

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATING STUDENTS FOR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Civic Learning Spiral

Caryn McTighe Musil

The students, both rising high school seniors and rising seniors in college, were puzzled by the words *civic engagement*. The focus group leader prodded them by recasting her question a number of ways. Glazed eyes looked back at her. Then students finally began to talk about providing service to those in need, but few had any other conceptual understanding of the phrase *civic engagement* or its critical connection to democratic institutions. None connected it to expectations they had for what college would or should teach them. As one of the high school students explained, “Civic responsibility and leadership are qualities that individuals are born with” (Association of American Colleges and Universities Board of Directors, 2004).

Such notions are in direct contradiction with those of Thomas Jefferson, who argued that the struggling new republic would surely founder if it did not invest in educating its citizens. Developing a strong democracy, according to Jefferson, was inextricably linked to education. For contemporary students in U.S. higher education, however, that bond has largely faded from their consciousness. In fact, in the series of focus groups sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 2004 to explore what students hoped to achieve as a result of going to college, students identified civic learning outcomes as

the two least critical ones from a list of sixteen (Humphreys and Davenport, 2005). Thus, students in both groups selected among *three of the least desirable* capacities learned in college: “tolerance and respect for people of other backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and lifestyles”; “expanded cultural and global awareness and sensitivity”; and at the very bottom, “appreciation of your role as a citizen and an orientation toward public service” (Humphreys and Davenport, 2005, p. 40). Developing civic knowledge, skills, and habits are, of course, utterly dependent on all three. Without them, U.S. democracy and its concomitant responsibilities as part of a globally interdependent world are at peril.

These students did look to college to develop their *individual* aspirations of maturity, succeeding on their own, time-management skills, strong work habits, and self-discipline. But there was little sense of a heightened responsibility to others locally or globally as an important outcome of a college education. In fact, some of the students thought that service-learning, one of the more benign faces of civic engagement, threatened to interfere with what they perceived to be their primary college goals, such as preparing for a career (Humphreys and Davenport, 2005). Students have not developed their more narcissistic perspectives on their own. Higher education has accommodated them by largely abandoning its historical role in educating students for democracy. It has gladly assigned civics to high schools and rarely paid any attention to the quality of what students might have learned in those mandated courses that everyone had to take and few can remember.

A NEW EDUCATIONAL COMPACT

Happily for the future of a vibrant democracy dependent on participatory citizenship, a seismic shift is occurring that promises to disrupt this devilish compact. (Chapter 1 provides an overview of the current resurgent focus on civic engagement in higher education.) In its recent report, *College Learning for the New Global Century* (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise, 2007), AAC&U argues that there is consensus among colleges and universities about four broad essential learning outcomes that students will need for a world characterized by dynamic change, interdependence, destabilizing inequalities, and volatility:

- Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world
 - Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts
- Intellectual and practical skills
 - Inquiry and analysis
 - Critical and creative thinking
 - Written and oral communication
 - Quantitative literacy
 - Information literacy
 - Teamwork and problem solving
- Personal and social responsibility
 - Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
 - Intercultural knowledge and competence
 - Ethical reasoning and action
 - Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- Integrative and applied learning
 - Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized education (p. 12)

The first pair is familiar, embraced by faculty and branded as distinguishing hallmarks of U.S. higher education around the world. The second pair of essential learning outcomes expands the vision and expectations of higher education. As such, they represent a source of innovation and creativity that also promises to reinvigorate our nation's civic imagination and habits. However, the latter two also have much in common with the bottom tier of outcomes that students in the focus groups ranked so low.

The challenge is how to translate all four of these consensus outcomes into the academic and cocurricular life of students and into the everyday practices and policies of a tradition-bound academy. Success in accomplishing this will entail a radical transformation of how higher education organizes itself. But there seems to be agreement among higher education and business leaders alike that the country's economic and social future is at stake. In a national poll of business leaders, 76 percent of employers want colleges to place more emphasis on the intercultural competencies that lead to teamwork skills in diverse groups, and 72 percent want more emphasis on global knowledge (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007). Developing a talent pool equipped to address the challenges of the new global

century requires graduates who are adept critical thinkers capable of addressing unscripted problems whose solutions require navigating through and relying on the resources of highly diverse communities. Ultimately, this leads inevitably to a new framework for excellence governing higher education. As *College Learning for the New Global Century* describes it, such a vision for learning calls “for a far-reaching shift in the focus of schooling from accumulating course credits to building real-world capabilities” (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise, 2007, p. 5).

