby et al.'s (2003) *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*.

would not necessarily agree what role it should play on college campuses. Of these, a few would side with Newman and embrace education for citizenship as the principal, unifying aim of schools in America.

A quick scan of the mission statements of public colleges and universities in New Jersey complicates the notion that a single, guiding principle exists to direct the activities of higher education. No one mission, let alone education for citizenship, drives institutions of higher learning; rather they pursue a variety of interconnected yet distinct aims. Universities all in some way address their threefold mission of scholarship, teaching, and service, with the dimension of research being emphasized most heavily. Community and state colleges, on the other hand, maintain a dual mission of teaching and service that recognizes their special relationship with the local community.

Perhaps providing a high quality education could be considered the guiding principle of colleges and universities. But the process of trying to determine what a "high quality education" constitutes, or rather which learning aims should be prioritized, quickly demonstrates the futility of this argument. Academic rigor, critical thinking skills, and other cognitive outcomes, such as problem-solving abilities, would undoubtedly be tabbed as essential elements of a high quality education. Still, some educators would deride this education as incomplete or insufficient since it does not address the issue of who students become as people, as beings with emotional, social, moral, and civic needs.

Given the diversity of interests balanced by colleges and universities, one idea cannot realistically guide higher education; however, a collection of core principles that are enshrined in the mission statement and embodied in policy seems not only reasonable but also necessary. One of those core principles should unequivocally be education for

citizenship. Many colleges and universities in New Jersey have ostensibly made an institutional commitment to civic education. Of the nineteen community colleges in New Jersey, ten explicitly include education for citizenship in their mission statements. For instance, both Atlantic Cape and Raritan Valley Community Colleges express their commitment to promoting "responsible citizenship" in students ("Atlantic Cape Community College," 2007; "Raritan Valley Community College," 2007). Brookdale Community College wants its students to "be knowledgeable about the fundamental values of a democratic society" while Union County College encourages its students to construct "an understanding of their obligations as members of a democratic society" ("Brookdale Community College," 2007; "Union County College," 2007). Hudson County Community College considers the ability to "participate as informed citizens" a chief learning outcome of its general education curriculum ("Hudson County Community College," 2007).

Only a handful of state colleges and universities incorporate education for citizenship in their mission statements. The College of New Jersey offers the most extensive acknowledgement of its institutional obligation to instill students with a sense of civic responsibility. Part of its mission statement reads: "Proud of its public service mandate to educate leaders of New Jersey and the nation, The College will be a national exemplar in the education of those who seek to sustain and advance the communities in which they live" ("The College of New Jersey," 2007). Similarly, Montclair State University expects its students "to become informed citizen-participants prepared to assume leadership roles in a democracy" ("Montclair State University," 2007). The William Patterson University of New Jersey aspires to equip students with the education

necessary to reach high levels of "productive citizenship in an increasingly global economy and technological world" ("William Paterson University," 2007).

Mission statements provide an important look at the educational priorities of colleges and universities but their importance should not be overstated. Most likely every college president in New Jersey would claim that her institution has a responsibility to prepare its students for participation in public life and that it is actively working towards doing so. How well colleges and universities actually follow through with these claims varies significantly. Some schools that do not explicitly include education for citizenship in their public missions still devote significant resources to centers and programs charged with fostering civic habits in students. At the same time, others that express a public commitment to instill students with a sense of civic responsibility fail to back up their rhetoric with institutional leadership and action.

Regardless of whether each institution of higher learning considers civic education a core component of its overall mission, the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education identifies it as a principal objective of tertiary education in the state. In *A Blueprint for Excellence: New Jersey's Long-Range Plan for Higher Education*,[3] the Commission states: "Colleges and universities should reflect the value of service in their teaching and research and engage students, faculty, and staff in public service on and off campus, reaching out to the community, state, nation, and world and imparting lifelong civic responsibility" (Mertz, Collins, & Oswald, 2005, p. 13). In order to "prepare a

[3] *A Blueprint for Excellence: New Jersey's Long-Range Plan for Higher Education* was originally adopted in 2003 by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education. In 2005, the Commission published an updated version and will be releasing a subsequent update in 2007. The development of the long-range plan involved "over 500 stakeholders, including business leaders, government officials, legislative staff, community leaders, students, parents, trustees, faculty, alumni, college administrators, and others..." (Downes, Freeman, & Sulton, 2003, p. 1).

growing and increasingly diverse population for responsible citizenship in a democratic society," the Commission recognizes that New Jersey's higher education system must "support targeted, multifaceted increases in capacity and specific state and campus programs" (Mertz et al., 2005, p. 17).

The original 2003 long-range plan did not elaborate on how the Commission would exactly catalyze these increases in capacity or what types of state and campus programs it hoped to assist.[4] The 2005 update to the plan offered a little more insight, explaining that:

> A working group will be formed to consider strategies to further advance the public purpose of colleges and universities, improvement of community life, and education of students for civic and social responsibility. Discussion will include the possibility of becoming a state affiliate of Campus Compact… (Mertz et al., 2005, p. 13)

A working group has been formed but is still in its early planning stages (J. Oswald, personal communication, March 16, 2007). The 2007 Update, which has not yet been released publicly, provides the most concrete goals to date for strengthening and expanding civic education at New Jersey's colleges and universities. These goals include: 1) strengthening the statewide college service-learning network; 2) organizing a statewide policy forum to create a state agenda; 3) increasing student participation in community service by a minimum of 5 percentage points by 2010 ("New Jersey's Strategic Plan for Higher Education - Working Draft," 2007, p. 10).

While the importance the Commission has placed on civic education is commendable, its efforts suffer from a lack of an overarching framework. What is the larger vision that the Commission has for what education for citizenship could become at

[4] The only action step mentioned in the 2003 long-range plan is that "the Commission on Higher Education will survey institutions in 2007 and 2010 on their progress in enhancing on- and off-campus public service" (Downes et al., 2003, p. 8).

New Jersey institutions of higher learning? How do the three specific goals listed in the 2007 Update help realize the larger vision? Without an overarching framework, there is no effective way to measure progress and no mechanism for ensuring that goals and action steps strategically advance the larger vision. What the Commission needs is a state-wide plan that lays out how public colleges and universities can work towards meeting their institutional responsibility of educating students for citizenship.[5]

The purpose of this thesis is to explore this issue in greater depth in order to develop a working civic education blueprint for New Jersey's public colleges and universities, and to suggest how the State, particularly the governor and the Commission, can support their efforts. Chapter 1 will examine what is meant by the phrase "responsible citizenship in a democratic society." The following questions will be addressed: What are the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and habits required for people to participate in public life and become civic leaders in their communities? Does responsible citizenship refer solely to one's interactions with the State, such as voting or working on political campaigns, or does it encompass a much broader range of activities, such as coaching a youth sports team, joining a neighborhood association, or building a nature trail for a nearby school?

Once responsible citizenship is more clearly defined, the role that colleges and universities can play in preparing students for it will be examined in Chapter 2. How do students think of citizenship upon entering college, and based on this information, what

[5] Much of this paper applies to both public and private higher education institutions. In fact, the first two chapters, which look at what responsible citizenship means and how colleges and universities can prepare students for it, make no distinction between public and private institutions. However, the third chapter specifically examines three public higher education institutions in New Jersey. Most of the policy recommendations in the final chapter actually encompass both public and private institutions, but in terms of ensuring that colleges and universities educate students for citizenship, the State of New Jersey has significantly more influence over public institutions than private ones. As a result, this public-private distinction is made throughout the paper.

are the areas of citizen development towards which higher education should devote its energies? What are the mechanisms, curricular and co-curricular, through which civic education can be accomplished, and in particular, how can faculty members contribute to these efforts?

Chapter 3 will look at the status of civic education at public colleges and universities in New Jersey. This chapter will specifically focus on how Rutgers University, The College of New Jersey, and Raritan Valley Community College have tried to educate students for citizenship. Using this research university, this state college, and this community college as case studies, I will conclude with lessons drawn from their particular experiences that can be used to guide civic education at institutions of higher learning across the state.

The final chapter will explore how the federal government and other states have catalyzed higher education civic engagement efforts. Based on that analysis, what are the steps the State of New Jersey can take to support the civic mission of its colleges and universities? In particular, what roles can Governor Corzine and the Commission on Higher Education play? Taking into account the severe New Jersey budgetary constraints, I will recommend immediate steps that the State can take that require minimal financial investment and then others that must await a healthier state budget.

CHAPTER ONE
DEFINING RESPONSBILE CITIZENSHIP

"A democracy is more than a form of government: it is primarily a mode of associated living, a conjoint communicated experience."

– John Dewey, Democracy and Education (1916)[6]

Although New Jersey's *Long-Range Plan for Higher Education* cites preparing students for "responsible citizenship in a democratic society" as one of its key objectives, it does not define what it means. Public colleges and universities cannot work towards this objective strategically if there is not a shared understanding of what responsible citizenship should signify, as the idea could mean very different things to people at different campuses. For instance, casting one's ballot in local, state, or national elections is an image that commonly pops into peoples' minds when asked to describe an act of citizenship. If pressed for a further example, people might respond with contacting an elected official to voice one's concerns. While quite narrow, this conception of citizenship—voting and contacting elected officials—is illustrative of how some people might see their roles in sustaining America's democracy.

Responsible citizenship, as understood in this paper, encompasses a far broader set of activities, all of which in various ways work towards promoting the public good. Thus, the idea of citizenship should not be tied solely to peoples' interactions with the State but extended to their involvement with community and civic organizations, other civil society institutions, and their professional life. Citizenship must be broadly conceived as something that every societal member is capable of pursuing at some level

---

[6] (Dewey, 1916, p. 87)

on a regular basis either through civic works or one's professional arena. Not everyone will make a lifelong commitment to a public service career; in fact most will not, but that does not preclude them from becoming responsible citizens.

Every individual can work actively towards advancing the public good, improving the welfare of all in society, and should see it as integral to her way of living. What that public good should be is not always so obvious, and in fact can be quite contested, which is why citizenship requires education and training as will be discussed in the following sections.

WHAT RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP MEANS AND REQUIRES

Being a responsible citizen in a democratic society[7] demands acquiring a strong foundational understanding of American history and the political process, staying informed of current events, upholding democratic values, cultivating a habit of civic involvement, and recognizing oneself as a democratic participant and contributor to the public good. In line with this definition, responsible citizenship can be broken down into these six categories: knowledge, values, skills, engagement, identity, and sense of efficacy. Although these are mutually reinforcing elements, any pattern of engagement, formation of civic identity, and feeling of a sense of efficacy must be predicated on civic knowledge, values, and skills. Collectively, these attributes anchor any serious attempt at becoming an active and effective citizen.

People can still be engaged community members, and effective ones at that, without necessarily mastering a broad set of knowledge, values, and skills. Community

[7] The democratic society in this case refers to the United States of America, which is why a foundational understanding of American history and its political process are emphasized. Increasingly, there is a call for people to see themselves as "citizens of the world." The way this paper defines citizenship does not preclude this international dimension but firmly roots it in the idea of the nation-state.

involvement happens on many levels, some of which require greater knowledge and skills than others. For example, someone who runs a local Big Brothers Big Sisters program must recruit volunteers, screen applicants, manage the matches, etc., and therefore, will need considerably more experience and expertise than someone who participates as a volunteer in the program; the Big Brothers and Sisters must have some background as mentors, but they do not need nearly the training required for actually overseeing the program itself. Nonetheless, the more civic knowledge, values, and skills that people have, the more capable they will be at evaluating competing conceptions of the public good, at sustaining and deepening their civic involvement, and at effectively creating societal change. Examining at greater length the core considerations of responsible citizenship is therefore extremely important.

Civic Knowledge: The Foundational Layer of Responsible Citizenship

Knowledge constitutes a main ingredient of responsible citizenship. The type of knowledge and how much of it is needed depends on the academic discipline from which a scholar writes. Each discipline considers itself the holder of an essential piece of the knowledge required for becoming an enlightened citizen. For instance, political scientists naturally claim that a thorough understanding of political systems and philosophies, with an emphasis on the democratic tradition, should be the cornerstone of knowledge for citizenship. Historians would agree that an introduction to political thought is important but contend that it could not be properly understood unless it were rooted in a firm understanding of the American heritage. Engineers would applaud political scientists and historians for their social science work but remind them that much progress in the world has been driven by technological innovation, and that being versed in the properties of

materials, for instance, can equip people to build the structures that have sustained and advanced America's democracy.

Engineers have a valid point but making sure that the fundamentals of civil engineering are learned by all in society is not nearly as pressing to citizen development as some other knowledge areas. Having a basic understanding of the major themes in American history, its democratic tradition, and its social, political, legal, economic, and cultural institutions is critical for situating oneself in local, regional, national, and global contexts. Of course, what those major themes are and how much material should be known about them remains debatable. The idea though is that big picture concepts should be emphasized over details. Without this broad knowledge base, people cannot accurately gauge the extent to which societal changes in general and public policy decisions in particular affect their wellbeing (Galston, 2001, p. 223).

While recognizing the need for a broad knowledge base, some scholars put forth the argument that being able to recall details about significant moments in American history is equally important and revealing. In fact, one group of scholars has actually measured the civic strength of the country by the depth of factual knowledge students displayed of American history, government, international relations, and the market economy. Using these categories, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI) assessed the robustness of civic engagement in young people in a 2006 report entitled *The Coming Crisis in Citizenship.* Fourteen thousand undergraduates at 50 colleges and universities across the country were asked 60 multiple choice questions to determine their level of citizenship knowledge. The average score for college seniors was slightly over 50

percent, which according to the study demonstrates the monstrous failing of higher education to produce responsible citizens (Cribb, 2006, p. 6).

This seems an extremely bold assertion to make as the report curiously bases its conclusion of a crisis in citizenship on the inability of student respondents to reproduce learned facts. Civic knowledge under this definition consists of a memorization of names, locations, battles, and historical explanations. For instance, 75 percent of college seniors did not know the rationale behind the Monroe Doctrine and over half could not identify Yorktown as the final battle in the American Revolution (Cribb, 2006, p. 10). Ideally, well-educated citizens would exhibit mastery over a wide range of historical facts, but how significant is the relationship between this factual knowledge and civic engagement? Does the former in some way promote the latter?

The ISI report responds that a close relationship between knowledge and involvement does exist as evidenced by the fact that the students who performed best on the multiple-choice exam were those who voted, volunteered, and worked on political campaigns most regularly (Cribb, 2006, p. 7). The limited indicators of civic engagement aside, the report claims that greater factual knowledge results in higher levels of community involvement. Looking specifically at political engagement, Galston (2001, p. 224) reaches similar conclusions and finds that knowledge, both factual and thematic, leads to increased political participation. These findings suggest that a potentially strong relationship between factual knowledge and civic/political action exists.

Perhaps that is the case but neither study shows a causal link between the two that demonstrates how they interact and why it is exactly that factual knowledge promotes civic engagement. Furthermore, it is unclear from Galston's research what he defines as

"civic knowledge." It could very well be that people who are more engaged know more about the political process, for example, because they have observed it firsthand or know more about events in American history because it is a topic that greatly interests them.

Arguably, a working knowledge of a complex array of policy issues from stem-cell research to affordable housing to social security is equally as important for responsible citizenship in today's world as a foundational understanding in American history and government (Bok, 2006, p. 72). Not only U.S. policymakers but also the American public at large must be able to analyze and respond to these complicated problems. Making informed voting decisions grows increasingly difficult as people must know more about more things than ever before if they hope to participate fully in the political process. Knowledge on many levels is important for becoming a responsible citizen.

Civic Values: A Set of Guiding Principles for Ethical Engagement in Public Life

Taking part in the public sphere not only requires the acquisition of the appropriate knowledge but also the willingness to use it to make decisions, many of which are moral in nature. Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens (2003, p. 15) define morality as "...prescriptive judgments about how one ought to act in relation to other people." Civic values encompass the moral considerations involved in responsible citizenship and consist of the following: personal integrity and common decency, commitment to civil discourse and procedural impartiality, an appreciation of and respect for difference, and recognition of societal interconnectedness (A. W. Astin, 2004; Colby et al., 2003; S. Hurtado, Engberg, & Ponjuan, 2003).

Personal integrity and common decency refer to how one interacts with or treats others on a daily individual basis. Honesty and trustworthiness form the pillars of personal integrity with respect, empathy, and generosity doing the same for common decency (A. W. Astin, 2004). A spirit of humility and humaneness should guide participation in public life. Without these fundamental values, civic engagement is rendered meaningless.

Similarly, commitment to civil discourse and procedural impartiality is necessary to allow respectful dialogue and to ensure a sense of fairness to all stakeholders (Colby et al., 2003, p. 13). Free speech should be valued and exercised but not used in such a way that it becomes an instrument for the denigration of others. Tolerance of opposing religious views and political ideologies must be practiced if honest, productive dialogues are to occur within and between diverse constituencies (Colby et al., 2003, p. 13; Hollander & Hartley, 2000, p. 354; Keohane, 2006, p. 100). Also, one must appreciate and respect difference, either in religion, sexual orientation, race, class, gender, etc. (S. Hurtado et al., 2003, p. 7).

Each individual member in society needs to recognize her interconnectedness—an unavoidable interdependence—with others. Only by situating oneself in a larger social fabric can one understand that individual actions have societal implications, even if they are not immediately obvious.[8] Throughout their lives, people must grapple with what their personal as well as society's obligations are to others.

[8] Some concrete examples of individual actions with societal implications that are not immediately obvious include: poor dietary and exercise habits that result in health problems (taxpayers must subsidize part of the medical costs), not turning off lights in unused rooms (wastes the world's limited energy supply), and unsafe sexual activity that spreads sexually transmitted diseases (taxpayers must subsidize part of the medical costs).

Framing these larger moral questions can be extremely challenging given the incredible importance Americans have historically placed on individualism. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton (1986, p. 142) provide the following assessment of American culture: "Individualism lies at the very core of American culture...We believe in the dignity, indeed the sacredness, of the individual. Anything that would violate our right to think for ourselves, judge for ourselves, make our own decisions, live our lives as we see fit, is not only morally wrong, it is sacrilegious." At the same time, as Bellah et al. point out, many Americans would concede that meaningful lives must be lived in common with others. An irreconcilable tension has always existed between this individualism on the one hand and collectivism on the other. Only by properly balancing these sometimes conflicting, but not necessarily mutually exclusive interests of the individual and the community, can one become a responsible citizen who values and promotes the public good (Colby et al., 2003, p. 13; Keohane, 2006, p. 100; Sandel, 2006, p. 47).

Civic Skills: The Armament Necessary for Action in the Public Interest

Even if one possesses the knowledge and values for becoming civically engaged, the skills needed to take action in the public interest must still be acquired. These skills include: the ability to evaluate information critically, to communicate effectively, to work well with people from diverse backgrounds, and to lead judiciously (Boyte & Kari, 2000, p. 51; Colby et al., 2003, p. 100).

As a result of the Internet, an unprecedented amount of information is readily available and easily accessible. Constructing well-informed public opinions relies more than ever before on the ability to wade through this information and determine what is

credible and pertinent (Boyte & Kari, 2000, p. 51). After processing this information and arriving at defensible positions, people must decide what to do with it and how to communicate their ideas effectively to others. Expressing oneself ably through written and verbal media is essential to engaging in the art of public discourse that has the power to persuade others of one's point of view (Kirlin, 2002, p. 21). Mobilizing collective action thus hinges upon well-honed communication skills (Boyte & Kari, 2000, p. 51; Colby et al., 2003, p. 100).

Along these same lines, a civic actor must be able to work effectively with people from diverse backgrounds. This skill signifies an ability to understand other peoples' perspectives and to include them in decision-making processes (S. Hurtado et al., 2003, p. 5; Kirlin, 2002, p. 21). All the skills mentioned above form the basis for strong leadership for any action taken in the public interest (A. W. Astin, 2004).

Putting It All Together: Cultivating a Habit of Civic Involvement

In the process of building a foundation of civic knowledge, values, and skills, citizens must put these acquired traits into practice by becoming civically engaged. The former does not necessarily need to precede the latter. For instance, the desire to take action might encourage someone to investigate the matter in greater depth (e.g. – increase knowledge) or through action someone might gain relevant skills. Gaining the knowledge, values, and skills to act and then actually taking action should be thought of as mutually reinforcing processes. Since they are so closely entwined it often might be hard to separate them into distinct categories (e.g. – gaining skills while acting).

In the broadest sense, civic engagement means getting involved locally, nationally, or globally in an effort to advance the public good (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi). In

particular, this involvement entails helping to grow and strengthen civil society institutions—those entities that fall beyond the family, the government, and the for-profit sector—and to support the activities that they undertake. Some scholars make a helpful, if at times tenuous distinction, between civic and political engagement (Ehrlich, 2000, p. xxx). For the purposes of this paper, political engagement will be considered an important subset of civic involvement that covers actions directed at the body politic.

The possibilities for getting involved civically are truly boundless. Some general areas for civic engagement include direct service, community-initiated projects, advocacy work, and political involvement. Direct service work refers to a variety of tasks from tutoring and mentoring to volunteering with Special Olympics to helping to build a Habitat for Humanity house. Assisting with community-initiated projects could be anything from painting a mural on a public building to beautifying a local park to administering a neighborhood health survey. Advocacy work might consist of informing immigrants of their rights, educating people about the problem of global warming, or alerting residents in nearby communities to the environmental and health impact of a proposed construction project. Expressing one's views to government officials, voting, working on political campaigns, helping to register voters, and advocating for specific policy positions are examples of political involvement.

These categories of civic engagement are certainly not comprehensive or exhaustive in any sense but rather are intended to illustrate what this paper means when it talks about civic engagement. There are many paths to involvement, and what is most important is not which specific paths one chooses, but with how much regularity and

consistency one pursues them. Cultivating a habit of involvement that takes advantage of civic knowledge, values, and skills constitutes the ultimate aim of responsible citizenship.

Civic Identity: Learning to See Work as Citizenship

To develop a habit of involvement, people must come to see themselves as democratic participants and contributors to the public good. People of all professions, especially those who have not dedicated their professional careers to public service, need to see their work as connected to larger societal purposes. In other words, people need to develop civic identities. The concept of a civic identity is very much in line with Beaumont, Colby, Ehrlich, & Torney-Purta's (2006, p. 255) definition of a 'politically engaged identity,' which is "the extent to which being politically engaged is experienced as central to one's sense of self—the perception that being politically informed and acting on one's political beliefs is very important to one's identity or who one is as a person." Civic engagement, it follows, must be seen as central to one's sense of self—as something inseparable—in order to promote a habit of involvement.

