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Introduction

Two thousand years ago, Roman senator and legendary orator and author, Marcus Tullius Cicero declared triumphantly, “civis Romanus sum,” or “I am a Roman Citizen.” This was a proud boast when few were citizens. It was enough to stop arbitrary condemnation, bonds, and scourging, because Roman citizenship granted the right to be tried in Roman courts.

Citizenship, today, in the United States confers many well-established individual rights. However, to protect, maintain, and enlarge these rights requires that citizens accept the responsibility to defend and exercise them as well. If we want to boast proudly that we are American citizens, we must not simply wear the title as an honorary office, but must understand that to be a citizen, we must act as citizens with the responsibility of self-government. Even in societies where titles are hereditary, the title brings responsibilities. Therefore, Americans who have inherited the blessings of freedom and democratic government must learn about and practice the responsibilities that come with that heritage.

As Americans, each of us has a responsibility – perhaps even a sacred trust, to insure that our country, its states and communities always remain in the words of Abraham Lincoln, a “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

You can meet that responsibility by registering and voting; making known your desires and beliefs on particular issues; getting involved in campaigns for candidates who support your beliefs; personally applying those values and beliefs through some form of public service or civic activity; and, ultimately by running for public office yourself, if you desire.

Every one of us has a moral obligation to serve his or her country at the community, state, or national level. For some, that could mean military service. But for others, there are a host of opportunities to serve others through the new USA Freedom Corps or the Peace Corps, through teaching, through work with a government agency, or even by running for public office.

For all that is wrong with our system of government, and there is much that needs repair, it remains a place where one can truly and uniquely make a difference, where one can help improve our country and, sometimes, even the world.

Amidst all the sadness and anxiety following the tragic events of September 11, 2001, there are some positive developments. In several national opinion polls, young people are looking favorably at public and community service. In fact, seventy percent of America’s youth say that they are now at least somewhat more likely to participate in politics and vote as a result of the war on terrorism. Fully one-third say they are now much more likely to participate.
That’s great news because we truly need more than the flag waving and patriotic fervor that followed September 11th to sustain our democracy. We need to summon within us a patriotism that is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but is the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime.

The Massachusetts Campaign for Civic Education, led by the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration, is part of the Campaign to Promote Civic Education. The Campaign has two important objectives. The first is to reaffirm the civic mission of our nation’s schools and the second is to encourage states and school districts devote a sustained and systematic attention to civic education for kindergarten through twelfth grade and even into college.

With this in mind, the Massachusetts Campaign for Civic Education, with financial support from the Center for Civic Education, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, and the Lincoln Filene Foundation, in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Education, the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, the Massachusetts General Court’s Joint Legislative Committee on Education, and the Boston University Center for Ethics, convened a summit of educational and public policy leaders to focus on the need to develop a curriculum framework to introduce civic learning concepts and practice to those preparing to teach and those seeking professional development in teaching. The summit attracted representatives of teacher preparation and development programs at many of the Commonwealth’s leading public and independent colleges and universities as well as representatives of public education and charter schools for a daylong symposium on civic learning. It was held in the Senate Reception Room in the State House in Boston – the former Senate Chamber where, as Senate President, Horace Mann launched the drive for free public education for every child in Massachusetts.

This book contains the papers presented by distinguished scholars who participated in the Summit. It is the hope of the sponsors and participants of the Summit that this information will encourage discussion among educators, policy makers, and all citizens of the need to strengthen and promote civic learning among all our citizens so that they may be active partners in governing our communities, our Commonwealth, and our country.

Senator Richard T. Moore, President
Massachusetts Chapter
American Society for Public Administration
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Opening Remarks by Senator Richard T. Moore
President, Massachusetts Chapter, American Society for Public Administration

As President of the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration, I am pleased to welcome each of you to this “Summit on Civic Learning in Teacher Preparation.” As a member of the Massachusetts Senate, I also want to welcome you to this historic building – the Massachusetts State House – and to this room that, from the opening of this building in 1798 to 1898, served as the meeting place of the Massachusetts Senate.

Among America’s early giants in public education, there was a belief that preservation of our democracy was inextricably linked to the need for an educated citizenry. In his recent book, Making Patriots, Walter Berns, John M. Olin Professor Emeritus at Georgetown University, writes:

“Thomas Jefferson…(in founding the University of Virginia)...proposed the teaching of John Locke’s treatises and Algernon Sidney’s discourses on government, as well as other works expounding the general principles of liberty and the rights of man, in nature and society. His purpose,” Berns noted, “was to secure republican government in America by ensuring that students be thoroughly schooled in its first principles.”

B erns added: “Inculcation of a love of country, like moral education generally, takes place at an earlier age, which is why Jefferson also proposed that the young – boys and girls alike, and without regard “to wealth, birth, or other accidental conditions or circumstance” – be educated at public expense. A liberal education “reading, writing, and common arithmetick,” Jefferson writes, followed by the reading of Graecian, Roman, English, and American history, “would render them “worthy to receive, and able to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens.”

Our own Horace Mann, who once presided in this very Chamber and whose portrait is displayed on the wall to my left, also promoted the concept of public education to train future citizens to preserve and lead our democracy as well as to produce competent professionals, business people and workers with the skills needed for economic security. Mann explained: “In order that men may be prepared for self-government, their apprenticeship must commence in childhood. The great moral attribute of self-government cannot be born and matured in a day, and if school children are not trained to it, we only prepare ourselves for disappointment.”

In our own time, a leading observer of the moral status of education and society, for U. S. Education Secretary William Bennett, writes in his latest book, “Why We Fight,”
“…‘what is not taught will be forgotten, and what is forgotten cannot be defended.’ In these pithy, precise words,” Bennett notes, “the American Council of Trustees and Alumni recently summarized the utter failure of our institutions of higher learning to provide college students with a thorough grounding in the history and civilization of their own country.”

“The ignorance of our college students,” Bennett continues, “is old news; even older news is the ignorance of students, and teachers, at lower levels. That ignorance has been documented over and over again in international comparative surveys in which American children regularly score at or near the bottom in mastery of everything from math to history…If our students do not know their nation’s past, have never been informed about the ideals and values of their society, how are they to participate knowledgeably in our national life…how are they to understand the challenges to American principles and values, or what it has taken to defend and protect them, over the last two centuries and still today?”

The dramatic outpouring of patriotic sentiment and widespread display of patriotic symbols after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 was encouraging to many of us who worry about the future of American democracy. Prior to that defining event, we had witnessed a dramatic decline in voting and participation in the civic process. As our keynote speaker, Derek Bok, notes in the introduction to his book, The Trouble With Government, “The number of people to trust the federal government to do the right thing all or most of the time plummeted from 76 percent in 1964 to 21 percent in 1994…”

If we want the patriotism of Americans that followed September 11th to be sustained throughout the time that the President, and other leaders, have described as a long-term effort to eliminate the threat of terrorism, and more importantly, if we want the American people to understand why they are fighting and what they are fighting for, beyond the base instincts of retaliation, we need to make significant changes to an educational curriculum that, for the past twenty-five years has, at best, ignored teaching civics at any level and, at worst, promoted beliefs that could be described as antagonistic toward America.

According to a recent article that appeared in the Washington Post and The Boston Globe, the Bush Administration is seriously considering options for rekindling civic education throughout America that could include federal incentives for states to adopt civic education classes and standards in public schools.

Another reason to provide our students at all levels with an understanding of our history and our democratic principles and civic participation skills, is to help interest them in the opportunity for careers in government service where a large number of openings are expected in federal and state service to fill senior executive and administrative positions that will be vacant from retirement of the generation that was inspired to public service by John F. Kennedy’s call to do something for their country.

Beyond encouraging some of our brightest young minds to seek careers in government service, we also need to encourage bright, honest men and women to consider elective office as well. As U. S. Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut wrote in his book, In Praise of Public Life, “For all that is wrong with our system of government, and there is much that needs repair, it remains a place where
one can truly and uniquely make a difference, where one can help improve our country and, occasionally, even our world. We need to convince more young people who want to make a difference to enter public service. For the American experiment in self-government to remain vital, we need more people to serve in that government and to live public lives. If we didn’t have politicians, we would need to invent them. We can turn our backs and abandon them in disgust, thereby ensuring that the government does indeed belong to the privileged and powerful few. Or we can conclude that public life is a worthy pursuit, that it can be an honorable, constructive, satisfying, enjoyable career, deserving of the best among us. We need to nurture this belief, especially in the generation now coming of age.”

In more immediate terms, however, if we want our public school students to advance in school and graduate from high school, their teachers will need to help them understand, not just the math, science and language skills to pass the current Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment of Skills (MCAS), they will soon need to prepare them to be measured in the areas of history, civics, economics, and geography.

Before we can teach these skills to the students of Massachusetts, we need to prepare those who seek to teach and those who wish to improve their professional development. Our present and future teachers need to learn about the ideals and principles of American democracy and how citizens participate in their government at all levels. In order to do this we need to review our current curriculum for the preparation and professional development of teachers to determine how best to incorporate the concept of civic learning. Our speakers today will help you to think about this issue and offer some suggestions that may be of assistance.

During our “working lunch,” we want to hear from you on how we might support the effort to bring civic learning into your curriculum and how we can evaluate our collective efforts during the coming year in order to determine our next steps in restoring the historic civic education mission of public education so necessary to the preservation of our democracy.
Opening Remarks by Chancellor Judith I. Gill, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education

The Board of Higher Education is delighted to co-sponsor this important conference on the need for higher education to integrate more effectively the concepts of civic learning into the teacher preparation curriculum. The need, according to many writers, exists because sustained and systematic attention to the study of civics and government has been neglected in too many American schools. This wasn’t true in my youth, for in elementary and secondary school civic learning was a valued component infused into the curriculum of most of my classroom work and into required school activities. It also was a topic at home. And the theme of responsibility and giving back to my community dominated many dinner table conversations.

The person I am today is embodied in the love and excitement I felt as a young person when the topic was one related to government activities, to political leaders, or civic involvement focused on making changes that would improve the quality of life for all citizens or for a group of individuals. Idealist? You bet! The glass is definitely half full.

We know, and our children know that life is hard. It is not fair, and many days are filled with disappointments. Thus don’t we as educators have a very real responsibility to ensure that our children’s teachers help them to understand that tomorrow can be different and that each child has the power to make it better?

The phrase, curriculum frameworks, does not translate into textbook learning only. The basic principles of government, the facts, the statements on values and the speeches of great political leaders will be found in books, but civic education is more interactive. It was for me, and I suspect it will be for our children and grandchildren. If we are to ask the next generation to make an investment in the political processes that are essential to democracy, we need to provide examples that will encourage learning.

In the 1950s and early sixties I was a student in the Brookline school system. We had a native son who ran for president, and classroom discussion included the intrigue of the Nixon-Kennedy debates and arguments on why a Catholic should or shouldn’t be president. We had field trips to Lexington and Concord, to the Charlestown Navy Yard to tour the Constitution, and to the State House to sit in the House gallery. There were class elections and discussions on Cuba, Russia and the cold war. In high school we debated why our brothers must go to Vietnam, and we mourned the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy and tried to answer the question WHY? What happened? And how can we make it different? As a student activist at UMass in the late sixties and early seventies, I brought state legislators to campus to help them understand why students were protesting.
and why that was not a good reason for cutting funds to public higher education; I asked that
legislation be filed to add a student to the UMass Board of Trustees, and I interned at NASA's
legislative office in Washington, D.C. Following graduation, my involvement in political campaigns
continued, and my interest in the politics and policies of public higher education provided the
foundation for my scholarship. Today it is my belief that I can make a difference that keeps me going
on the difficult, tension-filled days.

Higher education in Massachusetts has responded to the challenge of re-engaging students in civic
life, but there is clearly more to be done. One of the best models on which we can build is the Campus
Compact, a national coalition of more than 800 college and university presidents committed to the
civic purposes of higher education. To support this mission, Campus Compact has responded to the
challenge of re-engaging students in civic life, but there is clearly more to be done. To support this
civic mission, the Compact promotes community service that develops students' citizenship
(http://www.compact.org/aboutcc/) skills and values, encourages partnerships between campuses
and communities and assists faculty who seek to integrate public and community engagement into
their teaching and research. The Massachusetts Campus Compact, located at Tufts University,
involves 60 public and independent colleges and universities from throughout the Commonwealth. In
the past six years, over 250,000 college students have provided over 12 million hours of community
service, often growing out of a course in which service learning was a component. The Campus
Compact reflects the desire of our institutions to encourage civic engagement and the willingness of
students to contribute to their communities.

These kinds of activities are one way that higher education has responded to the challenge of
engaging students in our civic life, but there is another role for higher education in this effort. True
civic education must include a clear sense of who we are as a people, where we have been as a nation,
and where we can and will go in the future. This is the provenance of the arts and sciences. It is
through the work of scholars in our colleges and universities that we interpret the changes in the world
around us and forge new understandings in each generation.

But to bring this broad and deep civic education to our children in the public schools, we must
rely on the teachers and the teacher educators on our college campuses. Teacher educators form the
vital link between the understandings that emerge from the arts and sciences and the development of
citizenship and a sense of civic belonging in the school children of a nation of immigrants. It is for
teacher educators to make and maintain that connection so that civic education does not slide into
indoctrination on the one hand or meaningless generalities on the other.

More important, perhaps, we look to teacher educators to prepare teachers who can engage our
children and youth in the task of sustaining and renewing our civic life. Teachers pursuing a civic
agenda must compete for their students' attention against a world of intense commercial pressure to
seek material gratification and personal wealth. Engaging students in the civic agenda calls for
commitment, ingenuity, and a clear sense of mission.
While there is much to be proud of in higher education’s contribution to civic education, there is much to be done. We need to look more closely at the standards for civic education identified by scholars. We need to determine what we can do to provide the environment where students will learn the importance and excitement of being a part of the democratic process.

In the past three years I have worked closely with many of you as your advocate to assist you in carrying out your important responsibilities. I will continue to be one – especially in this critical area to help you to provide faculty with the tools to help instill in those students who will educate our children the love and excitement I enjoyed in every civic education experience.
Summit Presentation

The Trouble With Government is the Lack of Participation By Informed Citizens

Remarks by Derek Bok, President Emeritus
Harvard University and Author of The Trouble With Government

Senator Moore, thank you very much, and congratulations for inspiring and organizing this Summit on Civic Learning. We know that greater attention to civic education in schools and in the preparation of schoolteachers is very much needed, but all too often neglected. Just this week, the subject got an unexpected boost from the President of the United States, who announced a new federal interest in promoting civic education. This gathering, therefore, could not be more timely.

As I talk to you today, I am mindful of something a distinguished former Harvard student, Adlai Stevenson, used to say when he went around the country speaking in his ill-starred efforts to win the presidency of the United States from President Eisenhower. He would often begin by looking out at his audience and saying, “It is your job, today, to listen; and it is my job to speak, and if history is any guide, you will be finished with your work long before I have finished mine.”

I am also mindful of some advice that a Harvard colleague once gave me. Shortly after I had taken office and delivered an exceptionally turgid and lengthy speech, he gave me a report of a study that had been done by a psychologist about the attention span of audiences to speeches such as the one on which I am about to give. According to this study, for the first ten minutes the audience is really carefully attuned to what the speaker says, during the second ten minutes the attention of the audience begins to wander in and out, and after twenty minutes, the thoughts of the audience start to stray increasingly into what the author called “erotic fantasies.”

Well, the last thing I want to do is to come over from Cambridge and encourage you to indulge in anything as depraved as that. Therefore, I’m going to speak for considerably less than the hour that
I’ve been allotted on the program in the hope that we can have a discussion about any and all of the concerns that bring us all here today.

I thought I’d try to put the subject into context by talking a little bit about why civic education matters much more than we have given it credit for in recent years. We hear a lot about issues like “clean elections” and election reform, particularly after the election of 2000. We hear much less about what is undeniably the sad state of civic participation in this country, the lack of civic engagement in our own political system.

I believe that’s a big mistake. The more that I work at legislative reform of one kind or another, the more convinced I am that without an active, voting citizenry, a lot of other reforms are not going to accomplish much, or at least accomplish what people expect when they enact them. We are far from an active, engaged citizenry at the present time. There’s a lot of evidence, as we know, of the decline that has occurred in civic engagement in the last forty years. Voting participation is what we hear about most. It has gone down by about twenty percent since the early Sixties. This decline is especially remarkable when you remember that during that period of time, African Americans have been enfranchised, the college-educated population has markedly increased (and education is what is most strongly correlated with voting) and registration laws that used to keep people from becoming eligible to vote have been greatly eased. All of those things should have caused voting participation to rise substantially and, yet, it has declined by twenty percent.