CONVERGING STUDENT LEARNING REFORM MOVEMENTS

The fecundity of innovative programs about civic engagement and social responsibility that are currently lodged everywhere on campuses—from the president’s office and course catalogs to campus life and facility operations—have begun to lay the scaffolding for how higher education can reassume its role of preparing graduates for their roles as informed citizens ready to engage and lead responsibly in their work and community roles. The growing breadth and depth of these myriad activities have been fueled by the convergence of three streams of educational reform movements, all of which have brought exciting possibilities at this historic juncture. While the trio use different nomenclatures, they include constellations of activities around U.S. diversity, global learning, and civic engagement.

Any learning goals for civic engagement diminish these movements’ intellectual scope and capacity to seriously address social justice issues in diverse democracies if isolated from the powerful critical lenses of the other two. Far too often, however, that is exactly what has happened as civic engagement activities have taken root on college campuses. Similarly, U.S. diversity and global learning, devoid of an exploration of their responsibilities to a larger public good, reduce their power as education for democratic citizenship.

U.S. DIVERSITY

Nowhere have civic lessons been more instructive than in the very democratization of colleges and universities themselves over the past century as they moved from being exclusionary institutions to more inclusive ones. Such a change did not occur simply because

time passed. It occurred because citizens at every level, especially those denied even the right to vote, acted collectively to recast the script of American democracy. They organized, marched, lobbied, used legal strategies, wrote, tapped the media, defied the laws that excluded them, and through their public actions, largely ended the most shameful aspects of apartheid systems in the United States. Higher education was largely a conspirator in this apartheid system until the civil rights movement forced it to change. Progress first appeared in the kind of student population sought and admitted, then in the campus life structures to support those students, and finally in the new areas of scholarship and teaching spurred by the greater diversity of people working and studying on college campuses. One consequence of this dramatic shift in the demographic profile of students is a concurrent commitment to engage more responsibly and deeply with diverse local and global communities.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, only 4 percent of Americans went to college (Veysey, 1965). Today 75 percent of students who complete high school go on to some kind of college (Education Trust–West, 2002). Even as late as 1976, after the civil rights movement had ended the formal apartheid educational laws and practices, only 14.5 percent of all enrolled college students were minorities (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Today, that percentage has climbed to 28 percent, with predictions of a steady increase across all nonwhite racial groups (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). The number of female college students across all racial/ethnic groups increased from 44 percent in 1970 to 57 percent by 2005 (U.S. Department of Education, 2006), which has accelerated the readiness of higher education to address local and global issues because the students who participate in service-learning and study abroad programs are predominantly female. A disposition to reach out to underserved communities is also enhanced by the fact that by the 1989–1990 academic year, 43 percent of first-time entering students were first generation, the majority of whom were likely to be racial minorities being taught by some faculty who were themselves the first in their families to go to college (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1998).

The rich perspectives brought to the classroom, to areas of research, and to the very definition of what issues are considered urgent have been captured in the expanding body of work that

illuminates how diversity, if deployed correctly, is a not just an expression of democratic opportunity but a source of educational insights and excellence. Some examples of this body of work include the following: Lawrence W. Levin, *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History* (Beacon Press, 1996); Daryl G. Smith and Associates, *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit* (AAC&U, 1997); Patricia Gurin, Eric L. Dey, Sylvia Hurtado, and Gerald Gurin, "Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes," *Harvard Educational Review*, Fall 2002; and Patricia Gurin, Jeffrey Lehman, and Earl Lewis, *Defending Diversity: Affirmative Action at the University of Michigan* (University of Michigan Press, 2004). The effort to diversify higher education is, of course, a reflection of the larger societal demands that American democracy extend its opportunities, education among them, equally to everyone. At its very heart, then, the U.S. diversity reform movement is civic work and offers deliberation across differences as an everyday encounter.