Boyte & Kari (1996) contend that the principal dilemma confronting American society, much of which is due to the specialization of work, is the loss of this civic identity. They argue:

> In the 1990s the civic dimension of one's identity (that is, how work is tied to the rest of society) as a professional, or as a young person, parent, community member, factory worker, or almost anything else, is given little thought at all. This does not mean that people are apathetic about public affairs. It simply means that people see themselves largely as outsiders and observers in this arena, and they see their work as isolated from larger problems and purposes. (p. 25)

If people do not see themselves as creators of public goods that are necessary for promoting a democratic society, then much of their everyday existence—the

workplace—distances them from the body politic. Boyte & Kari (1996) suggest that even those active in the community might not see themselves as democratic participants. Sustaining civic involvement depends upon people developing civic identities, as it is the only way to ensure that responsible citizenship is seen as something integral to self.

A Sense of Efficacy: Knowing That One Can Make a Difference in Society

In order to become lifelong citizens, people must not only see the work that they do as part of a larger societal effort to advance the public good but must also feel that what they are doing is actually accomplishing something. In other words, they must feel a sense of efficacy, a sense that progress is being made (Colby et al., 2003, p. 122; Giles & Eyler, 1994, p. 4; Hollander & Hartley, 2000, p. 354). Giles and Eyler (1994, p. 4) convey the connection between efficacy and sustained engagement: "A sense of personal efficacy has long been an important predictor of citizenship involvement. At a personal level, this includes the faith that one can make a difference, a sense of being rewarded for involvement, and some connection to personal beliefs about change." For people to want to continue to get involved in public life, they have to believe that they can make a difference and then see that what they are doing is in fact making a difference.

CONCLUSION

As this chapter has shown, becoming a responsible citizen capable of effecting positive societal change constitutes a complex developmental process that spans years. Only through an accumulation of experiences can one be prepared to participate in public life, and those experiences often start at a young age. Many factors influence or contribute to citizen development in an individual's early years, including family life,

geographical location, religious affiliation, schooling, etc. A host of civil society organizations from the local YMCA to youth sports teams to church youth groups provide healthy venues for early citizen development. Colleges and universities sit at the end of this young adult citizen development spectrum and can easily be overlooked as important sites for preparing students for lives of responsible citizenship. Higher education institutions can do much to equip students with the civic knowledge, values, and skills that will lead to a lifelong habit of civic engagement. Chapter 2 will explore the instruments colleges and universities have at their disposal to develop students' civic capacities.

CHAPTER TWO

ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PREPARING STUDENTS FOR LIVES OF RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP

"When I think about education, I think about the ideal human types for the society we envision. It is not simply what we teach, or even what our students learn, but what kind of persons they become that really matters."

– Harold Shapiro, A Larger Sense of Purpose (2005)[9]

While colleges and universities cannot be expected to instill in their students all the knowledge, values, and skills necessary to generate lifelong habits of civic involvement, they can play a substantial role. From extracurricular activities, such as student groups and sports teams, to coursework and independent research, higher education institutions wield an array of mechanisms that can positively influence the development of their students. This chapter will explore what some of those mechanisms are and how institutions of higher learning can leverage them to promote a shared ethic of responsible citizenship among their students.

As briefly mentioned in the Introduction of this paper, some in the academy might question whether colleges and universities should even have a role in developing the civic capacities of their students. Fish (2003) has repeatedly asserted that democratic values and academic ones should not be confused. Moral education, he argues, could potentially harm the overall quality of instruction by indoctrinating students with a set of prepackaged values. Professors, in his opinion, should be responsible solely for cultivating the intellectual and scholarly capabilities of students. As he would probably agree, the teaching of these academic skills actually prepares students to become more

[9] (Shapiro, 2005, p. 90)

discerning and effective citizens who are better equipped to contribute to the public good. Fish and other critics of civic education are correct in that knowledge and skills required for civic action can be, and often are, learned through experiences not directly connected to education for citizenship.

However, it cannot be assumed that students will take that knowledge and those skills and use them in an effort to solve public problems and build stronger communities; instead, higher education institutions must deliberately link what students learn and do inside and outside the classroom with the larger purpose of the common good. Fish's narrow definition of what universities should teach students might hold more weight in the context of private higher education, but it is misplaced, even irresponsible, in the realm of public colleges and universities. As the word "public" suggests, these institutions of higher learning are of the public, funded by it, and beholden to it. Their public mandate is to provide a high quality education and part of that education must intentionally strive to sensitize students to their responsibilities as citizens, convince them of the importance of becoming civically engaged, and then provide them with a variety of opportunities to get involved. Freshman year commences this journey towards becoming fuller citizen participant-leaders.

HOW STUDENTS THINK OF CITIZENSHIP UPON ENTERING COLLEGE

Having been molded during their adolescent years by a significant number of influences, students enter college with varying conceptions of what responsible citizenship means. A few have had little to no community involvement while most have had at least some. Sax (2004) finds that freshmen often ground their understanding of citizenship in their volunteer experience at their high school (bake sales, painting the

football field fence, etc.) or in the local community (cleaning up a local park, mentoring underprivileged youth, etc.). Roughly 80 percent of freshmen in 2002 reported doing volunteer work during their last year in high school. Of those who volunteered, 70 percent did it on a weekly basis.

Conversely, politics and political engagement have disappeared from the vast majority of incoming college students' notion of responsible citizenship. The percentage of students who report that they have stayed informed of political affairs has declined by nearly half, from 57.8 percent to 32.9 percent, from 1966 to 2002. Similarly, substantially fewer students today than several decades ago report discussing politics on a regular basis. Sax suggests three primary reasons for this political apathy. First, the seemingly endless political debacles that have engulfed much of American politics over the past four decades have turned youth off. Sax (p. 68) elaborates on this point: "Students reported having negative perceptions of politics and politicians, as well as a sense of skepticism that was no doubt fueled by extensive media coverage of political scandals, negative campaigns, and government gridlock." Second, politics is not seen as an "effective vehicle for change." Third, college students feel a "disconnection or alienation from the political issues themselves." All of these factors result in students feeling that since public policy decisions do not have much effect on their lives they need not bother getting involved politically (p. 69).

According to this data, most freshmen view volunteerism as the more preferred way to improve their communities and society while politics and public policy are seen as corrupt, ineffectual, and unimportant vehicles for change. Volunteerism and local community involvement on the one hand and political disinterest and disengagement on

the other characterize most incoming college students' attitudes of what active and effective citizenship means. An unintended consequence of this development over the past decades is that volunteerism has come to signify an act of citizenship, something that someone elects to do out of goodwill and generosity, rather than a moral duty that is expected of all in society. But in actuality volunteering is one extremely important way to engage as a citizen but certainly not the only way; therefore, it should not be used as a substitute for the much broader and inclusive understanding of responsible citizenship advanced in this paper. Colleges and universities have the weighty charge of helping freshmen to expand and refine how they view and practice citizenship over the course of their collegiate career.

FOSTERING AN ETHIC OF SERVICE ACROSS CAMPUS: A MULTIFACETED APPROACH TO EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

Education for citizenship in modern colleges and universities demands unwavering support from administrators and faculty members across all levels of these institutions. Colleges and universities no longer resemble their small colonial forerunners and in fact have not done so for quite some time. Around the 1920s, student affairs emerged as a distinct campus entity; this development shifted the university responsibility of educating for citizenship from the curriculum to the co-curriculum. Reuben (1996, p. 255) captures this shift: "University leaders' commitment to student services reflected their growing belief that the moral value of a university education resided in the community life of students, not in their formal education." All institutions of higher education have since adopted similar structures and become large bureaucratic

managers of a range of functions, including academic centers, residential colleges, student groups, sports teams, and community-relations events (Kerr, 2001).

Given the complexity of modern colleges and universities, higher education cannot prepare students for responsible citizenship in a "one and done" manner through a few programs, but rather must develop a multi-faceted approach offering a rich selection of extracurricular and curricular opportunities for engagement (Ehrlich, 2000, p. xxvi). Colby et al. (2003, p. 279) clearly map the interconnected but distinct pathways available for affecting students' civic dispositions:

> There are three main sites of moral and civic education, and all are important: the curriculum, including both general education and the major; extracurricular activities and programs; and the campus culture, including honor codes, residence hall life, and spontaneous teachable moments, as well as various cultural routines and practices—symbols, rituals, socialization practices, shared stories, and the like.

All three areas—the campus culture, the co-curriculum, and the curriculum—must be strategically addressed if higher education institutions hope to foster an ethic of service that diffuses across campus and reaches all students. This calls for the creation and maintenance of a thick undergrowth of civic programs and initiatives; the following sections lay out some of the ways this can be done.

SETTING THE TONE: INFUSING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND CULTURE

The importance of the institutional mission and culture along with administrative and faculty leadership in promoting, sustaining, and institutionalizing civic engagement efforts cannot be overstated. The mission statements of public colleges and universities should explicitly articulate their goal of preparing students for responsible citizenship in a

democratic society. More than merely voicing this professed educational objective, institutions of higher learning should revisit those statements regularly and evaluate how well they are living up to them. Even the establishment of standing committees charged with overseeing this evaluation might be considered. Administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and community members should be constantly reminded of these civic goals by the college president, ideally in major public addresses throughout the year (Ehrlich, 2000, p. xl). Engendering civic expectations in entering college students should begin immediately with the welcoming speech and freshmen orientation.

Through this official institutional endorsement, a campus culture of civic engagement can be inculcated and infused throughout every type of activity the college or university undertakes. Colby et al. (2003, p. 83) argue:

> Whether the leadership comes from the president and others in the upper levels of administration, from catalytic centers, or from interested faculty, a full-scale institutional commitment to moral and civic education involves creating a campus climate or culture that reinforces what students learn in curricular and extracurricular programs.

Repeated messages to students from a variety of campus actors, from peers to professors to alumni, encourages some not already involved to become so and reaffirms what others are already doing on campus and in the local community (Sax, 2000, p. 13).

Of course, a full-scale institutional commitment to civic engagement cannot be fully realized until the tenure or promotion process reflects what colleges and universities supposedly value in their mission statement (A. Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikede, & Yee, 2000, p. 3). No matter how frequently or how fervently university leadership stresses its commitment to civic education verbally it will not be taken seriously by faculty unless accompanied with institutional change (Vogelgesang, 2004, p. 37). Given the incredible

demands on faculty members' time, they cannot realistically be expected to dedicate substantial amounts of time and energy educating students for citizenship without in some way being rewarded professionally.

CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES: A COMPLEMENT TO THE CURRICULUM

Because of the structural changes that have led to modern colleges and universities, activities outside the curriculum constitute a significant portion of civic learning in today's higher education institutions. Colby (2003, p. 222) defines high-quality extracurricular programs as the following:

> They are *intentionally designed* with specific learning outcomes in mind, they are *aligned with the mission* of the campus as a whole so that the various academic and extracurricular programs reinforce each other, their organizers *collaborate* with each other, they are overseen and *guided by student affairs or faculty*, and they are regularly *assessed* to document and guide program improvement.

Extracurricular activities include, but are not limited to, community service volunteering programs, work-study programs, alternative spring break trips, and student groups with a civic focus. Some campuses support a single center that serves as the clearinghouse for civic engagement efforts while others coordinate civic education through multiple institutional structures.

Community Service Volunteer Programs

Volunteering through campus community service programs is one of the most traditional and largest means through which students engage with the local community. According to the report *College Students Helping America* released by the Corporation for National and Community Service, roughly 30 percent of college students, including both those attending 2- and 4-year institutions, volunteered in 2005 (Dote, Cramer, Dietz,

& Grimm, 2006, p. 4). Of those who volunteered, 44 percent participated in what the report calls "regular" volunteering (volunteering 12 weeks or more per year with the same organization) (p. 5). On the flipside, 27 percent of college student volunteers were "episodic," meaning that they volunteered for fewer than two weeks per year with the same organization. Tutoring, teaching, and mentoring were the most common service activities undertaken (p. 15).

Astin et al. (2000) have produced the most comprehensive assessment of the impact of service work on students' intellectual, interpersonal, and civic development. Using an assortment of service participation outcome measures, they concluded that there were significant positive effects on academic performance, commitment to activism and promotion of racial understanding, self-efficacy, leadership, and public service as a career choice (p. ii). These findings would seem to indicate that regular volunteer work in college helps students develop the civic skills, values, and commitments necessary to participate actively in public life. Above all, the volunteer experience promotes a sense of civic responsibility and self-efficacy that engenders in students the conviction to get involved and to make a difference.

Besides the short-term goal of providing service to the local community and the immediate measurable impact on students' development, what are the long-term effects of volunteering? Does it better prepare students for lifelong citizenship? Empirical research shows that the answer is yes. Astin & Sax (1998, p. 6) found that compared to college seniors who did not volunteer regularly seniors who volunteered for six or more hours weekly were doubly likely to remain civically engaged after graduation. Astin & Sax (p. 7) also demonstrate that volunteering in college promotes these civic attitudes and

actions later in life: "helping others in difficulty, participating in community action programs, participating in environmental cleanup programs, promoting racial understanding, and developing a meaningful philosophy of life." Besides increasing the likelihood of volunteering post-graduation, students who volunteer in college are more likely to be politically engaged during their years after college than those who did not (Misa, Anderson, & Yamamura, 2005, p. 19).

Student Government

Student government offers one of the most serious campus venues for activating students' political sensibilities mainly because of its simulation of democratic elections that extend to the entire student body. A few students will actually decide to run for student government, and they will organize campaigns, gather key campaign supporters, canvass for votes, and deliver speeches on their campaign platform. Those who run for student government, those who participate in campaigns, those who vote in the election, and those who are ultimately elected and govern gain critical civic skills that can be used to effect change in American public life before and after graduation. Empirical research reveals that those students active in student government are much more likely than those on the civic sidelines to maintain their involvement through future political participation and work in their local communities (Misa et al., 2005, p. 20).

Student Groups

Outside of student government, student groups of all kinds—cultural, musical, religious, dance, fraternal, club sports, political, environmental, social justice, international, etc.—abound. Chapters of College Republicans and Democrats provide

students an opportunity to get involved in organized politics. There are groups that have more of an outward orientation and try to raise awareness about issues of public concern both domestically and internationally; many of these groups also take action. There are others that come together for the purpose of displaying certain talents, such as juggling or singing. Some of these groups leverage their talents to benefit the larger community, such as performing at a benefit concert or putting on a show for underprivileged youth. Most groups are open to all while some are selective. Elections for officer positions enable all members to partake in the democratic act of voting. Students who assume leadership responsibilities gain experience organizing activities, setting agendas, and directing meetings.

Many of these groups are sustained year-to-year but many more, given students' short time in college, disband once their charismatic leader has left; however, associational renewal is constant as students perennially found new organizations. Those students who work toward founding a group gain even greater leadership experience than student leaders who assume responsibility for an established group. These students must tactfully negotiate the university bureaucracy, form the organizational structure of the new group, develop its mission and goals, and attract a core group of students. All of these tasks require a range of civic skills from working with people from diverse backgrounds to communicating and leading effectively. Participation in and leadership of student groups contribute to undergraduates' preparedness for undertaking lives of responsible citizenship.

Diversity Initiatives

Extracurricular diversity initiatives, such as racial/cultural awareness workshops and inter-group dialogues, foster cross-cultural exchange and in so doing derive important benefits to the students participating. Hurtado (2003, p. 18) succinctly captures these benefits: "...self-confidence in leadership skills, cultural awareness, self-efficacy for social change, have higher interests in social issues, value creating social awareness, and support institutional diversity initiatives." Involvement in these diversity events considerably enhances students' capacities as citizens in a multi-racial democracy. In addition to better preparing them, it increases the likelihood that they will apply those skills and values to strengthening our democratic society (Misa et al., 2005, p. 20). The ultimate goal of these extracurricular initiatives is to promote frequent interaction among diverse student bodies.

Work-Study

The Work-Study Program constitutes an important way that colleges and universities can involve students in community work. The original intent of the Work-Study Program when it began with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was to aid students who were unable to afford a college education by providing them with part-time work. The program still has the same rationale, but increasing emphasis has been placed on jobs that benefit both colleges and local communities, which is why starting in 1994 at least five percent of federal work-study monies were required to fund community service positions. Federal legislation defines community service as acts which "improve the quality of life for community residents, particularly low-income individuals, or to solve particular problems related to their needs..." (Bowley, 2007, para. 13). In 2000, the

required portion of work-study monies going to community service positions increased to seven percent (Bowley, 2007). Based on Campus Compact surveys, 56 percent of work-study students filling community service positions work as tutors at local schools and 23 percent assist nonprofit organizations (Bowley, 2003b).

Internships and Break Trips

Summer internships in the public interest can extend civic learning beyond the confines of the academic year. Well-run programs that offer high quality internship experiences can have a significant effect on students' civic knowledge and skills. Opportunities to undertake substantial work that is deemed by the non-profit or governmental agency as important for advancing their mission empowers students as citizen activists. These experiences can help students see themselves as participants in and contributors to a democratic society. For a much more limited amount of time, break trips can offer something similar.

THE CURRICULUM: PUTTING EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP INTO THE HEART OF THE ACADEMY

Regardless of how many extracurricular opportunities exist, civic engagement cannot be taken as seriously as it should by students without its integration into the curriculum. Realizing this integration constitutes the stiffest challenge confronting those who desire education for citizenship to become part of the lifeblood of colleges and universities. With the full-scale emergence of the modern university in the 20th century, civic education has been relegated to the margins of academia. Most professors do not see citizen development as a learning outcome for which they are responsible; they do not

see it as something befitting of an academic enterprise. Rather in their minds the division of student affairs should ensure that students have ample opportunities to get involved civically (Reuben, 1996).

In part, these faculty member attitudes stem not necessarily from a specific resistance to educating for citizenship, although in some cases they do, but rather from a prevailing tendency to prioritize research over teaching. Addressing this tension between research and teaching, Katz (2006) claims: "We have lost a sense of commonality as professors, the sense that we are all in this together — 'this' being a dedication to undergraduate teaching and not just specialized research. We have lost a belief in the relevance of teaching undergraduates for the health of our democracy" (para. 1). To say that professors do not care about their teaching responsibilities would be a gross exaggeration in most cases. However, few are interested in envisioning what a liberal education with a civic dimension could look like in the 21st century, and how they as individual faculty members could contribute to it.

With the increasing specialization of research, professors on the whole have become more loyal to their particular disciplines and less so to their home institution and its student body (Katz, 2006). Professors are increasingly failing to see themselves as "citizen-scholars" committed to the public utility of their research and the wellbeing of their own institution. As a result, they are less concerned about the full development of students, especially their civic capacities, and more about ensuring they gain the tools and insights of their specific disciplines (Schneider, 2005, p. 132).

In all fairness, professors endure tremendous demands on their time, which makes it hard for them to realistically fulfill all the expectations that higher education places on

them. Reflecting on this fact of professional life for faculty members, Cherwitz & Hartelius (2007, p. 269) note:

> Faculty are already frustrated and overwhelmed by the amount and variety of demands made by universities: to amass a sustained record of publication in refereed journals, to achieve and document excellence in teaching, to procure substantial extramural funding, and to participate in the governance of one's academic unit and university.

Due to this incredible array of demands, one can see why professors might view civic education as something "extra," an add-on to what is expected of them already. Cherwitz & Hartelius (2007, p. 276) effectively hammer home this point: "Nothing could be less appealing to faculty—or graduate students—than another obligation that detracts from time and energy spent on 'the real stuff' – rigorous research and publication in prestigious journals." In other words, to make civic education a cornerstone of the curriculum, it must be seen as part of "the real stuff."

And the only way for it to become part of "the real stuff" is for colleges and universities to promote and reward public scholarship, in particular through the tenure process. The three institutional pillars of research, teaching, and service cannot be approached as separate missions; instead, the artificial boundaries dividing them must be collapsed in order to construct a formidable whole capable of strengthening each individual part (Cherwitz & Hartelius, 2007, p. 269). A consequence of integrating these three missions would be professors seeing themselves first and foremost as "citizen-scholars" willing to undertake innovative, nontraditional scholarship that addresses public problems and is done in equal partnership with community partners. In fact, professors should not just be willing but challenged and expected to do this type of creative,

collaborative work. That is how civic engagement could be firmly cemented as an institutional imperative infused throughout the academy.

This public engagement-centered approach to scholarship could take many forms. Cantor & Lavine (2006) explain that this kind of scholarship:

> ...often involves complex projects carried out by teams of experts from both the campus and the community. Such projects may result in peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals and new or revitalized teaching approaches, but may also yield outcomes as varied as policy recommendations for local governments, a collaborative museum exhibit, a radio documentary about a local issue, a new elementary-school or secondary-school curriculum, or a creative-writing workshop for inmates at a state prison. (para. 2)

As a first step or foundation to promoting public scholarship, Grafton (2007) suggests that postsecondary institutions strengthen relations with one another; in particular, he urges research universities to share their resources with community colleges. Joint research projects involving faculty from both kinds of institutions could take advantage of their respective strengths and advance their collective research, teaching, and service missions.

Through public scholarship, professors will be much more inclined and better prepared to build education for citizenship into their teaching; they will no longer consider the civic development of students as the sole domain of student affairs but rather an important part of their own responsibility as educators. Students must be convinced that civic education is part of "the real stuff," otherwise they can too easily dismiss it as an "extra," something largely unconnected to good scholarship. Therefore, it is critical that students observe their professors practicing civic engagement in their own research, teaching, and daily lives (Colby et al., 2003, p. 11). Without this active faculty direction and leadership, civic engagement will continue in its marginalized state.

SERVICE-LEARNING

Service-learning has emerged as the favored means to achieve an integration of civic engagement with the curriculum. Because of the attention it has received, it has at times seemed the only curricular approach to civic education. While it is not the lone pedagogical tool available to educate students for citizenship, it constitutes an extremely powerful way to develop the student as a whole, particularly the civic being. Its implementation, though, can be more easily accomplished in certain disciplines, especially the social sciences, than others, such as math and the hard sciences.

