

AASCU First Session Tom Ehrlich

Everything we are doing in the American Democracy Project is shaped around helping you strengthen the civic engagement of your students. Our goal is to assist you build civic engagement into planning efforts that are currently moving forward as well as to shape new ones. In my own experience it is almost always easier to fuse an objective—in this case the civic engagement of your students—with an ongoing effort rather than to start a new one, though in some cases, I suspect you will be launching new programs around the American Democracy Project.

In all events, keep this issue in mind—how you might link the kinds of civic engagement that we will be discussing here with your own campus programs and plans. We will have a chance to begin discussing that issue when we meet in small groups after this session.

I'll start with a story—a story with a moral. Tico Almeida came to Duke University in 1995 from Wisconsin, where he had been president of his high school class. A first generation American from a Cuban immigrant family, he was like most undergraduates on most campuses in that he had no particular interest in civic issues generally or politics particularly when he came to college. As a sophomore, however, he began participating in a yearlong program called Service Opportunities in Leadership. Students in the program

first take a course that prepares them for community participation, exploring issues such as how conflicts in local communities can affect civic participation.

After completing this course, students participate in summer internships in community-based organizations. Almeida worked with a textile union in New York, teaching English and citizenship classes to Latino garment workers. He also helped workers prepare complaints to the U.S. Department of Labor about back wages owed, forced overtime, and sub-minimum pay, and even did undercover work by pretending to be an immigrant and working in a substandard garment factory.

In the current Opportunities in Leadership program, students may also conduct an optional service-learning research project—for academic credit—in conjunction with their internships. These projects are designed collaboratively with the agencies where the students are working so they address real needs and are genuinely useful to the agency. In addition to teaching valuable research skills, these projects can significantly strengthen students' sense of civic and political efficacy.

Almeida's interest in the conditions of low-wage workers led him to collaborate that summer with students from other colleges to plan the Sweatshop-Free Campus Campaign. The group studied international labor standards and monitoring mechanisms as they

drafted a code of conduct for college campuses that license apparel manufacturers, as do some of yours. They convinced Duke to become the first university in the nation to amend its multi-million dollar licensing contracts to require sportswear companies to disclose publicly the specific locations of their garment factories, an essential step to effective monitoring. Over the course of the next few years, more than 100 campuses followed Duke's lead.

Following his summer internship, Almeida began the third phase of the SOL program, a one-semester full-credit course taught by the program director. The course builds on the students' summer field experiences, connecting them with deeper substantive knowledge and careful thought about the systemic dimensions of the social problems they confronted in their internships. In the process, the teacher attempts to foster a long-term commitment to public service.

At the same time that Almeida was taking this course, he helped organize Students Against Sweatshops at Duke, which sought meetings with the university administration of President Nan Keohane to discuss the group's concerns. Although the administration initially did not agree with the group's recommendations, over time Duke administrators came to recognize the moral legitimacy as well as the educational value of the issue and invited students to participate in drafting a new code of conduct for

Duke licensees. In 1998, Duke became the first campus to adopt a code of conduct requiring a process for monitoring manufacturers of college-licensed products. Almeida and other students worked to help pressure the Collegiate Licensing Company, the licensing agent for 170 institutions, to adopt the Duke code.

As a result of these experiences--particularly in the SOL courses and research work and in his related extra-curricular activities—Almeida gained the understanding, skills, and commitment that are needed to become a competent and responsible civic leader. After college he continued to pursue his passion for workers' rights, doing student outreach around sweatshop issues for the AFL-CIO and then using a Fulbright Fellowship to study international trade and labor rights. He is now attending Law School with the expectation of continuing that work.

Alemeida is not an isolated example, though his story is a particularly compelling one. Under the leadership of the President and Provost, Duke has been committed to the moral and civic education of its undergraduates, and recently revised its entire general education program in ways that support those goals. The new Curriculum 2000 requires students to take two courses that help them develop skills of Ethical Inquiry and the campus has incorporated themes of ethical discourse into its required first-year writing program. An important institutional spark plug for the

focus on moral and civic concerns is the Kenan Institute for Ethics, which has as an affiliate a national organization promoting the thoughtful use of honor codes on campuses throughout the country. Not surprisingly, Duke itself has an honor code that is taken very seriously.

The moral of the Almeida story is that when colleges and universities institute programs of moral and civic education for their undergraduates, they can make a profound difference in students' lives and in their capacity to contribute productively to the world. I know this is true. My colleagues and I at the Carnegie Foundation heard scores of stories of students whose lives and futures had been shaped in similar ways, and we documented the courses, programs, and activities behind those stories in the course of the work that led to our book, Educating Citizens.