GLOBAL LEARNING

The educational reform movement of U.S. diversity has found a natural partner in the closely related reform movement centered on global learning. With an ever-sharpening awareness of the inescapable interdependency in the world, with all the asymmetries of power inherent in those relationships, higher education has recognized the necessity of incorporating global knowledge as a fundamental dimension of learning for contemporary graduates. An AAC&U project funded by the Mellon Foundation revealed that a large (and growing) number of liberal arts colleges specify in their mission statements that their graduates should be prepared to thrive in a future characterized by global interdependence (Hovland, 2005). Research universities, community colleges, and other types of higher education institutions are following suit. Preparing students to be "global citizens" is another phrase commonly sprinkled across mission statements. More than 70 percent of the respondents (Americans over age eighteen and college-bound high school seniors) in an American Council on Education (2005) study believe it is important for colleges and universities to offer international experiences and opportunities, and 83 percent

believe it is important for colleges and universities to offer occasions to interact with students from other countries.

While institutions claim that global learning is an essential component for a twenty-first-century college education, the Mellon study revealed that there is little evidence that students are provided with multiple, robust, interdisciplinary learning environments at increasing levels of engagement to ensure that they acquire the global learning professed in the mission statement. As the newest of the three reform movements, such structured learning opportunities, both within the curriculum and within student life, are the least developed. However, evidence abounds that colleges are devoting more attention and resources to new programs, courses, living-learning centers, and study abroad opportunities. They are also hiring new faculty across departments with expertise in global knowledge.

Like the U.S. diversity movement, global learning is both about new knowledge and about reframing existing knowledge. Global learning also has profound civic dimensions, since it is not just about what students think but what they do as a result of what they have learned. Sharing similarities with its cousins, U.S. diversity and civic engagement, global learning is not an add-on but an essential means for academic institutions to achieve their educational and civic missions. AAC&U's *College Learning for the New Global Century* states: "Global integration is now our shared context. The potential benefits of global interdependence are extraordinary, but so too are the challenges. Wealth, income, and social power are dramatically unequal within and across international boundaries. We are reminded daily of the clash of cultures, histories, and worldviews. The globe itself is fragile and vulnerable as are our shared civic spaces. These global challenges will be with us for the foreseeable future" (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007, p. 21).

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

As chapter 1 describes, civic engagement has been emerging as a focus as higher education institutions are recommitting to their public purpose. On many campuses, students have been the catalyst for a wide range of activities that serve communities in need, and structures to support that outreach are visible everywhere.

Throughout the 1990s, more and more students arrived on campus eager to continue the practice of volunteering in the community inspired by their faith communities, high school involvements, and the larger cultural focus on individual solutions for larger social problems. By 2005, over 3.3 million students arrived on college campuses having already served as volunteers (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2006). Volunteer centers, often run by nonacademic staff, became a more common fixture, and the numbers of student organizations devoted to community service grew. In many cases, presidents' offices readily took on civic engagement as a robust entrepreneurial and public relations dimension of the president's, and the institution's, role.

The last group to fall into line with the expanding civic engagement activities was the faculty. Gradually, however, they became more involved in incorporating the possibilities of community-based learning through credit-bearing service-learning courses and community-focused undergraduate research projects. Faculty teaching diversity courses had already initiated community-based internships, research, and pedagogy as a dimension of their work. From their inception, black studies and women's studies, for example, understood their academic disciplines as an aspect of larger historic and contemporary social movements for full equality. Other faculty fell under the civic engagement umbrella through their commitment to education for democratic citizenship or by embracing pedagogies of engaged civic learning.

The most recent focus of campus activity across students, faculty, administrators, and facilities' units is sustainability. Driven by a sense of environmental and economic responsibility and their link to developing viable social communities, colleges and universities have increasingly turned to "greening" their campuses, created new courses and programs in sustainability, and seen the rise of student activism. The sustainability movement locally is linked inevitably with larger global concerns, offering one more footbridge between these three reform movements, all of which are different faces of civic learning.

These various rivulets within the civic engagement movement have led to more comprehensive civic engagement initiatives or centers. Many of these are now housed within academic affairs, thus inserting themselves at the heart of student learning.

However, too often these new civic engagement initiatives or centers fail to connect with those addressing U.S. diversity and global concerns. Defining how all three share similar learning goals and work collaboratively within that larger vision can enhance the transformative civic power of all three movements.

MAXIMIZING THE EDUCATIONAL CAPITAL OF ALL THREE MOVEMENTS

Unfortunately, these powerful educational reform movements typically operate with different personnel, are located in different departments or divisions, use different language, and have different histories. But there is evidence of emerging efforts to capitalize on the congruencies as administrators and faculty members recognize common conceptual frameworks, complementary pedagogies, and increasingly similar student learning goals. Together they can and should form a powerful educational partnership that promises to provide students with the knowledge, commitment, and practical skills to be socially responsible citizens in a diverse democracy and increasingly interconnected world.