Although there are varying definitions of service-learning, Jacoby (1996, p. 5) provides one that conveys the essence of this teaching pedagogy: "Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development." Eyler & Giles (1999, p. 14) add the following: "Service-learning aims to connect the personal and intellectual, to help students acquire knowledge that is useful in understanding the world, build critical thinking capacities, and perhaps lead to fundamental questions about learning and about society and to a commitment to improve both."

As these definitions indicate, service-learning aspires not only to enhance the intellectual and critical thinking ability of students, a tremendous undertaking in itself, but also to hone their interpersonal skills and cultivate their civic sensibilities. How this is done fluctuates considerably between service-learning courses and programs. For this reason, providing a common definition of service-learning is difficult, perhaps even

misleading. Eyler & Giles (1999, p. 3) describe the breadth of service-learning courses offered by colleges and universities:

> Schools that have a fall orientation activity with an afternoon of community service may call it service-learning; at the other extreme, there are well-integrated programs within colleges and universities where students spend a year or two in a connected series of courses linked to service projects in the community. In between these one-shot efforts and intensive programs are individual courses that include a service component. These also vary dramatically. Commonly students may elect a service option as extra credit or in lieu of another assignment, and these options are often not incorporated into class discussion in any sustained way. Less often single courses may be built around community service, and reflection on this experience is central to the progress of the course.

Despite these variations in course duration and intensity, there are common elements between these curricular experiences that situate them in the realm of service-learning and make them powerful teaching tools. These elements are: high quality placements at a community site and structured reflection guided by faculty members.

High quality placements are crucial for enabling a beneficial and enjoyable service-learning experience. Eyler & Giles (1999, p. 33) define placement quality as "the extent that students in their community placements are challenged, are active rather than observers, do a variety of tasks, feel that they are making a positive contribution, have important levels of responsibility, and receive input and appreciation from supervisors in the field." Students often work at direct service sites, such as soup kitchens, homeless shelters, and hospitals, tutor at local schools, or get involved in varying kinds of advocacy work from housing to the environment to economic development (Jacoby, 1996, p. 9). Through these positions, they have the opportunity to contribute to nonprofits and public agencies' missions without these organizations incurring any financial cost; if

done well, this exchange between higher education and community partners can advance the missions of both (p. xvii).

Structured reflection, commonly considered the essential ingredient in service-learning, is what creates a potentially transformative experience for students. The act of doing service work by itself is insufficient. Rather what is required is ongoing reflection about how students' service experiences relate to the course content and why they should get involved with the community; this reflection connects the service and classroom experiences (Saltmarsh, 1996, p. 18). Astin et al. (2000, p. iii) comment on their findings affirming the importance of structured reflection:

> Both the quantitative and qualitative results suggest that providing students with an opportunity to 'process' the service experience with each other is a powerful component of both community service and service learning. Compared to community service, taking a service-learning course is much more likely to generate such student-to-student discussions.

As Astin et al. suggest, the "magic" of service-learning—reflection—is not necessarily confined to the curriculum but something that can occur with any service experience.

However, the role that faculty members play in guiding this reflective process should not be understated; their supervision is crucial to the successful integration of the service and classroom experiences (A. Astin et al., 2000, p. iii). Professors construct the general framework of the course and situate what students observe and experience at their placement sites into the overall subject matter. They help students make the necessary connections between what they are learning inside and outside the classroom. If they are not effective in helping students bridge these two experiences, then the transformative nature of the service-learning pedagogy is lost.

The most commonly used methods for bridging these experiences include discussions among students, class conversations facilitated by professors, and informal and formal written pieces, such as journals, field notes, papers, blogs, emails, etc. (A. Astin et al., 2000, p. 59). None of these reflective devices is necessarily more effective than the others. What is most important is how well integrated they are into the course itself. Professors cannot haphazardly assign them but must strategically locate them within the general framework of the course. In order to take their service experiences seriously, students must see these verbal and written means to reflection and learning as core elements of the class that build upon one another as the course progresses.

Equally important are how much feedback professors provide on students' reflective pieces and how regularly they offer that feedback. Professors, for instance, should not expect students to record their service experiences in a journal for the sake of doing it. Rather professors must critically evaluate what students are saying and thinking. They must challenge students' assumptions about their experiences and urge them to dig deeper so that they have a fuller understanding of how what they are doing in the field relates to what they are studying in the classroom. Through this intensive faculty supervision, students meaningfully process the service experience and contextualize it within the larger issues raised in the course.

Engendering a Sense of Civic Responsibility & Personal Efficacy in Students

Above all, and arguably most importantly, service-learning offers an opportunity for colleges and universities to engender a sense of civic responsibility in their students. Comparing students who participated in a service-learning course to those without either a curricular or extracurricular service experience, Astin (2004) presents substantial

evidence that those with a service-learning experience are much more civically engaged during and after college. These individuals not only harbor stronger civic attitudes, such as a commitment to becoming a community leader and promoting political and social change, but also reinforce these beliefs through civic action by voting more regularly, donating more frequently to non-profits, and working with others to alleviate community problems.

Service-learning has a significant effect on students' civic attitudes and behaviors but is it distinguishable from the impact of a service experience outside the curriculum, like volunteering at a local school? According to the findings of Astin et al. (2000), the response is a definitive yes. In a study that compared the effects of service-learning to extracurricular community service, they found that while both instilled a sense of civic responsibility in students, service-learning did so on a significantly higher level (p. ii). Those students who had taken a service-learning course were much more likely to be committed to activism and to promote racial understanding, to choose a public service career, and to participate in community work after college. In this study, service-learning had its strongest effect on a student's decision to pursue a public service career (p. iii). On some measures, though, extracurricular community service held its own with service-learning courses: building interpersonal skills, gaining a feeling of self-efficacy, and enhancing leadership ability (p. ii).

Despite the seemingly insignificant effect of service-learning on the measure of self-efficacy, qualitative data presents a vastly different picture. In interviews with students who had taken a service-learning course, Astin et al. (2000, p. 49) found that "gaining a sense of personal effectiveness" was the outcome reported with greatest

frequency. Eyler, Giles, & Braxton (1997) support this finding and extend it to include students' convictions that they could effect change through public policy or governmental action. These researchers elaborate on this attitudinal change and explain that: "Service-learning had an impact on student perceptions of the locus of social problems and on their belief in the importance of social justice, the need to change public policy, and the need to influence the political structure personally" (p. 149). According to this assessment, service-learning has the potential to empower students to become civically engaged and work towards bettering the world in which they live, especially through political involvement.

This empirical observation is intriguing because service-learning has been criticized by some scholars for ignoring the political dimension of civic engagement. They argue that some other type of curricular mechanism must be incorporated to address political engagement more directly. Calvert and a score of fellow academicians produced a work in 2006 calling for renewed emphasis on political education in colleges and universities. In the prologue, Calvert (p. 1) explains their intentions: "...by a 'political' education most of our authors have in mind something other than what may result from the good 'civic' works or local volunteerism, sometimes called 'community service' or 'service learning,' that is championed increasingly throughout the American educational system at all levels." Despite stating what they do *not* mean by a political education, the authors fail to define exactly what they do mean.

Their underlying argument is that students tend to approach civic engagement in an "either-or" manner, meaning that they either volunteer in their local community or work towards affecting change through the political system, but rarely do both. This

"either-or" hypothesis can be supported if one interprets the fact that students volunteer at a much higher rate than they vote as: "they select community involvement *over* political engagement." How well this hypothesis interprets the data is questionable. It is quite possible that the opposite often occurs, and that by getting involved locally, students actually become interested in public affairs. Despite this alternative view, Calvert and other scholars seem to suggest that political engagement and civic works are mutually exclusive enterprises.

They are right in saying that the practice of service-learning has been less concerned about political involvement per se and more so with civic engagement broadly defined. Students are rarely placed in governmental agencies, policy organizations, or nonprofit advocacy groups. Instead, as mentioned previously, the vast majority of students are placed at direct service nonprofits (Jacoby, 1996). Given these placement sites, few service-learning courses will dedicate substantial amounts of class time to discussing politics, political systems, and public policy. In that sense, Calvert and others make a strong point: service-learning classes generally speaking cannot substitute for political education. They cannot provide a thorough background in American history, its democratic tradition, or its social, political, legal, economic, and cultural institutions.

However, service-learning seems to hold at least part of the answer to encouraging youth to become more politically engaged. Eyler et al.'s finding that service-learning positively affects students' perception of government and enhances their desire to achieve societal change through it is critically important. In a separate but related study, Giles & Eyler (1994) examined to what extent a service-learning experience of limited intensity and duration affected the civic development of students. Exploring the

impact of a one credit "community service laboratory," they concluded that there were significant effects on students' civic attitudes. Specifically, the results revealed "a significant increase in their [students'] belief that people can make a difference, that they should be involved in community service and particularly in leadership and political influence, and in their commitment to perform volunteer service the following semester." (p. 327). Interestingly, even in a much shorter and less intense service-learning experience students identify political participation as an essential component of engaged citizenship. Since no follow-up study post-graduation was done, it is impossible to know whether these effects on civic and political attitudes were temporary or more permanent.

Improving Students' Ability to Work with People of Different Backgrounds

Much research points to service-learning as a way to increase students' willingness and ability to work with people of different backgrounds (Wellman, 2000, p. 333). Astin et al. (2000, p. 15) find that service-learning courses increase students' commitment to promoting racial understanding. Eyler & Giles (1999, p. 26) support this finding and show that course-based service work enhances students' appreciation of cultures different from their own and reduces the tendency to stereotype. Giles & Eyler (1994) demonstrate that even in a service-learning experience of limited intensity and duration students' negative perceptions of others can be improved.

Much of this attitudinal change might be attributed to the interaction with community members, both those working in nonprofits and public agencies and those being served by them. Giles & Eyler (1994, p. 1) explain that after a semester-long service-learning experience students "...became less likely to blame social service clients for their misfortunes and more likely to stress a need for equal opportunity. They

indicated that their experience had led them to more positive perceptions of the people they worked with." This particular effect of breaking societal stereotypes of certain people, in this case guests at soup kitchens, is probably not limited to a service-learning experience, but it can be realized through volunteering outside of coursework. Still, as argued earlier, service-learning is more potent because of the structured, faculty-guided opportunity it provides for reflection.

Academic Dimension of Service-Learning

Notwithstanding the civic knowledge, values, and skills gained and the sense of civic responsibility and personal efficacy engendered, service-learning must perform at least as well in academic outcomes[10] as any traditional course to warrant its inclusion in the curriculum. The question of how students grow cognitively in service-learning courses must be addressed. If alumni of service-learning courses were asked, they would most likely say they learned a great deal from the experience (A. Astin et al., 2000, p. iii). Eyler and Giles (1999, p. 61) issue a caution to these sentiments: "...students like service-learning and feel that they learn more in these classes than they do in the more typical classroom-bound curriculum. However, these students' sense of accomplishment is not entirely consistent with the evidence for academic achievement in the literature, which is mixed at best." It is necessary, therefore, to move beyond student self-assessment as the primary measure of academic outcomes.

Eyler and Giles (1999) have produced the most thorough and definitive look at the academic dimension of service-learning, and they conclude it performs equally well if not better than more traditional courses on many fronts. First, the issue of how one would

[10] Academic outcomes include comprehension of course content and the development of critical-thinking and writing skills.

determine whether intellectual growth had occurred must be tackled. Numerous studies have used students' overall GPA as one of the measuring sticks (A. Astin et al., 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Trying to establish a causal relationship between GPA and service-learning courses is fraught with complications; at the same time, a student's GPA is probably not the best measure of her intellectual growth. At the very least, it does not explain *how* a service-learning course affects a student's learning.

Some studies have moved beyond relying on GPA as the main barometer of academic learning to employ a more holistic strategy. In the following excerpt, Eyler and Giles (1999, p. 80) comment on the results of studies focusing on GPAs and then broaden that analysis:

> Although studies that compared grades between students completing service and nonservice options in courses have been mixed, with some studies showing no difference and others giving the edge to service-learning, when we expand our view of learning to include more complex understanding of issues and greater ability to analyze and apply information, service-learning came out ahead.

This research suggests that students' comprehension of course content is deepened and their capacity for critical thinking strengthened by taking a service-learning course.

Eyler & Giles (1999) build upon that initial assessment and provide an even more nuanced look at how service-learning courses enhance student learning. They (p. 81) find that:

> Students in classes where service and learning are well integrated through classroom focus and reflection are more likely to demonstrate greater issue knowledge, have a more realistic and detailed personal political strategy, and give a more complex analysis of causes of and solutions to the problem at the conclusion of their experience than those in classes where the service was less well integrated into the course or no service was done.

This dissection of student cognitive development elucidates the profound effects that a good service-learning course can have on young adults and their intellectual growth.

The extent to which a service-learning course can achieve these results depends largely on the amount of structured reflection, the quality of the placement site, and most importantly, the quality and intensity of faculty supervision. The more enjoyable and fulfilling the student finds the service component of the course, the more likely she is to assume ownership of her volunteer and academic work because she feels accountable not just to herself but the community partners involved (A. Astin et al., 2000, p. 75). Astin et al. add that one of the most important factors for creating a positive service-learning experience is the student's interest in the subject matter. Therefore, it is critical that students are not forced to take a service-learning course on a topic that does not interest them (p. iii).

CURRICULAR APPROACHES TO CIVIC EDUCATION BEYOND SERVICE-LEARNING

Service-learning might be the dominant way to develop the civic habits and convictions of students, but it is not the only curricular device capable of doing so. Problem-based learning, community-based independent work, and diversity courses, among others, can also play a vital role in educating students for citizenship.

Problem-Based Learning

Problem-based learning can complement service-learning efforts and particularly help reach those students majoring in the hard sciences and engineering. Typically, problem-based learning consists of small groups of students working collaboratively to

solve a challenging problem (Colby et al., 2003). For civic education, this pedagogical approach can be powerfully linked to public problems so that students address concerns or needs on campus, at area nonprofits, and in the local community more generally. For instance, groups of students could assess the environmental impact of a proposed construction project or the effect of closing an area hospital on the populace it serves.

A good example of problem-based learning in practice is the policy task force model offered by the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs and Public Policy at Princeton University. These task forces assemble 10-12 juniors to tackle either a domestic or international public policy problem. In the first half of the course, students acquire a context from which to approach the problem by doing background readings and learning from experts in the field who share their knowledge as guest speakers. Each student conducts individual research on a specific topic within the larger problem, and then collectively they craft a group recommendation paper. At the end, students present their findings to an appropriate action body.

A good non-policy example of problem-based learning was a collaboration between Princeton architecture students and a local day care center in fall 2006. The task for the 27 students in the building systems course was to design an original and fun playground while being mindful of a tight building space, a limited budget, and safety guidelines. Working in small groups supervised by their professor, students applied concepts learned in the class to carry out the project successfully. In addition to designing the equipment, students built and helped install some of it. The course offered a very concrete way, in the form of a campus-community project, for students to use the knowledge and skills of their discipline to advance the public good (Quinones, 2007).

Community-Based Independent Research

Much like problem-based learning, community-based independent research offers students an opportunity to analyze a public problem in great depth and then propose strategies for resolving it. The research issue would most likely be developed in partnership with a local non-profit or governmental agency, which otherwise would not have had the time or resources to do the research itself. Supported by a faculty advisor versed in community-based research, students have the potential with their scholarship to increase the capacity of community organizations to fulfill their missions and serve their clientele. This type of research demonstrates to students the importance of engaging community partners on various levels beyond meeting direct service needs.

Diversity Courses

Learning to collaborate with colleagues of diverse backgrounds, classes, races, genders, religious affiliations, sexual orientations, etc. is a critical component of active and effective citizenship. Considering that one out of three Americans belongs to a racial/ethnic minority, the ability to work across cultures is essential for organizing any meaningful public project within a heterogeneous community (S. Hurtado, 2003, p. i). Courses that examine issues of diversity challenge students' perceptions of people different from themselves. For instance, Chang (2000, p. 35) found that white students' image of blacks changed favorably after completing a required diversity course. Based on her results, Chang concludes: "Learning to think more broadly about human differences through diversity-related courses, whether it be through Asian American studies, women's studies, sociology, urban studies, etc., may thus broaden students' understanding in ways that extend beyond the particular focus of the course" (p. 35).

What Chang suggests then is that the knowledge and skills gained from investigating one major diversity issue in a structured course could be applied to wrestling with other differences which might result in the amelioration of numerous prejudices, even ones not directly studied (p. 35).

Not only do diversity courses help prepare students to interact in a multi-racial, pluralistic society, a vital civic skill, but they also increase the likelihood that students will want to involve themselves in it (Misa et al., 2005, p. 5). Not surprisingly, but in some ways problematic, those students who are most engaged in their communities are the ones who tend to enroll in diversity courses. The experience of this course usually strengthens the resolve of these students to become even more committed to working towards the public good (S. Hurtado, 2003, p. 17; Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005, p. 469). At the same time, those students who could probably most benefit from a diversity course are the ones least likely to do so. How to overcome this obstacle is extraordinarily challenging and something that will be explored in greater detail later in the following chapter since it is the dilemma that confronts any curricular attempt at civic education.

CONCLUSION

As this chapter demonstrates, educating for citizenship is not a simple undertaking that colleges and universities can accomplish through one extracurricular activity or a single course, but rather requires a series of varied and sustained curricular and co-curricular experiences that span the entire collegiate career. More needs to be known about the effects of particular programmatic and curricular mechanisms, such as service- and problem-based learning, on students' development as citizens to determine their effectiveness and improve their implementation ("Higher Education: Civic Mission &

Civic Effects," 2006, p. 4). As more is learned about how the civic capacities of students can be developed, the more institutions of higher learning will be able to tailor their efforts to educate for citizenship. In the meantime, colleges and universities must use the available information as best they can. The following chapter will look at how several New Jersey public colleges and universities have approached education for citizenship, examine the challenges they have encountered, and discuss how lessons from their particular experiences can be used to strengthen civic engagement at all higher education institutions in the state.

CHAPTER THREE

STATUS OF CIVIC EDUCATION AT NEW JERSEY PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

"I propose that we look at community service as a necessary component of the learning experiences which constitute a liberal education."

– Edward Bloustein, Rutgers Commencement Address (1988)

Although the previous chapter extensively explored the ways in which higher education institutions could prepare their students for participation and leadership in public life, it did not specifically address the status of education for citizenship at public colleges and universities in New Jersey. Many of the curricular and co-curricular mechanisms introduced in Chapter 2 have been adopted by higher education institutions in New Jersey. Some schools have established and sustained a variety of ways to engage students civically and politically while others manage to offer only a few means to educate for citizenship or none at all. Some have quite strategically made civic engagement a cornerstone of their overarching educational mission while others have been more neglectful, or at least less intentional, in readying students for rich civic lives.

Three schools that have made substantial and sustained efforts to more fully realize their public duty to instill students with a greater sense of civic responsibility are Raritan Valley Community College, The College of New Jersey, and Rutgers University. Ideally, site visits beyond these schools would have been made, but due to time constraints, a more exhaustive examination was not possible. However, the three higher education institutions listed above—a community college, a state college, and a research

university—provide a fairly representative sample of the types of public higher learning institutions in New Jersey.[11] Collectively, they illustrate some of the best work that has been done on the civic education front within New Jersey colleges and universities; at the same time, they reveal difficulties that can seriously hinder education for citizenship efforts.

The following look at Rutgers, The College of New Jersey, and Raritan Valley will not attempt to explore all the ways in which these schools influence the civic attitudes and behaviors of students. As detailed in the previous chapter, student groups, student government, and other extracurricular activities play an important role in readying students for lives of responsible citizenship. Given the decentralized nature of these activities, accurately capturing their presence and impact on college campuses can be challenging, even impossible. At best, an incomplete picture can be gained and that might be incredibly misleading of how extensive civic engagement actually is on these campuses. Rather, this chapter will explore the curricular programs that act as the main institutional drivers for educating students for citizenship.

[11] Each of these schools was selected for various reasons. As it turned out, all three schools were within a 45 minute drive from Princeton University, which facilitated multiple site visits, but proximity to Princeton was not an overriding criterion when deciding which schools to visit. Much more important to this decision was which schools had made significant efforts over the past couple decades to try to educate students for citizenship. After a web-based search of all community colleges in New Jersey and informal discussions with President Emeritus Jerry Ryan, it became clear that Raritan Valley Community College represents one of the pioneers in civic education at the community college level, if not all levels of higher education in New Jersey. The College of New Jersey is one of the few, if not only, public institutions of higher learning in New Jersey that has a community service requirement for graduation, which makes it an intriguing case study. Rutgers represents the flagship public university in New Jersey and serves as an access point for tens of thousands of students across the state.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY AND ITS STRUGGLE TO EDUCATE "CITIZEN-SCHOLARS"

Founded in 1766 as the eighth college in the nation, Rutgers has since evolved from a modest colonial college into a behemoth public research university that operates campuses in Camden, New Brunswick/Piscataway, and Newark, which collectively serve 50,000 students. Currently, the University finds itself in the midst of restructuring its undergraduate education for the 26,000 students on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus. Beginning with the 2006-07 academic year, students applying to Rutgers only needed to submit a single application to the Rutgers College of Arts and Sciences as opposed to selecting among the four separate liberal arts colleges that had existed previously ("Transforming Undergraduate Education " 2005, p. 6).[12]

The Task Force on Undergraduate Education, the group commissioned by President Richard McCormick in 2004 to review the undergraduate experience at Rutgers, discovered the following from its campus canvassing:

> From the confounding array of competing requirements at the various colleges to the inexplicable disparities in the quality of student services available across the campuses, there is everywhere evidence of a system that is broken. Admissions criteria vary; distribution requirements vary; graduation requirements vary; student centers and student services vary; and judicial affairs procedures vary...the university's massive, complex, baroque structure appears to newcomers as something 'hostile' and seems designed to discourage serious, sustained, programmatic engagement with undergraduate education here. (p. 5)

Based on these findings, the Task Force proposed a series of recommendations to President McCormick to overhaul the undergraduate program so that it would provide a similar experience for all students.

[12] Rutgers New Brunswick/Piscataway is physically divided into four campuses: Busch, College Avenue, Livingston, and Cook/Douglass.