Voting is not the only thing that has declined. There’s much less participation in election campaigns, fewer people run for office, they don’t go to campaign meetings, the number who give money to candidates is down almost fifty percent, and even a very simple act like watching the presidential debates has declined. About sixty percent of Americans watched Nixon debate Kennedy. Only about thirty percent took the trouble to watch Gore and Bush, even though that was a close election. There were wide differences between the candidates. People theoretically should have been interested in what they had to say, but they weren’t.

The interesting thing about those figures is that individual Americans are not actually participating less. How can that be, you may ask? What I mean is that people my age continue to vote at pretty much the same percentage as they ever did. What has happened is that each succeeding
generation has been less involved in civic affairs than the generation before. People under the age of thirty are not bothering to go to the polls even in presidential elections, voting at less than 33 percent. I’m not just talking about poor kids, or kids who don’t finish high school. Even college students today, whom we survey, and have surveyed for many years now, have the lowest level of political involvement, political interest, political conversation than they have ever had since the polls were invented in the 1960s.

That tells us something. If there’s one thing that is certain, it is that as time goes on there are going to be fewer and fewer citizens my age who are still able to vote. There are going to be more and more citizens, young citizens – the ones who are voting less than one third. What that means is that it is inevitable that civic participation in this country, as anemic as it is, is going to continue to get lower and lower if we don’t do something about it.

Strangely, not everybody is concerned about this decline in participation. You find that some political scientists, even those who ought to know better, who say; “Well, that is all right because it shows that everyone is contented.” That is sheer nonsense! If people are not voting because they are contented, it is very odd that all the surveys of satisfaction, confidence, and trust in government have gone down substantially during the same period of time that voting has declined. Moreover, those people who have the most reason to be dissatisfied with the government – the poor, less-educated people, – should be voting more according to this theory. Yet, they vote by far the least.

Most of the surveys show that people don’t vote because they don’t think politicians pay attention to their views. That’s another tragic misconception, because if there ever was a time when politicians pay very close attention to opinion polls, focus groups and every other evidence of public opinion, that time is now. So there’s every reason for citizens to be involved, but, tragically, they feel that it’s all a waste of time.

There are other, supposedly wise people, who tell us that it’s rather a good thing that not so many people vote or get involved. They reason that if people are apathetic, if they’re not interested, if they’re not well educated, we don’t really want them vote. They won’t know enough to make intelligent, informed choices.
When I was in the Magic Kingdom in Orlando talking to a group about higher education, I happened to pick up a copy of the Orlando Sentinel. The Sentinel has a columnist, Charlie Reese, who expressed this sentiment very pungently. He said, “the notion that it would be a good thing for more ignorant ignoramuses to enter the polling booth and pull a lever is one of the tragic misconceptions of post-industrial society.” Well, actually, you snicker a little at that remark, and yet, a hundred a fifty years ago one of the great political theorists of all time, John Stuart Mill, had many of the same sentiments.

Mill was worried about the consequences of allowing the least educated citizens to vote. At the same time, he believed, on principle, that everyone should have a say in a democracy. Therefore, he came up with this marvelous solution. He said, “let’s let everybody vote, but let’s allow the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge to have two votes.”

Of course, we laugh at that proposal today. Can you imagine someone saying let’s give the graduates of Harvard and MIT graduates two votes? That would hardly be a popular scheme in this Commonwealth. Yet the tragic thing is that Mill’s plan bears an eerie resemblance to the actual situation that we have today. If you look at the figures, people with college degrees do vote twice as often as people who have much more limited education. Therefore, in all practical respects, the vote of the highly educated segment of the population does count twice as much as people who are less well educated.

Mr. Reese of the Orlando Sentinel says that’s a good thing, our government will improve. If you believe that, you must believe that the most enlightened, most effective government in the United States is in Mississippi, in Alabama, in South Carolina where the voting participation is really low, especially among the less educated citizens. But, of course, the very opposite is true. If you look at all the surveys of effective government, you find that the highest rated governments are all in states where the voting rates exceed the levels in the population as a whole.

I suspect that what most people feel is not that it’s a good thing that fewer people vote. Most people recognize the fallacy in Mr. Reese’s argument. But I think most people probably feel that even though the situation is not idea – even though they’d like to have more people voting, more people participating – we still have enough participation to make the system work perfectly well. After all,
almost 100 million people go to the polls in presidential elections, surely that is sufficient to ensure that the government adequately reflects the public will.

Unfortunately, that opinion is mistaken, too, because it doesn’t take sufficient account of all the negative consequences of this apathetic, low-participation democracy that we currently have. In fact, a surprising number of the things that trouble people the most about government have a direct relationship to the apathy in the citizenry. For example, people don’t like the partisanship, the polarization in American politics today. All the polls show that. Yet, polarization is very much a consequence of apathy, because as fewer people vote, the one’s who continue to vote are the zealots. They’re the ones who feel so passionately that everyone must have guns, or that trees should never be cut down or goodness knows what else. It is not surprising, then, that all the studies show that the kinds of people who are nominated and ultimately elected tend to be further to right and further to the left than the general public. As a result, we get a polarized government with all the effects and backbiting and the negativism that we dislike.

People also don’t like the news media; they that they are sensationalized; they dwell on scandal rather than substance; they are too negative and shrill. But what do you expect? If the readership of newspapers are declining one percent a year, as it has for a very long time, of course the media are going to resort to more and more scandal, more human interest stories, more sensational accounts or whatever else grabs people’s attention, and the substance content of stories about government and politics is going to suffer.

Then, there are the interest groups. We don’t like interest groups. Most Americans say that all policies in Washington are made by only a few people representing powerful interests. A 1995 survey found that eighty-six percent agreed that Congress is too heavily influenced by interest groups in making its decisions. Yet interest groups thrive on an apathetic, inattentive public. Only an engaged, active, attentive citizenry can keep special interests in check.

The defects in the political process that flourish in an apathetic environment can only heighten the cynicism and distrust that already characterize the views of many Americans toward their government. Although a measure of skepticism toward government can be healthy for any democracy, suspicion can easily become excessive. Whereas too much trust allows officials to grow
complacent and irresponsible, severe distrust can make it impossible to muster the support needed to act effectively when circumstances require. Cooperation and compromise may become more difficult to achieve.

Finally, belief in the Constitution, and the framework of government that it provides, has long been a unifying force for America. With the end of the Cold War and any major opposing superpower, Americans could lose sight of the importance of preserving and protecting our democratic institutions. Without an established national religion, a monarchy or a respected head of state, America has historically placed their trust and confidence in the Constitution and its system of government. If election after election yields results that don’t satisfy the people and voting continues to decline, voters may decide that it is not just the officials who have lost touch, but the institutions themselves.

We are not likely to see an immediate rejection of our democratic institutions resulting from the cynicism and distrust that Americans bear toward government, the media, and other democratic institutions. The dangers are more subtle. Amidst the multitude of interest groups, religious denominations, advocacy organizations, and associations of all kinds, government is the one authoritative agency that can define, enunciate and validate a set of common moral standards for all people. Our constitutional system sets forth the essential framework of the social order: our basic liberties, our fundamental standards of fairness, our equality of rights enjoyed by different races, genders and ethnic groups. Continued lack of confidence in elected officials and diminished respect for the work they do could eventually weaken the moral authority of the state and its ability to exercise leadership and achieve compromise among the diverse factions that comprise America.

What can the country do to restore a proper balance between citizen power and civic responsibility? One answer lies in furthering what I take to be the central purpose to this gathering today. We must find ways to encourage active and informed citizen participation. We must look for ways of encouraging citizens to give more time and energy to their civic responsibilities.

Civic education in the public schools is clearly the first step toward increased civic participation. Washington and Jefferson understood this, and so did Horace Mann, the father of public education in America who has been mentioned earlier and whose portrait hangs in this very room. Mann declared
“One of the highest and most valuable objects to which the influence of a school can be made conducive consists of training our children in self-government.”

Most Americans understand this. A 1996 survey found that eighty-six percent of the public regarded civic education as a “very important” aim of education – a higher percentage than that recorded for any other educational goal. Yet civic education has now been totally eclipsed by a preoccupation with training the workforce for a global economy. Fewer than half of the states currently require high school students to complete even a one-semester course in government or civics. The Department of Education measured civic competence in a 1998 survey, it found that roughly 75 percent of high school seniors were not proficient in civics; one-third lacked even a basic comprehension of how government operates, while only 9 percent could give as many as two reasons why citizens should participate in the democratic process.

While civic education appears to be in considerable disarray, there are some hopeful signs such as projects like Kids Voting USA, in which students discuss elections in school and at home and go with their parents to vote, or in all the community service work that students are engaging in throughout the country. But much, much more needs to be done by the schools themselves. An effective civics programs should begin in the early grades, last through high school, and include a component of community service with a link to the curriculum so that students can understand how public policies relate to the social conditions they are witnessing in their service activities.

Efforts in the elementary and secondary schools will eventually prove insufficient unless out colleges continue the civic learning process. Alas, few undergraduate faculties have given specific attention to this problem. Fortunately, however, some colleges have begun to examine seriously the role of their undergraduate curriculum, in preparing active citizens. That’s a positive step. If those in this room are successful in restructuring the curriculum of teacher preparation programs to include an understanding of the teacher’s important part in preparing future citizens, another important step will have been taken. I encourage you to explore this process and provide the necessary leadership to help all of our colleges and universities to participate in producing individuals who posses the skills for actively engaging in the democratic process at home, as well as the skills for competing successfully in the global economy.
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Defining, Delivering, and Defending a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy

Remarks by John J. Patrick Professor, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington

The global surge of democracy during the last quarter of the 20th century has prompted a worldwide burst of new interest in civic education. In particular, leaders in post-communist countries have readily realized that the sustained development of an authentic democracy depends, in part, upon development through education of competent and committed citizens, who know what democracy is, how to do it, and why it is good, or at least better than the alternative types of political system.

The rising tide of international concern about education for democracy has stimulated fresh thinking about civic education in the United States of America. As educators abroad have turned to American colleagues for advice about how to teach democratic citizenship, we Americans have been challenged to think more carefully about what civic education is, how to do it, and how to justify it. My ongoing dialogue with colleagues from abroad has led to renewal and refinement of my thinking about education for citizenship in a democracy.

During the past 13 years, the period since the fall of the Berlin Wall, I have reflected and deliberated again and again with colleagues in the United States and abroad about three key questions.

1. What, exactly, is a common education for citizenship in a democracy?
2. How should a particular kind of common education for citizenship in a democracy be included in the K-12 curriculum and in the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers through higher education?
3. Why should a particular kind of education for citizenship in a democracy be implemented in K-12 schools and in programs for the education of teachers?

This paper is a summary of my tentative responses to the three key questions about the definition, delivery, and defense or justification of a common education for citizenship in a democracy. This paper, then, includes discussion of (1) a defensible definition of a common education for citizenship in a democracy, (2) how to deliver or use the definition in K-12 schools and the preservice education of
At the outset, I offer a word of caution to the consumers or users of this presentation: my conceptualization of civic education certainly is an unfinished project, a work in progress that has been and will continue to be modified and improved. So, I urge you to think critically about this presentation and to participate with me in discourse about its strengths and weaknesses as a useful guide to education for citizenship in a democracy.

**Defining a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy**

A worthy definition of education for citizenship in a democracy must be congruent with credible and practical definitions of democracy and democratic citizenship. We need a compelling image of citizenship in a democracy to guide a workable definition of education for democratic citizenship. Lengthy books have been written about the theory and practice of democracy and democratic citizenship. And the legendary social scientist, Seymour Martin Lipset, recently edited a four-volume Encyclopedia of Democracy. For the purposes of this presentation, brief definitions of democracy and democratic citizenship are offered, which have been derived from the vast literature on these two ideas.

Most political scientists agree with a minimal or threshold standard by which to judge whether or not a regime is a democracy. This minimal criterion is the regular occurrence of free, open, fair, and contested elections by which an inclusive electorate selects its representatives in government (Huntington 1991, 7). Thus, there is government by consent of the governed in which the people's representatives are accountable to the people.

A more fully developed democracy exceeds this minimal standard by providing constitutional guarantees for civil liberties and rights, which, if justice would prevail, are exercised and enjoyed equally by all individuals in the polity. In such a democracy, there certainly is, in the memorable words of Abraham Lincoln, “government of the people, by the people, for the people.” However, this popular government is both empowered and limited by the supreme law of a constitution, to which the people have consented, for the ultimate purpose of guaranteeing equally the autonomy and rights of everyone in the polity. In particular, there is constitutional and legal protection of the individual’s rights to think, speak, decide, and act freely to influence the policies and actions of government. This kind of political order is properly labeled a constitutional representative democracy, and it provides majority rule with protection of minority rights.

What image of citizenship is compatible with such a democracy? Well, responsible citizenship in a constitutional representative democracy entails the capacity for informed, reasonable, deliberative, and freely made choices in response to competitive public elections and contested public policy issues. Such freely made or self-determined choices, however, must take into account both personal, private interests and general, public interests in order for democracy, as we know it, to flourish. Thus, there is
an inescapable moral dimension to the freely made choices of democratic citizens, which involves pervasive and fundamental concern for the common good of the community.

The good citizen in a constitutional representative democracy takes responsibility for the common good by participating in and contributing to the political and civic life of the community. This quality of democratic citizenship is often labeled “enlightened self interest.” Long ago, Alexis de Tocqueville called it, “self interest rightly understood” because through voluntary contributions of time and effort to the good of the community, the citizens help one another to maintain conditions of public well-being needed for their fruitful pursuit of personal and private interests. Tocqueville wrote, “The principle of self-interest rightly understood is not a lofty one, but it is clear and sure. Each American knows when to sacrifice some of his private interests to save the rest” (Bradley 1945, Vol. II, 122-123).

According to Tocqueville, the success of American democracy was anchored in the “enlightened self interest” of citizens who regularly contributed to the common good. A leading American political scientist of our time, Robert Putnam, has confirmed the validity of Tocqueville’s insight through his empirical studies of political behavior in the United States and other countries. Putnam’s research demonstrates compellingly that the free, positive, and constructive participation of citizens in civic and political associations is “what makes democracy work” (Putnam 1993; 2000).

The four-component model of education for citizenship in a democracy, shown in Figure 1, is congruent with the preceding descriptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. Thus, it may be a useful guide to the construction, development, and implementation of common civic education in a constitutional representative democracy.

In recent years, there has been general agreement among civic educators about the four fundamental categories or components of education for citizenship in a democracy in Figure 1, which are (1) civic knowledge, (2) cognitive civic skills, (3) participatory civic skills, and (4) civic dispositions. These four categories, for example, were the interrelated components of the framework for the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in Civics. This framework will be used again to guide the next NAEP in civics (NAEP Civics Consensus Project 1996, 17-19).

The generally accepted four components of civic education have been articulated by me and others with minor variations or differences in categorical denotations. But the similarities of the alternative models are much greater than the differences. The model in Figure 1, however, includes several distinct denotations within each of its four components or categories (Patrick 2000a, 5; Patrick 1999a, 34).

Before explicating the categories and characteristics of the model, I want to stress the interrelationships and interactions among the four components. Although it is convenient to depict the components statically in a four-tiered illustration (Figure 1), I insist they be viewed and contemplated dynamically to emphasize continuous interactions of the categories in development and implementation of curriculum and instruction. As you respond to the discussion of the four-
As depicted in the first component of Figure 1, civic knowledge involves teaching and learning systematically and thoroughly a set of concepts by which democracy in today’s world is defined, practiced, and evaluated. These concepts include representative democracy or republicanism; constitutionalism or limited government and the rule of law; rights to life, liberty, equality, and property; citizenship, which entails civic identity and responsibility for the common good; civil society or a free and open society; and market economy or a free and open economy. Acquisition of such concepts as a set, a framework of connected ideas, enables learners to know complexly and deeply what a democracy in today’s world is, and what it is not; to distinguish democracy from other types of government; and to evaluate the extent to which their government and other governments of the world are or are not authentic constitutional representative democracies. (See the list of core concepts in Figure 2, page 12.)
The civic knowledge category of Figure 1 also denotes perennial and pervasive issues about the meaning and applications to political and civic life of core ideas, such as rights to liberty and the rule of law. What exactly do these ideas mean in the lives of citizens and the operations of government? How can these worthy ideas be applied through government most effectively and responsibly? Knowledge of public debates about these issues belongs in the common education of citizens in a democracy. So does knowledge of pivotal public policy decisions and landmark cases of the Supreme Court, which have exemplified ongoing controversy about the principles and practices of democracy in United States history. Further, the civic knowledge category properly includes ideas and information about the constitution and institutions of government in the polity. Finally, the history of democracy and freedom in the world is an important facet of civic knowledge that provides learners with various perspectives and contexts by which to more fully comprehend the enduring ideas, issues, decisions, and institutions associated with today’s dominant type of political order.