What was first developed to capture diversity literacy in a simple schema of five essential questions soon became equally useful in describing both civic and global learning. It is offered as additional evidence that while they may operate under different banners, all three are fundamentally about the same process. Students move from the self, to others, and finally to cooperating with others for a larger public good. The following five questions, slightly adapted from the original, suggest critical queries for students to pose that should lead them to a deeper capacity to work collectively with others toward shared social and civic ends:

Who am I? (knowledge of self)

Who are we? (communal/collective knowledge)

What does it feel like to be them? (empathetic knowledge)

How do we talk with one another? (intercultural process knowledge)

How do we improve our shared lives? (applied, engaged knowledge)
(Musil, 2006b)

When the power of each of the three educational reform movements is influenced by the special insights and distinguishing pedagogies of the others, they have greater likelihood of meeting

what are shared educational goals across the trio. A way out of the conundrum of intellectual silos between the three is the creation of a kind of intellectual commons. That such a space is possible can be most clearly seen in the common aspirations across all three as they seek to help students:

- gain a deep, comparative knowledge of the world's peoples and problems;
- explore the historical legacies that have created the dynamics and tensions of their world;
- develop intercultural competencies to move across boundaries and unfamiliar territory and see the world from multiple perspectives;
- sustain difficult conversations in the face of highly emotional and perhaps uncongenial differences;
- understand—and perhaps redefine—democratic principles and practices within an intercultural and global context;
- secure opportunities to engage in practical work with fundamental issues that affect communities not yet well served by their societies; and
- believe that actions and ideas matter and can influence their world. (Hovland, 2005)

As noted earlier, AAC&U has further articulated a simple phrase that connects all three movements as well: personal and social responsibility. Defined as one of the four essential learning outcomes of a college education, personal and social responsibility also offers overarching language that encompasses U.S. diversity, global learning, and civic engagement. It, too, tenders an intellectual commons for all three. By doing so, it reflects what college campuses are gradually discovering: the interchangeable and complementary concepts and commitments of the three.

Too frequently, however, civic engagement continues to narrow its scope by excluding the expanding dimensions possible when the insights of U.S. diversity and global learning inform understanding of civic engagement, civic responsibility, and education for democracy. By contrast, in the definition of civic engagement put forth in this volume, the integration of the three is clearly articulated: civic engagement is acting on a heightened sense of responsibility to one's communities that encompasses the notions

of global citizenship and interdependence, participation in building civil society, and empowering individuals as agents of positive social change to promote social justice locally and globally.

THE CIVIC LEARNING SPIRAL

As institutions struggle to move from scattered and uncoordinated activities within and across all three learning reform movements, one vehicle for creating educational coherence is to organize more intentional, developmental, and integrated student learning outcomes. As part of AAC&U's five-year initiative *Greater Expectations: Goals for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*, the Civic Engagement Working Group was charged with investigating whether there were pathways from K–12 through college that offered a developmental arc of civic learning that was cumulative over time and built on what had previously been learned. The members of the Civic Engagement Working Group were selected because they approached civic learning informed deeply by their expertise in U.S. diversity and global learning reform movements as well as in civic engagement.

Through a series of public forums in six cities across the country that gathered educators and nonprofit staff from all educational sectors, the Civic Engagement Working Group accumulated examples of models for civic learning and greater clarity about how educators were defining components of civic engagement. Elements of the working group's findings are captured in Andrea Leskes and Ross Miller's *Purposeful Pathways: Helping Students Achieve Key Learning Outcomes* (2006). Ultimately, the working group developed a new model of civic learning that could be applied from elementary school through college and, in the process, establish the habit of lifelong engagement as an empowered, informed, and socially responsible citizen. The group called its model the Civic Learning Spiral.