In light of the report and subsequent campus conversations, President McCormick issued his own recommendation paper to the Rutgers University Board of Governors in March 2006, in which he repeatedly reaffirmed the university's commitment to preparing its undergraduates for lives of responsible citizenship. McCormick (2006, p. 2) conveyed his broad hopes for involving students civically over the course of their undergraduate career while specifically mentioning the Citizenship and Service Education (CASE) Program as the main vehicle for channeling civic engagement activities:

> Engaging with faculty throughout this academic journey, Rutgers students will become involved with the three pillars of a public research university: teaching, research, and service...successful programs such as Citizenship and Service Education (CASE), which we will make available to a larger number of students, will imbue them with a spirit of service to constituents, true to Rutgers' proud standing as New Jersey's state university.

Given this presidential seal of approval, education for citizenship, it would seem, should rank as one of the core priorities advanced by Rutgers over the coming years.

However, anyone familiar with the history of CASE would immediately recognize that McCormick is not the first Rutgers President to praise it for its nationally recognized service-learning program.[13] This repeated verbal support over the past couple decades has not yet been matched with increased resources dedicated to strengthening and growing the CASE program or civic education efforts more generally across the

[13] McCormick's predecessor Francis Lawrence, for instance, was one of those presidents who often lauded the efforts of CASE. Reflecting on how Rutgers had evolved in the 1990s, Lawrence in his 2000 State of the University Address dedicated a substantial piece to CASE: "...I cannot discuss the changes at Rutgers between 1989 and the present without acknowledging one of our greatest success stories. Harnessing the energy of college students and bringing their skills and enthusiasm to bear on community issues has become an increasingly effective way for the university to serve its neighbors. Rutgers' Citizenship and Service Education Program, CASE, is a leader in this area, integrating community service into the academic curriculum with the goal of training students to be competent, participatory, democratic citizens. Between fall 1989 and summer 1999, students participating in CASE provided more than 500,000 hours of community service with an estimated value of $2.6 million based on the minimum wage" (Lawrence, 2000).

University. Before analyzing the seriousness of McCormick's and therefore Rutgers' intentions to make education for citizenship more central to the undergraduate experience, it would be helpful to understand what CASE is and how it has evolved over the years.

The Evolution of CASE and its Mission to Educate All Students for Responsible Citizenship

CASE emerged in 1988 as the programmatic embodiment of President Edward Bloustein's call for all Rutgers students to become civically engaged. Expressing his disheartenment at the decline of community on campus and throughout the country, Bloustein issued the following proclamation in a 1988 commencement address: "I propose that we look at community service as a necessary component of the learning experiences which constitute a liberal education." The Rutgers Board of Governors unanimously agreed with Bloustein's idea that the University should commit itself to instilling a lifelong ethic of service in its students (Shafer & Murry, 2002, p. 3). Bloustein tapped Benjamin Barber, a political theorist at Rutgers, to chair a committee that would explore how citizen education could best be realized in the university context and then translate those findings into a mandatory service program—something all Rutgers's students would have to take to graduate (Barber, 1992, p. 253).

The work of this committee culminated into a final report that outlined a series of guiding principles that should underpin any civic education program at Rutgers. Very much influenced by the political theory work of Barber on citizenship, the committee found:

> That the point of any community service element of civic education must be to teach citizenship, not charity. If education is aimed at creating citizens, then it will be important to let the young see that service is not just about altruism or charity; or a matter of those who are well-off helping those who are not. It is serving the public interest, which is the same thing as serving enlightened self-interest. Young people serve themselves as members of the community by serving a public good that is also their own. (Barber, 1992, p. 256)

In line with this view, education for citizenship at Rutgers would strive to help students understand that their wellbeing is forever linked with that of the immediate, national, and global community in which they live and that improving the community's general welfare also promotes the individual's self-interest.

To realize this conception of civic education, the committee proposed the integration of experiential learning across the curriculum, with added emphasis on service-learning. The report called for the following type of program to be implemented:

> A mandatory civic education course organized around (though not limited to) a classroom course with an academic syllabus, but also including a strong and innovative experiential learning focus utilizing group projects. A primary vehicle for these projects will be community service, as one of a number of experiential learning options; while the course will be mandatory, students will be free to choose community service or non-service projects as their experiential learning group project. (Barber, 1992, p. 257)

The program was not required of all students initially as the University wanted to evaluate its impact before investing the resources necessary to expand it across all disciplines.

Using grant money and funds from Rutgers, Barber along with fellow faculty members and students founded CASE in 1988; they chose Rick Battistoni, a former student of Barber, to direct the program. In fall 1989, the first service-learning courses were offered. Ten courses were taught with about ten students in each. CASE recruited

faculty members and provided them with $5,000 to develop entirely new courses and syllabi grounded in the pedagogy of service-learning that reflected the principles outlined in the committee's final report. In addition, CASE paid each department $3,500 in essence to "buy" the faculty member from the department so that it could hire a teaching replacement. During those initial years, CASE paid $85,000 for the teaching of 100 students, all of whom had elected to take the service-learning course (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Despite its auspicious beginnings with strong presidential support backed by significant monies, CASE never took off like its founders had anticipated and by 1994 teetered on the brink of extinction. Ironically, only a year before, President Clinton had visited Rutgers to unveil his national service plan and to recognize CASE as a model for civic education for colleges and universities across the country (Shafer & Murry, 2002, p. 3). The CASE Annual Report 2001-2002 (p. 3) reminds its supporters that: "Specifically, President Clinton came to recognize Rutgers' effort to make service-learning central to the undergraduate curriculum, and to train students to be competent, participatory democratic citizens possessing the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to flourish in today's complex world." While President Clinton praised CASE effusively, its promise of making service-learning and civic education an essential part of the undergraduate curriculum at Rutgers had not yet been fulfilled; in fact, in 1994 it was far from it.

That same year, Battistoni and others who oversaw the program resigned, leaving its fate uncertain. Michael Shafer, a political scientist at Rutgers, assumed the directorship of CASE that fall along with new assistant director Yvette Murry, a well-known and respected figure in the local New Brunswick nonprofit community. They

were given one year to turn the program around or else it would be terminated, and they were supposed to satisfy this ultimatum with a greatly reduced budget. After paying for staff positions, CASE was left with an operating budget of roughly $14,944.[14] Shafer had his teaching load reduced by one course, or what equated to ten hours per week, so that he could work to resuscitate the only program dedicated to civic education at Rutgers (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Shafer instituted a number of significant changes to the CASE service-learning model developed by Barber and Battistoni, a model largely premised on their reader *Education for Democracy*—an anthology of reflections and meditations on citizenship and democracy. Shafer admits that he had no service-learning background upon his appointment to the program but had done extensive service work as a student at Yale's Dwight Hall and Harvard's Philips Brooks House. Based on these experiences and his empiricist approach to research and education, he felt fundamentally at odds with the democratic theory method espoused by Barber and Battistoni. Shafer describes what he saw as their model for civic education:

> They constructed service-learning around teaching students about democracy, democratic theory, how citizens ought to think about themselves as citizens, what values citizens ought to have...there was a very important normative component in what was being taught itself... the purpose of the exercise was in a sense to lead or direct students to an established definition of citizenship and an established understanding of democracy that the professor had in mind.

Shafer concedes that Barber and Battistoni would disagree and argue that they were in no way trying to instill a particular set of democratic values in students (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

[14] This number for the operating budget was confirmed by Shafer's associate director Yvette Murry.

Even if it did not rest on a pre-determined definition of citizenship, the Barber-Battistoni model emphasized the substance of democracy over the practice of it, which severely limited its transferability across disciplines. Expecting all disciplines to teach the content of democracy is unrealistic, unworkable, and even undesirable, since it falls outside of many professors' academic purview and expertise. CASE courses under this model were largely confined to the political science department. Additionally, a service component was not allowed to be integrated into existing classes; instead, CASE courses had to be started from scratch. This approach unduly burdened faculty members and greatly reduced their interest in incorporating service-learning into their teaching (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Another critique, offered by Shafer, concerns how students perceive citizenship in the Barber-Battistoni model. Critical of the charity model often promoted by pure volunteerism programs and of the substantive democracy model pushed by Barber and Battistoni, Shafer contends: "...these [models] have the quite unintended consequence of defining service as being a separate part of your life...I'm going to go do service, I'm going to volunteer whether that is defined as something charitable or just something that is good however it gets labeled it is a separate thing...it is a good thing." The challenge Shafer posed at that time was developing a program capable of shaping students' views of citizenship so they saw it as something integral to one's personal and professional life rather than an "extra" or "add on" (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

In an effort to reorient civic education at Rutgers, Shafer introduced a model of service-learning that relied more on students exercising their skills and abilities to

advance the public good and less on them dissecting the meaning of citizenship. This approach attempted to show students the social utility of their personal and professional skills. Putting this model into practice, for instance, would mean that an accounting major would not benefit most from serving meals at a soup kitchen but from doing the books for that kitchen. This service placement not only provides practical experience for the accounting major but also the realization that her skills can be used to aid the work of a local nonprofit organization in a very substantial way. These types of experiences were what CASE tried to promote beginning in 1994 (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

In that year, Shafer along with his assistant director Murry and four work-study students worked towards remaking CASE in light of this skills-based civic education paradigm. CASE stopped its previous policy of buying out professors from departments and instead gave small grants, usually around $1,000, to interested professors to retool existing core departmental courses so that they offered a CASE component. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences forbade CASE to include service-learning in departmental requirements, so Shafer was forced to build his program around them. In spite of this limitation, upper level courses quickly became the new mainstay of the CASE program. Shafer worked with faculty members to integrate the service part into all aspects of the course from small discussion groups to research projects to papers and exams. Murry in the meantime promoted the CASE program in the local New Brunswick community. By the end of 1994, CASE offered 25 courses (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Throughout the late 1990s, the program continued to grow, reaching a maximum of 1,000 students per year, and then leveled off in the early 2000s with 500-700 students taking CASE courses annually. The program was able to grow so rapidly in the 1990s primarily because of the budgetary health of the University. With increased monies from an expanding economy, the University had more graduate funding and therefore could pay for more teacher assistants, resulting in a greater number of recitation sessions, or small discussion groups, per lecture course. Faculty members generally did not feel comfortable including a service option in the course if recitation sessions were too large, so more teacher assistants meant that CASE could expand its presence in large lecture-based courses. In the early 2000s, with the declining economy, this trend reversed itself pretty severely and forced CASE to switch its focus from large courses to smaller ones. This change, of course, reduced the number of students that could be reached through service-learning (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Ensuring High Quality Service Experiences

Coupled with the growth in the number of students affected by service-learning from 1994-2004 was a range of programmatic developments that ensured a high quality service experience. First, CASE had been able to build a formidable student support operation by securing a number of work-study students. Positions included a Service-Learning Advocate Coordinator, Community Relations Coordinator, Academic Coordinator, IT Director, Special Projects Coordinator, and the Neighborhood Relations Program (Shafer & Murry, 2002).

The Service-Learning Advocate Coordinator oversaw a group of students whose responsibility it was to act as liaisons between the CASE program, the Rutgers campus,

and the community. They were the official CASE representatives who were "responsible for motivating and training Rutgers University students to be effective participants in...[the] service-learning program and engaged citizens" (Murry, 2002, p. 4). These students organized a mandatory orientation for all CASE service-learning students at the start of each semester.[15] These orientations effectively prepared students to work in the community by developing their team building, communication, and presentation skills and by covering logistical and legality issues (Murry, 2002).

The Community Relations Coordinator handled CASE's relationships with its community partners. Any trouble with a student placement at a community partner was handled by the coordinator. This student leader also helped organize the annual Community Partner Conference which conveyed the expectations CASE had for nonprofit organizations participating in the program. This conference was mandatory and any community partner who did not attend was not allowed to host students. Although this policy reduced the potential number of community partners, it ensured CASE had a dedicated group of 200-250 organizations who understood its mission and was willing to support it actively (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

The Academic Coordinator oversaw all the logistical work with faculty, academic departments, and the registrar. The IT Director regularly updated and resolved technical problems with njserves.org, a website launched by CASE in 2000 that lists information on over 40,000 New Jersey civic organizations and allows them to post volunteer and job positions. Student leaders also ran several community service programs that comprised the Neighborhood Relations Program like Rutgers Readers, which provides reading help

[15] In an interview, Shafer confirmed that students who did not attend this orientation were not allowed to participate in the CASE course.

to K-3 students, and RU CHAMPS, which provides mentors to local middle school students (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Integrating Service and Scholarship: A Look at CASE Courses in Action

At its height in the late 1990s, CASE on average offered over 60 service-learning courses; that number was reduced to 50-55 in the early 2000s. The CASE Annual Report 2001-2002 provides a useful snapshot of the breadth of the service-learning courses. Due to Shafer's political science background, some of the courses were based in his department, but certainly not all. As an example, CASE courses for academic year 2001-02 extended to at least sixteen other departments, including English Composition, Ecology and Evolution, Information Technology and Informatics, Biomedical Engineering, and Spanish (p. 11). In other words, CASE cut across a wide spectrum of academic disciplines, even if it did not cut as deeply as it would have ideally liked.

One course that has lent itself particularly well to adding a community-based piece is Political Science Professor Beth Leech's "Activism and Advocacy."[16] The idea for the course came from a student of hers who wanted to create a curricular experience that examined how citizen action occurred at a grassroots level. Through something called a "variable seminar," which lets professors develop small seminars on a topic of their own choosing, Leech initiated the course in 2000 and has taught it every year since. Students are not required to work with a community organization during the semester but many choose to do so. The major project that all students undertake in small groups,

[16] The course description for "Advocacy and Activism" reads: "Teaches students about mobilizing for change. To prepare students for citizen advocacy this class provides a historical, philosophical, and theoretical context to understand the evolution of the organizing tradition, how it has played a role in social change, and models that have been developed. Beyond engaging the theoretical underpinnings of citizen advocacy, at their CASE placements students engage organizing from a practical angle" (CASE Annual Report 2001-02, p. 11).

regardless of whether they elect to do the CASE component, involves the planning of a hypothetical activism campaign from beginning to end. Students have to consider all aspects from writing press releases to recruiting new members to fundraising, and in the process they gain a range of understandings and skills needed to speak out effectively on an issue (B. Leech, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

Those that choose the CASE option work mainly with direct service providers, like the Red Cross or Elijah's Promise Soup Kitchen, instead of advocacy groups, since they are much closer to Rutgers campus and therefore easier for students to visit on a weekly basis.[17] Still, students are exposed to the general advocacy work of these direct service organizations. They try to focus on one particular aspect of advocacy work and examine it in great depth during their experience at the community partner. In the past, these organizations have called upon students to write press releases, plan and organize events, recruit new members, etc.; at the same time, students gain the tremendous insight of experienced community activists. Through this very hands-on experience, students observe and contribute to ongoing advocacy efforts in their local community, enabling them to challenge their in-class understanding of activism campaigns (B. Leech, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

For over ten years, Communications Professor Lea Stewart has taught a CASE course entitled "Communication & Gender" that examines how the issues of communication and gender interact in daily settings.[18] Every academic year she teaches

[17] Like in most CASE courses, students are required to work at the same community partner for at least 40 hours during the semester.
[18] The CASE Annual Report 2001-2002 describes the "Communication & Gender" course with the following: "Designed to show students how gender is encountered through communication in everyday life, how interpersonal conflict can be resolved, and how communication skills can be used in real-world situations. CASE placements with women's organizations engage students in situations that test what they are learning in the classroom" (p. 12).

the class as a CASE course one semester and as a regular course the other. In the CASE course, students work at a variety of community organizations from domestic abuse programs to sports leagues to service providers. During their service experiences, students observe how the issue of gender manifests itself. When asked to compare the course with a CASE component to the one without, Stewart responded that the main difference is that students involved in community work feel more "empowered" than those not involved (L. Stewart, personal communication, February 9, 2007).

Psychology Professor Maurice Elias has taught his CASE courses "Atypical Development" and "Community Psychology and Mental Health" [19] for as long as Stewart and manages to put about 100 students per year out into the community.[20] Approaching his CASE courses differently than most professors, he requires all his students to work at the same organization, the Middlesex County Head Start, so that they have a shared experience upon which they can center their in-class discussions. Although the service component is optional, like in most CASE courses, Elias fully integrates it in his general lectures and the recitation sections. In their field experiences at Middlesex County Head Start, students act as participant-observers both interacting with the children and noting their behavior. Before leaving their service placement, students create "good-bye" presents for the kids as thanks for the opportunity to work with them. Usually very creative with these presents, students have left picture albums of the children, games they

[19] The "Atypical Development" course "presents a theoretical and practical framework for conceptualizing atypical development and psychological disorders of children and adolescents in a family and social context, with an emphasis on transcultural approaches." The "Community Psychology and Mental Health" course looks at the "influence of social and community forces on development, treatment, and prevention; applications to community problems" (Shafer & Murry, 2003, pp. 13-14).

[20] Some of these 100 students are not involved in CASE courses. Elias runs an internship program that functions as an extension of CASE and gives mainly students majoring in psychology an opportunity for field experience.

have created, or something else that carries great meaning (M. Elias, personal communication, March 5, 2007).

CASE-Newark

In addition to the main CASE program on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus, Rutgers-Newark operates its own mini-version of the CASE program. Theresa O'Neill, a Career Management Specialist, has basically overseen the program single-handedly, growing it from a few courses in 2000 to twelve or more courses annually since. Nearly all of the courses are based in social science departments. O'Neill had a strong working relationship with Shafer and Murry when they ran the CASE program in New Brunswick-Piscataway. Recently, with the restructuring of the Rutgers undergraduate experience, that link between CASE campuses has weakened. The biggest obstacle faced by O'Neill in growing and sustaining the program has been overcoming her lack of teaching and research credentials. Without this background, she has found it much more difficult to establish credibility and legitimacy with faculty members, and consequently the program has not expanded as much as it would have if O'Neill had been a professor herself (T. O'Neill, personal communication, February 9, 2007).

CASE-Camden

Under the leadership of Urban Studies and Community Planning Professor Jon Van Til, CASE-Camden made more headway starting out than either CASE-Newark or CASE-New Brunswick/Piscataway. Shortly after the 1988 call by President Bloustein for a mandatory service program, Rutgers-Camden founded its own version of CASE. Head of the faculty senate at that time, Van Til put Bloustein's call up for discussion at one of

their meetings, and although no one supported creating a mandatory program, most felt Rutgers-Camden had some type of responsibility to educate students for citizenship. Van Til captures this consensus: "We all agreed that the university, as a public university, had an obligation to provide students with curricula that involved service-learning and it should do that and it should count for credit." Not too long afterwards, the University launched CASE-Camden (J. Van Til, personal communication, March 15, 2007).

Professor Van Til and the Urban Studies Department, which at that time was at its height with five faculty members, anchored the program. The University soon hired an administrator to oversee the day-to-day running of the program, to monitor placements, and to establish relations with community partners. A group of students organized by Van Til formed Students for Volunteer Services (SVS) to help with the operation of the program and to get the word out about it. Nearly all placements were at nearby social service agencies (J. Van Til, personal communication, March 15, 2007).

In 1996, a change in the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences resulted in funding being slashed for the salaried administrator overseeing the CASE program, essentially wiping out any logistical support that faculty members teaching service-learning courses had. With the loss of this administrative position, only a few service-learning courses have been offered regularly since: "Civic Education and Community Service" taught by Margaret Rogers-Darian, a former student of Van Til, and "Sustained Dialogue and Community Deliberation" taught by Van Til himself. The "Civic Education and Community Service" course has functioned as the gateway course to students interested in becoming heavily involved with the local Camden community. However, with the New Jersey budgetary crisis in 2006, many adjunct faculty members, including

Rogers-Darian, were released, putting the future of the "Civic Education and Community Service" course in jeopardy (J. Van Til, personal communication, March 15, 2007).

CASE's Precarious Existence: The Danger of Weak Institutional Support

From 1989-2003, CASE-New Brunswick/Piscataway engaged over 13,000 students in community work, and they in turn provided 730,000 hours of service to the local community (Shafer & Murry, 2003).[21] According to yearly evaluations, over 50% of students who participated in the CASE program continued working in some capacity at their community organization after the semester ended. In the mid-1990s, the CASE program gained such national recognition that it regularly offered consultation services to universities across the country. For instance, it assisted both Missouri State University and California State University at Monterrey Bay when they launched their service-learning programs (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Despite the overwhelming success of the program from 1994-2004, a claim which seems hard to dispute especially given its tumultuous state ten years prior, the University never embraced it as an institutional priority; in fact, it seemed perfectly willing to laud the program's accomplishments while simultaneously letting it dangle precariously on a minimal budget. The annual operating budget of CASE from 1994-2004 was $14,944, which Susan Forman, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education during that time and the VP to whom CASE reported, admits was insufficient considering the institutional mandate it had been tasked to carry out.[22] Forman explains: "I think that had it had more funds that it would have reached many more students and many more departments, in

[21] In each CASE course, students were required to do a minimum of 40 hours of service work during the semester.
[22] Forman reported to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs who was a member of the University President's Cabinet.

many ways it was working on goodwill" (S. Forman, personal communication, February 20, 2007). Since CASE was deemed the primary vehicle for civic education at Rutgers, realistically how much could the University have expected it to achieve with such a paltry budget?

The University expected a great deal, which is precisely why over those ten years CASE relied on substantial grant monies and a profitable consulting venture to augment its limited finances. Ironically in fall 1994, CASE benefited handsomely from the much maligned 10-year corporate deal that Rutgers struck with Coca-Cola for $10 million; the University took $40,000 from that deal and designated it for CASE's use in a special fund. The fund soon became known as the "Coke" account and enabled CASE to supplement its meager operating budget with outside funding sources, such as donations and sponsorships generated from njserves.org (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007; Shafer & Murry, 2002, p. 3).

Shafer attributes part of the lack of institutional support to the placement of CASE underneath the VP for Undergraduate Education. He claims that CASE was essentially the only teaching unit under Forman's purview while everything else related in some way to undergraduate student services. Because of this arrangement, Shafer argues, CASE was seen by some in the administration as separate from the curriculum and consequently less important (M. Shafer, personal communication, January 26, 2007).

Forman does not quite agree with that assessment and actually thought that it made sense for CASE to fall under her jurisdiction. She explains that in her role as VP: "I worked across the university to improve undergraduate education through a variety of vehicles: curricular improvement, teaching improvement, some work with student

support services, learning support services, and CASE." In other words, much of what she did went beyond undergraduate student services as Shafer asserts, but still CASE was the only curricular program she directly oversaw. In her explanation of why CASE fit into her purview, Forman gives these reasons:

> [It] was a program that cut across many academic units, that's why it was reporting to me and it was something that we saw that could really enhance the undergraduate experience by helping students learn how to become involved civically and politically, helping the university to...realize its goal of making sure that people are...engaged citizens when they leave.