Basic knowledge of democracy, its principles, practices, issues, and history, must be applied effectively to civic and political life if it would be learned thoroughly and used constructively. Thus, a central facet of education for citizenship in a democracy must be development of cognitive civic skills, which are included in the second component of Figure 1. Cognitive civic skills enable citizens to identify, describe, organize, interpret, explain, and evaluate information and ideas in order to make sense of their political and civic experiences. Thus, they might respond to those experiences reasonably and effectively; and when faced with public issues, they might adroitly make and defend decisions about them.

The third component of Figure 1 treats participatory civic skills, which empower citizens to influence public policy decisions and to hold accountable their representatives in government. In combination with cognitive civic skills, participatory civic skills are tools of citizenship whereby individuals, whether acting alone or in groups, can participate effectively to promote personal and common interests in response to public issues.

The fourth and final component of education for citizenship in a democracy pertains to civic dispositions, which are traits of character necessary to the preservation and improvement of a constitutional representative democracy. If citizens would enjoy the privileges and rights of their polity, they must take responsibility for them by promoting the common good and participating constructively in the political and civic life of the community. This kind of responsible citizenship depends upon the development and practice of traits such as self-discipline or self-regulation, civility, honesty, trust, courage, compassion, tolerance, temperance, and respect for the worth and dignity of all individuals. These moral traits must be nurtured through various social agencies, including the school, to sustain a healthy constitutional representative democracy. Alexis de Tocqueville called these traits of responsible behavior the “habits of the heart” that represent the indispensable morality of democratic citizenship. Without these “habits of the heart” firmly implanted in the character of
citizens, said Tocqueville, the best constitutions, institutions, and laws cannot bring about a sustainable democracy (Bradley 1945, Vol. I, 299).

Effective education for citizenship in a democracy connects the four components in Figure 1, which interrelate civic knowledge, cognitive civic skills, participatory civic skills, and civic dispositions. Effective teaching and learning of civic knowledge, for example, requires that it be connected to civic skills and dispositions in various kinds of activities, which involve application of core concepts through exercise of civic skills and dispositions. Elevation of one component over the other – for example, civic knowledge over skills or vice-versa – is a pedagogical flaw that impedes civic learning (Bruer 1993, 15; Shanker 1997, 5). Thus, the conjoining through curriculum and instruction of core content, processes, skills, and dispositions is necessary to develop effective and responsible citizenship in a democracy.

Delivering a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy

The kind of civic education represented by the four-component model can yield citizens with (1) deep understanding of the essential concepts and principles of democracy, (2) strong commitment to them based on reason, (3) high capacity for using them freely and independently to analyze, appraise, and decide about the issues and problems of the civic and political world, (4) well-developed dispositions to promote the common good, and (5) the competence to participate responsibly and effectively to influence constructively their civil society and government. But this desirable result will not be achieved unless the components of civic education are addressed adequately in well-designed programs for the education of K-12 students and their teachers (Butts 1989, 226-279; Niemi and Junn 1998, 158-159). Teachers cannot teach what they do not know and are unable to do. If they do not learn the principles and practices of democracy, and how to teach them, then they will not be prepared to educate their elementary and secondary school students for citizenship in a democracy. Let us, then, turn to the delivery or implementation of the four-component model (Figure 1) in the K-12 curriculum of public and private schools and in the programs in higher education by which prospective K-12 teachers are educated and certified. How can it be done?

Here is a short list of recommendations. Although they are put forward primarily for the improvement of civic education in the United States, these recommendations may also be usefully adapted by civic educators in other countries.

1. **Use the four-component model (Figure 1, page 6) to identify and articulate the core content of a common civic education in grades K-12; that is, civic learning for all citizens regardless of differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or socioeconomic class.** Implementation of the model is founded on the assumption that all knowledge is not of equal worth. Rather, some ideas, information, and issues should be viewed by teachers and students as more important for particular purposes and thereby more worthy of emphasis in the school curriculum than other subject matter (Bruer 1993, 63-79; Cromer 1997, 177-184). For instance, the ideas in Figure 2 (page 12) are examples of the concepts and principles of democracy in the first category of the model which are to be learned in common by all
students. These concepts should be in the core curriculum because they are widely, if not universally, accepted as the distinguishing categories and characteristics by which to judge whether a particular regime is more or less democratic. If people would establish, maintain, or improve a democratic political system, they must first know the concepts or criteria by which to distinguish a democratic government from a nondemocratic government. Thus, these concepts belong in the common education of all persons who would know the meaning and uses of democracy and democratic citizenship. As students mature, they should encounter and use the same interconnected core concepts in cycles of increasing depth and complexity and in relationship to an ever-broader scope of information.

Core content is the indispensable foundation of an effective civic education. Research on the learning of civic knowledge shows strong connections between conceptual understanding of core democratic principles, such as those in Figure 2, and "enlightened political engagement," which construct subsumes such attributes of democratic citizenship as political interest, sense of political efficacy, political tolerance, commitment to basic civil liberties, and civic competence (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996, 19-20; Nie, Junn, and Stehlik-Barry 1996, 14-38; Niemi and J unn 1998, 9-10; Putnam 2000, 35-36). So knowledgeable citizens are better citizens of a democracy in regard to their possession and use of civic skills and civic dispositions, such as those in Figure 1.

Figure 2
Concepts at the Core of Education for Citizenship in a Democracy
(The Civic Knowledge Component)

1. REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY (REPUBLICANISM)
   a. Popular sovereignty (government by consent of the governed, the people)
   b. Representation and accountability in a government of, by, and for the people
   c. Free, fair, and competitive elections of representatives in government
   d. Comprehensive eligibility to participate freely to vote and campaign in elections
   e. Inclusive access to participate freely to promote personal and common interests
   f. Majority rule of the people for the common good
2. CONSTITUTIONALISM
   a. Rule of law in the government, society, and economy
   b. A government limited and empowered to secure rights of the people
   c. Separation and sharing of powers as a means to limited government
   d. An independent judiciary with power of judicial or constitutional review by which to limit government according to the rule of law
3. RIGHTS (LIBERALISM)
   a. Natural rights/human rights/constitutional rights
   b. Political or public rights
   c. Personal or private rights
   d. Economic, social, cultural, and environmental rights
   e. Rights associated with negative and positive constitutionalism
   f. Individual and collective rights
4. CITIZENSHIP
   a. Membership in a people based on legal qualifications of citizenship
   b. Rights, responsibilities, and roles of citizenship
   c. Civic identity
   d. Citizenship in unitary, federal, and confederal systems
5. CIVIL SOCIETY (FREE AND OPEN SOCIAL SYSTEM)
   a. Voluntary membership in nongovernmental organizations/civil associations
   b. Freedom of association, assembly, and social choice
   c. Pluralism/multiple and overlapping group memberships and identities
   d. Social regulation for the common good (rule of law, traditions, morals, virtues)
6. MARKET ECONOMY (FREE AND OPEN ECONOMIC SYSTEM)
   a. Freedom of exchange and economic choice through the market
   b. Freedom to own and use property for personal gain
   c. Economic regulation for the common good (rule of law, traditions, morals, virtues)
2. **Identify and include as appropriate in the K-12 core curriculum the perennial public issues, and the pivotal decisions that have been made in response to these controversies, in the history of democracy in the world and in particular countries such as the United States of America.** Require students in elementary and secondary schools to apply the set of core concepts on democracy and democratic citizenship in Figure 2 to the analysis and appraisal of the enduring public issues and the authoritative decisions about them by executive and legislative policy makers and by judges in courts of law. This regular examination of key ideas and systematic practice in applying them to the organization and interpretation of information and issues is “what makes students learn” the meaning of democracy and how to practice it (Niemi and Junn 1998, 117-146). So, concepts on the substance of democracy, listed in Figure 2, are prerequisites to the development and maintenance of an active and responsible community of self-governing citizens. Without this kind of common civic knowledge, which can be developed through common learning experiences in school, citizens are unable to act together to analyze public policy issues or problems, to make cogent decisions about them, or to participate intelligently to resolve them (Niemi and Junn 1998, 19-20).

Toni Marie Massaro, the author of *Constitutional Literacy: A Core Curriculum for a Multicultural Nation*, persuasively advocates teaching and learning core ideas in constitutional history through analyses and evaluation of core constitutional conflicts or issues. She recommends a core curriculum consisting of the kind of civic knowledge exemplified in Figure 2 and the constitutional issues in history associated with political and governmental practices of the core ideas about democracy. Mastery of her proposed core curriculum, she maintains, will yield “constitutional literacy, which means not only recognition of constitutional terms, constitutional dilemmas, and historical assumptions on which the Constitution arguably rests but also the recognition of the paradox on which the document is based [majority rule with protection of minority rights], its dynamism, and its multiple contested interpretations” (Massaro 1993, 153).

3. **Use landmark historical documents as sources of ideas and information about enduring public issues and as objects for the practice of cognitive and participatory skills, such as those in categories 2 and 3 of the model in Figure 1.** Core concepts and issues on democracy and freedom are embedded in the founding documents and in documents of subsequent periods of U.S. history. The pedagogical problem is to select a few of the very best documents available, and to organize them effectively for teaching and learning in the classroom.

A worthy list of core documents on democracy suitable for the core curriculum certainly includes the traditional texts of the founding era, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Federalist Papers, and the Antifederalist Papers (Patrick, 1995, 2000b, 2002). But it also includes pieces by women, African Americans, indigenous peoples, and others that broaden a student’s understanding of multiple perspectives and interpretations of key founding-era events. A few examples of nontraditional founding-era documents worthy of inclusion in the core curriculum are a petition against slavery to the General Court of Massachusetts by free African Americans, 1777, which used principles of the Declaration of Independence in arguments for freedom; a letter from three Seneca leaders to President Washington, 1790, which expressed critical opinions about the effects of the American Revolution on indigenous peoples; letters exchanged by Abigail Adams and Mercy Otis Warren on political and social issues of the 1770s; a sermon against slavery by the Reverend James Dana, 1791; and a letter to Thomas Jefferson from Benjamin Banneker, 1791, which included discussion of severe discrepancies between civic ideals of the American Revolution and the condition of black people in the United States (Patrick 1995, 73-107).

Ideas and controversies about constitutional democracy and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, rooted in the founding era, have permeated U.S. history from the 1770s through
the 1990s. Thus, documents in subsequent periods of the country’s history, which fit the American civic tradition, should be part of the core curriculum. And they should reflect various voices, diverse perspectives, and multiple interpretations of fundamental ideas, issues, and events in the development of American constitutional democracy. A few illustrative examples of the kinds of documents subsequent to the founding era that might be included in the core curriculum are the Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions at Seneca Falls, New York, 1848; the Independence Day Speech by Frederick Douglass at Rochester, New York, 1852; the Gettysburg Address, 1863, and Second Inaugural Address, 1865, by Abraham Lincoln; the Four Freedoms Speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1941; and Letter from Birmingham Jail and the I Have a Dream Speech by Martin Luther King, Jr., 1963 (Center for Civic Education 1997; Patrick 2000b and 2002).

Excerpts from certain landmark Supreme Court decisions, which apply fundamental principles of democracy to key constitutional issues, should also be included in any collection of core documents for secondary school students (Patrick 2001). Many of these court cases involve issues of majority rule and minority rights, liberty and equality, diversity and unity, which significantly have affected the civic life of diverse individuals and groups in the United States.

4. **Emphasize deliberative classroom discussions of core ideas and issues in landmark historical documents through which civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions can be developed among elementary and secondary school students.** The deliberative discussion is a method of teaching that challenges classes of students to participate in discourse for the purposes of (1) organizing and interpreting information in primary documents, (2) examining collaboratively core ideas and issues, and (3) exchanging viewpoints, which may be more or less different, about enduring controversies in history. Deliberative discussions provide opportunities for students to practice such cognitive processes as reflective thinking, critical thinking, and historical thinking. Deliberative discussions are also occasions for the practice of habits associated with the dispositions or morality of democratic citizenship. As they interact reasonably and cooperatively to discuss ideas and issues, students cultivate cognitive skills, participatory skills, and traits of morality, such as civility, and tolerance.

Deliberative discussion that encourage free expression of ideas in an open classroom environment have been related empirically to development of democratic dispositions, civic skills, and knowledge of democracy (Niemi and Junn 1999, 151-152). An international assessment of civic education and achievement revealed a strong relationship between the students’ beliefs that they could speak freely in the classroom about public issues and their development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of democratic citizenship (Torney-Purta, et al. 2001, 137).

5. **Teach civics and democracy across the curriculum through courses in language arts, literature, social studies, history, geography, and economics in addition to direct instruction through civics/government courses at particular points in the curriculum.** Teaching and learning about citizenship in a democracy is too important to be restricted to one or two semester-length courses in secondary schools. Rather, this essential element of education should be a pervasive theme throughout the K-12 curriculum. In particular, teaching and learning of U.S. history and world history, which are staples of the curriculum, should be directed to the purposes of civic education. Thus, students may have ample opportunity to learn the civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are necessary to the development of democratic citizenship.

An excellent example of pervasive civic education from kindergarten through grade 12 is the Indiana Academic Standards for Social Studies. The Indiana standards include a substantial civics/government strand at each level from kindergarten through the eighth grade. There also are standards for a high school course in civics/government. And the standards for U.S.
history and world history amply address the core ideas, issues, and documents about the development of democracy in various periods of the past.  

6. **Use the four-component model of civic education in Figure 1 to design and conduct courses in the preparation of social studies teachers, which involve collaboration among professors of education and professors of history and the social sciences.** Teachers cannot teach democracy effectively unless they know it thoroughly. And they are not likely to acquire deep comprehension or conceptual understanding of core concepts about democracy unless they encounter them again and again through various facets of their teacher education program. So, concepts at the core of K-12 education for citizenship in a democracy (Figure 2) should also be used to structure the content and instructional activities of civics-centered teacher education courses. This set of ideas and the information and examples denoted by them could bring cohesion, coherence, and cogency to the content base of civics-centered teacher education courses. By doing this, such common weaknesses of teaching methods courses as fragmentation of subject matter and subordination of content to process might be avoided. 

Throughout a civics-centered teaching methods course, the concepts in Figure 2 could be the substantive focal points for planning, constructing, and demonstrating lessons. Various kinds of instructional materials and methods could be used consistently and coherently in terms of the core concepts on citizenship in a democracy. Further, connections easily could be made between the core concepts in Figure 2 and the curriculum frameworks, content standards, and instructional materials commonly used in elementary and secondary school history and civics courses. For example, the core concepts permeate the instructional materials of *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, a three-level civics program for elementary and secondary school students (Center for Civic Education 2000).  

Pivotal public issues about the development of democracy in United States history and world history should be focal points of teaching and learning in civics-centered teacher education courses. Through systematic analysis of these issues in landmark historical documents, students preparing to become teachers might learn how to teach core concepts on democracy in connection with pivotal constitutional and political issues in United States history and world history. They also might develop skills in interpreting and deliberating about enduringly important primary texts in history, which skills can later be passed on by them to their elementary or secondary school students.  

Prospective teachers can learn how to conduct deliberative discussions of core ideas and issues in primary documents by regularly engaging in such discussions in their teacher education courses. Thus, they might develop the skills and dispositions needed for successful use of this teaching method.  

Finally, civic learning in the preparation of social studies history and civics teachers is equally the responsibility of professors of education and professors of history and the social sciences. Thus, there should be cooperation across university departments in the design and deliver of civic education for prospective teachers.  

**Defending a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy**  

A well-defined education for citizenship in a democracy will not be delivered successfully to learners unless it can be defended reasonably against skeptics or opponents. What, then, are a few brief but compelling reasons for the common civic education set forth in the preceding parts of this presentation?
The primary justification for a common civic education grows out of the perennial challenge confronting every human society to maintain some form of social stability, cultural continuity, and political order against the perpetual threats of disintegration, discontinuity, and anarchy. For most peoples of our world today, the preferred system for maintaining social stability and political order is some kind of constitutional representative democracy, because only this type of regime protects public and personal rights and provides government by consent of the governed. And only a constitutional representative democracy guarantees both individual liberty and collective order. A democratic political order, however, cannot be sustained unless a sufficient proportion of individuals within such succeeding generation learns the civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by citizens to make the polity work. Further, sufficient numbers of persons in each succeeding generation of citizens are not likely to learn essential civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions unless they are taught them deliberately and effectively by well-educated teachers in primary and secondary schools. Finally, social studies teachers in public and private schools are not likely to teach effectively the civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by citizens to sustain and improve their democracy unless they are equipped to do so through civics-centered teacher education courses, which are connected to relevant university-based history and social science courses.

There currently are grounds for great concern about our effectiveness in teaching about democracy and citizenship to young Americans. The 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in civics revealed unsatisfactory achievement among a majority of students in grades four, eight, and twelve (Lutkus, et al 1999). The results of the 2001 NAEP in U.S. history were worse than those of the NAEP in civics (Lapp, et al 2002). And current research by political scientists indicates disturbing evidence of political and civic apathy and a gross decline in the kind of civic engagement required to sustain a healthy democracy (Putnam 2000; Sandel 1996). So, we Americans currently face an especially challenging time in the history of our democracy, when we must strengthen common civic education as one way to renew the vitality of common citizenship in our democracy.