Distinguished by principles of interactivity and integration, the spiral has six elements or braids within each full turn:

1. Self
2. Communities and cultures
3. Knowledge

4. Skills
5. Values
6. Public Action (Musil et al., in press)

These six braids coexist simultaneously, indicating the connections between and among them, even if a given educational environment is designed to develop one element more than another. An introductory writing course at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey, that uses ethno-autobiographies might have special emphasis on the self and communities and cultures, but students in that course would likely also learn something about the history of other people's ethnic groups, better understand and appreciate others' perspectives, and perhaps be more inclined to join in a public rally to support immigrants' rights because of what they might have learned from classmates in their personal writings. Living-learning programs organized around civic engagement—like those being created at the University of Delaware in Newark—offer a series of developmental outcomes for students across four years, with each year having a designated set of activities that help develop students' dialogic and deliberative skills, ethical values, and practice in public service. By contrast, a senior capstone course in general education at St. Edwards University in Austin, Texas, has a thicker braid in public action since it requires students to organize a project that addresses a social dilemma to which they apply knowledge from their major.

The Civic Engagement Working Group chose the metaphor of the spiral over the more commonly used steps and ladders because ladder advocates typically organize student learning into a series of separate and unconnected boxes instead of a fluid, integrated continuum. In contrast to a hierarchical ladder model often used to justify deferring some learning as inappropriate at lower levels, the spiral suggests that complexity and integration can be—and, in fact, should be—addressed at all levels. With each turn of the spiral, learners bring with them their recently acquired knowledge and their synthesis of the integration of the six interrelated braids of the spiral. The repetitive rhythm of the rotation of the wheel also helps foster a routine of integration that can lead to a lifelong disposition of open inquiry, dialogue across differences, and practice in public activism.

The spiral is constructed around the notion of relationships and deeply embedded interdependencies that are part of everyday life and learning. The working group argued that schools should introduce students to the core principles and dilemmas of democracy at an early age to begin the process of acquiring a sophisticated understanding of their rights and responsibilities as citizens in a diverse democracy and multicultural global society. Such learning requires repeated opportunities in high school and college to translate new knowledge, values, and skills into the practice of collective public action. As Benjamin Barber (2007) argues, “We are born free, but we are not born citizens. The difference between born free and becoming citizens is a lifetime of learning and practice, of which formal education is only a piece.”

LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR THE SIX BRAIDS WITHIN THE CIVIC LEARNING SPIRAL

The Civic Engagement Working Group asserted that a series of assumptions undergirds the Civic Learning Spiral and therefore should influence the pedagogies, the nature of assignments, and the intellectual architecture of a given course or program:

- We all learn and live within an intricate web of interdependencies that are with us from childhood to old age.
- Being a learner and being a responsible citizen are continuous, lifelong, and intricately dependent upon cultivating and recognizing relationships.
- At the heart of education for civic engagement is the notion of the self in ongoing relationship with others.
- Civic engagement is dependent upon collaborative inquiry, dialogic pluralism, and negotiated collective action.
- Civic engagement needs to be informed by knowledge, rooted in values, tied to democratic aspirations, and embodied through practice.
- Given that U.S. democracy is marked as much by its failures as its aspirations, engagement in such a context implies both a promise and an undertaking. (Musil et al., in press)

Every college should examine its curriculum to be sure it provides a pathway for students to develop civic imagination,

civic values, and civic habits cultivated in part by exposure to the complex struggle for democratic justice that poses both enduring and contemporary questions in human history. There is no single model. But within whatever mapping of mindful citizenship that is selected, the Civic Learning Spiral can help bring coherence and integration to the student so that this century's graduates will be informed, responsible, and civically engaged members of their globally linked societies. Following is a set of civic learning outcomes that the Civic Engagement Working Group developed for the six braids of the spiral for the purpose of integration into a wide range of courses and cocurricular experiences:

Outcomes for civic learning about the self:

- Understanding that the self is always embedded in relationships, a social location, and a specific historic moment
- Awareness of ways one's identity is connected to inherited and self-chosen communities
- Ability to express one's voice to effect change
- Disposition to become active in what a person cares about
- Capacity to stand up for oneself and one's passionate commitments

Outcomes for civic learning about communities and cultures:

- Appreciation of the rich resources and accumulated wisdom of diverse communities and cultures
- Understanding how communities can also exclude, judge, and restrict
- Curiosity to learn about the diversity of groups locally and globally
- Willingness to move from the comfort zone to the contact zone by transgressing boundaries that divide
- Capacity to describe comparative civic traditions expressed within and by different cultural groups

Outcomes for civic learning about knowledge:

- Recognition that knowledge is dynamic, changing, and consistently reevaluated
- Understanding that knowledge is socially constructed and implicated with power
- Familiarity with key historical struggles, campaigns, and social movements to achieve the full promise of democracy