Based on years of conversations with fellow faculty members and administrators, Forman seemed to think that her colleagues saw the value of CASE, but given the many competing priorities for university monies, it was challenging to secure greater funding for the program (S. Forman, personal communication, February 20, 2007). Ultimately, CASE was not made one of those institutional priorities from 1994-2004 and, since the departure of Shafer as its director in 2004,[23] has severely languished, offering less than half the courses than it did previously on an annual basis (Y. Murry, personal communication, February 3, 2007).

Reconceptualizing Service-Learning: Plans for the Rebirth of CASE

Based on President McCormick's promise to make civic education a core part of the Rutgers undergraduate experience, CASE might finally become an institutional priority. Over a year ago, CASE moved from the Office of Undergraduate Education to the newly formed Office of Academic and Public Partnerships in the Arts and Humanities. This office, under the leadership of Associate Vice President Isabel Nazario,

---

[23] Shafer resigned from the CASE program in 2004 and currently serves as the Director of the Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy.

has been tasked by President McCormick to spearhead the rebuilding and expansion of the CASE program and civic education more broadly across campus. Amy Michaels, the Senior Program Coordinator of the Office for Academic and Public Partnerships, is currently responsible for the day-to-day administration of the CASE program until a faculty member assumes the position (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

Two faculty committees have been formed: one to develop the framework for CASE itself and the other to reconceptualize civic education generally at Rutgers. The plans for CASE involve appointing a professor to head it and then regularly rotating the position so that faculty members from various departments have the opportunity to direct the program. Additionally, a 28-member faculty committee representing a range of disciplines has come together to reconceptualize education for citizenship at Rutgers. The committee has broken up into various subcommittees to address: mission and goals, academic standards and structured governance, national and international public service, assessment and evaluation, and best practices. Before the end of academic year 2006-07, this committee will submit a report to President McCormick with its recommendations on how Rutgers should proceed with educating students for responsible citizenship (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

One of the grand aspirations is to have CASE, or perhaps a new institutional structure, become the clearinghouse for civic engagement on Rutgers campus. Nazario contends that a collective understanding of what the University means by service has never been established, and although individual academic departments can have slight variations in how that understanding is carried out, the core of what civic engagement

signifies should be uniformly shared.[24] CASE would not only offer its own courses, but help coordinate and enhance ongoing activities undertaken by myriad civic actors university-wide, including student organizations, Greek societies, the Bloustein School of Public Policy and Planning, and the Eagleton Institute for Politics. The guiding mission of CASE would be to institutionalize service-learning and civic engagement efforts across campus (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

The only way for this institutionalization to become a reality will be if President McCormick and the University take their rhetoric of responsible citizenship seriously. At first glance, the initial step of moving CASE from the Office of Undergraduate Education to the Office of Academic and Public Partnerships in the Arts and Humanities appears counter to the recommendations that McCormick had laid out to the Rutgers' Board of Governors. In that document, he explained that the responsibility of overseeing CASE should fall to the VP for Undergraduate Education, which made sense given its charge to implement nearly all the restructuring of undergraduate education. Particularly, that oversight included programs that cut across the university, like CASE (McCormick, 2006, p. 14).

However, upon further reflection, the Office of Academic and Public Partnerships seems likely to provide CASE with the strongest launching pad for gaining a foothold in a broad range of disciplines. This office was created during the restructuring to foster mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and the public. With the relations

[24] In an interview, Nazario shared snippets of a tense conversation that the 28-member faculty committee had at one of its early meetings about what service-learning meant: "...departments were actually 'fighting' with one another in discussions about what it [service-learning] is. Some would say this is not what service-learning is, service-learning should be research-based and it's the academy in the sense solving some important problem out there, and other departments saying no it is about reciprocity. We need the community to identify problems for us while you see the community as a lab and you go out there and you don't give back..." This discussion reveals the serious challenge to unifying service-learning and civic engagement efforts across campus.

formed inside and outside the University, this office should be best positioned to traverse the campus-community divide. Even more importantly, though, is the fact that the VP for Undergraduate Education now has some 55 units reporting to him and that by itself could easily have caused education for citizenship to be neglected or overlooked (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

Nazario, on the other hand, wants to make CASE and civic engagement an overarching priority of her office and the University.[25] Realizing the importance of breaking down institutional barriers, her office has developed formal relations with numerous campus organizations, particularly the School of Arts and Sciences, Student Affairs, and Undergraduate Education. The most fluid relationship exists with the Office of Undergraduate Education. Nazario regularly sends reports to its VP with updates on the progress of reconceptualizing CASE and civic education. To solidify communication networks and to move work on service forward, some of the Undergraduate Education staff will soon work part-time with Nazario's office (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

The work of Nazario's office has been boosted by the leadership of President McCormick. Nazario explains: "President McCormick took a lead in saying to the deans we are going to work on supporting service and I need you to put together all the faculty who are doing this and we need then to support all of those departments." Rutgers will be launching a fundraising campaign, and President McCormick has promised to build

[25] Despite the initial progress that Nazario has made among faculty members, as demonstrated by her ability to organize several faculty committees, it is uncertain how they will respond to her long-term since she is not a faculty member herself. Having the strong backing of President McCormick has been instrumental to her efforts thus far, and his continued backing will be needed going forward. The fact that CASE will soon have a faculty member directing it will also help advance the broader notion of civic engagement that Nazario and her office are working towards.

campus civic engagement efforts into it. Also, unlike in previous years, CASE, because it is under the Office for Academic and Public Partnerships, will have the Rutgers Foundation helping it raise money (I. Nazario, personal communication, February 15, 2007).[26] Due to these impressive promises of institutional support, CASE and education for citizenship more broadly at Rutgers might soon be in their strongest position yet. However, if these promises are not matched with corresponding action in the coming years, it would not be unprecedented; the struggle to prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship at Rutgers, the State University, is far from over.

THE COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY: AN INSTITUTION COMMITTED TO EDUCATING THE STATE'S CITIZENRY

Founded in 1855 as the first State teacher training school in New Jersey, The College of New Jersey (TCNJ), located about 10 miles north of Trenton in Ewing Township, in its modern form functions as a comprehensive institution[27] almost entirely dedicated to the undergraduate experience.[28] Reflecting its original mission, the College for many years was called the New Jersey Normal School and offered the "normal" curriculum, or what was needed to prepare students to become teachers, instead of more specialized education such as a medical or divinity school would provide. Linking the College's origins to its present state, President Gitenstein explains: "This whole notion of a public institution that serves the State—that is part of the core of educating the

[26] At the time of my interview with Nazario, she was not sure how much money would be raised for campus civic engagement efforts.
[27] The word "comprehensive" is used to capture the fact that TCNJ is no longer just a teaching college. In fact, while still a hallmark program at the College, the School of Education has been joined by a cohort of distinguished schools. A few of these academic programs include the School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the School of Art, Media & Music, the School of Business, the School of Science, and the School of Culture & Society.
[28] Of the 6,500 full-time enrolled students, 6,000 are undergraduates. Ninety-five percent are from New Jersey.

citizenry—is what the normal school movement was about and to me it is still at the core of the college of New Jersey…" According to President Gitenstein's vision, education for citizenship constitutes the bedrock of the College (B. Gitenstein, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

The College's mission statement, part of which Gitenstein quoted from memory in an interview, reaffirms that institutional commitment to preparing students for lives of responsible citizenship. The ending of this statement reads: "Proud of its public service mandate to educate leaders of New Jersey and the nation, The College will be a national exemplar in the education of those who seek to sustain and advance the communities in which they live." President Gitenstein adds: "The goal of the School is to prepare this educated citizenry and to serve the State. We really do have a public mandate and I take that very seriously, so that's part of who we are…" How this goal has been realized has differed throughout the College's history, but for the past ten years it has largely been governed by a shared community engagement experience during the freshmen year (B. Gitenstein, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

Front-End Loading: The Evolving Implementation of the Service Requirement

In 1995, as part of a broader set of new first year experiences, the College of New Jersey instituted a ten-hour community service requirement for graduation. At that time, the College had decided to strengthen the sense of community within dormitories and to provide a common intellectual experience for underclassmen. Service to the local community was to become the link between those two elements.

Students did not have an option of completing the service requirement over a four-year span but rather had to fulfill it as freshmen in conjunction with an

interdisciplinary core course entitled "Athens to New York." Each course had about 20-25 students in it and took place in those students' respective residence halls. Thirty to forty faculty members each year would teach the course, which examined western and non-western cultures and aided students in addressing questions like what it means to be human, a member of a community, and moral, ethical, and just. Nino Scarpati, who became the director of the program in 1996, describes the connection between these central questions and community involvement: "As part of students' exploration of those questions they had an experiential component that extended the borders of the classroom out into the community and put them face to face with some of the social problems that exist in local communities particularly urban Trenton or ethnically diverse Ewing Township." Thus, a primary purpose of the service experience was to enhance the learning outcomes in the core course (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

Despite the institutional support behind the initiative, its first year of operation exposed the myriad difficulties in requiring all students to get involved in the local community, especially when nearly all of them live on a campus located in a suburban area. Compounding these inherent challenges was the fact that the College underestimated the resources needed to carry out the program. With the exception of some clerical work, a single individual, the part-time Community Service Coordinator, acted as the liaison between the community and the campus and tried to arrange community service experiences for some 1,200 students. No vehicles were designated for the initiative, making it nearly impossible to transport students from the campus to the community and back. As a result, only about 60 percent of students that first year

completed the service requirement. Many faculty members were less than enthusiastic about the course because they did not consider it academic enough, given that Student Life oversaw its implementation (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

In response to this criticism, the College in 1996 hired a full-time Director of Service-Learning, Nino Scarpati, to replace the Community Service Coordinator. Scarpati had worked for a number of years as the Director of Campus Life and had begun incorporating community-based experiences into his teaching of social work as an adjunct professor. Supporting Scarpati was an office with a full-time secretary, a graduate assistant, and a part-time office assistant. The program acquired three vans and paid multiple part-time student drivers to ease the strain of transportation. The previous year students had been assigned to a community partner without any effort to match their personal interests with the mission of the organization where they would be volunteering. Many students consequently were not satisfied with their placement; but in 1996, students were instead allowed to select a site that matched their interests. After the first year of these changes, student fulfillment of the service requirement had risen to 99 percent (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

Self-reported learning outcomes indicated that the service experience elevated students' understanding of the course content and their ability to respond to the central questions of the course. More than 80 percent of students reported gaining insights into social problems that they otherwise would not have had. Scarpati attributes an increase in a sense of social justice on campus to the service component. He measures this sense of social justice by the formation of many new student groups committed to strengthening

the local community. For instance, some students who had volunteered with Martin House decided to start a campus Habitat for Humanity Chapter, which has remained active for the past ten years. Alpha Phi Omega, a service fraternity, quickly became a campus presence. Scarpati estimates that roughly 15 percent of students did more than the required ten hours and sustained their involvement with the community partner beyond freshmen year (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

After anchoring the first year experience for roughly seven years, the "Athens to New York" course was overhauled and replaced with the First Seminar Program (FSP). The "Athens to New York" model demanded that a large number of faculty members teach a very general course that emphasized breadth over depth. Since the course did not tap into the individual passions of the professors, many were apathetic about its existence. The First Seminar Program, on the other hand, capitalized on the professor's expertise and offered students a wide-range of topics, most of which were not connected to community-based learning opportunities, but some of which were. For example, Scarpati began to teach "The Myths and Realities of Poverty in America," which required students to go on an alternative spring break trip organized in collaboration with the campus Habitat for Humanity Chapter (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

Essentially, this switch to the First Seminar Program moved service from the curriculum to the co-curriculum. While a few students took seminars that lent themselves to community engagement, most completed the service requirement through volunteering unconnected to curricular content. Scarpati trained about twenty students as civic engagement peer advisors who led regular reflection sessions in the dormitories for those

doing service outside of the classroom. Each session focused on a particular interest area, like education, hunger, or homelessness. Although Scarpati contends that both the old and new iteration[29] of a freshmen wide service experience were largely successful, he concedes that others would disagree (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

Notwithstanding this criticism, perhaps the greatest challenge that Scarpati and the program faced involved trying to create curricular mechanisms to extend the pathway of student civic development beyond freshmen year. Scarpati explains:

> We needed a program that would mature and be more developmental and allow students to examine and reflect and develop more sophistication in their understanding of the systemic nature of social problems and allow them to move beyond the positive socio-emotional rewards associated with doing good for others.

A brief community orientation through a limited freshman year service experience could not possibly accomplish these goals alone (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

In an effort to further develop the civic capacities of students, Scarpati worked with faculty members to develop service-learning courses. In 1998, his office began offering small stipends to faculty members willing to incorporate a community-based component in their courses. One willing professor, for example, was Susan Mitchell, an Associate Professor in the School of Nursing, who began to require her students in "Wellness Across the Lifespan" to examine poverty-related health issues during a 30-hour field experience. Besides working with individual professors, Scarpati also formed a community-based research coalition among faculty. However, despite some modest

[29] The old iteration was the "Athens to New York" model, while the new iteration was having most students complete the community engagement requirement in the co-curriculum, with a few taking community-based First Seminars.

progress, Scarpati did not have sufficient time, given the overwhelming nature of overseeing the first year service experience for all freshmen, to grow community-based research or other curricular initiatives that furthered student civic development, particularly as upperclassmen (N. Scarpati, personal communication, February 28, 2007).

The Bonner Center: Developing the Civic Capacities of Students and Community Partners Alike

Recognizing that Scarpati could not deepen students' sense of civic responsibility alone, the College, with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, formally teamed with the Bonner Foundation in 2004 to establish the Bonner Center. Several years prior to that, Beth Paul, a faculty member in the Department of Psychology currently serving as the College's Interim Provost, had begun receiving Bonner Leaders from the Foundation.[30] AmeriCorps monies funded these Bonner Leaders and enabled them to participate in a multi-semester community-based research course under the guidance of Paul. Due to the success of this course in providing students with longer and more substantial periods of community engagement that simultaneously increased the capacity of community partners to effect change, the College created the Bonner Center to offer similar opportunities. Prensky, the original director of the Center, shares what he saw as its mission: "The push was to get students to do something beyond first year, to provide more support to faculty in later classes, and also to do some of the

[30] The Bonner Leaders Program is an official program of the Bonner Foundation. The Program started roughly 15 years ago as a way to create a service-based scholarship that would eliminate the financial barrier to doing service for many students. Students are required to complete 300 hours of service throughout the year. The Program has spread to 45 colleges and universities. In compliance with AmeriCorps Program guidelines, students can only participate in the program for two years. The colleges and universities, rather than the Foundation, actually act as the conduit of the AmeriCorps funding. The Foundation supports the Leaders and ensures that they follow Bonner's model of community engagement (D. Prensky, personal communication, February 19, 2007; E. McGrath, personal communication, February 8, 2007).

other things that were happening on campus and to coordinate them and centralize them." The Center was to become the College's gateway between the campus and the community (H. Camp, personal communication, February 8, 2007; D. Prensky, personal communication, February 19, 2007).

To complement the Bonner Leaders Program, the College began funding Bonner Community Scholars in 2004. Although they bear distinct titles, Bonner Leaders and Scholars both undertake 300 hours of community service per year. The primary difference is that Bonner Leaders are funded by AmeriCorps and have a maximum of 2-years of funding while Bonner Scholars receive full-tuition scholarships[31] from the College that can be renewed every year. In 2006-07, the College had about 12 Bonner Leaders and 30 Scholars; those numbers are expected to rise next year[32] (D. Prensky, personal communication, February 19, 2007).

Due to significant budget cuts in state funding, the College made the decision to dissolve the Office of Civic Leadership Development, which Scarpati headed, in summer 2006 and shift all responsibilities for civic education to the Bonner Center; the most significant responsibility involved getting all freshmen to complete their community engagement requirement. Provost Beth Paul cautions peoples' use of the word requirement and suggests thinking about it in this way: "...going from service requirement in the first year to initiating our effort to build civic engagement among students to help them to develop into citizens...I think that is really different...I think that it creates a very different scaffolding for what we are trying to do." This language

[31] Full-tuition per year at The College of New Jersey costs around $7,000. These scholarships do not cover student fees or room and board.
[32] For the remainder of this paper, the term Bonner Scholars will be used to describe both Bonner Leaders and Scholars as that is how the College of New Jersey refers to them collectively.

change, even if more complicated to convey, captures the charge that the Provost has sent to the Bonner Center and its director, Pat Donohue[33]: abundant civic engagement opportunities should start freshmen year but extend throughout a student's collegiate career and be integrated into the curriculum (B. Paul, personal communication, March 2, 2007; P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

An accompanying aspect of that charge, which largely reflects the Bonner philosophy of community engagement, addresses the community partner dimension of citizen development and demands that the College work strategically to expand the capacity of those organizations with which it works. Therefore, the work that the Bonner Center does should be both student- and community partner-centered. At the moment, the College has strong, active partnerships with 12-15 community partners. Site plans, which are in the process of being developed collectively by Bonner Scholars, Bonner staff, community partners, and other key stakeholders, will provide a framework for short- and long-term collaboration between the College and local nonprofits. Donohoe identifies five main levels of community needs: direct service, research, planning, professional development, and resource development. Each site plan will take these needs into account and construct a multi-faceted strategy to meet them (P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

The lynchpin for developing and sustaining these partnerships is the Bonner Scholars who have the potential to work with the same organization on a weekly basis for a 2- or 4-year stretch. Donohue emphasizes the importance of these Scholars and their

[33] Donohue is a tenured-faculty member at Middlesex Community College who has taken time off to spearhead the efforts of the Bonner Center. Roughly ten years ago at Middlesex, Donohue founded Democracy House, a program committed to preparing students for lives of responsible citizenship and building the capacity of community partners.

role in the larger overarching framework for community engagement and empowerment: "The idea is to unite everyone around the community partners' needs with a site plan that speaks to their four or five different levels and then start connecting those dots and in my opinion it really starts with those Bonner Scholars because they are the anchor and they are the foundation..." Ideally, Bonner Scholars will be able to take on projects that address various levels of a community partners' needs and progressively assume more significant responsibilities (P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

As the connector of the College and the community partner, these Scholars help organize and lead the Community Engaged Learning (CEL) Days—the new iteration of the freshman first year service experience. Rather than a ten-hour service requirement that could be fulfilled throughout a student's freshman year, the 1,270 freshmen now have the option to participate in one of the many available CEL Days. Each day is organized around a particular theme, like hunger, homelessness, disabilities, education, or the environment, and has four parts. An educational piece comes first with relevant literature distributed several days in advance to students and then a speaker who gives a brief presentation that provides some context for the day. After this introduction, students work in teams with the designated community partner for that day and help out with whatever tasks need to be done. At the end of the day, students congregate for a reflection period in which they evaluate their experience, what they learned, what they thought could have been better, etc. Finally, students are apprised of how they can become more involved with this particular issue or with their community more generally (H. Camp, personal communication, February 8, 2007).

The First Seminar Program provides an alternative way for students to satisfy their community engagement requirement, and it is one that the Bonner Center plans to utilize more in the future. Some seminars lend themselves nicely to incorporating a civic project. For instance, students in a seminar entitled "Changing the World One Song at a Time," collaborated with the Young Scholars Institute, which offers a year-round learning center for Trenton youth, to teach history lessons using songs. Another seminar "Effective Student Leaders" has partnered with the Trenton Area Soup Kitchen to organize a hunger banquet in spring 2007 on a Saturday—a day during which the Kitchen is typically closed. The students will sell tickets, develop the program, and bring a band from campus to raise awareness about hunger issues and generate funds for the Kitchen (P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

Whether students take advantage of the First Seminar Program or CEL days, the College wants them to see these experiences as a stepping stone for future involvement and greater development as citizens. Elaborating on her initial charge to the recently created Bonner Center, Paul emphasizes the potential of these first year service experiences:

> To me the really important part of this charge was to make this the beginning and to develop a hunger in these students so that they are going to want to continue it because what we were seeing was we were trying to help students check off this box called service. Well, they checked off the box called service and they were done with it, and we were not seeing good hunger for moving forward. We were having a hard time stimulating movement from the first year into the upper level so how do we...start something that students cannot help but want to continue?

Both Paul and Donohue acknowledge that more opportunities must be created in upper-level courses to fuel that passion after it has been ignited. Once site plans at community partners have been developed, then the needs at those particular organizations will drive

campus efforts to connect service to curricular and co-curricular experiences beyond the freshman year. Everything will be guided by and measured on how well those site plans are being realized in furthering both community partners' needs as well as development needs of students as citizens. For years, the College of New Jersey has been educating its students for citizenship but given recent developments it is positioned to do so better than ever before (B. Paul, personal communication, March 2, 2007; P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

RARITAN VALLEY: A COLLEGE BUILT ON AN ETHIC OF SERVICE

Nestled in suburban Somerset and Hunterdon Counties, Raritan Valley Community College enrolls roughly 6,500 students annually with 2,700 of those attending full-time ("Raritan Valley Community College," 2007). While The College of New Jersey and Rutgers provide 4-year residential experiences for students, Raritan Valley functions as a commuter campus offering 2-year educational programs to an older student population; like community colleges across the country, though, its student body has been becoming increasingly younger.[34] President Casey Crabill[35] identifies four main types of educational missions Raritan Valley pursues: transfer, job skills, developmental education, and continuing education. Over half the students at Raritan Valley intend to transfer to a four-year institution after graduation and therefore view it as a stepping stone to further post-secondary education. Other students take classes to learn technical skills for new jobs, to acquire basic literacy and mathematical skills, or to fulfill ongoing

[34] The average age for community college students has traditionally been estimated at 29 years old. Adelman (2003) reports that the median age of community college students in 1991 was 26.5 years but had declined to 23.5 years by 1999. In an interview, President Casey Crabill confirmed that this trend of attracting younger students has continued at Raritan Valley.

[35] Crabill has dedicated her professional career to work in community colleges. Before coming to Raritan Valley, she served for seven years as president of the College of the Redwoods in Northern California.

certification requirements for a range of professions (C. Crabill, personal communication, February 7, 2007).