A common civic education, such as the kind defined in Figure 1, is directed to development of a common civic identity among citizens with the freedom to choose or affirm different ways to pursue happiness or fulfillment. Cultural diversity flourishes in a free and democratic society, such as the Untied States of America. And national and civic unity may be at risk in such a multicultural society. Unless citizens with diverse identities regarding race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and socioeconomic class can know and support in common certain civic principles and values, they will not develop a common and unifying civic identity, which can be the cohesive core of a multicultural society. And a functioning civic community or civil society will be sustained only if citizens can communicate and cooperate in terms of a common civic culture (Curtler 2001, 91-115; D amon 2001, 133-140).

Civic educators of yesterday and today have understood that Americans have been and are a people tied together primarily by common civic principles and values rather than common kinship,
ethnicity, or religion – the ties that have bound most other nations in the world. A main point of civic education in the United States, therefore, has been to develop among diverse people a common commitment to principles and values expressed in such founding documents as the 1776 Declaration of Independence, the 1787 Constitution, and the 1791 Bill of Rights. Building and maintaining national unity from social and cultural diversity is an imperative of education for citizenship in a democracy like the United States (Higham 2001; Patrick 2000).

Another compelling justification for a common civic education is a long-standing assumption in Western civilization: all human beings have a common human nature (Coons and Brennan 1999; Danford 2000). By nature, therefore, each individual is equal in her or his possession of certain natural or human rights, such as those to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” In line with this assumption about human nature, all individuals in a democracy are thought to be equal in their rights and their status as citizens. And, as we Americans have long believed, “Governments are instituted among Men to secure these rights, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

Citizens of such a government must be educated to judge and decide freely, for themselves, what actions of their government will or will not secure their natural rights. So, the overriding purpose of a common education for citizenship in a democracy is to develop each person’s capacity to make informed and reasonable decisions about public policy issues and constitutional controversies. This educational purpose is anchored in the principles and values of America’s founding documents and in the belief that each person is “by nature equal” (Coons and Brennan 1999).

Civic education in an authentic constitutional representative democracy has the paradoxical mission of sustaining a particular kind of political order and, at the same time, promoting free and independent choices by autonomous citizens. Amy Gutmann (1999, 114-16) refers to this paradox as “conscious social reproduction,” and she says it is a necessary educational process in any free and democratic society.

Gutmann claims, and I agree, that the free and democratic society, if it would survive, must transmit its civic and political traditions from one generation to the next. “We are all committed to recreating the society that we share,” says Gutmann (1999, 39). Stephen Macedo concurs, “The project of creating citizens is one that every liberal democratic state must somehow undertake” (2000, ix). However, a central tradition and essential element of our free and democratic society is the capacity of citizens to comprehend and think critically about the content and processes of the political socialization, or social reproduction, that they inevitably experience (Cremin 1977, 36-37). “It follows,” says Gutmann, “that a society in support of conscious social reproduction must educate all educable children to be capable of participating in collectively shaping their society” to sustain and improve it (1999, 39). If so, education for citizenship in a constitutional representative democracy is true to a core principle of its theory and practice – the individual’s right to liberty within conditions of an open and orderly society.
Civic education in a modern democratic and free society, if it would be true to its mission, paradoxically conjoins two competing political and educational traditions in western civilization: liberalism and civic republicanism. Purposes of liberal education are addressed by promotion of the individual’s autonomy and capacity for making informed, reasonable, independent, and free choices in response to public policy issues and constitutional controversies (Levinson 1999). Thus, the tendencies toward political indoctrination inherent in the idea of a common civic education are limited or thwarted. Likewise, the inherent liberal tendencies toward socially irresponsible individualism and license are constrained or controlled by civic republican purposes pertaining to responsibilities of citizenship for the common good.

This blend of civic republicanism and liberalism in education for democratic citizenship reflects the hybrid political and civic tradition of the United States, which has prevailed from its founding era until today (Rahe 1992; Sinopoli 1992). Stephen Macedo calls it “civic liberalism” and it demands a “liberal civic education” that fosters liberty and order in a community that promotes both individual rights and the common good (Macedo 2000, 149).

My definition of education for citizenship in a democracy, depicted in Figure 1, implies a liberal civic education to prepare individuals for a life of liberty in a well-ordered community. If they experience such a liberal education for democratic citizenship, students will learn what democracy is, how to practice it, why it may succeed or fail, and why it is worthy. They may also enhance their capacities to develop and maintain the kind of political and civic conditions that are indispensable to its survival. Finally, through this kind of liberal civic education, students may learn that a democracy’s success or failure depends ultimately on the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and actions of committed citizens, just like them. Let us strive to achieve this outcome through a carefully defined, effectively delivered, and compellingly defended education for citizenship in a democracy.

Notes


4. The four-component model presented in Figure 1 is generally similar to the Civics Framework for the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP Civics Consensus Project 1996) and to components of civic education in the National Standards for Civics and Government (Center for Civic Education 1994). A previous formulation of the model depicted in Figure 1 was developed by John J. Patrick and published initially in 1999. The current rendition of the model is a refinement of the earlier one.

5. A previous formulation of this list of core concepts on citizenship in a democracy (Figure 2) was developed by John J. Patrick and published in 1999. The current rendition of this list includes minor revisions. This list of core concepts was developed from an extensive review of literature on the theory and practice of democracy. A systematic discussion of each concept its relationship to other concepts in this set and the application of the set to civic education can be found in the first chapter of Principles and Practices of Education for Democratic Citizenship: International Perspectives and Projects (Patrick 1999b, 1-40). Each concept in this list and its connections to other basic ideas in democratic theory can also be found, among much broader treatments of democratic ideas, in such widely recognized standard works on civic education for democracy as Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education (Center for Civic Education 1991), National Standards for Civics and Government (Center for Civic Education 1994), and An International Framework for Education in Democracy (Center for Civic Education 2001). So, the core concepts in Figure 2 can justifiably be presented as a generally acceptable and minimally essential set of ideas by which to construct the knowledge component of civic education in elementary and secondary schools as well as in civics-centered programs for teacher education.


8. The Indiana Academic Standards for Social Studies were approved by the State Board of Education on August 3, 2001. http://ideanet.doe.state.in.us/standards/welcome2html.

9. An excellent curriculum for teaching elementary and secondary students about core concepts of democracy and issues connected to them is We the People...the Citizen and the Constitution, published by the Center for Civic Education. This civics curriculum includes three sets of materials: the first for students in grades 4 or 5, the second for students in grades 7 or 8, and the third for high school students in grades 11 or 12. These instructional materials can also be used in civics-centered teacher education courses to prepare future social studies teachers.

10. My emphasis is upon common civic education, which can be delivered through the common or public school or through independent or private schools. In this emphasis, I am influenced by Rosemary Salomone, Visions of Schooling: Competence, Community, and Common Education (New Haven: CT: Yale University Press, 2000). State departments of education can mandate requirements for a common education, including civics, which apply equally to public and private schools in the state. So, I do not tie a common education for citizenship in a democracy to attendance at a public or common school.

11. Throughout this paper, I use the term constitutional representative democracy to refer to the kind of democracy in which the Constitution guarantees equally the rights of individuals in the polity, and where representatives in government are elected by and accountable to the people. Therefore, this label, constitutional representative democracy, may be used interchangeably with two other terms: liberal democracy and constitutional republic.


13. The source of the quotation in this paragraph is the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

14. The major goal of Thomas Jefferson in the common education of citizens was “to enable every man to judge for himself what will secure or endanger his freedom” (quoted in Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas J. Pangle, The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideas of the American Founders (Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1993), 108.
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Civic Learning in Russian Teacher Preparation

Remarks by Charles S. White, Associate Professor
School of Education, Boston University
Associate Project Director, U.S. Russia University Partnership for Civic Education

It is a pleasure to share with you today a summary of efforts currently underway in the Russian Federation to advance the teaching of democracy in Russian schools through an intensive preparation program for new teachers. I will begin that summary by providing some historical context for our project, starting with reforms initiated during the Gorbachev years and accelerating in the post-Soviet decade. I will describe the U.S./Russia University Partnership for Civic Education and its program for preparing teachers to teach democratic civics in the Samara region, which we hope will serve as a model for future efforts in other regions in the Federation. Finally, I will suggest some features of the project that may be relevant to American efforts to energize civic education in our schools.

The term “civic education” will be used in this presentation to describe those recent efforts to promote education for democracy in Russia. There was, of course, civic education under the Soviet regime, but its function was to promote the maintenance of a communist form of government. Current developments in Russian civic education can be traced to reforms initiated in 1988 by the Party and the Ministry of Education, within the broad context of Perestroika. In an effort to “humanize and democratize” education, the Federal Ministry implemented the course “Mankind and Society” for grades eight through eleven. The content was multidisciplinary and drawn from a broad range of disciplines, including history, economics, law, political science, philosophy, psychology, and ethics. Much of the civics-related content of this course would be taught in the ninth grade as “Civics” or “Politics and the Law.”

With the fall of the communist government, the “new” civic education enjoyed a surge of activity. Yakov Sokolov established the Grazhdanin Center in 1991 and has produced the most widely used textbooks for civics in Russia. While Sokolov’s texts were targeted at the “Civics” course, Anatoly Nikitin’s books focused on law-related education and the “Politics and the Law” course. The Moscow-based Teachers’ Newspaper (Uchitelskaya Gazeta), with some 40,000 subscribers nationwide, added a Civics Supplement that disseminated news and lesson plans to teachers eager to implement the new civics. The locus of teacher training for civics was the national system of teacher training institutes, also referred to as teacher re-training institutes. Teachers must renew their teaching
credential every five years and these institutes provided courses to satisfy that requirement (and to reinforce the state ideology in Soviet times). Teacher training institutes and influential authors attracted the attention of Western educators (and funders) who were eager to support the fledgling civic education movement after 1991. By the mid-1990s, the first national association for civic education was established, under the auspices of the Teachers' Newspaper.

In 1995, the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California, received funds from the U.S. Department of Education to establish “Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange Program.” Its purpose was to partner states in the U.S. with NGOs in NIS/EEN countries to bolster education for democracy, through teacher inservice and curriculum development. In 1996 the School of Education at Boston University joined a partnership with Russia, which included the Teachers’ Newspaper (Uchiteľskaya Gazeta), the Russian Association for Civic Education, and the Grazhdanin Center (Sokolov). Over the past seven years, other Russian organizations have become partners in Civitas@Russia, including St. Petersburg Law School and the Samara Teacher Training Center. Partners in the U.S. include Russell Sage College (Troy, NY), the American Federation of Teachers (Washington, D.C.), and the Philadelphia Public Schools.

A conference sponsored by the Samara Regional Minister of Education in 1998 determined that there was a critical need to focus more attention on the preparation of new teachers at universities and colleges. In the fall of 2000, the U.S. Department of State funded a three-year project to design and implement a preservice teacher education program at three institutions in Samara, Russia – a city about 600 miles east of Moscow on the Volga River. These include Samara State University, Samara Pedagogical University, and Samara Pedagogical College. The U.S. partners for the project are Russell Sage College and Boston University.

Over past two years, this partnership has designed a scope and sequence for content and pedagogy in civic education. Implementation of new courses began in the spring of 2001 with a cohort of 50 students from each of the Samara institutions. The total course of study requires 1,000 hours of instruction and practice. This includes 560 hours of content coursework across five semesters, 200 hours of pedagogy coursework across two semesters, and a 240-hour practicum. (For students at the pedagogical college who will eventually teach in grades 1-4, the hours are 120, 50, and 80, respectively).

The content coursework reflects to some extent the content in the “Mankind and Society” course that grew out of the 1988 reforms. Students in our program study a broad range of areas within law, including constitutional, criminal, civil, labor, and family law. Other topics include economics, government and politics, mass media and its role in society, human rights (drawing heavily from the United National Declaration of Human Rights), and social roles. Personal and civic morality is included within the content scope, as well as ecology (a major concern for the Russian Federation), national and international symbols, and multinationalism (similar to what we might call ethnic diversity or multiculturalism).
The pedagogical content of the preservice civic education program focuses particular attention on active and interactive methods of teaching and learning. In the past, the primary mode of classroom activity was lecture and recitation, and Russian teachers (and students) generally have little experience with leading and engaging in discussions and debates. The methods coursework also provides guidance in the development of skills associated with civic participation, including critical thinking and decision-making. As is the case in American methods courses, students in the Russian program learn about available curricula and teaching materials for democratic civics, they practice developing units and lessons in civic education, and they learn how to evaluate the outcomes of civic education. Finally, the pedagogical coursework links the formal classroom curriculum to students' extracurricular lives. Among the extracurricular activities relevant to education for democracy are “Project Citizen”¹ (the Russian version is called “I am a Citizen of Russia”), “Civil Forum,” and the annual Civics Olympiad held in Moscow. In December 2000, “I am a Citizen of Russia” was approved by the Russian Federal Ministry of Education for use in schools throughout Russia.

We are now in the second year of our three-year project and our work is not completed (nor do we know yet what will be the long-term effects of our work). Nonetheless, we have tried to build into the Russian teacher education curriculum some elements that bear consideration by American teacher preparation programs as they work to invigorate teacher preparation in civic education.

First, the Samara teacher preparation curriculum requires considerable engagement with broad content relevant to civics. This is partly a reflection of the Russian education system’s tradition of requiring students to acquire encyclopedic knowledge from the disciplines. But it is, more importantly, also a reflection of what Russians believe citizens need to know as the country constructs a democratic society. What knowledge do American students need to master in order to sustain their democracy?

Second, the curriculum has a strong emphasis on cognitive skills development. For example, much time is devoted to critical analysis of media and evaluation of primary documents, most evident in the pedagogy/methods portion of the curriculum. In a country whose media is still largely controlled by the government or by oligarchs, it is not surprising that Russian educators would hold these skills in high esteem. What is the proper array of cognitive tools with which American students should be equipped in order to be thoughtful, deliberative citizens in their democracy?

Third, the methods curriculum in Samara spotlights civic participation skills. Teachers-in-training closely examine effective group work in the classroom as well as curriculum links to participation in Project Citizen and other community-based activities. While part of the motivation is to foster civic efficacy, Russian educators are also very concerned about what they perceive as a lack of patriotism and commitment to community and country. What is the proper array of participatory skills American students should master in order to be effective and committed citizens in their democracy?

Finally, both the content and methods curricula in Samara is infused with moral and ethical discussion and reflection. Much of the character education in Soviet times was carried by extracurricular activities, the Pioneer movement being most prominent. Many of these organizations
responsible for “upbringing” (vospitanie) were dismantled after 1991 and little has been built to fill the void. As a result, more of what we call character education is being integrated into the regular curriculum (obrazovanie), making it imperative that new teachers are prepared to engage students in the examination of moral and ethical issues relevant to the lives of citizens in a democracy. How shall American schools promote civic virtue among its young citizens?

What is true for Russian teacher preparation programs is true for American programs—teachers need to be equipped to teach the content, skills, and dispositions of democratic civics to their students. To do so, teachers must themselves master this content and these skills; they must know what civic virtue is. Teachers must acquire and practice pedagogical methods and techniques necessary to transmit civic knowledge, foster civic skills, and promote civic dispositions. And teachers must be committed to and exhibit those same virtues and dispositions, to serve as models of democratic citizenship in action.

Notes

1. “Project Citizen” is a program that was developed and administered by the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, CA. It is in use throughout the United States and in many emerging democracies overseas.
Thank you Senator Moore for inviting me to participate in today’s summit.

When we look at so many of the current scandals featured prominently in the media—from those involving high profile writers and professors to top corporate executives and church leaders who betrayed the trust of so many—we are reminded of Benjamin Franklin’s sage words,

Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious they have more need of masters. Nothing is more important for the public weal than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue. (April 17, 1787)

Freedom needs direction and vision. We can draw inspiration and insights about this idea from the American founders who strove to seek answers to fundamental questions, such as: In what does our human dignity reside? What is freedom? What is our responsibility for the common good? And finally, what are the implications of these answers for education at large?

It is with these ideas in mind that I want to speak to you today about moral and civic virtue as the heart of citizenship. For education to fulfill its task of educating a virtuous citizenry, our future teachers need to be prepared with this vision in mind. Civic and moral virtue must be taught in tandem—as political and moral discourse go hand in hand and inform one another.

The teachers we prepare today will educate tomorrow’s leaders. They will help (or fail to help) their students develop the sound judgment and strong character necessary to embrace their responsibilities as citizens. The other presenters here today are better equipped than I to talk with you about the specific curricular and standards-based approaches to civic education. My goal is to invite you to step away from the canvass of civic learning and reflect on the big picture.