I am delighted to be your partner in the American Democracy Project, and appreciative that "Educating Citizens" was chosen as text for the Project. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and its member institutions are particularly well suited and situated to be focal points for civic learning. The students you educate will live and work in their communities; most often near your campuses, and should be the leaders of those communities. They need the knowledge, the skills, and the motivation to assume that responsibility. The American Democracy Project offers a

special set of opportunities for collaboration in ways that build on the strengths of your campus, its faculty, staff, and resources.

This morning I want to talk first with you a bit about the problem of civic learning in higher education, what we mean by that term, and its historical setting. Afterward, we will have a chance to meet in small groups to discuss the circumstances and perspectives on your campus. During those sessions, we can review your campus pre-audits. Then, in the next session this morning, George Mehaffy and I will turn to specific campus strategies that will further the goals of the American Democracy Project.

Anne Colby and I wrote our book, along with two graduate students, because we felt deeply that higher education could and should have exactly the kind of shaping influence on the lives and character of undergraduates that we analogize to the preparations of Meriweather Lewis for his great journey of exploration with William Clark. We do not suggest that any of us can provide the sort of tutorial in the White House of Thomas Jefferson that Lewis received from Gallatin, Benjamin Rush, and many others along with Jefferson himself. Students may leave college with their lives shifted only slightly, but they should have gained ways of approaching and responding to their subsequent experiences that magnify the shift over time, until much later it becomes clear that the gap between where they are and where they would have been without those

influences is dramatic. The undergraduate experience has the potential to be this kind of pre-expedition for millions of Americans. We saw clear and convincing evidence that colleges are most effective in this preparation if their institutional efforts are self-conscious and intentional, not simply dependent on fortuitous impact, and if they coordinate programs and activities in the curriculum, the co-curriculum, and the campus culture. The aim of the Democracy Project is to help you and your campuses promote that kind of institutional intentionality—for you to learn from the experiences of other campuses and for you to contribute to civic engagement of other AASCU institutions.

What about the charge that college years are too late to make a meaningful difference in the moral or civic lives of students? It is true that time the time they arrive on our campuses, whether they are right out of high school or older students who have worked and are still working, a lot has happened to form their character, values, interests, understanding of moral issues, and attitudes toward civic life and politics. Some would argue that by this time, the most important aspects of students' moral and civic character are already permanently established, for better or worse. The research evidence on human development, however, proves just the opposite. Studies have consistently shown that, under the right

circumstances, moral and civic development continues throughout adolescence and well into adulthood.

Throughout our work we refer to moral and civic values, development, and education. We do so in order to underscore that moral and civic values are inseparable. By the term “morality” I mean prescriptive judgments about how one ought to act in relation to other people, in personal relationships, in one’s work, and in the public realm. Morality is centrally important in public as well as personal domains, and many core American democratic principles, including tolerance and respect, impartiality, and concern for both the rights of the individual and the welfare of the group, are grounded in moral principles.

The problems that confront civically engaged citizens almost always involve strong moral themes. These include fair access to resources such as housing, the obligation to consider future generations in making environmental policy, and the conflicting claims of multiple stakeholders in community decision-making. None of these issues can be adequately resolved without a consideration of moral questions and values. A person can become civically and politically active without good judgment and a strong moral compass, but it is hardly wise to promote that kind of involvement. Because civic responsibility is inescapably threaded with moral values, undergraduate education should aspire to foster

both moral and civic maturity and should confront educationally the many links between them.

What are the educational goals of this preparation for responsible citizenship? Moral and civic maturity is not a unitary phenomenon. It is made up of three closely related and interactive dimensions: (1) understanding; (2) motivation; and (3) skills. Research shows that all three can be profoundly shaped by undergraduate experiences.

First, in terms of moral and civic understanding, it is key that students gain sophisticated moral judgment and the understanding of key civic and political concepts. Knowledge isn't everything, but it is something, and students need to master and learn to apply knowledge in areas of critical importance for responsible citizenship at every level---local, state, national, and international.

In order to be morally and civically engaged and responsible, students must not only achieve a deeper understanding of the issues, they must also be highly motivated to do something about them. This means their interests and values must reflect social and moral concerns, and these concerns must be central to their sense of who they are, to their identity. If they are to be engaged citizens, they must also have a sense of political efficacy, that is, a sense that what they think and do civically and politically matters. They need long-term faith and hope to get them through the inevitable times when

their well-intended actions do not seem to move them toward their goals.