- Deep knowledge about the fundamental principles of and central arguments about democracy over time as expressed in the United States and in other countries
- Ability to describe the main civic intellectual debates within one's major

Outcomes for civic learning about skills:

- Adeptness at critical thinking, conflict resolution, and cooperative methods
- Ability to listen eloquently and speak confidently
- Skills in deliberation, dialogue, and community building
- Development of a civic imagination
- Capacity to work well across multiple differences

Outcomes for civic learning about values:

- Serious exploration of and reflection about core animating personal values
- Examination of personal values in the context of promoting the public good
- Espousal of democratic aspirations of equality, opportunity, liberty, and justice for all
- Development of affective qualities of character, integrity, empathy, and hope
- Ability to negotiate traffic at the intersection where worlds collide

Outcomes for civic learning about public action:

- Understanding of, commitment to, and ability to live in communal contexts
- Disposition to create and participate in democratic governance structures of school, college, and the community
- Disciplined civic practices that lead to constructive participation in the communities in which one lives and works
- Formulation of multiple strategies for action (service, advocacy, policy change) to accomplish public ends/purposes
- Planning, carrying out, and reflecting upon public action
- Development of the moral and political courage to take risks to achieve the public good
- Determination to raise ethical issues and questions in and about public life (Musil et al., in press)

USING AND ASSESSING THE OUTCOMES OF THE CIVIC LEARNING SPIRAL

While this chapter can only begin to touch on some key issues related to using and assessing the outcomes of the Civic Learning Spiral, clarifying what the key civic learning goals are for each course, program, or other educational experience is the necessary starting point. An AAC&U board of directors report, *Our Students' Best Work* (2004), suggests three levels of learning to aim for that can be applied within a single course or over time in a full program of study. Those include foundational learning, milestone learning, and capstone experiences. What, for example, would be the foundational learning necessary to gain some threshold civic skills? Are there milestones that might illustrate that a student has turned the spiral one more time and developed new democratic competencies to stay in sustained dialogue despite congenial differences? In a capstone experience in that skill-building area, how might a community-based service project demonstrate a student's ability to negotiate the complex power differentials that typify so many campus-community partnerships? Without the inherent structure of the syllabus, attendance requirements, and grades in an academic course, it is more challenging to assess learning in cocurricular experiences.

If we examine one level of learning—the individual course—as an example, several questions arise that enable the faculty member to integrate student learning outcomes and assess the degree to which students achieve them. Are the civic components of the course clearly defined? Would a student know these are goals for the course? Is the course constructed in such a way as to give students the opportunity to achieve those goals? Has the faculty member clearly articulated to the students what success would look like related to the course goals? Are the course goals part of a larger developmental arc of more complex and long-term goals? Do the course assignments build on one another? How are students involved in assessing their gains so they might become more adept at evaluating both their own civic knowledge and skills and those of their peers?

It is important for an institution to align its overall commitment to students' civic learning at all levels. If local and global

citizenship is articulated as a goal in the institution's mission statement, how do divisions, departments, programs, courses, and campus life reinforce that goal, develop different aspects of the Civic Learning Spiral, and assess how well a student has mastered new competencies, values, and dispositions that serve as evidence of civic imagination and habits?

New publications about how to assess different dimensions of civic engagement are appearing regularly. And many have become concerned that while students acquire elements of the Civic Learning Spiral, most structured campus experiences fail to foster a sense of political efficacy, and as a result, the public action braid is underdeveloped (Musil et al., in press; Spiezio, 2002). *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Political Engagement* (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold, 2007) offers new research about what kind of courses most effectively instill in students the will, capacity, and practice to effect political change in society. Other publications in this vein include the following: José Z. Calderón's *Race, Poverty, and Social Justice: Multidisciplinary Perspectives through Service Learning* (Stylus, 2007); Susan A. Ostrander and Kent E. Portney's *Acting Civically: From Urban Neighborhoods to Higher Education* (Tufts University Press, 2007); and Lorraine McIlrath and Iain Mac Labharainn's *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives* (Ashgate Publishing, 2007). It is also extremely important to harvest the accumulated civic learning across the range of opportunities offered to students that are embedded in U.S. diversity and global efforts as well as in those domains labeled "civic engagement." There is a rich set of assessment books and articles to capture institutional and student learning in diversity as well as an emerging body on assessing global learning, all of which are also useful for assessing civic learning (Bolen, 2007; Clayton-Pederson, Parker, Smith, Moreno, and Teraguchi, 2007; Garcia et al., 2001; and Musil, 2006a).