This nation’s founders understood the centrality of virtue to self-government. James Madison put it this way in his speech at the Virginia Ratifying Convention on June 20, 1788:

Is there no virtue among us? If there be not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks, no form of government can render us secure. To suppose that any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without any virtue in the people is a chimerical idea.
While our system of government tries to balance powers against each other to safeguard individual rights, it presupposes that individuals acquire certain virtues to be capable of self-government. Laws and institutions can sanction and control human action, but they cannot make a person virtuous. Fear of sanction does not engender loyalty and patriotism. Herein lies the link between the cultivation of moral virtue and civic virtue and the success of self-government.

This link was well understood in early American education, which was viewed primarily as a moral endeavor. The development of intellect and character was central to the enterprise of learning. Because virtue was considered a means to sustain “the body politic,” a direct approach to moral instruction prevailed. Students were taught Scripture and moral adages. By 1836, the McGuffey Reader, a more secular resource, became the mainstay of the American curriculum. Rich in moral tales, selected Bible stories, exhortations, and moving accounts of heroism and patriotism, this reader presented students with images of a virtuous life on a daily basis.

Twentieth century Social Darwinism and the increasing emphasis on scientific method gradually led to a break with earlier moral and philosophical traditions. Morals and values, formerly a staple in the public school curriculum were drawn into the private realm. Scientism engendered a new view of the person liberated from what Alasdair MacIntyre refers to as “the external authority of traditional morality.” And virtue, both in the classical and Christian sense, began losing ground in public education.

The antiestablishment movement and the sexual revolution of the 1960’s intensified the segregation of objective moral values from schooling. Morality and traditional ideals were questioned, and perhaps rightly so. Growing consciousness of racism, segregation, and unequal opportunity for women, followed by spirited disagreement over the war in Vietnam gave rise to the gradual erosion of what had been previously regarded as a consensus on traditional and shared American ideals.

Moral authority, once vested firmly in both schools and teachers, receded dramatically. Teachers distanced themselves from students’ moral development and attempted to become neutral facilitators, leaving students free to arrive at their own values and to figure out some of life’s toughest questions on their own. They were encouraged to view society’s traditions of civility and ideals with skepticism and even scorn.

If hindsight is twenty-twenty, today we are well poised to reconnect civic and moral education in schools—to embrace virtue as the heart of citizenship. While virtue may conjure images of a Victorian tea party or a religious treatise, the word itself means something quite different. The Greek word usually translated as virtue is arete, which means human excellence—excellence of mind and character. The Latin root of virtue is vir, which means manliness, strength, force or agency. Virtue strengthens us from within. Virtue is key to the exercise of one’s freedom, to the realization of one’s best potential, and to the strength of a self-governing people.

I would like you to consider the relationship between virtue and the freedoms we hold so dear; freedoms that are actually quite fragile. Virtue is integral to freedom because it is a disposition
involving choice, as Aristotle noted. Learning to choose well in all spheres of life—civic, academic, and personal—is central to moral and intellectual maturity, to using our freedom well.

We enjoy enormous freedom of choice in this country, but we sometimes have a deeply impoverished sense of what is worthy of our choosing. Americans young and old are easily seduced by the allure of money, fun, power, and popularity. Many of us confuse too easily wants for needs, impulse for intelligent choice, infatuation for love. Choice is often heralded as the freedom to do as I please. Choice, however, means more than a preference for Cheerios over Corn flakes or the emphatic declaration, “I have the right to choose.” We as well as our students can be deceived by the widely popularized myth that happiness is the freedom to do whatever I want, whenever I want.

Viktor Frankl, concentration camp survivor and renowned psychiatrist, makes this observation in his Man’s Search for Meaning,

We who lived in the concentration camps remember the men who walked through the huts comforting others, giving away their last piece of bread. They may have been few in number, but they offer sufficient proof that everything can be taken from a man but one thing: the last of the human freedoms—to choose one’s attitude in any given set of circumstances, to choose one’s own way.3

Frankl speaks of individuals who had the strength of character—the virtue—to maintain great human dignity even in the most inhumane circumstances. Virtues help us to deal with all of the situations that we encounter as both private persons and citizens.

Virtues help us to respond well to a range of emotions such as anger (instead of giving into road rage, for example, we choose patience and calm, or in the face of injustice, we choose indignation and outrage). The list goes on: in the face of sadness (good humor and hope, or commiseration and acceptance), fear (courage), temptation (self-mastery), and concern for others (compassion). A virtuous person is not a charlatan or a performer, politically astute and socially savvy, but morally bankrupt. Education in virtue—that old-fashioned word and seemingly unpopular idea—is about helping students to develop an internal compass that will serve them on the field and off, at school and at home. Education in moral and civic virtue helps students to develop good dispositions that will last a lifetime.

**Civic Learning.**

One of the goals of the history and Social Science Frameworks is to help students develop the knowledge, skill and virtue they need to exercise sound judgment, to make informed decisions and to deliberate thoughtfully. Civic learning is not simply about functioning well politically—savvy with respect to democratic processes—how a bill becomes a law, due process, and the importance of voting. These are only tools, the mechanics not the heart of good citizenship. Civic participation and responsibility are not only manifest in social service or concern for the environment. Civic learning at
its best embraces the moral and intellectual goals of education. It seeks to cultivate wisdom—the practical intelligence and moral insight students need to make good choices.

For teachers to take civic learning seriously, they must encourage and foster virtue. In this way they will help their students author their own choices intelligently. They will teach them to make informed decisions and not simply arrive at consensus. They will help them learn to deliberate thoughtfully and carefully, to engage in dialogue that seeks to understand and pursue the truth not simply the lowest common denominator.

Virtue’s internal compass provides students with the moral orientation they need to use their freedom well both in public and private life. Taking citizenship seriously is about helping young people refine their vision and capacity to choose well. In civic learning educators must keep their sights high, staying focused not merely on political skill but also on the kinds of citizens their students are becoming.

While it is beyond the purview of this presentation to discuss all the “how-tos” of educating for moral and civic virtue, one important principle prevails. The most powerful education in virtue and citizenship does not come from a lesson but from a life. Young people need to become familiar with the lives of those whose citizenship is worthy of emulation—Eleanor Roosevelt, Martin Luther King Junior, Mahatma Gandhi, and Nelson Mandela. Becoming familiar with the lives of some of these extraordinary individuals can help counter the current and widespread loss of heroes in public life.

Education in civic and moral virtue will enable our students not only to choose well but also to judge capably and critique those customs, social institutions and laws that hinder both their own and others civic development.

Conclusion

In a sense, it is not anything new to be concerned about the moral content of our civic education. The American people have been clamoring for a return to a focus on character and ethics in public schools. Yet, our 1999 study, Teachers as Educators of Character: Are the Nations Schools of Education Coming Up Short? shows that focused preparation of teachers in character education is paltry. There is overwhelming support from deans and department chairs for the general concept of character education (91.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “There exists a set of core values/virtues upon which most Americans can agree, regardless of race, class, religion or culture, which can be taught in school.” And 97.1% “disagreed” or strongly disagreed” with the statement “Schools should avoid teaching values or influencing moral development.” However, only 13% are satisfied with their efforts to address this programmatically in teacher training.

Addressing thousands of educators at the annual Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) conference in Boston last March, Rabbi Kushner identified perhaps one of the reasons for this failure: teacher burn-out due to a growing sense of the futility in their work. Without vision and a driving sense of purpose, it is difficult to continue along an arduous path.
My purpose today is to urge renewed efforts in this arduous but crucial task. If our schools—alongside our parents—do not offer students worthy goals and a vision for their lives, someone or something else will, without qualms about making power, deceit, violence, and consumerism attractive and worthy of pursuit. A renewed effort in civic and moral learning will provide students with the wisdom and inspiration they need to make good choices for themselves and for their country. In this way we will help them steer clear of mere subjectivism in moral discourse and be better prepared to uphold the high ideals of freedom and human dignity upon which this nation was founded.

Notes
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We the People... Programs and Civic Education

Remarks by Diane N. Palmer, Massachusetts State Coordinator
We the People... Programs, Center for Civic Education

The idea that American schools have a distinctly civic mission has been recognized since the earliest days of the Republic: Jefferson, Madison, Adams, and others realized that the establishment of well-constructed political institutions was not in itself a sufficiently strong foundation to maintain constitutional democracy. They knew that ultimately a free society must depend on its citizens on their knowledge, skills, and civic virtue. They believed that the civic mission of the schools is to foster the qualities of mind and heart required for successful government within a constitutional democracy. (Senator Richard T. Moore, Educating the Ideal Citizen of Massachusetts) According to a Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll carried out in 2000, respondents ranked “preparing people to become responsible citizens” as the number one purpose of the nation’s schools. (Ibid.) The Constitution and the General Laws of Massachusetts require the teaching of civic education in public schools and colleges for the purpose of developing an active and informed citizenry to participate in the public affairs of communities and the Commonwealth. (Ibid.)

Excitement,
Stimulation,
Understanding of philosophical concepts,
Demonstration of individual knowledge of fundamental principles,
Teamwork in investigating and solving problems.

These are all words to describe the We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution and the We the People... Project Citizen programs. These programs of the Center for Civic Education are outstanding examples of excellent civic education materials to achieve the goals for civic education stated above.

The Center for Civic Education is an outgrowth of the Law in a Free Society project of the California State Bar Association in the 1960s and 1970s. The Center became an independent non-profit organization in 1981. It receives the majority of its funding from Congress through the United States Department of Education. The mission of the Center is to promote an enlightened and
responsible citizenry committed to democratic principles and actively engaged in the practice of
democracy in the United States and other countries. The three principal goals of the Center’s
programs are to help students develop (1) an increased understanding of the institutions of Ameri-
can constitutional democracy and the fundamental principles and values upon which they are founded, (2)
the skills necessary to participate as effective and responsible citizens, and (3) the willingness to use
democratic procedures for making decisions and managing conflict.

The Center was in charge of writing the National Standards for Civics and Government published
in 1994. Hundreds of teachers, scholars, and other interested persons collaborated with the Center on
the project, which was a resounding success. Nearly all states, including Massachusetts, have used
these standards as the basis for writing their own frameworks or standards in civics and government.

As part of the national bicentennial celebration in 1987, the present We the People... The Citizen
and the Constitution program was founded. [henceforth called We the People] It is an instructional
program on the history and principles of American constitutional democracy for elementary, middle,
and high school students. At the high school level, classes may choose to enter a competition
structured as a simulated hearing where their knowledge of the Constitution is tested.

In the We the People program students study six units related to the Constitution: 1) What are the
philosophical and historical foundations of the American political system; 2) How did the framers
create the Constitution; 3) How did the values and principles embodied in the Constitution shape
American institutions and practices; 4) How have the protections of the Bill of Rights been developed
and expanded; 5) What rights does the Bill of Rights protect; and 6) What are the roles of the citizen
in American democracy? These units are related to the fundamental questions of the National
Standards for Civics and Government. Toward the end of the period of study, students in a class form
six teams, one for each unit, and prepare answers to questions based on the material of their unit.
They present their answers in simulated congressional hearings, which also allow the panel of ‘judges’
to ask the students further questions. At the high school level, each state holds a statewide
competition; the winning team moves on to a national competition held in the spring in Washington,
DC.

We the People... Project Citizen, [henceforth called Project Citizen] the second major program,
became part of the Center for Civic Education in 1995. Project Citizen is administered by the Center
in cooperation with the National Conference of State Legislatures. It is a middle grades (5-8) civic
education program designed to develop interest in public policy-making and the ability to participate
competently and responsibly in state and local government.

In the Project Citizen process, after a study of the concept and practice of public policy, students
decide on a school, community, or state issue of concern to them. They research information;
interview officials, experts, parents, and others; develop alternative policies and decide on their class
public policy; and finally, develop a plan of action to achieve their policy and solve the problem. As a
conclusion of the process, students create a portfolio of their work and participate in simulated
hearings. After a statewide competition, the winning portfolio is sent to a national competition held in conjunction with the National Conference of State Legislatures annual meeting.

Many of the policies initiated by these middle school students have become policy at the school, community, or even state level. In Massachusetts, students at the Citizens School obtained a policy for creation of a student government; in Barre their policy will add shoulders on the road in front of a school; and in Chatham, they achieved authorization for a community center. Both the We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution and Project Citizen emphasize participatory education and interconnected learning of knowledge, skills, and values.

The Center also has a number of other programs; one of which, the Foundations of Democracy series, supplements particularly well with these two. There are curricular materials for K-12 of the basic concepts and principles of constitutional democracy: those of authority, privacy, responsibility, and justice. This multidisciplinary curriculum draws upon political philosophy, political science, law, history, literature, and environmental studies. Project Citizen and Foundations of Democracy are also used extensively in the Center’s work with numerous emerging democracies in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

As part of the promotion of the Center’s programs, state and district coordinators offer training workshops for teachers and others. The duration may be a few hours, a day or two, or, in the summer, a week-long institute. The Center offers regional and national institutes as well, which provide work with scholars, such as John Patrick, professor in the School of Education at Indiana University, and practical application in unit teams.

Beyond in-service training, what can be done to promote more and better civic education? As we know, in Massachusetts there is no state graduation requirement for civics or government. Even so, middle school students in Barre won second place at the national competition for Project Citizen, and the high school team from Chatham won the national award for Unit 2 at this year’s We the People national competition. One wonders how much better Massachusetts students might do if government and civics were required?

To be in compliance with the Constitution of the Commonwealth and the desire of the general public, teacher preparation at all levels should require courses in civics and government. Right now, most elementary teachers do not have to take such a course, though usually they do take United States history. For middle or high school certification, prospective teachers may have government courses, along with history. However, the number of hours of civics or government varies greatly. Ideally teacher education would require study of the concept of public policy and ways citizens can competently and effectively participate in the process. It would also require a study of the U.S. Constitution- its principles, democratic values, and evolution. Thus more teachers and students would be prepared for the excitement, stimulation and demonstration of understanding of the foundation of the nation and their role as citizens.
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National Civic Education Organizations

Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship
Purdue University
Dr. Phillip J. VanFossen, Director
1442 Liberal Arts and Education Building, Room 4115
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1442
Phone (765) 494-4755 or (765) 494-2372
vanfoss@purdue.edu

Alabama State Department of Education
Cyndi Townley
50 North Ripley St., Rm. 5348
P.O. BOX 302101
Montgomery, AL 36104
334-353-7001
townley@sdnet.alsde.edu
www.alsde.edu/ver1

Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Judy Salo
333 W. 4th Ave., Suite 320
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-269-4659
Judith_salo@eed.state.ak.us
www.educ.state.ak.us

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1307 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005-4701
Tel 202/293-2450
www.aacte.org

American Association of Community Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036
www.aacc.nche.edu/

American Bar Association
Division for Public Education
Mabel McKinney-Browning, Director,
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
mckinneyb@staff.abanet.org
312-988-5731

Civis Americanus sum.
The American Civic Forum
Harry Boyte, National Coordinator
Hubert Humphrey Institute
University of Minnesota
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone(612) 625-0142

American Civil Liberties Union
125 Broad Street
18th Floor
New York, NY 10004-2400
www.aclu.org

American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 879-4400
www.aft.org/

American Institute for Public Service
100 West 10th St, Suite 215
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-622-9101
info@aips.org
www.aips.org

American Legion
1608 K Street, NW
Washington D.C., 20006
acy@legion.org
www.legion.org

American Legion Auxiliary
777 North Meridian Street, Third Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317-955-3845
alahq@legion-aux.org
www.legion-aux.org

American Political Science Association (APSA)
1527 New Hampshire Ave, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-1206
Ph(202) 483-2512
E-Mailapsa@apsanet.org
www.apsanet.org

The American Society for Public Administration
1120 G Street, N.W., suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-393-7878
www.aspanet.org

America's Promise – The Alliance for Youth
909 N. Washington Street, Suite 400
Alexandria, VA 22314-1556
(703) 684-4500
americaspromise.org
Arkansas Department of Education
Karen Ghidotti
#4 Capital Mall - Room 402A
Little Rock, AR 72201
501-682-4847
kggidotti@arkedu.K12.ar.us
arkedu.state.ar.us

Arizona Department of Education
Jan Brite
1535 West Jefferson Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-4365
jbrite@mail.adे.state.az.us
www.adе.state.az.us

Arthur F. Bentley Professor of Political Science
Indiana University
Elinor Ostrom
Woodburn Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
ostrom@indiana.edu

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
1703 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311-1714
703-578-9600 or 1-800-933-ASCD
www.ascd.org/

Better Government Association
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
Suite 1900
Chicago, IL 60604
312-427-8330
www.bettergov.org
bgainfo@aol.com

Boy Scouts of America
1325 Walnut Hill Lane
PO Box 152079
Irving, TX 75015-2079
214-580-2000
www.bsa.scouting.org

Boys and Girls Clubs of America
1230 W. Peachtree St. NW
Atlanta, GA 30309
404-815-5700
lmclemore@bgca.org
www.bgca.org