Finally, we want our college graduates to be skilled in their civic and political participation. This means they need to develop an understanding of the particular mechanisms that are likely to be effective in tackling different kinds of issues and to have the practical skills they need to succeed. These skills include moral and political discourse and other forms of communication, interpersonal capacities, and many specific skills of civic and political engagement, for example, how to negotiate differences of opinion and move a group forward under conditions of mutual respect

As you know if you have had a chance to read “Educating Citizens,” my colleagues and I collected information about moral and civic education programs at dozens of campuses and did in-depth studies of twelve—including two campuses represented here, Portland State University and California State University at Monterey Bay--that make a conscious effort to reach all their students, using multiple approaches to address the full range of dimensions entailed in moral and civic development. We spent several days at each of these twelve campuses, interviewing administrators, faculty, and students, conducting focus groups, sitting in on classes, and observing a wide range of programs.

These twelve institutions are not the only ones doing notable work in this area. We chose these particular ones in part because they represent a very wide range. They include every category of higher education institution – comprehensive universities, and universities with graduate and professional programs, as well as community colleges and liberal arts colleges. They include residential and non-residential, public and private, highly selective and non-selective, large and small institutions. Some are religiously affiliated, while most are secular.

All twelve are marked by a high degree of institutional intentionality about moral and civic learning. The administration, the faculty, and the staff—not every one, of course, but substantial shares of them--make clear a set of expectations to students about their learning. The curriculum, the extra-curriculum, and the campus climate are all three shaped to promote that learning in reinforcing, interactive ways. Over the next couple of days, we will be looking together at how you and your colleagues at your campus can promote this kind of civic engagement for your students in ways that are crafted to your unique circumstances, but are nonetheless informed by lessons learned from other institutions.

Anne Colby, my co-author, and I first connected because I used one of her books, “Some Do Care,” in a course that I taught for honors seniors when I was at Indiana University. I wrote her a fan

letter, we met, and we have been working together for the last four years with a number of graduate students, two of whom are co-authors with us of Educating Citizen. Anne has spent her lifetime studying moral and civic development, primarily from her position as director of the Henry Murray Center at Radcliffe, and I have been grazing for most of my professional life in higher education.

Anne and I were led to this study by our common concern about the increasing public disdain for civic engagement, particularly political involvement, in this country, and our conviction that higher education should have important roles in reversing that trend. Many commentators have chronicled the widespread lack of trust in and respect for American democratic processes, perhaps most powerfully Bob Putnam in his wonderful work, *Bowling Alone*. This troubling reality is manifested in an overall decline in civic and political participation and in the rise of superficial sloganeering over thoughtful, substantive, and honest public debate.

Political disaffection is especially pronounced among youth. Americans growing up in recent decades vote less often than their elders and show lower levels of social trust and knowledge of politics. Many surveys show that on college campuses, political discussion has declined sharply. The annual Astin Freshman Surveys indicate that the percentage of college freshmen that report

frequently discussing politics dropped from a high of 30% in 1968 to 15% in 1995 to even lower rates today, though 9/11 triggered what now seems a temporary shift. Similar decreases are seen in the percentages of young people who believe it is important to keep up to date with political affairs or who have worked on a political campaign. This mounting political apathy bodes ill for the future of American democracy, unless these generations of young people come to see both the value of and necessity for political participation. More specifically, it means trouble for our state colleges and universities—they depend on political support, and galvanizing that support among our students and their families can be an important by-product of the American Democracy Project.

Disdain for politics does not mean lack of civic concern among college students. A recent study, for example, indicates that nearly three-quarters of college students (73%) have done volunteer work in the past two years, and most (62%) more than once. Those students understand that their communities face real needs and that they can help meet those needs. But they are unlikely to view politics as an effective vehicle for change. They may well believe strongly in a cause such as improving the environment, but they are skeptical that politics and politicians can further that cause. Too often they fail to understand that if they want not only to assist at a community kitchen, but also help eliminate the need for that kitchen, then they

must work to change public policy, and politics in one form or another is the means we have in American democracy for effecting public policy.

What's the best place to start when trying to design a campus response to this challenge? There are many touchstones. One whom I particularly commend is John Dewey, whose seminal work at the University of Chicago ended just a century ago, in 1904. Dewey, especially in his great book "Democracy and Education," was clear that the overarching goal of education should be no less than democracy. By democracy he meant much more than government by majority rule. Democracy was a way of life to Dewey; one that enabled educated citizens to use their full potential of intellect and emotion for productive and interactive lives. Educational institutions—schools and colleges--are small communities that should prepare their students for the deliberative processes that democracy requires to ensure social action that is both collaborative and informed. Democracy is the form of political organization that best allows a citizenry to test its options in the pragmatic modes of learning that Dewey thought should be central to education. A democracy, wrote Dewey, is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience.