According to President Crabill, community colleges have been designed and built with the purpose of being public fixtures integrated into the local community. Since community colleges are "externally focused," as Crabill describes it, and driven by community needs, they have a natural orientation to service. Well before the concept of "service-learning" emerged, the work that community colleges undertook reflected their intimate connection with the local community. Paralegal, accounting, nursing, and early childhood education programs, among others, have always considered engagement in community-based research and outreach as core to their missions. This service orientation has traditionally been further strengthened by an older student population, many of whom have brought with them rich civic lives. However, as more and more students directly out of high school have enrolled in community colleges, the challenge of preparing students for public work has magnified (C. Crabill, personal communication, February 7, 2007).

Cultivating Habits of Civic Involvement: The Ongoing Infusion of Service-Learning into the Curriculum

Partly in response to this challenge but more generally to cultivate habits of civic involvement across disciplines and student constituencies, Raritan Valley has developed and grown its nationally acclaimed Service-Learning Program over the past thirteen years. Of the nineteen community colleges in the state, Raritan Valley maintains the strongest, most institutionalized service-learning program, and it arguably has the best program of all New Jersey higher education institutions. The Service-Learning Program holds the following mission: "[We are] committed to engaging students, faculty,

administrators, staff, and members of the community-at-large in service-learning; in order to foster skills and values that contribute to the improvement of society, to civic literacy, and to students' career resiliency" ("Raritan Valley Community College," 2007). Service-learning is the primary means through which Raritan Valley educates its students for citizenship, but several other programs, including the Institute for Holocaust & Genocide Studies and the Paul Robeson Institute for Ethics, Leadership and Social Justice, complement it to form an umbrella of civic engagement initiatives on-campus.

The Service-Learning Program began in 1993 with a small grant from the New Jersey Higher Education State Department (NJHESD)[36]. Importantly, and unusually for service-learning initiatives, both the faculty and top-level administration pushed for the introduction of this type of experiential learning. Lori Moog, the Service-Learning Coordinator at Raritan Valley since 1996, explains that during the launch of the program in 1993 "there were both faculty and administration that were interested in the concept and they worked collaboratively together to develop the program." Using the seed money from the NJHESD, Raritan Valley offered stipends to faculty members willing to tweak their courses so that they contained a service option (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

When the program formed in 1993, it had twenty students and a few dedicated faculty members. Faculty members had to assume responsibility for all parts of both the curricular and service experience—a significant and deterring burden for most. Since at that time no designated liaison between the campus and community—no service-learning coordinator—existed, faculty members had to seek out local nonprofits and develop and

[36] The New Jersey Higher Education State Department has since dissolved and been replaced by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education.

maintain relationships with them. Any difficulties with the placement of students at community sites fell to the faculty members to handle and resolve. Federal work-study students assisted these faculty members in overseeing the few existing service-learning courses; but understandably, these students, despite their efforts, did not have sufficient time to manage the program properly (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

However, roughly around the time that it received the NJHESD grant, Raritan Valley welcomed a new university president, Cary Israel, who quickly became a champion of the fledgling service-learning program. Moog describes the significance of Israel's active presidential leadership on campus culture: "President Cary Israel was very excited about moving the program forward…so because we had the strong presidential support he would go around publicly and on campus and really talk up service-learning." This vocal support and presidential affirmation of the educational value of this largely unaccepted, often marginalized, teaching pedagogy coupled with the initial success of the Raritan Valley program convinced many reluctant professors to incorporate it into their courses. As more professors expressed interest in doing service-learning, the more glaring became the inability of students and professors to manage the program alone (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

In response to this growing demand for service-learning by the president, faculty members, students, and community partners, the college in 1996 agreed to fund a part-time service-learning coordinator, a position filled by Moog and still held by her ten years later. Immediately after her appointment, Moog met with faculty members previously involved with the program to discuss what was working well and what the

greatest challenges for ensuring quality service-learning experiences had been. Based on this feedback, it became apparent to Moog that professors, despite their best intentions, had not been able to invest enough time into checking that community partners understood what service-learning entailed and therefore how they should treat students. Many community organizations put students to work stuffing envelopes for mass mailings or making copies, mundane activities, which while necessary for the functioning of the nonprofit, did nothing to enhance students' understanding of course content or to deepen their sense of civic responsibility (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

To improve students' experiences volunteering in the community, Moog worked relentlessly to provide outreach to the community partners on what the expectations would be for their participation in the Service-Learning Program. Moog elaborates on the importance of striking balanced relationships with community organizations:

> One of the things that is very important in establishing a program...is to ensure that your community partners that you choose to work with...understand the expectations for service-learning because quite often...I would get phone calls from people looking for students because they thought it was free labor and service-learning is not about free labor...it is about raising the awareness of students about civic activities that promote the public good and that is something that community partners needed to be on board with us...that this was a give and take.

By readjusting their expectations of student volunteers, local nonprofits and government agencies assumed their newly conceived role as both recipients of students' services and facilitators of their education. More and more they saw themselves as partners with faculty members in the educational process (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

Better site placements at a greater variety of nonprofits alongside the fact that faculty members no longer were responsible for identifying and managing community partner relationships resulted in a service-learning course boom. The number of students taking service-learning courses doubled from slightly less than 200 students in 1996 to 400 students the following year. A concomitant expansion in faculty members teaching these courses and in community partners placing students ensued. By 1998, the number of students opting for service-learning courses each year reached 800 and the number of faculty incorporating service-learning into their courses rose to 65. From 1998-2003, the number of students and faculty members participating in the program hovered around the 1998 figures (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

National recognition through the 1998 Service-Learning Collaboration Award presented by the Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges cemented the credibility of the burgeoning program. The Raritan Valley Service-Learning Program was selected for this honor based on the following criteria: "leadership in developing college/community relationships; development of quality learning opportunities for students; collaborative contributions to the community; and the potential for other colleges and schools to replicate [the program]" ("Raritan Valley Community College," 2007). In 1999, Campus Compact featured Raritan Valley in its *Service Matters: The Engaged Campus*; only one other community college was included in this publication. According to Moog, for five years running from 1998 to 2003, the program received some type of national accolade as a model for service-learning. Because of its recognition as a service-learning leader, Moog and her faculty colleagues regularly present at national conferences and advise on the development of service-learning programs at other

community colleges. For instance, Moog is currently helping Kingsborough Community College and Manhattan Borough Community College in New York City to grow their programs (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

In 2003, the Service-Learning Program received a Supporting Actions for Engagement (SAFE) grant from the Community College National Center for Community Engagement (CCNCCE) which enabled Raritan Valley to push the number of students involved in service-learning to over 1,000 annually from 2003-2007.[37] Raritan Valley has received $45,000 over the past three years to fund projects that address issues of homeland security and domestic preparedness.[38] These monies allowed the Service-Learning Program to extend its reach on campus and in the community by working more closely with the Nursing Program, the Somerset Policy Academy, and other academic disciplines. The partnerships forged from the SAFE grant have left the already successful Service-Learning Program in its best position ever moving forward (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

Service-Learning in Practice at Raritan Valley: Examples from the Field

Students who participate in service-learning courses at Raritan Valley must complete around 20 hours of service on average, and roughly 70 percent of students continue to volunteer with their organization after their initial service experience in the course.[39] The primary reason Moog believes Raritan Valley students are so committed to

[37] The money for the grants came from the Corporation for National and Community Service but was sub-granted by the CCNCCE. Six other colleges besides Raritan Valley were funded.
[38] Originally, colleges receiving a SAFE grant were limited to 3-years participation in the program. A few colleges, Raritan Valley included, have been offered grant money for a fourth year.
[39] Moog justifies why the average of 20 service hours is the rule of thumb: "It seems to work for students in terms of a valuable experience. Twenty hours is a really good amount of time for them [students] to learn from this experience; it is also a fair amount of time to give to a community organization, anything less

service-learning is the fact that they come from, live, and work in the community in which they are expected to design and carry out community-based projects. Moog explains:

> Some want to work at the local nursing home because their grandma used to be there and it is a chance for them to give back; some have family members with disabilities; some have parents who died and want to work at Robert Wood Johnson Center; they have seen family members in these situations and it becomes very personalized and they feel like they're giving back to their own community.

This high degree of personalization is a signature mark of the Raritan Valley Service-Learning Program that distinguishes it from many other programs (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

The creative, entrepreneurial spirit underpinning the community-based projects undertaken by Raritan Valley students presents a compelling testimony to the profound impact of the Service-Learning Program. No example captures this innovativeness more ably than the service-learning courses funded by the SAFE grant in the Nursing Program. Jan Buttler, an associate professor of health science education, and Susan Williams, a nursing instructor, jointly teach a capstone course required for becoming a certified nurse called "Trends in Nursing."[40] The course includes a mandatory service-learning component that has recently prompted students to form small groups and develop a project in collaboration with a community partner that addresses homeland security and domestic preparedness issues (J. Buttler and S. Williams, personal communication, February 15, 2007).

---

than that becomes burdensome for a community organization because they have to train a student to be up and running." Training usually takes a minimum of 5-7 hours.

[40] The catalog summary provides the following description of the course: "Trends in Nursing is designed to examine historical, philosophical, ethical, and legal aspects of nursing practice, contemporary issues facing nursing, and the influence of societal trends on nursing practice and the health care delivery system" (Buttler & Williams, 2007, p. 3).

After conducting focus groups at various assisted care living facilities, one group, for instance, realized that many elderly people were concerned about what would happen to them if a disaster struck their community. In response, the nursing students produced a brochure entitled "CHAT: Communicating Honestly About Terrorism" which provided the elderly with a list of relevant resources they could consult. The pamphlets generated extensive conversation among seniors, and then at the end the students ran workshops to assuage any lingering fears (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007). Another group partnered with the American Red Cross in Hunterdon County to educate the public about "Preparedness for Emergent Health Issues with Bio-Terrorism." They put together a comprehensive slide show that advised community members on ways to deal with various kinds of terrorist attacks, such as biological, chemical, and explosive (Hill, 2004). A third group worked with a local elementary school to develop a standard medication form that could be filled out by parents and then filed in the nurse's office. Because of their efforts, the entire school district adopted the form (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

Unlike the "Trends in Nursing" course, service-learning is an option in Dana Nelson's "Child Psychology."[41] Nelson began teaching this course last year, and the professor before her decided to change what had traditionally been a required service component to an option. This switch from a requirement to an option illustrates the curricular challenge of satisfying the varying needs of Raritan Valley's diverse student body. For those with families or who are working full-time, eighteen hours of service—

[41] The "Child Psychology" syllabus describes the course: "The focus of this course is on development from conception through the middle years of childhood. The developmental aspects of the child's cognitive, personality, social, and physical growth are presented. The impact of both psychological and biological factors on the child are investigated. Additionally, the course will integrate cross-cultural comparisons of child development in all of the above areas" (Nelson, 2007, p. 1).

the expectation for those choosing the service-learning option—can be overwhelming and even unmanageable. Given these serious impediments and since the course must be passed for education majors, Nelson has kept service-learning as an option; still over 30 students in fall 2006 elected that pathway[42] (D. Nelson, personal communication, February 13, 2007).

All of the community placements in "Child Psychology" provide students with an opportunity to interact with children and to observe their behavior. Nelson describes the impact of the service experience on one of her older students:

> One male student career-changer was in his 50s last semester and he was one of my really dedicated, enthusiastic service-learners and he was so amazed because he realized that potty training was part of supervising young children at this age and he was asked to...take kids to the bathroom and help take down their pants, and he really didn't know how to deal with it because as a single man...he'd never done that before so...as a man who wanted to be hands-off he was very nervous about it...

Through journal entries, class discussions, and one-on-one conversations with Nelson, students, like this career-changer, share their experiences and observations and incorporate them into the course content. In the case of the career-changer, he wanted to better understand the issue of privacy and child development and at what age kids started becoming self-conscious (D. Nelson, personal communication, February 13, 2007).

Two other students, both white suburban females, volunteered with Girl Scouts Beyond Bars, a program which serves girls whose mothers are incarcerated. Both female students expressed serious reservations about being able to connect with six and seven year old girls, all African-American, who knew more than they did about heroine, gangs,

[42] A direct benefit not often recognized in service-learning courses, which Nelson points out, is the relationship building that occurs between student and nonprofit employer. Five of her 30 students in fall 2006 had supervisors write recommendations for them. Several even received job offers at their community sites.

and prostitution. To their surprise, they were able to connect, and their community experience provided invaluable practical instruction in the development of racial identities (D. Nelson, personal communication, February 13, 2007).

The Institutionalization of Service-Learning at Raritan Valley

Beginning with Cary Israel, three consecutive presidencies at Raritan Valley have pushed service-learning as a cornerstone of the college. Jerry Ryan, President from 2000-2005, in fact taught his own service-learning course on local and state government for a number of years. With Ryan's guidance, Raritan Valley developed a Leadership Transcript that records students' involvement in service-learning and accompanies their official academic transcript (J. Ryan, personal communication, February 5, 2007). The 2002 Raritan Valley Strategic Plan ranks civic engagement as one of the priorities of the College. The plan articulates the College's commitment to: "Catalyze civic engagement and community service opportunities by identifying and supporting students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community members who develop creative and effective approaches to active citizenship" ("Raritan Valley Community College Strategic Plan," 2002, p. 3). This statement accurately reflects what service-learning in practice already embodies at Raritan Valley, as exemplified by the community-based projects developed in the "Trends in Nursing" course.

President Crabill intends to maintain and advance the College's civic engagement efforts.[43] Comparing Raritan Valley to other colleges, Crabill offers this important observation: "Every college that I've ever been to has had a general education goal that talks about preparing students to be active, thoughtful, and engaged citizens, and it is

[43] In fact, Raritan Valley's impressive service-learning program and overall civic engagement efforts were instrumental in her decision to come to the College.

almost always worded that way but that's typically kind of been a by-product and not a focus and interestingly I think here it has been a focus." Crabill hopes to help keep it a focus through personally modeling engagement with the community. Within six months, she has joined four boards of local nonprofits and will extend her community involvement from those opportunities (C. Crabill, personal communication, February 7, 2007).

Strong presidential and faculty support, the presence of a permanent service-learning coordinator, and repeated national recognition has resulted in full-scale institutionalization of service-learning at Raritan Valley. Moog explains the mutually reinforcing nature of these positive factors:

> The presidential support and a well managed office committed to developing the program led to more faculty involvement and more community participation which resulted in more student participation and more successful experiences all around and that success built on more success and so over the years more and more faculty and community people continued to participate in the program.

These synergies have fueled a campus culture sympathetic to service-learning as a way to educate for citizenship, and members across the Raritan Valley campus community strive to support it in their daily jobs. For instance, Career Services regularly points students Moog's direction if they express any interest in service work. Deans from other offices are well-versed in the concept of service-learning and involve the Service-Learning Program in their initiatives to the extent that they can. Raritan Valley maintains a government relations office with an advisory board and each time the board meets, the director looks for new non-profits to participate in the discussion. He turns to Moog, who has put together a fairly thorough catalogue of 200-250 community organizations, for recommendations about whom to invite to these board meetings. Several of the College

Board of Trustee members, namely Vice Chairman Dick Wellbrook and Assistant Secretary David Livingston, support the work of the Service-Learning Program either by coming to functions or participating in projects (L. Moog, personal communication, February 2, 2007). Because of all these reasons, Raritan Valley exhibits the most institutionalized service-learning program in New Jersey.

CONCLUSION: LESSONS LEARNED FROM THESE THREE SCHOOLS

As this chapter demonstrates, these three schools, Rutgers, The College of New Jersey, and Raritan Valley, have some of the longest histories in New Jersey of trying to prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship. At times, they have been more successful at doing this than at others, and their successes have by and large depended on the level of resources committed to civic engagement efforts.[44] An absolutely necessary resource for doing this type of work well is having a permanent campus-community liaison or service-learning coordinator. Neither students nor faculty members can dedicate sufficient time to both establishing and maintaining campus-community relations and overseeing and managing student placements at community sites.

Each particular institution, and often individual professors and administrators within those institutions, have their own views about what education for citizenship should look like. In principle, they would all agree, as Donohue and Paul strongly emphasized in an interview, that two overriding objectives should guide any attempt to

[44] I would have liked to compare the budgets of the civic education programs at Rutgers, The College of New Jersey, and Raritan Valley. All the necessary figures, though, were not available. Even if they were, the cross-institutional analysis would have been very tricky, even misleading, for various reasons. For instance, it seems obvious that Rutgers New Brunswick-Piscataway must dedicate more monies to civic education if it wants to reach its 26,000 students than The College of New Jersey and its 6,000 undergraduates, but how much more is needed? And, even more importantly, for what specific purposes are those monies being spent (staff positions, programmatic initiatives, marketing, office supplies, etc.)? Perhaps it is more expensive to run a program at one institution than another? Without having this more specific information, it is hard to compare programs fairly and accurately.

educate for citizenship: 1) providing students with multiple pathways, both curricular and co-curricular, that support their development as citizens across their collegiate career and 2) identifying and increasing the short- and long-term capacity of community partners. Colleges and universities must be both student- and community partner-centered, always taking multiple perspectives when measuring the effectiveness of civic engagement efforts; only by doing so can they form mutually beneficial partnerships between the campus and the community (B. Paul and P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

Although all colleges and universities claim to foster these mutually beneficial partnerships and sincerely mean it when they say it, some who have dedicated their personal lives and professional careers to this type of work contend that in practice most schools fall short of bolstering the capacity of community partners. Donohue and Paul, for instance, are highly critical of more traditional service-learning models, in which students rarely offer more to community organizations than direct service. They recognize that direct service is vital to the continuing operation of these organizations and agree in fact that it should form the foundation of any campus-community partnership; nonetheless, these nonprofits have many other more substantial needs, like research, planning, and professional and resource development, which go unattended by partner colleges and universities.

One of the most discussed and contentious issues of education for citizenship centers on whether it should be mandated by colleges and universities, particularly those that are public institutions. Of the three schools examined in-depth in this paper, The College of New Jersey is the only one that requires a service experience for graduation.

Based on my research, I think it likely that the College is the only public higher education institution in the state that has such a graduation requirement. Many more have actively pursued a similar measure, most notably when former Rutgers President Edward Bloustein in the late 1980s tried to institute some kind of service requirement for all Rutgers undergraduates.

For the most part, the rationale behind a service requirement is twofold: to reach all students, particularly those who would not get involved with their community otherwise, and to send a message to students that responsible citizenship is a duty borne by all rather than a voluntary act elected by a few. Addressing the second half of this rationale, Barber (1992, p. 256) argues:

> That civic education needs to be regarded as an integral part of liberal education and thus should both be mandatory and should receive academic credit. Because citizenship is an acquired art, and because those least likely to be spirited citizens or volunteers in their local or national community are most in need of civic training, an adequate program of citizen training with an opportunity for service needs to be mandatory.

Barber's reasoning makes a good deal of sense, as he argues for making education for citizenship an integral part of what colleges and universities do and placing this education at the heart of the institution—the curriculum.

However, in practice, as illustrated most forcefully by The College of New Jersey's experiment with a service requirement for more than a decade now, students do not necessarily come to view "citizenship as an acquired art" simply because it is mandated by their college or university. Regardless of the language—"service," "community engagement," or some other euphemism—used to cloak the requirement, students equate it to "forced volunteerism." In other words, making service a mandatory part of a college education does not mean that students will automatically see its

importance and therefore embrace it; in fact, the natural response for many students will be to resist that which is forced upon them by the college. A widespread reaction by students at The College of New Jersey has been to compartmentalize service into a box, as explained by Paul, which they can then check off once they have completed their required number of hours. Trying to combat this response is not impossible but requires ingenuity, persistence, and skill in convincing students that education for citizenship transcends a single course or experience.

An interconnected issue, which colleges and universities must consider when thinking about a civic engagement requirement, is what exactly it would entail. Would the requirement target a specific year, as at The College of New Jersey? Would some type of prolonged community experience be expected, or could a course that examined a public policy problem in-depth count too? Would the experience have to be connected to the curriculum or could service through a sports team work? Would the requirement operate on multiple levels with curricular- and co-curricular-based experiences being demanded?

Even if these questions could be resolved, the logistics of coordinating these civic engagement activities would present immense challenges. As The College of New Jersey has shown, the logistics can be worked out, but they can also create undesired consequences. In the case of the College, Scarpati, the director of the Office of Civic Leadership Development, dedicated nearly all of his office's energies to helping students complete their service requirement. Although his office was also responsible for coordinating civic engagement efforts more broadly on campus, it did not have adequate time or resources to grow the civic development pathway beyond freshman year. While

every student participated in the freshman year service experience because it was required, subsequent curricular- and co-curricular mechanisms necessary to further this civic involvement were lacking, partly because so much was invested in making this first year experience possible.[45]

Unless colleges and universities conclude that a service requirement furthers both objectives of building student civic development pathways and community partner capacities, they should not invest the energies to make it a reality. Yes, some type of service requirement would mean that every student could be reached, but given how much disdain students hold for "requirements," it is questionable how many of those reached would actually be positively affected by the experience. Colleges and universities should instead commit their energies to infusing everything they do with an ethic of service and offer students so many opportunities for civic engagement that they must make an effort to avoid it. The State of New Jersey can help colleges and universities strengthen this civic infrastructure, and the following chapter will look more specifically at ways that can be accomplished.

[45] Similarly, if colleges and universities were to require all students to take some experiential-learning course with a civic focus, substantial professional development of faculty members would most likely be needed. The College of New Jersey Interim Provost Beth Paul makes this pointed observation: "I think that is actually one of the most underestimated challenges in this work is presuming...that faculty have developed as citizens themselves..." (B. Paul, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

CHAPTER FOUR
THE STATE'S ROLE IN STRENGTHENING CIVIC EDUCATION

"From the time of the ancient Greeks through that of Tocqueville and into the present century, it was assumed that one of the purposes [of colleges and universities] was to train citizens, to teach individual men and women to look beyond our horizons of narrow selfishness, to see our interest in attending to the needs of others, in the reciprocity of the golden rule and the common good."

– Nannerl Keohane, Higher Ground (2006)[46]

As the last chapter revealed, much progress over the past several decades has been made by New Jersey public colleges and universities in preparing students to become lifelong engaged citizens. However, as it also pointed out, some higher education institutions for varying reasons have done significantly more than their peers to institute the curricular and co-curricular mechanisms necessary to affect students' civic and political attitudes and to involve them in public life. It is apparent that some schools have made education for citizenship a priority, others have made piecemeal efforts, and some have barely gotten off the ground.[47] If the State of New Jersey seriously believes its colleges and universities should be mandated to equip students with the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and habits that make for active and effective citizens, then it must require public higher education institutions to do more and help them in doing so.