Boys Nation
c/o American Legion
1608 K Street, NW
Washington D.C., 20006
acy@legion.org
www.legion.org
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Delaware Learn and Serve America
c/o Delaware Department of Education
Margaret Dee
PO Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903-1402
302-739-4885
mdee@state.de.us
www.doe.state.de.us

Democratic National Committee
430 S. Capitol St. SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
202-863-8000
www.democrats.org

District of Columbia Department of Education
Beverly O'Bryant
825 North Capital St, N.E., Rm. 8148
Washington, D.C. 202-442-5155
obryant@k12.dc.us
www.k12.dc.us/ dcps/ home.html

Do Something
423 West 55th Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10019
212-523-1175
mail@dosomething.org
www.dosomething.org

Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
732/932-9384
eagleton@rci.rutgers.edu
www.eagleton.rutgers.edu/

Educators for Social Responsibility
23 Garden St.
Cambridge, MA 02138
800-370-2515
educators@esrnational.org
esrnational.org

Federal Elections Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20463
800-4249-530
fec@fec.gov
www.fec.gov

Florida Department of Education
Tom Zutell
345 South Magnolia Drive
Suite D-11
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-488-9660
zutell@mail.doe.state.fl.us
www.firn.edu/ doe/ index.html
Green Party USA
PO Box 1406
Chicago, Illinois 60690
978-682-4353
www.greenparty.org

Habitat for Humanity
121 Habitat Street
Americus, GA 31709
912-924-6935
public_info@habitat.org
www.habitat.org

The Harwood Institute of Public Innovation
4915 St. Elmo Ave, Suite 402
Bethesda, MD 20814
301-656-3669
thi@theharwoodinstitute.org
www.theharwoodinstitute.org/

Hawaii Department of Education
Stephen Kow
189 Lunalilo Home Road, 2nd Floor
DLTSS, Curriculum and Instruction Branch
Honolulu, HI 96825
808-394-1360
Stephen_kow@notes.k12.hi.us
doe.k12.hi.us

Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture
University of Virginia
Professor James Davison Hunter, Director
Cabell Hall #539
PO Box 400766
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4766
jdhunter@virginia.edu
434-924-6524

Idaho Department of Education
Valerie Aker
650 West State Street
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720
208-332-6903
vaker@sde.state.id.us
www.sde.state.id.us/dept

Illinois State Board of Education
Gary Greene
100 W. Randolph Street, Suite 14-300
Chicago, IL 60601
312-814-3606
ggreene@isbe.net
www.isbe.state.il.us
Indiana Department of Education
Civic Literacy Project
William Morgan
210 Woodburn Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
812-856-4677
wmorgan@indiana.edu
www.doe.state.in.us/srvrm

Iowa Department of Education
Joseph Herrity
Grimes State Office Building
East 14th and Grand AVE.
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-2481-3290
joe.herrity@ed.state.ia.us
www.state.ia.us/educate/index.html

Kentucky Department of Education
Karen Schmalzbauer
1731 Capitol Plaza Tower
500 Merro Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-3678
kschmalz@kde.state.ky.us
www.kde.state.ky.us

Labor Party
PO Box 53177
Washington, D.C. 20009
202-234-5190
www.labornet.org/lpa

League of Women Voters
1730 M Street NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-429-1965
lwv@lwv.org
www.lwv.org

Libertarian Party USA
2600 Virginia Ave. NW, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20037
202-333-0008
www.libertarian.org

Louisiana Department of Education
Kay Bailey
263 Third Street, Suite 610-B
Baton Rouge, LA 70801
225-342-3333
kaysbailey@aol.com
www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/asps/home.asp

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
University of Texas at Austin
Professor Kenneth W. Tolo
tolo@mail.utexas.edu
512-471-3270
Maryland State Department of Education
Luke Frazier
Maryland Student Service Alliance
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0356
lfrazier@msde.state.md.us

Maine Department of Education
Edward Maroon
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
207-624-6749
ed.maroon@state.me.us
www.state.me.us/education/lsa/homepage.htm

Michigan Department of Education
Paula Kaiser
George W. Romney Bldg, 4th Floor
111 South Capitol Ave.
Lansing, MI 48913
517-373-1376
kaiserp@state.mi.us
www.mde.state.mi.us

Minnesota Department of Education
Carter Hendricks
Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning
1500 Highway #36 West
Roseville, MN 55113
651-582-8307
carter.Hendricks@state.mn.us
www.educ.state.mn.us

Mississippi Department of Education
Frednia Perkins
PO Box 771
359 North West Street
Jackson, MS 39205
601-359-3988
fperkins@mde.k12.ms.us
www.mde.k12.ms.us

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Karen White
PO Box 480
205 Jefferson Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573-526-5395
kwhite3@mail.desl.state.mo.us
www.dese.state.mo.us

Montana Department of Education
June Atkins
1300 11th Street
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620
406-444-3664
jatkins@state.mt.us
www.metnet.state.mt.us
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
1120 G Street NW Suite 730
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-628-8965
naspa@naspa.org

National Civic League
1319 F Street, N.W., Suite 204
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-783-2961
www.ncl.org

National Commission on Civic Renewal
Lloyd V. Hackley, Commissioner
511 Van M unching Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-2790

National Conference of State Legislatures
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400
www.ncsl.org

National Council for the Social Studies
8555 Sixteenth Street, Suite 500
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
301-588-1800

National Student/Parent Mock Election
225 West Oro Valley Drive
Tucson, AZ 85737
520-742-9943
nspme@bpa.arizona.edu
www.mockelection2000.net

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Norman Camp
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601
919-807-3764
nregion@dpi.state.nc.us
www.dpi.state.nc.us

Nebraska Department of Education
Mel Nielsen
301 Centennial Mall South, 6th Floor
PO Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509
402-471-0940
mnielsen@nde.state.ne.us
www.nde.state.ne.us

Nevada Department of Education
Deborah Loesch-Griffin
PO Box 1128, 991 So. 'C' St
Virginia City, NV 89440
775-847-9311
jwright@nsn.k12.nv.us
www.nsn.k12.nv.us/nydpe
New Hampshire Department of Education
John Deziel
101 Pleasant St.
Concord, NH 03301
603-271-3867
jkeziel@ed.state.nh.us
www.ed.state.nh.us

New Jersey Department of Education
Michael Gowdy
100 Riverview Plaza
PO Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625
609-777-4612
mgowdy@doe.state.nj.edu
www.state.nj.us/education

New Mexico Department of Education
Robert Olix
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-827-6652
rolix@sde.state.nm.us
www.sde.state.nm.us

New York State Education Department
Fran Hollon
Room 965 Education Building Addition
Albany, NY 12234
518-486-5202
fhollon@mail.nysed.gov
www.nysed.gov

Ohio Department of Education
Charlotte Jones-Ward
25 South Front St., 4th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-9520
pd_jonesward@ode.ohio.gov
www.ode.state.oh.us

Oklahoma State Department of Education
Charles Mohr
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Suite 213
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405-521-6205
charles_mohr@mail.sde.state.ok.us
www.sde.state.ok.us/default.html

Oregon Department of Education
Beverlee Jackson
Public Service Building
255 Capitol St., NE
Salem, OR 97310
503-378-3584 x369
bev.jackson@state.or.us
www.ode.state.or.us
Virginia Department of Education
PO Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218
804-225-2847
nbrooks@pen.k12.va.us
www.pen.k12.va.us

Washington Department of Education
Gayle Pauley
PO Box 47200
600 South Washington St.
Olympia, WA 98504
360-753-2858
gpauley@wednet.edu
www.k12.wa.us

Washington Semester Program
American University
800-424-2600
washsem@american.edu
www.american.edu/washingtonsemester

West Virginia Department of Education
Fred Harrington
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
Building 6 - Room 230
Charleston, WV 25305
304-558-7881
fharrin@access.k12.wv.us
wvde.state.wv.us

The White House Project
110 Wall St.
2nd Floor
New York, NY 10005
admin@thewhitehouseproject.org
www.thewhitehouseproject.org

Wisconsin Department of Education
Jeffery Miller
125 South Webster Street, 5th Floor
PO Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707
608-261-7494
Jeffery.Miller@dpi.state.wi.us
www.dpi.state.wi.us

Wyoming Department of Education
Kathleen Scheurman
Hathaway Building 2nd Floor
2300 Capitol Ave.
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-6234
kscheu@educ.state.wy.us
www.k12.wy.us
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Massachusetts Civic Education Organizations

Academy for Public Service
c/o Dorchester High School
Paul Casilli, Lead Teacher
9 Peacevale Road
Dorchester, MA 02124

American Institute for Economic Research
PO Box 1000
Great Barrington, MA 01230
413-528-1216
info@aier.org

American Legion
Lawrence Connors, Commander
State House, Room 546-2
Boston, MA 02133
617-727-2966
masslegion@worldnet.att.net

American Legion Auxiliary
Beverly J. Monaco, Secretary/Treasurer
State House, Room 546-2
Boston, MA 02133
617-727-2958

Beacon Hill Institute
8 Ashburn Place
Boston, MA 02108
617-573-8750
bhi@beaconhill.org
www.beaconhill.org

Boston Foundation
President, Paul S. Grogan
75 Arlington Street, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02116
info@tbf.org

Boston University
Institute for Economic Culture
10 Lenox Street
Brookline, MA 02446
617-353-9050
isec@bu.edu
www.bu.edu/isec/index.html
Educators for Social Responsibility
23 Garden Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
800-370-2515
educators@esrnational.org
http://esrnational.org

Freedom's Answer - Massachusetts
Felipe Perez, State Coordinator
P. O. Box 381012
Cambridge, MA 02238
617-594-9943
felipe@freedomsanswer.net
www.freedomsanswer.net

General Federation of Women's Clubs of Massachusetts
Education Department and Special Projects
Alberta Durfee, Chair
100 Merriam Road - P. O. Box 168
Grafton, MA 01519-0168
508-839-4689

gfwcms@aol.com

Girl Scouts of America - Boston
95 Berkeley Street
Boston, MA 02116
617-482-1078
info@ptgirlscouts.org
www.ptgirlscouts.org

Girl Scouts of America
Montachusett Council
Worcester, MA 01609
508-853-1070
barb@mgsc.org

Girl Scouts of America - North Andover
1440 Turnpike Street
North Andover, MA 01845
978-689-8015
info@ssgsc.org
www.ssgsc.org

Girl Scouts of America
Pioneer Valley Council
40 Harkness Avenue
E. Longmeadow, MA 01028
413-525-4124
pvgsc@worldnet.att.net
www.pvgsc.org
Girl Scouts of America
Southeastern Massachusetts Council
11 East Grove Street
Middleboro, MA 02348
508-923-0800
staff@girlscouts-pb.org
www.girlscouts-pb.org

Girl Scouts of America-Western Mass.
241 Haydenville Rd.
P.O. Box 550
Leeds, MA 01053
413-584-2602
wmgsc@the-spa.com
www.the-spa.com/wmgsc

Girls Nation - Massachusetts
C/o American Legion Auxiliary of Massachusetts
Carolyn A. Baranowski, President
Beverly J. Monaco, secretary/treasurer
State House, Room 546-2
Boston, MA 02133
617-727-2958

Girls State
C/o American Legion Auxiliary of Massachusetts
Carolyn A. Baranowski, President
Beverly J. Monaco, secretary/treasurer
State House, Room 546-2
Boston, MA 02133
617-727-2958

Harvard University
Judy Kugel
Assistant Dean for Degree Programs and Registrar
79 JFK Street, Rm. L113
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-495-1337
judy_kugel@harvard.edu

Harvard University
Government Department
Pamela Metz
79 JFK Street, Rm. T402B
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-496-5810
Pamela_metz@harvard.edu

Harvard University
Government Department
Professor Jennifer L. Hochschild
Littauer M-30
1805 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-496-0181
hochschild@latte.harvard.edu
Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps
c/o North High School
150 Harrington Way
Worcester, MA 01604-1898
508-799-3370

Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps
c/o O'Bryan School of Math and Science
55 New Dudley Street
Boston, MA 02120
617-635-9932

Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps
c/o Oxford High School
493 Main Street
Oxford, MA 01540
508-987-6081

Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps
c/o Quabbin Regional High School
P.O. Box 429, S Street
Barre, MA 01005-0428

Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps
c/o West Roxbury High School
1205 VFW Parkway
Boston, MA 02132-4399
617-635-8917

New England Economic Project
27 Emerson Road
Walpole, MA 02081
508-660-1968
www.neepecon.org/welcome.html

Northeastern University
Political Science Department
Amilcar Antonio Barreto
360 Huntington Avenue, Rm. 303 ME
Boston, MA 02115
617-373-2783
abarreto@lynx.neu.edu

Northeastern University
Political Science Department
Denis Sullivan, Chair
360 Huntington Avenue, Rm. 303 ME
Boston, MA 02115
617-373-4409
djs@neu.edu

Northeastern University
Political Science Department
Prof. William Crotty
360 Huntington Avenue, Rm. 303 ME
Boston, MA 02115
617-373-2349
wcrotty@lynx.neu.edu
Veterans of Foreign Wars of Massachusetts
Voice of Democracy-MA
State House, Rm. 546-1
Boston, MA 02133-1043
617-727-2612
massstateadj@aol.com

Worcester State College
Department of Business Administration & Economics
Robert Hartwig
486 Chandler Street
Worcester, MA 01602
508-929-8047
rhartwig@worcester.edu

Worcester State College
Department of Sociology
Corey Dolgon
486 Chandler Street
Worcester, MA 01602
508-929-8534
cdolgon@worcester.edu
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We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution

A Program of the Center for Civic Education

The We the People... experience has opened up a whole new world to me. Not only has it increased my knowledge of the Constitution, but it gave me a chance to learn to speak better in public and how to work together in a team to achieve a common goal. — Amie Thompson, 1999 National Finals Participant

Introduction

The primary goal of We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution is to promote civic competence and responsibility among the nation’s elementary and secondary students. What makes the program so successful is the design of its instructional program, including its innovative culminating activity.

The instructional program enhances students’ understanding of the institutions of American constitutional democracy. At the same time, students discover the contemporary relevance of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The culminating activity is a simulated congressional hearing in which students “testify” before a panel of judges. Students demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles and have opportunities to evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary issues.

Since the inception of the We the People... program in 1987, more than 26 million students and 82 thousand educators have participated in this innovative course of study. The program enjoys the active participation of members of Congress, as well as support from professional, business, and community organizations across the nation.

The Curriculum

The foundation of the We the People... program is the classroom curriculum. It complements the regular school curriculum by providing upper elementary, middle, and high school students with an innovative course of instruction on the history and principles of constitutional democracy in the
United States. The We the People... textbooks are designed for a wide range of student abilities and may be used as a supplemental text or for a full semester of study.

Critical thinking exercises, problem-solving activities, and cooperative learning techniques help develop intellectual and participatory skills while increasing students’ understanding of the institutions of American constitutional democracy. The We the People... curriculum fosters attitudes that are necessary for students to participate as effective, responsible citizens. After studying the textbook, students take a multiple-choice test and prepare for the simulated congressional hearing. Upon completion of the course, they receive a certificate of achievement signed by their member of Congress or other prominent official.

The Textbooks

We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution is the high school level textbook. We the People... is the title of the books designed for the upper elementary and middle school levels. Teacher’s guides for each level contain lesson plans and suggested activities to enrich classroom instruction.

Classroom sets include 30 student books, a teacher’s guide, and an instructional packet containing the information and supplies necessary to complete the program. Free classroom sets are available on a limited basis in each congressional district in the nation. Additional sets may be purchased from the Center at a nominal cost.

We the People... Hearings

Performance Assessment in Action

Participants hold a simulated congressional hearing as the culminating activity for the We the People... program. The entire class, working in cooperative teams, prepares and presents statements before a panel of community representatives who act as congressional committee members. Students then answer questions posed by the committee members. The format provides students an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles while providing teachers with an excellent means of assessing performance.

Teachers may engage their students in the simulated hearing activity at the following levels:

Elementary and middle school level classes may conduct noncompetitive hearings in front of a classroom or auditorium-size audience with community members acting as judges. Teachers at the high school level may conduct a noncompetitive hearing, but are encouraged to participate in the nationwide competitive program. High school competition begins at the congressional district level with teams from each school vying for the district championship. District winners go on to compete at a statewide hearing, and state champions travel to Washington, D.C., in the spring to represent their state in the We the People... national finals.
More than 1200 high school students and their teachers participate annually in the We the People... national finals. While in Washington, students also have an opportunity to visit historic sites and meet with members of Congress and other dignitaries.

"The competition has enormous potential as a model for the evaluation of history/social studies and government classes. It is the most imaginative and well-organized social studies assessment I know of...."