CONCLUSION

Adam Hochschild's *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (1998) recounts the brutal regime of Belgium's King Leopold at the end of the nineteenth century, when he subjugated people in the Belgian Congo through systematic

murder, torture, and enslavement as he exploited the riches from that piece of Africa. His heinous operation was uncovered and forced to end in part because E. D. Morel, a lowly civil servant working as a shipping clerk in Antwerp at the time, happened to notice that something was awry. The ships coming into port from the Belgian Congo were laden with ivory, rubber, and other material goods, but the ships that were sent back offered no such exchange of goods. Instead, they were filled with soldiers, guns, machetes, and chains. Also a newspaperman, Morel documented what he saw and had the skills, courage, and will to speak up publicly about what he had discovered. The result was the emergence of a massive global human rights movement that continued until King Leopold was forced to abandon his unchecked exploitation.

At this historic juncture, higher education has the opportunity to help equip all its graduates with the civic engagement personified by E. D. Morel. To achieve such a goal, the academy needs to realign its goals and reassess its offerings to include personal and social responsibility as an inescapable dimension of every student's college experience. Students need to acquire the knowledge to see the threads that link local and global fortunes, to recognize when injustice is the normative coin of the realm, and to document the impact of the unchallenged systems that perpetuate destabilizing inequalities. They also need to cultivate civic skills to speak up and think that it matters when they do. In addition, they need to have the intercultural competencies to work in concert with others in public actions to demand that a more just society be put in place and the motivation and commitment to persist. It would take many turnings of the Civic Learning Spiral to hone such capacities, but higher education has an unprecedented opportunity to reengage with its fundamental mission to educate citizens. Higher education holds the potential to turn democracy's peril into democracy's promise.

References

- American Council on Education. *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2005.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities Board of Directors. *Our Students' Best Work*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2004.

- Barber, B. "Global Education in a World Torn between Jihad and McWorld." Paper presented at the Association of American Colleges and Universities conference, Denver, CO, October 2007.
- Bolen, M. C. (Ed.). *A Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad, 2007.
- Clayton-Pederson, A. R., Parker, S., Smith, D. G., Moreno, J. F., and Tera-guchi, D. H. *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007.
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., and Corngold, J. *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Political Engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Corporation for National and Community Service. *College Students Helping America*. http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/06_1016_RPD_college_full.pdf, September 2006.
- Education Trust–West. *The High School Diploma: Making It More Than an Empty Promise*. Prepared for Senate Standing Committee on Education hearing on Senate Bill 1731, April 2002.
- Garcia, M., Hudgins, C. A., Musil, C. M., Nettles, M. T., Sedlacek, W. E., and Smith, D. G. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives: A Guide for Campus Practitioners*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2001.
- Hochschild, A. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.
- Hovland, K. "Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility." *Diversity Digest*, 2005, 8(3), 1, 16–17.
- Humphreys, D., and Davenport, A. "What Really Matters in College: How Students View and Value Liberal Education." *Liberal Education*, Summer/Fall 2005, 1–6.
- Leskes, A., and Miller, R. *Purposeful Pathways: Helping Students Achieve Key Learning Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006.
- Musil, C. M. *Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006a.
- Musil, C. M. "Discovering the Streets Where We Live: Mapping the Future of Inclusion and Higher Education." Paper presented at the Association of American Colleges and Universities conference, Washington, DC, January 2006b.
- Musil, C. M., Wathington, H., Battistoni, R., Calderón, J., Trementozzi, M., Fluker, W. E., et al. *The Civic Learning Spiral: Education for*

- Participation in a Diverse Democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, in press.
- National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise. *College Learning for the New Global Century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007.
- Spiezio, K. E. "Pedagogy and Political (Dis)Engagement." *Liberal Education*, 2002, 88(4), 14–19.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Digest of Education Statistics*. (National Center for Education Statistics No. 2006–030). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. *First-Generation Students: Undergraduates Whose Parents Never Enrolled in Postsecondary Education*. (Statistical Analysis Report No. 98–082). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1998.
- Veysey, L. R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.