Actually, the now defunct New Jersey Department of Higher Education provided small grants to several colleges and universities in the early 1990s to launch civic education initiatives, specifically service-learning programs. In fact, these grants originally funded what has become the highly institutionalized and successful Service-

[46] (Keohane, 2006, p. 92)
[47] I make this claim based on interviews with state higher education leaders and email exchanges with contacts at a variety of New Jersey institutions of higher learning.

Learning Program at Raritan Valley Community College. They also supported early service-learning endeavors at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. These examples demonstrate the potential of what further financial aid from the State of New Jersey could enable. The federal government, along with several states, has dedicated substantial monies to grow civic engagement efforts at colleges and universities, and their experiences collectively offer invaluable insight into why government support is essential for the founding and sustainability of civic education initiatives at institutions of higher learning.

LEARN AND SERVICE AMERICA HIGHER EDUCATION INITIATIVE

Since 1995, Learn and Serve America Higher Education (LASHE), an initiative of the Corporation for National and Community Service, has offered grants to colleges and universities to help promote an ethic of service on campus. As outlined in its program evaluation, the initiative over the years has worked towards the following goals:

> (1) Engaging students in meeting the unmet needs of communities;
> (2) Enhancing students' academic learning, their sense of social responsibility, and their civic skills through service-learning;
> (3) Increasing institutional support and capacity for service-learning, as manifested in the number, quality, and sustainability of opportunities for students to serve (Gray et al., 1998, p. 7).

Of the three goals listed, the third, "increasing institutional support and capacity for service-learning," ranks as the one LASHE aspires to influence most directly. By funding capacity-building projects at colleges and universities, LASHE hopes that once the grant monies are exhausted, the initiative(s) will be strong enough to continue and ideally even grow with the appropriate administrative support (p. 7).

In 1998, LASHE conducted a review of its grant program to evaluate how well it was meeting the above goals, especially how well it was helping to build the civic infrastructure of college campuses. Over 930 higher education institutions who had received some amount of grant money from the period 1995-97 participated in the impact study. Most colleges and universities, it turns out, used the grants for either establishing or expanding service-learning programs. In fact, over three-quarters of the institutions directed the funds to help develop service-learning courses. Collectively, they added 3,000 service-learning courses to the curriculum. The remaining schools used grant monies to augment direct service to the local community (p. 72).

The report, through multiple examples, illustrates the capacity-building power of the grant money. Increasing the staff size of service-learning programs represents one important outcome. For instance, the report explains: "One college used its LASHE grant to pay part of the salary for a staff person in a service-learning center. The center supported a wide variety of service-learning and community service programs, including individual internships, extracurricular activities, and service-learning courses" (p. 8). Due to the grants, others were able to do more with the service-learning staff they already had and could integrate service-learning further into the curriculum. The report (p. 8) depicts this capacity-building with the following example:

> A larger LSAHE grant was used to infuse service throughout a college curriculum. In addition to adding a service component to a required course for freshmen, the grant indirectly helped build support for service-learning in higher-level courses, and once faculty agreement was secured, the program director used grant funds to help the academic departments develop service opportunities for upper division students.

As these anecdotes reveal, the LSAHE grants over the years have enabled colleges and universities to grow civic engagement programs in ways that would otherwise not have been possible.

MINNESOTA AND CALIFORNIA: EXAMPLES FROM TWO STATE LEADERS

Complementing this federal support for civic engagement on college campuses are several state-funded grant programs. With the exception of Minnesota and California, states have by and large haphazardly financed higher education efforts to ready students for civic contemplation and action. Like federal funding through the LASHE initiative and most calls for colleges and universities to instill a greater sense of civic responsibility in their students, state funding has for the most part equated civic education to service-learning.

Minnesota's Post-Secondary Service-Learning Grants[48]

The state that acted earliest and most extensively in deciding to financially support civic education initiatives at colleges and universities was Minnesota. In 1989, the Minnesota Legislature created the Statewide Campus-Community Collaboration and Service-Learning Grant Program: "to increase the quality, impact and sustainability of community service-learning efforts and campus-community collaboration initiatives" ("Minnesota Office of Higher Education," 2007). The program is overseen by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education, and a committee of higher education leaders and community-based organizations selects the recipients of the grant monies. The Minnesota

[48] An evaluation of the post-secondary service-learning grants notes that: "While the name of the grant program reflects its origins focused on service-learning, the scope of the program now includes campus civic engagement more broadly defined" (Bowley, 2003a, p. 56). This broader conception is evident in the projects currently being funded, some of which are discussed later in this section.

Campus Compact lends substantial support by coordinating the grant review process, monitoring progress, and offering technical assistance to grantees.

In 2006, the program awarded grants totaling $230,000 to thirteen colleges and universities across the state.[49] An on-line description of the grants explains:

> All programs receiving grants from the Community Service-Learning and Campus-Community Collaborations Program have demonstrated appropriate collaboration among campus and community partners, have institutional support, addressed real community issues, and increased the capacity of participating community-based organizations to fulfill their mission.

It is a two-to-one matching grant program, meaning that colleges and universities that receive a grant must match it with twice the grant amount in either cash or in-kind services ("Minnesota Office of Higher Education," 2007).

The 2006 grants are funding a diversity of proposals, from those focusing on increasing student retention rates to those building civic engagement centers to those developing civic learning assessment metrics. For instance, the College of St. Scholastica will use its grant monies to institute an intensive two-week residential service-learning experience in its Jump Start Bridge Program in hopes of increasing retention rates among underrepresented students. In a different use of the grant, the Alexandria Technical College's Small Business Center will offer its students an opportunity to apply their expertise in brochure development, website design, and other areas to advance the work of local nonprofits and small businesses. As a final example, Hamline University will develop a rubric for evaluating students' academic and civic learning in its seven existing community-based courses and based on those assessments will construct a plan for

[49] Monies to fund these grants have been approved each year by the Minnesota legislature. The Minnesota Higher Education Omnibus Bill of 2005 funded the most recent grants ("Minnesota Office of Higher Education," 2007).

moving civic engagement efforts in the curriculum forward ("Minnesota Office of Higher Education," 2007).

In 2002, the Minnesota Campus Compact evaluated the impact of the grant program from 1989-2001 on colleges and universities' efforts to promote civic engagement. During this time, the state funded 51 grants totaling $1,066,000 for an average grant amount of $15,500 (Bowley, 2003a, p. 56).[50] Because of these funds, more than 25,000 students took 1,200 service-learning courses, and a few thousand more engaged in one-time or sustained community projects. Bowley reports that nearly all the funding resulted in sustainable initiatives with 78 percent ongoing and another 15 percent becoming or significantly influencing other projects. Only 7 percent of funded projects no longer existed (p. 6).[51]

One of the most important, even if unsurprising, findings of the evaluation is that those colleges and universities that received grants from the State invested considerably more in educating students for citizenship than those that did not. According to the report, 65 percent of grant-receiving institutions committed substantial institutional funds to the coordination and leadership of civic engagement efforts, while only 38 percent of institutions not receiving a grant did so (Bowley, 2003a, p. 59). In some ways, this should be expected, since those colleges and universities that applied for the grant were most likely already inclined to make institutional investments in these efforts; but of course, they still had to agree to match the grant monies dollar-for-dollar. As the impact study

[50] The grants were distributed in this way: 40 percent went to ten different community or technical colleges, 34 percent to ten different private colleges, 15 percent to three University of Minnesota campuses, and 11 percent to four state universities (Bowley, 2003a, p. 57).

[51] Bowley (2003a, p. 60) details this breakdown further in the Campus Compact report: 33 percent of the programs were sustained in an expanded form, 24 percent in a similar form, 21 percent sustained parts, but not all, the original program, 10 percent evolved into a different program, 7 percent no longer existed, and 5 percent no longer existed but significantly influenced other existing programs.

strongly confirms, grants have an extremely powerful role to play in advancing education for citizenship at higher education institutions.

California: A Governor's Call for Service

In 1999 in the form of a letter to state higher education leaders, then California Governor Gray Davis issued a call to the state's institutions of higher learning to create a community service requirement for students. His goals for this requirement were "to enable students to give back to their communities, to experience the satisfaction of contributing to those in need, and to strengthen an ethic of service among graduates of California universities." The most responsive statewide higher education system to the call has been the California State University (CSU) ("California's Call to Service," 2001).[52] The CSU Board of Trustees agreed with Governor Davis in principle, but rather than make service a requirement, they passed a resolution instructing all university presidents to ensure that students had amble opportunities to become civically engaged ("The California State University," 2007). After conversations across CSU campuses and the Board of Trustees resolution, the CSU developed a funding proposal detailing the resources needed to fulfill the Governor's charge. In 2000-01, the Governor directed $2.2 million from the state budget to the CSU, which it then matched with $2 million from other sources, so that service-learning offices could be established on all CSU campuses and new service-learning courses created ("California's Call to Service," 2001). Since 2000-01, the CSU has received $7.7 million to continue these activities ("The California State University," 2007).

[52] The California State University system consists of 23 campuses scattered throughout the state.

Based on data from 2003, over 31,900 new opportunities for students to take service-learning courses were created by the financial investment of the State and monies from other sources ("California's Call to Service: The California State University Responds," 2003). Additionally, this funding has since spawned numerous other initiatives geared towards increasing student civic involvement. CSU campuses annually participate in Campus Compact's "Raise Your Voice - A Month of Action," which celebrates and renews students' commitment to civic engagement. In 2003, with a $1.2 million grant from the Corporation for National and Community Service, the CSU began an initiative called "Realizing the Civic Mission of Education" to further institutionalize service-learning and civic engagement at CSU campuses ("The California State University," 2007).[53]

Lessons New Jersey Should Draw from Minnesota and California

As the examples of Minnesota and California cogently illustrate, financial support from the State can greatly strengthen higher education's efforts to educate for citizenship. Importantly, as Minnesota in particular demonstrates, grants can support not only service-learning programs but also broader campus civic engagement efforts. By funding a diversity of civic initiatives, the State can help promote a rich definition of responsible citizenship that encompasses many types of involvement. And through a matching grant requirement it can ensure that colleges and universities invest their own funds, increasing

[53] The grant supported the institutionalization of service-learning and civic engagement in the following ways: (1) offering trainings to various stakeholders; (2) assessing the campus's academic culture and civic mission; (3) developing specific activities to transform academic culture in order to more fully realize the civic mission of education; and (4) developing student leadership opportunities through the Students in Action Program ("The California State University," 2007).

the likelihood that funded programs will be sustained after the grant monies have been exhausted.

MOVING FORWARD: WHAT THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CAN DO

The most obvious and serious impediment to the State doing more to help colleges and universities educate students for citizenship is the disastrous state of its budget.[54] In Fiscal Year 2007, the budget allocation to New Jersey higher education institutions was slashed by $198 million ("Invest in Our Future," March 19, 2007).[55] Rutgers University, by far the hardest hit, incurred a $66.1 million shortfall, resulting in the loss of over 750 staff and faculty and the cancellation of nearly 500 courses ("FY2007 State Budget," 2007).[56] Similar cutbacks happened at all levels of public higher education institutions across the state. Even though the forecast for FY2008 is looking rosier, with Governor Jon Corzine proposing to reallocate $35.7 million of the $198 million cut from higher education the previous year, it only recoups a fraction of what was lost in FY2007 (Williamson, 2007). That means the total FY2008 higher education appropriation will be roughly $1.32 billion. Public colleges and universities will again be hard pressed to maintain their current levels of services, let alone put more towards education for citizenship.

That being said, there are other less financially burdensome roles the State, particularly the Commission on Higher Education, can play in strengthening campus

[54] To balance the budget for FY2007, the State had to overcome a $4.3 billion budget deficit (Williamson, 2007).

[55] The total amount appropriated by the State to higher education for FY2006 was $1.48 billion which would mean that with a $198 million cut the total FY2007 appropriation was roughly $1.28 billion (Mann & Forsberg, 2006).

[56] One hundred eighty-nine staff members were laid off, 374 part-time lecture appointments were eliminated, 229 open faculty positions went unfilled, and 64 faculty searches were deferred ("FY2007 State Budget," 2007).

civic engagement efforts; these will be discussed shortly but they can only be understood in the context of New Jersey's higher education governance system. In 1994, under Governor Christine Whitman, the Higher Education Restructuring Act eliminated the Department, Board, and Chancellorship of Higher Education. Under this earlier governance model, the Department under the directorship of the Chancellor, who held a position on the Governor's Cabinet, exerted broad regulatory powers over public higher education institutions, ensuring that these institutions complied with the mandates set by the Department. However, with the 1994 restructuring, the former governing body was downgraded to a coordinating role, thus decentralizing the governing system of New Jersey higher education and effectively placing decision-making power in the hands of individual institutional boards (Mann & Forsberg, 2006).

The significantly less powerful Commission on Higher Education currently fills that coordinating role alongside the New Jersey President's Council. The Commission mainly functions as a planner, advocate, and facilitator of higher education statewide; it cannot mandate action but can encourage colleges and universities to do certain things, especially by providing incentives (J. Oswald, personal communication, March 16, 2007).[57] For example, the goal contained in the 2005 Update to the *Long-Range Plan on Higher Education* of increasing student participation in community service by a minimum of 5 percentage points by 2010 is not something that the Commission can

[57] Mann & Forsberg (2006, p. 18) describe the powers of the Commission: "...the Commission directs system-wide planning, research and advocacy; final decisions on institutional licensure, university status and mission changes; policy recommendations for higher education initiatives and incentive programs and an annual coordinated, system-wide budget policy statement; and, upon referral from the Presidents' Council, decisions on new academic programs that exceed an institution's mission or are unduly costly or duplicative."

mandate public colleges and universities to do. Rather the Commission must find other ways to entice these institutions into actively pursuing this goal.

Despite these limitations, the Commission has a crucial role to play in making education for citizenship an institutional priority of statewide higher education. The following policy recommendations, informed and shaped by a series of conversations in 2007 with state higher education civic engagement leaders, offer Commission Director Jane Oates and Governor Jon Corzine concrete ways for strengthening the civic development of New Jersey's college students. Taking into account the presently severe budget constraints, my recommendations are divided into two sets: 1) those that require minimal financial investment and can therefore be implemented immediately; 2) those that require substantial financial investment and must therefore await a healthier state budget.[58]

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS (Requiring Minimal Financial Investment)

Given the limited cost involved, these recommendations can be undertaken immediately.

- **Establish a New Jersey Campus Compact**

The closest thing New Jersey has to a statewide coordinating body for college civic engagement activities is the New Jersey Higher Education Service-Learning Consortium, and, as its name suggests, it only focuses on service-learning. Founded by the Department of Higher Education in 1993, the Consortium, made up of thirteen

[58] This does not mean that discussion and planning of this second set of recommendations should not take place immediately. In fact, it should, with the understanding that their implementation will be down the road.

colleges and universities[59], meets regularly, usually once every three months, to share service-learning best practices and to discuss how service-learning could better be promoted across the state. Along with the service-learning coordinators from these schools, representatives from the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education and the Governor's Office of Volunteerism try to participate in these conversations (L. Moog, personal communication, March 2, 2007). Although these meetings provide a venue for comparing programmatic initiatives and models, generating ideas for improving the outcomes of service-learning, and more generally sharing service-learning best practices, they do not do much in the way of concretely aiding education for citizenship at these institutions. In fact, the same can be said for the Consortium as a whole.

The greatest strength of the Consortium—the fact that its members are those on the ground implementing service-learning programs—is also its greatest weakness. Even if service-learning coordinators consider involvement in the Consortium important to the larger work they are doing, it is still secondary to their primary job responsibilities of overseeing service-learning on their own campuses. They simply do not have large chunks of time for promoting service-learning statewide. Secondly, the Consortium only includes a fraction of all higher education institutions in New Jersey: 13 of 57.[60] Thirdly, these service-learning coordinators are not positioned politically to advance policy agendas that would further their efforts on a state level. Lastly, while the Consortium

[59] The thirteen colleges and universities include: Bergen Community College, Brookdale Community College, Kean University, Long Island University (Brooklyn campus), Monmouth University, Montclair State University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Ramapo College of New Jersey, Raritan Valley Community College, Rutgers University, Saint Peter's College, and Stockton State University.

[60] This number includes public institutions (community colleges, state colleges, and state universities) and private 4-year colleges and universities.

represents an important means of educating for citizenship, service-learning is not the exclusive method for achieving this goal, as this paper has demonstrated repeatedly.

If New Jersey takes education for citizenship seriously at its colleges and universities, the logical next step to bolster this work would be to create an entity charged with coordinating and supporting statewide civic engagement efforts on all college campuses. No organization nationally has proven itself more in this arena than Campus Compact, and it would make sense for it to fill this role in New Jersey. Founded in 1985 by the presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford universities, and the president of the Education Commission of the States, Campus Compact started as an organization promoting increased community service on college campuses. Beginning in the early 1990s, its primary focus shifted from extracurricular service involvement to a new type of teaching pedagogy, now commonly called service-learning, that integrated community service with learning in the classroom. Over this twenty-plus year stretch, Campus Compact has grown to a coalition of over 1,000 colleges and works toward advancing civic engagement in general and service-learning in particular in higher education. Thirty-one states have Campus Compact chapters ("Campus Compact," 2007).

States with a Campus Compact Chapter have benefited enormously from the organization's active presence. As outlined on the National Campus Compact website, a New Jersey Campus Compact (NJCC) would be able to support statewide education for citizenship efforts on college campuses in the following ways:

- **Convene statewide conferences, workshops, and meetings**. The NJCC could connect students, faculty members, and administrators from institutions across the state. Conferences could cover a wide-range of topics from service-learning (e.g. –

starting programs, best practices, strategies for gaining faculty support) to capacity-building of community partners to assessment and evaluation of civic learning outcomes.

- **Coordinate and promote civic engagement grant opportunities.** The NJCC could serve as the leading resource for a wide-range of civic engagement funding opportunities. Many State Compacts have sought out additional funding sources to create grant programs that advance service-learning and civic engagement programs in their states (see Appendix A-1). A NJCC could actively seek out these sources and coordinate civic engagement related grant programs.

- **Enhance the capacity of college civic engagement programs.** The NJCC could oversee a team of AmeriCorps*VISTA members[61] who would work at select college campuses in the state as community service, service-learning, and civic engagement specialists. Many State Compacts have AmeriCorps*VISTA members working with students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners to enhance their efforts.

- **Recognize outstanding public service and leadership.** The NJCC could solicit nominations for national service awards that recognize outstanding civic engagement work done by students, faculty members, and administrators. It could also institute and coordinate New Jersey specific awards as many State Compacts have already done (see Appendix A-2).

[61] The Corporation for National and Community Service website provides a description of the AmeriCorps*VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) Program: "[It] provides full-time members to nonprofit, faith-based and other community organizations, and public agencies to create and expand programs that ultimately bring low-income individuals and communities out of poverty" ("AmeriCorps*VISTA," 2007).

- **Promote public policy that would advance civic engagement efforts.** The NJCC could unify statewide civic engagement efforts at colleges and universities and make it a public policy priority of state legislators and officials.

The process of bringing a Campus Compact to New Jersey has already been initiated. At the February Commission on Higher Education meeting, Maureen Curley, the Executive Director of the National Campus Compact, presented on the organization's work. Further, the Commission and the New Jersey Higher Education Service-Learning (NJHES-L) Consortium are in the midst of bringing onboard an AmeriCorps*VISTA volunteer to serve as the first Statewide Service-Learning Coordinator in 2007-08.[62] According to the position description, the Coordinator will undertake the following activities:

- Work with college service-learning program administrators in the development of planning activities for Campus Compact start-up.
- Prepare the New Jersey Campus Compact application.
- Support the NJHES-L Executive Board in recruiting colleges to Consortium membership.
- Manage communications for the NJHES-L Consortium and New Jersey Compact.
- Leverage resources to assist member campuses in increasing the quantity and quality of higher education service-learning.
- Serve as a resource for reference material and best practices in service-learning.
- Plan and deliver relevant programming for service-learning staff, community partners, and students at member campuses.[63]

---

[62] The position description explains that "the Coordinator works collaboratively with the Consortium Executive Board to create a thriving NJ Compact with strong links to the NJ higher education community, NJ community organizations, the national Campus Compact, and the nationwide community of service-learning professionals" ("NJ: Campus Compact Coordinator," 2007).

[63] Position description located at: https://recruit.cns.gov/searchDetails.asp?listingid='07VSANJ003-3'&

- **Exert Gubernatorial Leadership**

Governor Corzine should create the expectation that public colleges and universities can only truly fulfill their responsibilities to the people of New Jersey if they make civic engagement an institutional priority. Some higher education institutions already see education for citizenship as integral to their mission, but those that do not require outside pressure to do so. If necessary, Corzine can threaten further funding cuts unless colleges and universities take steps to advance their civic missions.

- **Call on Public Colleges and Universities to Develop Strategic Plans That Address Their Civic Missions**

Governor Corzine should specifically call on all public colleges and universities in New Jersey to develop a 10-year strategic plan for educating students for citizenship in collaboration with the proposed New Jersey Campus Compact[64]; committees at each institution should be formed to oversee this planning process and regularly assess how well the plan is being implemented. Colleges and universities should evaluate existing campus programs that promote civic engagement and determine how both curricular and co-curricular opportunities could be expanded. Institutional mission statements and faculty reward structures should be revisited to see if they align with the overarching goals of preparing students for lives of responsible citizenship. The New Jersey Campus Compact can offer assistance during the formation of the strategic plan and later during its ongoing implementation and review.

[64] Until a New Jersey Campus Compact is established, the Commission on Higher Education should fill this role.

- **Form a Task Force on P-16 Civic Education**

Governor Corzine should form a task force, made up of state leaders from pre-kindergarten, elementary, secondary, and tertiary education, charged with looking at citizen development holistically; its efforts should result in a P-16 civic learning outcome continuum that clearly defines the responsibilities of educating for citizenship borne by each tier of the educational system. Since currently there is no mechanism in the state for planning or coordinating P-16 education, the task force should recommend to the governor an appropriate body for filling this role. If a New Jersey Campus Compact has been established by then, it should oversee this system-wide coordination, otherwise this responsibility should fall to either the Commission on Higher Education or the Department of Education.