Program Evaluation

The Program Effectiveness Panel of the U.S. Department of Education’s National Diffusion Network examined the reports of numerous research studies on the We the People... program. The panel validated the results of those studies and confirmed the program’s powerful educational effects on students’ civic knowledge and attitudes. This formal validation recognizes the We the People... program’s “contributions to excellence in education.”

What the Research Says

A “great instructional success,” is how the Educational Testing Service characterizes the We the People... program. Independent studies by ETS have revealed that We the People... students “significantly outperformed comparison students on every topic of the tests taken.”

Students involved in the We the People... program develop greater commitment to democratic principles and values, according to a study by Richard Brody of Stanford University. The study concludes that the program is effective in promoting political tolerance because participating students feel more politically effective and perceive fewer limits on their own political freedom.

“Teachers feel excited and renewed.... Students are enthusiastic about what they have been able to accomplish, especially in terms of their ability to carry out a reasoned argument. They have become energized about their place as citizens of the United States,” say researchers from the Council for Basic Education.

In a study conducted in Clark County, Nevada, 80% of students participating in the We the People... program registered to vote compared with the average of 37%. This confirms what teachers taking part in the program have consistently observed: their students become more interested in participating in government.

How to Get Involved

The National Network The Center for Civic Education administers the We the People... program nationally through a network of coordinators in 50 states, 435 congressional districts, 4 trust territories, and the District of Columbia. These coordinators work with their members of Congress, business and community leaders, and local educators to contribute to the success of the program.

Teachers and civic educators

Contact the coordinator for your state or the Center for Civic Education to involve their students in the We the People... program. Work with their congressional district coordinator to include community leaders and members of Congress as judges, speakers, and presenters at the simulated hearings.
Members of Congress

- Sign and present award certificates, speak at simulated hearings, serve as judges, and welcome students from their state to the national finals in Washington, D.C.
- Discuss constitutional issues with students in their classrooms and speak at teacher training workshops
- Support the efforts of their district and state coordinators in all aspects of program implementation

Community, business, and professional associations

- Volunteer time and expertise by serving on advisory committees, providing leadership support, and serving as competition judges
- Provide financial support to help purchase program materials, underwrite local and statewide competitions, and send winning classes to state and national finals

For more information on participating in the We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution program, contact the Center for Civic Education at:

Robert Leming
Center for Civic Education
5146 Douglas Fir Road, Calabasas, CA, 91302-1467
tel: 818-591-9321 or 800-350-4223
fax: 818-591-9330
e-mail: wethepeople@civiced.org

We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution is funded by the U.S. Department of Education by act of Congress
Civis Americanus sum.

Appendix E

We the People... Project Citizen

A portfolio-based civic education project for middle school classes presented by the Center for Civic Education and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Material courtesy of the Center for Civic Education / www.civiced.org

Introduction

We the People... Project Citizen is a civic education program for middle school students that promotes competent and responsible participation in state and local government. It actively engages students in learning how to monitor and influence public policy and encourages civic participation among students, their parents, and members of the community.

As a class project, students work together to identify and study a public policy issue, eventually developing an action plan for implementing their policy. The final product is a portfolio displaying each group’s work.

In a culminating activity the class presents its portfolio in a simulated legislative hearing, demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of how public policy is formulated. Classes may also be able to enter their portfolios in a local competition with other classes. Local winners submit their portfolios for a statewide competition, and state winners go on to be evaluated in the Project Citizen national finals.

The Curriculum

We the People... Project Citizen focuses on the role of state and local governments in the American federal system. The curriculum involves an entire class of middle school students in a series of structured, cooperative learning activities which are guided by their teachers and adult volunteers.

Working in cooperative teams, the class learns to interact with their government through a five step process that includes:

- identifying a public policy problem in their community
- gathering and evaluating information on the problem
- examining and evaluating solutions
- selecting or developing a proposed public policy
- developing an action plan
Students’ work is displayed in a class portfolio containing a display section and a documentation section.

**The Textbook**

*We the People... Project Citizen* is a process oriented instructional guide designed for use in the middle grades. The teacher’s guide includes directions for leading the class through the five-step process and developing a class portfolio. It also contains instructions and evaluation procedures for conducting a simulated legislative hearing.

**Simulated Legislative Hearings**

Participating teachers are encouraged to hold a simulated legislative hearing as the culminating activity for *We the People... Project Citizen*. Each of the four portfolio groups prepares and presents a statement on its section of the portfolio before a panel of community representatives who act as legislative committee members. Each group then answers questions posed by the committee members. The format provides students an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of how public policy is formulated while providing teachers with an excellent means of assessing performance.

**Critical Acclaim**

"It’s great to see more of today’s youth getting involved and being rewarded for their interest in government policy and procedures." — Rep. Herschella Horton, Arizona House of Representatives

"...I not only found this to be an excellent, hands-on approach to public policy but also one of the most thorough, detailed, and easy-to-use programs I have ever seen." — Hank Rowe, Teacher, Amphitheater Middle School, Tucson, Arizona

"As a judge and practicing attorney, I have been involved in many programs, but none that even approached the excitement in civil participation of this program. *Project Citizen* is practical experience in democracy and civil involvement." — Judge Gregory J. Donat, Tippecanoe County Court I, Lafayette, Indiana

"[My students] love it because it is about real problems with real-life actual solutions which they can implement." — Pam Luenz, Teacher, Sunnydale Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana

**Program Participation**

The curriculum was first used in the 1995-96 school year as a pilot in 12 states. Since then the domestic program has expanded to include schools in every state as well as American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and Guam. As of May 2001, approximately 5,000 teachers have taught Project Citizen to 304,000 students.
The formula for tracking student participation is based on two different surveys. The first was conducted in November 1997 by researchers at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, in preparing An Assessment of We the People. Project Citizen: Promoting Citizenship in Classrooms and Communities. The second was conducted by the Center for Civic Education in February 1999.

How to Get Involved

Teachers and Civic Educators

To request a free classroom set of Project Citizen and to involve your classes in the program, contact the program coordinator for your state, complete and submit the application or contact Michael Fischer at the Center. Enlist members of your local state legislatures, community and business leaders, and other educators to assist your students in preparing their portfolios and to serve as judges, speakers, and presenters.
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Educating the Ideal Citizen of Massachusetts

Diane Palmer, Ph.D., Massachusetts Coordinator, Center for Civic Education
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Excepted from “Memos to the Governor: Public Policy Management Advice from the Commonwealth’s Experts in Public Administration and Policy,” a project of the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration

Introduction

In a 1956 publication of the Massachusetts League of Women Voters entitled Massachusetts State Government - A Citizens Handbook, the authors wrote that the purpose of their publication was “to assist the citizen in understanding his government, and to encourage him to participate more fully in its processes. If the first task is difficult, the second is unending.” The publication concludes:

“Can we doubt that our government today needs, as in the past, the devotion and skill of its citizens? It is up to each of us to appraise his own interests and capabilities, and to contribute his share toward asking that our government serve us better. Only then can we hope to leave for coming generations a government effective in organization and responsive to a broad range of human needs.”

The Constitution and General Laws of Massachusetts require the teaching of civic education at public schools and colleges for the purpose of developing an active and informed citizenry to participate in the public affairs of communities and the Commonwealth.

With this as a legal foundation, the teaching of civics has been recognized as an important responsibility of the Commonwealth and its system of public education since Horace Mann launched the system of public education. This fundamental concept has been proclaimed by several United States Presidents, including George W. Bush, who stated in his inaugural address:

“We are bound by the ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests and teach us what it means to be citizens. Every child must be taught these principles. Every citizen must uphold them. And every immigrant, by embracing these ideals, makes our country more, not less American...I ask you to be citizens. Citizens, not spectators. Citizens, not subjects. Responsible citizens, building communities of service and a nation of character.”
However, the continual decline in voting at all levels, in attendance at town meetings, in the numbers of those seeking elective and appointive offices at the state and local level, and in the general public apathy of a large number of citizens, except when projects are proposed in specific neighborhoods, has raised concern among all who care deeply about the Commonwealth's historic tradition of democratic government and representative democracy. As the well-known educator, Robert Hutchins noted, “The death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush. It will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference, and undernourishment.”

If America is to truly win the war against terrorism that began in response to the horrific attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001, we must rekindle the vitality of our civic life. While the terrorist attacks sparked a renewed patriotic fervor of flag waving and sloganeering, it remains unclear if that will translate into a more active citizenship or even simply inspire more citizens to vote. But as the late Texas Congresswoman Barbara Jordan told Harvard graduates in a 1977 commencement address, “The stakes...are too high for government to be a spectator sport.” We must encourage all citizens, especially our young, to understand and participate in their own government at all levels.

One of the most important parts of America's infrastructure is its democratic foundation and the system of education that helps to prepare the Nation's future citizens. If young people are not able to learn how to become active participants in democracy, if they have not experienced the democratic process, if they are uninformed and uninterested in the workings of democracy or the process by which America chooses its leaders and representatives and, sometimes its policies, this part of the national infrastructure will be less resilient to the threat of terrorism.

Before the attacks on America, Americans said they thought of “the government” (55%) rather than “our government” (42%) - that is, a majority of Americans viewed government as a distant and unrelated institution.

Since the attacks on America, those Americans who said they thought of “the government” dropped (30%), but those who thought of “our government” increased (68%). Clearly, the new attitude among Americans toward institutions of government demonstrated since September 11th offers an important opportunity for civic renewal if that attitude can be translated into civic action. It is the purpose of this policy memorandum to explore the need to rebuild our civic education infrastructure and steps that the next governor should consider leading that effort.

**Attitudes of Americans Toward Government in Recent Years.**

A nationwide study of American youth aged 15-24-years-old was completed in January 1999 under the “New Millennium Project,” commissioned by the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) and conducted by the Tarrance Group and Lake, Snell, Perry and Associates...

“Among the key findings of the New Millennium Project were:
Young people today lack interest, trust, and knowledge about American politics, politicians, and public life generally.” Since 18-year-olds were first given the right to vote in the 1972 elections, the voter turnout rate of 18- to 24-year-olds has steadily declined. In 1972, 50% exercised that right. In 1996 only 32% of that age group turned out at the polls. Turnout among this age group in 1998 is projected to have been below 20%, perhaps the lowest in the nation’s history.

Young people today are generally apprehensive about the future and cautious in dealings with others. Barely half (51%) believe America’s best years are ahead, while fully 39% worry its best years are already past. By more than a two-to-one margin, youth questions whether, in general, people can be trusted. Some 65% of our young say most people should be approached with caution.

The highest youth priorities are personal and individualistic. Having a close-knit family (61% give it a 10, the highest importance rating), gaining knowledge and skills (60%), and becoming successful in a career (50%) are youth’s three most important goals. In contrast, the lowest-rated youth priorities include being a good American who cares about the good of the country (27%), being involved in democracy and voting (26%), and being involved and helping your community be a better place (25%).

Youth voluntarism is on the rise; however, this involvement remains both decidedly individualistic and apolitical. It is one-on-one social service most likely to take place in community institutions like soup kitchens, hospitals, homes for the elderly, and schools. Research also shows that volunteering and voting are unrelated. They are not predictors of one another nor are the two variables significantly statistically correlated. Those findings about the apolitical nature of voluntarism ought to raise a cautionary flag for civic educators. Substituting “community service” for well taught classes in civics and government will not achieve the goals of good civic education.

The Secretaries of State study also found that young people are highly critical of how school government and civics classes are taught. The respondents in this study do not feel that high schools do a very good job of teaching about the democratic process, current events, or voting. In fact a majority (55%) agreed with the statement that schools do not give them information about how to register or even about the “mechanics of voting.” Many of the focus group respondents expressed a desire for schools to teach more about politics, issues, and candidates. More than a third of the survey respondents said that making American government classes more participatory would make young people a lot more likely to get involved in the community and in political activities.

Finally, and perhaps the most disturbing conclusion drawn from this study is that young Americans have only a limited, vague understanding of what it means to be a citizen in a democratic society.

According to Margaret Branson, June 1999 (address to the center for civic education) while most young people subscribe to abstract statements about the importance of “being an American” (78%) and “being a good American who cares about the good of the country” (65%), the focus groups suggest that youth identify with the specific rights associated with citizenship, but have only vague ideas about the public responsibilities. For example, they articulate a more personalized vision of good citizenship that included volunteering, helping others, and raising children well. In the survey, 94% of all respondents agreed that “the most important thing I can do as a citizen is to help others.”
Traditional notions of citizenship, which include being politically interested and involved, are much less salient to this generation.

National Educational Goals for Civic Education

In March 1994 Congress passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (Public Law 103-227). Two of the eight national goals the law established dealt specifically with civic education.

Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship
By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our Nation's modern economy.

All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate...good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.

Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning
By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (emphasis added).

The Center for Civic Education, a non-profit, non-partisan corporation, was chosen to develop the National Standards for Civics and Government. Those standards have been widely used by states to develop their own frameworks, standards, and assessment programs because they meet criteria established by specialists in curriculum and assessment. One criterion, for example is that: standards must define content, knowledge, and skills for all students that are explicit, measurable, and show an increasing level of difficulty through the grades. Because the National Standards for Civics and Government satisfy that requirement, as well as other requirements, they have been adopted and/or adapted by many states including Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, Tennessee, California, and New York.

Education for Active Citizenship

The idea that American schools have a distinctively civic mission has been recognized since the earliest days of the Republic. Jefferson, Madison, Adams, and others realized that the establishment of well-constructed political institutions was not in itself a sufficiently strong foundation to maintain constitutional democracy. They knew that ultimately a free society must depend on its citizens-on their knowledge, skills, and civic virtue. They believed that the civic mission of the schools is to foster the qualities of mind and heart required for successful government within a constitutional democracy.
Students and other citizens should be given the opportunity to;

- Take part in discussion of public matters
- Participate in organizations that make up civil society
- Monitor government officials and institutions
- Serve on juries
- Vote
- Seek or hold public office

Americans still believe that schools have a civic mission and that education for responsible citizenship should be the schools' top priority. The 32nd Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll conducted in the year 2000 asked respondents what they considered to be the most important purpose of the nation's schools. They ranked “preparing people to become responsible citizens” as number one. Other purposes such as “helping people become economically self sufficient,” “promoting cultural unity,” and “improving social conditions” were mentioned but were considered to be of lesser importance.

It is worth noting that over the course of 32 years of Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup polling the public has not wavered in its conviction that the schools' central mission is educating young people for citizenship. It is also worth noting that the public's conviction depends on whether or not respondents have children in school or whether or not their children are in public or private school.

Despite this concern, schools today seem fixated on teaching reading and mathematics—with only an occasional nod to science and social studies. If Americans are agreed, as they in fact are, that the primary purpose of schools is to “educate people for responsible citizenship” then one would expect to see civic education given a prominent place in the curriculum and in the life of the student body. Unhappily that is not the case. The evidence is abundant. Civic education is grossly neglected, as we know from a plethora of recent studies. Let me share with you highlights from just a few of those studies.

- The 1998 “Civics Report for the Nation” (from the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics) found more than 30 percent of all students tested at grades 4, 8, and 12 scored below a “Basic” level of understanding of civics and government. Another 39 to 48 percent scored at the “Basic” level, defined as a “partial mastery of the knowledge and skills that are fundamental to proficient work at a given grade.” The National Assessment Governing Board, however, has said “All students should reach the Proficient level; the Basic level is not a desired goal....” Even so, only 21-22 percent scored at Proficient level—the achievement level that the Governing Board said all students should reach. A mere 2-4 percent achieved the “Advanced” level signifying superior performance.

- A study completed by the National Secretaries of State in 1999 was based on a representative survey of 18-24 year-olds. It found that young people “lack any real understanding of citizenship..., information and understanding about the democratic process..., and information about candidates and political parties.” Furthermore, the Secretaries of State report noted that most young people do not seek out political information and that they are not very likely to do so in the future.”
• The National Commission on Civic Renewal tells us that two other measures of democracy-political and interpersonal trust-have declined sharply. In the early 1960's, more than three-quarters of Americans said that the federal government could usually or just about always "be trusted to do the right thing." In the 1990's that figure was closer to one-quarter.

• A National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Trend Report released late last year (2000) found a trend toward less frequent social studies classes in grade four. In 1988 less than half (49%) of students nationwide reported daily classes in social studies. Ten years later in 1998 daily classes in social studies for fourth graders had dropped to just 39 percent.

• The Council of Chief State School Officers Survey of State Student Assessment Programs for the year 2000 found that "Almost all states regularly assess mathematics and language arts/reading (47 and 46 states respectively) while about two-thirds assess writing and science. Not quite half of the states assess social studies.

Again, according to Margaret Branson of the Center for Civic Education, much as we may lament an emphasis on testing as opposed to an emphasis on learning, the truth is that what is tested is deemed to be the most essential subject matter. Today schools are ranked according to their pupils' achievement in reading, mathematics, writing, and science. Parents, the public, and policymakers make judgments about the needs and worth of teachers and schools based on those test scores. It is curious that parents, the public, and policymakers are not equally, if not more, attentive to what they repeatedly proclaim to be the primary purpose of schools-educating informed, effective, and responsible citizens.