This mode of experience, Dewey said, requires that “each have to refer his own action to that of others to give point and direction to his own.” Educational institutions should be shaped to nurture communal values, abilities, and understandings. This can happen only if students are constantly collaborating and interacting with others both within and outside the institutions. Their teachers should establish, within the controlled environment of a school—but closely linked to the broader social setting—the collaborative arrangements that enable students to learn from each other and to learn cooperatively. In that process, a democratic community of learning is created that provides an education for a lifetime of civic engagement.

Dewey’s view was by no means universally accepted. Some forty years later, for example, when Dewey was still active, Robert Maynard Hutchings, president of the University of Chicago in the 1930s and perhaps the most famous educator of his day, took a much different stance in a little book called “The Higher Learning in America.” Their argument will have a familiar ring to your ears today. Like Dewey, Hutchings believed that an educated citizenry was necessary to a democracy, but to Hutchings, an education for citizenship meant a liberal education, and a liberal education meant reading and discussing the great books of the Western world, with particular emphasis on metaphysics.

Hutchins was troubled that the university had become a vast center of vocational training. It was past time, he pressed, “to stand firm and show our people what higher learning is. As education it is the single-minded pursuit of the intellectual virtues. As scholarship it is the single-minded devotion to the advancement of knowledge.” To meet the scourge of vocationalism, Hutchins proposed “a course of study consisting of the greatest books of the western world . . .”

Hutchins was an elitist in his views about society and its functioning, and how education should support that functioning. He did hope to expose wider audiences to the Great Books, but his elitism was expressed in terms of who should be the teachers and should control the teachings. He also believed that higher education should be restricted to a small segment of the population who could, by his standards, truly benefit from that education. Ideally, they should be chosen on the basis of intellectual potential, not wealth—an aristocracy of intellect—but in all events limited in number. He shared that view with most of the presidents of major private research universities at the end of World War II, like Conant at Harvard, who opposed the GI Bill because it was designed to open higher education to masses of returning servicemen.

Dewey responded sharply. Blasting Hutchins, he wrote that students learn best not by sitting in a closed room reading the works

of Aristotle and other great Western minds in search of first principles, as Hutchins proposed, but by opening the doors and windows of experience to the problems that surround us. Learning starts with problems rooted in experience, Dewey urged, and continues with the application of increasingly complex ideas and increasingly sophisticated skills to increasingly complicated problems. There must be both experiences that interest students and problems that emerge out of those experiences. To resolve the problems, students naturally need information and techniques. Aristotle can be a superb teacher in that process. But learning starts with experience and problems. The goal of education is not intellectual inquiry for its own sake, as Hutchins proclaimed, but the betterment of democratic practice across the whole of American society.

So the lines were formed. For Hutchins, “education was nothing more or less than the cultivation of the intellect, the training of the mind.” For Dewey, a democratic society is a collaborative, interactive one in which individuals continuously learn from each other in making the whole more than the sum of the parts. It is hardly surprising that for Dewey, higher education should be open to expanding numbers, while to Hutchins it should be reserved for an elite. Viewed from today’s perspective, on that issue, of course, Dewey has won. When he crossed swords with Hutchings, fewer

that one in five high school graduates went on to college. Today the figure is more than two-thirds.

In terms of the content and form, however, the debate between Dewey and Hutchins--the terms of their engagement on the substance and the pedagogy of higher education—has been very much alive from the 1930s until today. A few years ago, I participated in a public forum at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The issue was whether community-service learning is a sound pedagogy for undergraduates, as I have strongly urged. By community service learning I mean linking academic study and community service through structured reflection so that each reinforces the other. Harvard Law School professor Charles Fried, former Solicitor General of the United States, was among the panelists, and he objected to my approach. During the undergraduate years, he said, there should be a “moratorium” on student interactions with society. Young people in those years, he argued, should “be confronted with ideas, with truths, with reflection somewhat detached, perhaps even entirely detached, from the practical consequences of what they are learning.”

Undergraduates will be “submerged in practical consequences for the whole rest of their lives.” College years are a time to learn “things that are to be understood for their own sake, understood for the truths they contain.”

Hutchins would have been pleased with Fried's "moratorium," and so, I fear, would numerous faculty today in college and university teaching. Many find it threatening that students might learn outside of the classroom and apply that learning to enrich their academic learning that they might learn something that the faculty member does not know. Many claim, like Fried, that undergraduates should look solely inward, enriched by great minds and their great books. But while I can join Hutchins and Fried in some sorrow in the loss of learning for its own sake, I am confident that Dewey was on target in his approach to higher education.