As the work of the task force will reflect, civic education must be viewed as a process that begins in students' early instructional years and continues as they mature into young adults. Colleges and universities cannot possibly prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship alone; rather, through a multitude of experiences, many of which would ideally happen before college, students become fully engaged members of society.

- **Organize a Statewide Colloquium on Education for Citizenship**

Until the proposed New Jersey Campus Compact becomes a reality, the Commission on Higher Education should assume responsibility for planning an annual statewide colloquium that brings together public and private institutions of higher learning to talk about their efforts to educate for citizenship. In fall 2006, the Commission held a statewide conference on service-learning at Montclair State University. While important, future gatherings should extend the discussion of education for citizenship

beyond service-learning to include other civic education curricular devices, extracurricular civic engagement activities, public service summer internships, etc. These conferences could serve a variety of functions, some of which are: 1) information sharing about the types of civic initiatives on college campuses across the state; 2) sharing best practices (e. g. – how to integrate service into the curriculum, how to get faculty involved, how to form a mutually beneficial campus-community partnership, etc.); 3) brainstorming on how to overcome common challenges; 4) celebrating work done for the public good.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS (Requiring Substantial Financial Investment)

These recommendations require the State to invest substantial monies and must therefore await a healthier budgetary climate. However, the current budgetary constraints should not be used as an excuse to put off discussion and planning of these recommendations. In fact, further investigation of them should proceed, with the understanding that their implementation will be down the road.

➢ **Fund a New Jersey Higher Education Civic Engagement Matching Grant Program**

Even if New Jersey founds a State Campus Compact, monies will be needed to finance both the start-up of new civic engagement programs and the expansion of existing ones; therefore, a New Jersey Higher Education Civic Engagement Matching Grant Program should be established. The program should operate a 2:1 matching grant so that colleges and universities will have to double the investment the State makes with their own monies; this investment should not only aid the success of the campus initiative

short-term but also increase the likelihood that campus resources will be devoted to it after the grant monies have ended. Minnesota's Post-Secondary Service-Learning Grants should be used as a model for New Jersey's grant program; however, unlike the original Minnesota program which funded solely service-learning courses, a New Jersey grant program should define civic engagement broadly and fund both curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Special emphasis should be placed on developing projects that enhance the long-term capacity of colleges and universities to educate students for citizenship while at the same time increasing the capacity of local community organizations to fulfill their missions.

➢ **Pilot a New Jersey Campus-Community Corps Program**

The State of New Jersey should pilot a New Jersey Campus-Community Corps Program to supplement federally funded AmeriCorps positions, which enable college students of limited financial means to dedicate substantial amounts of time to community-based projects. The work of the Bonner Center at The College of New Jersey and Democracy House at Middlesex County College—two of the leading higher education civic programs in New Jersey—rely heavily on AmeriCorps funding. If this funding were to dry up, which, given the unpredictable nature of budget allocations to the AmeriCorps Program, is a distinct possibility, these programs would be seriously undermined. A state-funded program, like the New Jersey Campus-Community Corps, would not only guard against this possibility but also enable other campuses in the state to break down financial barriers to service that preclude many students from getting involved civically (B. Paul and P. Donohue, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The policy recommendations outlined above in no way constitute an exhaustive look at how the State of New Jersey can support public colleges and universities' efforts to educate for citizenship. However, collectively they offer a formidable starting point. They at the very least show that the State can play a significant role in helping higher education prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship. Frank Newman's claim, presented in the opening line of this paper, that schools have failed to educate for citizenship might be too strong, but it would be no exaggeration to say that there is a great deal more that colleges and universities could do on this front. The ability to do more in many ways hinges on how willing the state government is to exert its leadership and leverage its resources to make education for citizenship a priority. One thing is for certain: All people in New Jersey would benefit from such a move.

APPENDIX A-1: STATE CAMPUS COMPACT GRANT PROGRAM EXAMPLES

CALIFORNIA CAMPUS COMPACT (CACC)

Grant Program: California Campus Compact – Carnegie Foundation Faculty Fellows Service-Learning for Political Engagement
Amount: $1,000 per faculty fellow per year; 2:1 funding match
Description (according to CACC website): The CACC – Carnegie Fellows Program will bring together 25 outstanding tenured and tenure track professors across disciplines and from diverse types of institutions throughout California. The Program asks faculty to design and implement a service-learning courses geared towards increasing students' understanding, skills, and motivation for political engagement.

Grant Program: 2007 Faculty Development Subgrant Application
Amount: up to $4,000; 2:1 funding match
Description (according to CACC website): This small scale grant award is designed to support campuses as they recruit and train faculty in service-learning development and implementation.

FLORIDA CAMPUS COMPACT (FCC)

Grant Program: Impact Projects Funding
Amount: Varies
Description (according to FCC website): These funds are for the purpose of increasing the quality, impact and sustainability of the scholarship of engagement through service-learning, civic engagement, applied research, and campus-community collaboration in Florida.

LOUISIANA CAMPUS COMPACT (LaCC)

Grant Program: Course Development Mini Grants
Amount: Varies
Description (according to LaCC website): offered through LaCC's grant from the National Campus Compact Office in order to increase the number of service-learning courses available at LaCC member institutions. Grants are available for the development of a new service-learning course or implementation of service-learning into an existing course.

MICHIGAN CAMPUS COMPACT (MCC)

Grant Program: Venture Grants
Amount: Up to $2,500
Description (according to MCC website): Grants are used to develop or expand community service programs, service-learning initiatives, and/or civic engagement activities.

APPENDIX A-2: CAMPUS COMPACT PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

NATIONAL CAMPUS COMPACT AWARDS

Award: Frank Newman Leadership Award
Recipient: Students
Description (according to CC website): The Frank Newman Leadership Award is designed to support students with financial need who have shown civic leadership potential through public and community service and scholastic achievement. The award provides financial support and mentorship to help students achieve their civic and academic goals. Two awards are available to undergraduate students at Campus Compact member colleges and universities; one from a 2-year institution and one from a 4-year institution.

Award: Howard R. Swearer Student Humanitarian Award
Recipient: Students
Description (according to CC website): Each year since 1987, five students at Campus Compact member schools have been honored with this prestigious award. The award recognizes students for their innovative strategies in addressing community issues and needs, and their efforts to build and sustain this work among their peers and within their institution. Five awards are available to undergraduate students at Campus Compact member colleges and universities, one of which is reserved for a student at a 2-year institution.

Award: The Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning
Recipient: Faculty members
Description (according to CC website): Campus Compact recognizes and honors one faculty member from a member institution each year for contributing to the integration of community or public service into the curriculum and for efforts to institutionalize service-learning. The recipient receives a $2,000 cash award. The award is named in honor of Thomas Ehrlich, former chair of the Campus Compact board of directors and president emeritus of Indiana University.

STATE CAMPUS COMPACT AWARDS

California Campus Compact (CACC)

Award: Richard Cone Award for Excellence & Leadership in Cultivating Community Partnerships in Higher Education
Recipients: Faculty members and administrators
Description (according to CACC website): It is awarded to an individual who has made significant contributions to the development of partnerships between institutions of higher education and communities surrounding the campus. The objective of this award is to recognize an individual whose work is guided by the best practices of campus-community partnerships and who seeks to ensure these practices become a part of the life of their home institution.

FLORIDA CAMPUS COMPACT (FCC)

Award: Excellence in Service Award
Recipient: Students
Description (according to FCC website): It honors six of Florida's most dedicated student volunteers, who have demonstrated excellence in service, and made a positive, significant, and outstanding contribution to the field of higher education, the State of Florida, and the global community.

Minnesota Campus Compact (MCC)

Award: Sister Pat Kowalski Leadership Award
Recipient: Open
Description (according to MCC website): It is awarded to individuals who demonstrate commitment to high-quality service-learning and campus-community collaboration; success at building strategic, reciprocal, long-term partnerships with communities; and have a positive impact on both the community and the educational institution, including catalyzing institutional change necessary to sustain and grow these civic engagement efforts.

Ohio Campus Compact (OCC)

Award: Charles J. Ping Student Award for Ohio
Recipient: Students
Description (according to OCC website): The 2007 Charles J. Ping Student Award application is open to all Ohio Campus Compact members' students. This award is designed to recognize and honor undergraduate students for their outstanding leadership and contributions to community service or service-learning on their campus and within their community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AmeriCorps*VISTA. (2007). Retrieved March 27, 2007, from http://www.americorps.org/about/programs/vista.asp

Astin, A., & Sax, L. (1998). How Undergraduates are Affected by Service Participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A., Vogelgesang, L., Ikede, E., & Yee, J. (2000). How Service Learning Affects Students [Electronic Version]. *UCLA Higher Education Research Institute*. Retrieved December 1, 2006 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/PDFs/HSLAS/HSLAS.PDF.

Astin, A. W. (2004). Exercising Leadership to Promote the Civic Mission of Higher Education [Electronic Version]. *Florida Campus Compact*. Retrieved December 1, 2006 from http://www.floridacampuscompact.org/misc/astinspeech.html.

Atlantic Cape Community College. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.atlantic.edu/

Barber, B. R. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone : the politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Ballatine Books.

Beaumont, E., Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). Promoting Political Competence and Engagement in College Students: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Political Science Education, 3*(3), 249-270.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1986). *Habits of the heart : individualism and commitment in American life* (1st Perennial Library ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Bok, D. C. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges : a candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowley, E. (2003a). The Minnesota Campus Civic Engagement Study: Defining Civic Engagement in a New Century [Electronic Version]. *Minnesota Higher Education Services Office and Minnesota Campus Compact*. Retrieved November 29, 2006 from http://www.mncampuscompact.org/vertical/Sites/{E34AF879-F177-472C-9EB0-D811F247058B}/uploads/{F19C5D4D-1DFD-4A15-B67D-2792E4036D13}.PDF.

Bowley, E. (2003b). To Serve the College or the Community? [Electronic Version]. *Campus Compact*. Retrieved February 12, 2007 from http://www.compact.org/policy/FWS.pdf.

Bowley, E. (2007). Federal Work-Study. *Campus Compact* Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.compact.org/policy/federal_work_study

Boyte, H., & Kari, N. (1996). *Building America : the democratic promise of public work.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Boyte, H., & Kari, N. (2000). Renewing the Democratic Spirit in American Colleges and Universities. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education.* Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Brookdale Community College. (2007). February 28, 2007, from http://www.brookdale.cc.nj.us/

Buttler, J., & Williams, S. (2007). Trends in Nursing.

California's Call to Service [Electronic (2001). Version]. *California State University.* Retrieved November 29, 2006 from http://www.calstate.edu/csl/initiatives/documents/GovCall_Fall.pdf.

California's Call to Service: The California State University Responds [Electronic (2003). Version]. Retrieved March 4, 2007 from http://www.calstate.edu/csl/initiatives/documents/2002-03_gcs_progress_report.pdf.

The California State University. (2007). Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://www.calstate.edu/csl/initiatives/resolution.shtml

Calvert, R. E. (2006). Political Education and the Modern University In R. E. Calvert (Ed.), *To Restore American Democracy: Political Education and the Modern University* (pp. xii, 276 p.). Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Campus Compact. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.compact.org/

Cantor, N., & Lavine, S. (2006). Taking Public Scholarship Seriously [Electronic Version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved March 17, 2007 from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i40/40b02001.htm

Chang, M. J. (2000). The Impact of an Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement on Students' Racial Views and Attitudes. *Journal of General Education, 51*(1), 21-42.

Cherwitz, R., & Hartelius, J. (2007). Making a "Great 'Engaged' University" Requires Rhetoric. In J. Burke (Ed.), *Fixing the Fragmented Public University: Decentralization with Direction.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The College of New Jersey. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.tcnj.edu/

Cribb, T. (2006). The Coming Crisis in Citizenship: Higher Education's Failure to Teach America's History and Institutions [Electronic Version]. *Intercollegiate Studies Program*. Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.americancivicliteracy.org/report/pdf/09-26-06/civic_literacy_report.pdf.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dote, L., Cramer, K., Dietz, N., & Grimm, R. (2006). College Students Helping America [Electronic Version]. *Corporation for National & Community Service*. Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.nationalservice.org/pdf/06_1016_RPD_college_full.pdf.

Downes, L., Freeman, W., & Sulton, J. (2003). A Blueprint for Excellence: New Jersey's Long Range Plan for Higher Education ~ Stage 1 ~ [Electronic Version]. *New Jersey Commission on Higher Education*. Retrieved March 19, 2007 from http://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/PDFs/lrp1103.pdf.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eyler, J., Giles, D., & Braxton, J. (1997). The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*(4), 5-15.

Fish, S. (2003). Aim Low: Confusing Democratic Values With Academic Ones Can Easily Damage the Quality of Education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(36), C.5.

FY2007 State Budget. (2007). Retrieved March 27, 2007, from http://www.rutgers.edu/FY2007budget/impact.shtml

Galston, W. (2001). Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. *The Annual Review of Political Science*(4), 217-234.

Giles, D., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994). The Impact of a College Community Service Laboratory on Students' Personal, Social, and Cognitive Outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 327-339.

Gray, M., Ondaatje, E., Fricker, R., Geschwind, S., Goldman, C., Kaganoff, T., et al. (1998). *Coupling Service and Learning in Higher Education: The Final Report of the Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program.*

Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects [Electronic (2006). Version]. *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and CIRCLE*. Retrieved November

29, 2006 from
http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/files/elibrary/highered_civic.pdf.

Hill, K. (2004). Nurses Protect with Homeland Security. *The Record*

Hollander, E., & Hartley, M. (2000). Civic Renewal in Higher Education: The State of the Movement and the Need for a National Network. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Hudson County Community College. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.hccc.edu/

Hurtado, S. (2003). Preparing College Students for a Diverse Democracy [Electronic Version]. *University of Michigan Center for Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education*. Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/031819.FIS_report_Wed_rev.pdf.

Hurtado, S., Engberg, M., & Ponjuan, L. (2003). The Impact of the College Experience on Students' Learning for a Diverse Democracy [Electronic Version]. *University of Michigan Center for Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education*. Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/Ashe03num2.pdf.

Invest in Our Future. (March 19, 2007). *The Times of Trenton*.

Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Katz, S. (2006). What Has Happened to the Professoriate? [Electronic Version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved March 17, 2007 from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i07/07b00801.htm.

Keohane, N. O. (2006). *Higher ground : ethics and leadership in the modern university*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kirlin, M. (2002). Civic Skill Building: The Missing Component in Service Programs? *PS: Political Science and Politics, 35*, 571-575.

Laird, T., Engberg, M., & Hurtado, S. (2005). Modeling Accentuation Effects: Enrolling in a Diversity Course and the Importance of Social Action Engagement. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 448-476.

Lawrence, F. (2000). State of the University Address [Electronic Version]. *Rutgers University*. Retrieved February 28, 2007 from http://senate.rutgers.edu/state00.html.

Mann, A., & Forsberg, M. (2006). Flunking Out: New Jersey's Support for Higher Education Falls Short [Electronic Version]. *New Jersey Policy Perspective.* Retrieved March 27, 2007 from http://www.cnjscl.org/Library/Flunking%20Out%202006.pdf.

McCormick, R. (2006). Transforming Undergraduate Education: President's Recommendations to the Rutgers University Board of Governors regarding Undergraduate Education on the New Brunswick/Piscataway Campus [Electronic Version]. *Rutgers University.* Retrieved February 28, 2007 from http://urwebsrv.rutgers.edu/transform_ru/presidents_plan/pdf/presidents_plan.pdf.

Mertz, F., Collins, K., & Oswald, J. (2005). A Blueprint for Excellence: New Jersey's Long Range Plan for Higher Education [Electronic Version]. *New Jersey Commission on Higher Education.* Retrieved January 31, 2007 from http://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/PDFs/LRPupdate05.pdf.

Minnesota Office of Higher Education. (2007). Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://www.ohe.state.mn.us/

Misa, K., Anderson, J., & Yamamura, E. (2005). The Lasting Impact of College on Young Adults' Civic and Political Engagement [Electronic Version]. *UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.* Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~heri/PP/Lasting%20Impact%20of%20College%20-%20ASHE05.pdf.

Montclair State University. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.montclair.edu/

Murry, Y. (2002). *CASE Service-Learning Advocate Training Guide 2001-2002.*

Nelson, D. (2007). PSYC 216: Child Psychology.

New Jersey's Strategic Plan for Higher Education - Working Draft. (2007). New Jersey Commission on Higher Education

NJ: Campus Compact Coordinator. (2007). Retrieved March 27, 2007, from https://recruit.cns.gov/searchDetails.asp?listingid='07VSANJ003-3'&

Pipho, C. (2001). State Policy Options to Support a P-16 System of Public Education. Retrieved April 2, 2007, from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/30/28/3028.htm

Quinones, E. (2007). Playground Project Benefits Day Care Center and Princeton Students [Electronic Version]. *Princeton University.* Retrieved March 21, 2007 from http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S17/18/98O13/.

Raritan Valley Community College. (2007). Retrieved February 18, 2007, from http://www.raritanval.edu/

Raritan Valley Community College Strategic Plan [Electronic (2002). Version]. Retrieved February 28, 2007 from http://www.raritanval.edu/publications/sp_docs/RVCC_Strategic_Plan.pdf.

Reuben, J. A. (1996). *The making of the modern university : intellectual transformation and the marginalization of morality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Saltmarsh, J. (1996). Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Community Service Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*(3), 13-21.

Sandel, M. (2006). Liberal Education and the Civic Project. In R. E. Calvert (Ed.), *To Restore American Democracy: Political Education and the Modern University.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Sax, L. (2000). Citizenship Development and the American College Student. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education.* Phoenix Oryx Press.

Sax, L. (2004). Citizenship Development and the American College Student. In J. Dalton, T. Russell & S. Kline (Eds.), *Assessing Character Outcomes in College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, C. (2005). Liberal Education and the Civic Engagement Gap. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shafer, M., & Murry, Y. (2002). *CASE Program Annual Report 2001-2002.*

Shafer, M., & Murry, Y. (2003). *CASE Program Annual Report 2002-2003.*

Shapiro, H. T. (2005). *A larger sense of purpose : higher education and society.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Transforming Undergraduate Education [Electronic (2005). Version]. *Rutgers Task Force on Undergraduate Education.* Retrieved February 28, 2007 from http://www.rutgers.edu/fullreport.pdf.

Union County College. (2007). February 28, 2007, from http://www.ucc.edu/default.htm

Vogelgesang, L. (2004). Diversity Work and Service-Learning: Understanding Campus Dynamics. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 10*(3), 34-43.

Wellman, J. (2000). Accounting for the Civic Roles: Assessment and Accountability for Civic Education and Institutional Service. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education.* Phoenix: Oryx Press.

William Paterson University. (2007). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://ww2.wpunj.edu/

Williamson, S. (2007). McCormick, Students React to Governor's New Budget [Electronic Version]. *The Daily Targum*. Retrieved March 27, 2007 from http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2007/02/27/PageOne/Mccormick.Students.React.To.Governors.New.Budget-2744393.shtml.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Bonner Foundation

Foell, Christen. Program Coordinator of the Bonner Leader Program. Personal Interview. 8 Feb. 2007.

McGrath, Erin. Program Director of the Bonner Leader Program. Personal Interview. 8 Feb. 2007.

New Jersey Commission on Higher Education

Oswald, Jeanne. Deputy Executive Director. Phone Interview. 16 Mar. 2007.

Raritan Valley Community College

Buttler, Jan. Associate Professor of Health Science Education. Personal Interview. 15 Feb. 2007.

Crabill, Casey. President of Raritan Valley. Personal Interview. 7 Feb. 2007.

Moog, Lori. Program Manager of Community Outreach. Personal Interview. 2 Feb. 2007.

Nelson, Dana. Instructor of Social Science & Education. Personal Interview. 13 Feb. 2007.

Ryan, Jerry. Former President of Raritan Valley. Personal Interview. 5 Feb. 2007.

Williams, Susan. Nursing Instructor, Health Science Education Department. Personal Interview. 15 Feb. 2007.

Rutgers University

Chmielewski, Randi. Eagleton Institute of Politics, Events Coordinator and Youth Political Participation Program. Personal Interview. 27 Feb. 2007.

Elias, Maurice. Professor of Psychology. Personal Interview. 5 Mar. 2007.

Forman, Susan. Professor of Psychology and Former Vice President for Undergraduate Education (1994-2004). Personal Interview. 20 Feb. 2007.

Leech, Beth. Professor of Political Science. Personal Interview. 6 Feb. 2007.

Matto, Elizabeth. Eagleton Institute of Politics, Youth Political Participation Program. Personal Interview. 27 Feb. 2007.

Michaels, Amy. Senior Program Coordinator of the Office for Academic and Public Partnerships in the Arts and Humanities. Personal Interview. 15 Feb. 2007.

Murry, Yvette. Former Associate Director of the CASE Program (1994-2006). Phone Interview. 3 Feb. 2007.

Nazario, Isabel. Associate Vice President for Academic and Public Partnerships in the Arts and Humanities. Personal Interview. 15 Feb. 2007.

O'Neill, Theresa. Career Management Specialist at Rutgers-Newark and Director of CASE-Newark. Personal Interview. 6 Feb. 2007.

Shafer, Michael. Professor of Political Science and Former Director of the CASE Program (1994-2004). Personal Interview. 26 Jan. 2007.

Stewart, Lea. Professor of Communications. Phone Interview. 9 Feb. 2007.

Van Til, Jon. Professor of Urban Studies and Community Planning at Rutgers-Camden. Personal Interview. 15 Mar. 2007.

The College of New Jersey

Camp, Heather. Associate Director of the Bonner Center for Civic and Community Engagement. Personal Interview. 8 Feb. 2007.

Donohue, Pat. Director of the Bonner Center for Civic and Community Engagement Personal Interview. 2 Mar. 2007.

Gitenstein, Barbara. President of The College of New Jersey. Personal Interview. 28 Feb. 2007.

Paul, Beth. Professor of Psychology and Interim Provost. Personal Interview. 2 Mar. 2007.

Prensky, Dave. Former Director of the Bonner Center. Personal Interview. 19 Feb. 2007.

Scarpati, Nino. Assistant Dean of Nursing and Former Director of the Office of Civic Leadership Development. Personal Interview. 28 Feb. 2007.

This thesis represents my own work in accordance with University Regulations.

I authorize Princeton University to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Andrew Paul Frederick