Civic Education for Public Service

In addition to educating for citizenship, schools can encourage public service to help provide the elected and appointed officials and civil servants that will be needed by government at all levels. However, before we can revitalize civic education in our schools we need to help teachers understand its importance to social science.

A recent symposium sponsored by the Center for Civic Education and conducted by the Social Studies Development Center of Indiana University attempted to answer the question "Why should civic learning be at the core of social studies teacher education in the United States?"

Professor R. Freeman Butts, the William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, in his keynote address at the symposium answered that question in four parts:

• Preparing citizens to preserve and improve constitutional democracy has been the most important state purpose of K-12 education ever since there has been a United States of America.

• While the civic learning that is required as preparation for democratic citizenship is a prime purpose of all institutional schooling in the United States, it is now peculiarly the function of
public educational institutions to provide universal, free, compulsory, common schooling which is accessible to all persons regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or socio-economic status.

- Above all other subject matter fields in the K-12 curriculum, the “social studies” (however they may be defined today) should be specifically designed to provide the civic knowledge, civic values, and civic skills of citizenship in our constitutional democracy.

- Since the quality and training of teachers are the most important elements in achieving any educational goal in elementary and secondary schools, it is incumbent that the civic learning of prospective social studies teachers should be at the core of the preparation they undergo in their teacher education programs.

Research Results

The Center for Civic Education’s School Violence Prevention Program was designed to investigate ways in which civic education can be used as a violence prevention program. Using grant funds from the U.S. Department of Education, the program studies how the teaching of civic knowledge and skills can affect those attitudes that serve as early warning signs of violence among youth. The Program’s quasi-experimental research study attempts to answer two questions:

1. Will the teaching of civics and government, using high quality educational materials - the Center for Civic Educations Authority: Foundations of Democracy, We the People...the Citizen and the Constitution, and We the People, Project Citizen - and well-trained teachers, increase students’ civic knowledge, sense of civic responsibility, tolerance for the ideas of others, respect for authority and the law, and inclusion for all people in the social and political process?

2. Can regular classroom subject areas that are required in most state and local frameworks be enhanced to include effective violence prevention strategies?

The program measures results through attitudinal tests to gain insight in four target areas of violence prevention - respect for authority and the law, tolerance for the ideas of others, inclusion of people in the social and political process, and a demonstrated sense of civic responsibility. It has proved successful in statistically significant results as well as through teacher and student focus groups.

A Pioneer Institute study focused on a wide array of civic measures in order to examine the widest possible spectrum of civic consequences. The components of civic education included:

- Community Service
- Extracurricular Activities (student clubs and sports)
- Student Government
- Substantive Classroom Instruction in civics and government
- Civic Skills
- School Environment
- Political Efficacy
- Political Tolerance
Among the major findings of the study was that students in schools that have high scores on standardized tests also score highly on an array of civic measures.

Both studies offer evidence that two public policy priorities – safe schools and school with high academic performance - may be realized through a comprehensive program of civic education.

Suggested Steps

Massachusetts Department of Education

The Massachusetts Department of Education is in the process of finalizing the History and Social Science Framework that will become part of the educational requirements for advancement in schools and for graduation. The frameworks are based on seven “Guiding Principles,” and are consistent with the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics. The principles are:

- History and social science should be studied by every student every year from Pre-Kindergarten through high school. (Study of history and social science encourages civic participation and enriches private life...Students should, for example, study the United States Constitution several times during their school years, each time achieving deeper understanding by considering through reading, writing, and discussion, progressively more demanding questions.)

- An effective history and social science curriculum combines the learning of content and skills in the study of history, geography, economics, and civics and government. (Students need to learn about events, ideas, individuals, groups, ideals, dreams and limitations that have shaped our country and the world. Intellectual and political freedom, informed judgment about the present and the future, and an understanding of one's rights, opportunities, and responsibilities depend on such learning.)

- An effective curriculum in history and social science draws on other disciplines.

- An effective history and social science curriculum develops students' common civic identity as American citizens. The curriculum should help students acquire a common understanding of American history, its political principles, and its system of Government in order to prepare them for responsible Participation in our schools and civic life----this is from the Latest version of the frameworks handed out in May.

- An effective history and social science curriculum emphasizes the development of the political principles and institutions of Western civilization. (The origins of most United States political principles, institutions and ideals, -- including the concept of democracy, rule of law, and individual rights and responsibilities - can be traced through European history.)

- An effective history and social science curriculum prepares students to understand the world outside the United States.

- The historical narrative should provide the continuous setting for learning in social science, as well as the frame of reference from which teachers choose the current events and public policy issues for student study, presentations and classroom discussion.
The frameworks for history and social science provide for history, geography, economics, and civics and government to be integrated in the learning standards and skills supporting the teaching in a coherent narrative. The frameworks define civics and governments as follows:

The study of civics and government pertains to the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Students study how people have organized authority and exercised power from the earliest civilizations to the present. While several forms of government will be introduced as part of the study of the past, the philosophy, structure, and evolution of American government are recurrent topics. Students will repeatedly examine the founding documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, other Constitutional amendments, and key Supreme Court decisions and explain their relevance to current events.

The fundamental ideals of democracy - liberty and justice for all - depend for their security on institutions of government; laws that apply equally to those who govern and are governed, and non-governmental religious, social, and economic institutions. As they study American history, students learn the concepts and principles central to American constitutionalism - representative government, the purposes of a written constitution, citizenship, rights, duties, ordered liberty, justice, law, privacy, authority, and power. Further, as students study U.S. and world history, and as they analyze different types of government, they will learn that the quest for freedom and justice transcends national boundaries.

What appears to be missing in the learning frameworks is an opportunity to understand in any real depth the workings of local government - the New England Town Meeting - and urban government or to appreciate the role that Massachusetts played in the national model. John Adams wrote the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 and the United States Constitution of 1789. Massachusetts has been a leader in public education, public health, mental health and other fields setting the standards that were later followed by other states.

In addition, there should be greater stress on practicing and experiencing democratic processes such as through class and student council elections, the Public Project Citizen, the American Legion’s Boys and Girls State programs (and similar programs offered by 4-H and Hugh O’Brien Youth programs), and other programs such as essay contests like the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest and the Massachusetts League of Women Voters Essay contests. There should be an opportunity for service learning through community service as well.

An important benefit from a renewed focus on civic education is that studies have shown that schools with instruction in civic education tend to be less likely to experience school violence. (www.civiced.org - School Violence Prevention Demonstration Program May, 1999-June, 2000.) A recent Massachusetts study by the Pioneer Institute, a conservative think tank, suggested a favorable correlation between civic education and higher standardized test scores. (www.pioneerinstitute.org - White Paper No. 17, September, 2001).

Programs To Promote Civic Education in Our Schools:

- Introduce legislation to require instruction in Civics (U.S. Government, State and Local Government) in compliance with the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics (NAEP) Frameworks as a requirement for graduation and direct that civics be a component of learning standards in any standardized test required for graduation.
- Encourage college schools or departments of education to include training in civic education as part of teacher preparation and in-service professional development programs.
- Establish executive branch internship programs for students to obtain first-hand experience in state government.
• Contract with the Massachusetts League of Women Voters and/or other qualified entities to update and republish a new version of the League's 1956 guide entitled “Massachusetts State Government - A Citizen’s Handbook” to be made available on the state's website.

• Participate in civic education public policy initiatives such as “Project Citizen” that is sponsored by the Center for Civic Education. Project Citizen uses an innovative approach to address public policy issues and challenges that face our communities, generating ideas to meet those challenges. Co-sponsored by NCSL and the Center for Civic Education, project citizen is a national academic program for middle schools students designed to involve young people in identifying, researching, and creating policy initiatives to solve community problems. By focusing on real-life concerns, students learn practical ways to participate actively and responsibly in state and local government. Support for project citizen will ensure expansion of this innovative curriculum throughout Massachusetts middle schools.

Additional Recommendations

In order to strengthen democracy, Massachusetts needs to encourage more people to participate as citizens and more people to seek opportunities for public service. Citizens need to vote, to participate in public policy discussions at the community, state, and national levels on a broad range of issues, not just when some development threatens their neighborhood or employment. Citizens also need to be encouraged to volunteer for community service as interns, serve in one of the divisions of the new USA Freedom Corps (www.usafreedomcorp.org), AmeriCorps (www.americorps.org), CitizenCorps (www.citizencorps.gov); or non-profit organization, faith-based initiative or other service program.

Whether we are addressing the needs of those citizens who live in the shadows of society through AmeriCorps, or responding to the threat of terrorism through the various units of CitizenCorps - Community Emergency Response Teams, Neighborhood Watch Program, Volunteers in Police Service, Medical Reserve Corps, Operation TIPS, or Citizen Corps Councils every American should accept the responsibility of volunteering at least the 4,000 hours of service in a lifetime suggested by the President.

Beyond renewing the civic fabric of America, our government – at federal and state levels - needs to be renewed as well by attracting some of our best and brightest young adults to consider careers in public service.

In Massachusetts, with the “graying” of much of the public sector workforce, in part resulting from early retirement programs, as well as the allure of higher pay in many private sector positions, the governor needs to focus on the issue of recruiting and retaining career public employees as one of the top priorities of the next administration. With regard to career public employees, Massachusetts should:

• Improve the opportunities for attracting talented citizens to accept the call to service at all levels of state and local government. This effort must include and examination of recruitment policies and practices to make public service more attractive such as the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of others.

• Reorganize the laws governing state and local human resources to be more reflective of actual job requirements than the current rigid civil service classifications, as well as the ability to provide incentives for advancement and re-assignment or termination of poor performers. Develop pension and employee benefit laws that facilitate the hiring of employees from the private sector to work in the public sector for a time and then return to the private sector.
• Restructure salaries and benefits of public service positions to more effectively compete with private sector opportunities.

• Review the relationship between public employees who perform core government responsibilities and private sector employees who are contracted by government to perform services to determine what positions should be considered career government service.

• Develop a public sector leadership corps of career and political managers and the relationship between them to make both more responsive to the changing needs of government.

• Promote government performance measures to help build trust in government and our democratic institutions.

State House Fellows Program

The purpose of the State House Fellows Program shall be to provide gifted and highly motivated young men and women from Massachusetts with some first-hand experience in the process of governing the Commonwealth and a sense of personal involvement in the leadership of Massachusetts. It is essential to improving and maintaining the healthy functioning of our democratic system that we have in the non-governmental sector a generous supply of leaders who have a first-hand understanding of the challenges of state government. In a time when many of our citizens feel remote from the decisions that lead to public policy, such leaders can help their fellow citizens to comprehend the process by which the Commonwealth is governed.

In Massachusetts today, our outstanding institutions of higher learning produce many skilled professionals. However, too few of this intellectual elite provide our society with statesmanlike leadership and guidance in public affairs. The State House Fellowship program is designed to develop our ablest leaders and statesmen of the future. The program is intended to broaden the horizons and experience of the participants to give them a sense of personal involvement in the leadership of Commonwealth, a vision of the Commonwealth's historic greatness and its potential for the future greatness, and a sense of responsibility for bringing that greatness to reality. It is possible that some Fellows may seek appointment to positions in state service at the conclusion of their fellowship, while others will return to the private sector. In either case, it is expected that the experience will produce new leaders who will contribute to the improvement of the public sector in the Commonwealth.

Modeled on the successful White House Fellows program, the Governor should establish a commission to select outstanding young Massachusetts residents for the opportunity to participate in the day to day business of governing the Commonwealth. Each year twelve applicants and twelve alternates should be selected to serve for one year as State House Fellows.

The fellowship year would begin in July and run through the following June. Each fellow would work as a special assistant to a cabinet level official or senior executive and would also participate in an educational program designed to nurture his or her development as a leader.

Applicants must be U.S. citizens and residents of Massachusetts. Current employees of the state government are not eligible. Applicants must be out of school and working in their chosen profession. They are expected to have a record of remarkable achievement in their early careers; the skills required for service at the highest levels of state government; and a proven commitment to public service. There would be no formal age restrictions; however, the fellowship program is intended to give those selected the experience of government service early in their careers. Fellowships would be awarded on a non-partisan basis reflecting a balance and diversity comparable to the general population of the Commonwealth.
Candidates would be judged on their professional, academic and other accomplishments that indicate they have demonstrated remarkable achievement in the early stages of their career. They are also judged on their current leadership skills and evidence of growth potential in those skills. In addition, a strong commitment to public service, exceptional writing ability, and strong organizational and management skills would be required for a successful year as a special assistant to the highest level of state government officials. All of these qualities, combined with others such as strength of character, a positive attitude, and the ability to work well with others, should be taken into account in selecting each class of fellows.

The most promising applicants would submit to a required interview, develop a memo to the Governor on some proposed new or changed policy, and undergo a comprehensive background investigation including recommendations.

Engagement in the work of the state government should lie at the center of the State House Fellowships. State House Fellows spend a full year as full-time, paid assistants to senior staff of the Governor, the Constitutional Officers, the Cabinet, and other top-ranking state government officials. Typically, the fellows would write speeches, help draft and review proposed legislation, answer legislative inquiries, chair meetings, and conduct briefings. Fellows would receive salary and benefits comparable to other executive branch employees. Salaries for the first year of the program would be set at $60,000 each and as determined by the State House Fellows Commission in subsequent years. State House Fellows would not be allowed to receive compensation from any other source during their year of government service.

To promote geographic diversity in representation from all regions of the state, the fellows would be selected - one fellow and one alternate from each of the state's ten Congressional Districts - and two fellows and two alternates selected at large. In the event that one or more Congressional districts do not have qualified applicants, the number of at-large fellows may be increased at the discretion of the Commission.

To ensure the highest level respect for the program, the State House Fellows Commission should be chaired by the Lieutenant Governor and include the Secretary of Administration and Finance, the President of the University of Massachusetts System, the Director of Human Resources for the state, and several private sector community leaders. After the first year, former Fellows may be asked to serve on the commission.

The Commission should select a college or university to design, manage, and implement the fellowship's education program that would augment and amplify the work experience. Over the course of the year, each class of fellows should meet with key leaders in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of state government, with members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation, and with leaders from the worlds of business, the arts, science and technology, and the media. These briefings could include visits to locations around the state as appropriate.

**Promote Respect for Public Service and Public Servants**

- Support efforts such as “Public Employee Recognition Week” and the Carballo Awards, to honor and respect those who work in public service, publicizing through public service recognition programs and awards, the most able, dedicated public servants and citing them as role models for young people who may be interested in public service careers or opportunities. www.theroundtable.org

- Restructure state employee systems to recruit and retain the best citizens in public service and develop salary and benefit programs that are competitive with other employment options.
• Promote programs to bring teacher trainers and teachers, especially social studies teachers, to the State Capitol for seminars on state government. A program could be developed for intensive education in state government for teachers during the February school vacation period that would award professional development credit and provide a modest stipend to offset travel and expenses.

• Encourage the many private, non-profit organizations with civic education programs to expand their efforts and work with local schools and community organizations to broaden the student opportunities to experience the role of active citizenship.
The presentations in this volume were derived from the first Massachusetts Summit on Civic Learning in Teacher Preparation and Professional Development that was held in the historic Old Senate Chamber (now the Senate Reception Room) in the Massachusetts State House. The Summit, sponsored by the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Education and other organizations, was held on May 15, 2002. Organizers believe that in order to begin to re-invigorate civic education as a major part of the mission of public education, those who prepare or develop teachers need to be among the missionaries of civic engagement.

The central theme of the conference focused on those who are responsible for the preparation of new teachers or the professional development of in-service teachers. The goal was to encourage planning for curriculum improvements in teacher education that would create an understanding of the role of teachers as coaches for democracy. We use the coaching analogy because a coach teaches not only the basic essentials of what to do, but shows how to achieve successful performance through constant practice. Improving education for civic engagement in our democracy in programs of teacher education and professional development is the key to improving teaching and learning of democracy in our schools. For prospective or in-service teachers to be effective educators for democracy, they must know what it is, how to do it. And why it is good.

The speakers, including Harvard’s Derek Bok, author of The Trouble with Government; Indiana’s John Patrick, and Boston University’s Charles S. White and Karen E. Bohlin, challenge university-based teacher education to renew American education’s historic role as the incubator of the next generation of citizens involved in their communities and their government.

The Massachusetts Civic Learning Summit was initiated by Massachusetts State Senator Richard T. Moore in his capacity as President of the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration. He serves as Editor for the publication and authored the introduction of the Summit that appears in the book.

The Massachusetts Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration is committed to the advancement of excellence in public service. The society seeks to achieve that by the advancement of the science, art, and processes of public administration; the development and exchange of public administration and literature; and advocacy on behalf of public service and high ethical standards in government.