Dewey had two radical insights about U.S society. One was that most citizens, not just an elite, could have a life of the mind. The other was that a life that is only of the mind is inadequate to the challenges of American democracy. Our society requires civic engagement to realize the potential of its citizens and its communities. These were important lessons that Hutchins failed to grasp. These are the aims and purposes of the American Democracy Project.

Dewey did not give concrete examples or even many hints about how best to promote civic responsibility in our students. He was never one to practice what he preached—a failing of most of us in the academy. As was so often the case, he suggested a framework

and left the details to others. Clearly he had in mind that a school should be a microcosm of society, structured in ways that enhance the learning environment by simplifying and organizing. He stressed two key “conditions” (as he called them). First, the school must itself mirror community life in all, which that implies. Second, the learning in school should be continuous with that out of school. How best to meet those conditions? Again, Dewey did not give specifics.

He did, however, stress three key elements in the democratic learning process:

***First, that process should engage students in reaching outside the walls of the school and into the surrounding community;**

***Second, it should focus on problems to be solved; and**

***And third, it should be collaborative, both among students and between students and faculty.**

Each of these elements is reflected in an active pedagogy--a pedagogy of engagement--that is increasingly infusing undergraduate education throughout the country:

***First, community-service learning, to supplement closed classroom learning;**

***Second, problem-based learning, in addition to discipline-based learning; and**

***And third, collaborative learning, as well as individual learning.**

These are not the only emerging pedagogic strategies for civic education, but on the basis of my wanderings over the past decades they seem to me particularly promising for realizing Dewey's ideas and ideals. They also underscore that how a subject is taught is as important as what is taught. Especially in general education, substance and pedagogy are closely intertwined.

Common to these strategies are two threads that spiral through them like a double helix. Education as a social and socializing function is the first. For Dewey, education must be both an individual function and a community function, the two were interdependent. The one motivated students to learn; the other made that learning worthwhile. Individualization without community led to self-indulgence and to the privatization and atomization of learning; community without individualization tended toward conformity, coercion, and even stagnation.

The second common thread is a shift from teaching to learning and a shift in the role of faculty member from teacher to coach and mentor. In this sense, the thread marks a return to Dewey's concept that student interest should be the starting point in education. Of all elements in Dewey's views on education, this can be the most easily misunderstood, for it sounds suspiciously like a call to let

students play in sandboxes or do whatever else they want to do. Instead, it was a call to shape learning experiences around the individual interests and needs of students.

Many programs could be used to illustrate these three pedagogic shifts that are occurring nationally, and that together are key components of the curricular dimension of civic engagement. One example that we discuss in “Educating Citizens” is a course on the Social and Environmental History of California, taught at California State University at Monterey Bay, where it meets both campus requirements and state requirements in U.S. and California history. It uses all three of the pedagogies, and does so in ways that integrate them with each other and into the structure of the course. This multidisciplinary course looks at the way the geography of California has shaped the evolution of the state’s diverse cultures and how the choices people made have shaped the physical landscape. The faculty members in charge expect students will not only learn about history but will also learn how to use historical analysis and knowledge to illuminate contemporary issues and to clarify what they believe in and are prepared to act on. As one of them said, “Our primary goal... is for students to use what they learn in our class to become historically informed, self-aware, ethical participants in the civic lives of their communities.”

The faculty use a wide array of strategies to accomplish this goal, but the centerpiece of the course is every student's Historically Informed Political Project (HIPP), which brings together history, ecology, personal values, and political action. Projects must address a California issue that has both environmental and social dimensions. Students conduct historical research as background to the project, articulate the values and assumptions they bring to it, and reflect on how those values and assumptions change as a result of engaging in the project. The project itself must involve at least ten hours of community work and lead to a set of policy recommendations informed by the historical research and community experience. Students can choose to work together on a joint project or do their work independently, but even those doing individual projects have many opportunities to work with others on the questions their projects raise. By centering on the project, the course takes advantage of the pedagogical strengths of multidisciplinary, problem-based, collaborative, and service learning.

The projects are extremely challenging for students. They demand in-depth historical research and extensive analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Students must place their political projects in a larger social and environmental context and make

policy recommendations based on what they learn through their research and political action.

This is one of many examples we cite to underscore the importance of what we call pedagogies of engagement to the success of civic learning. As Howard Gardner and others have shown, conventional modes of instruction, especially listening to lectures and reading textbooks, are all too likely to lead to superficial understanding in which students forget much of what they have learned, are unable to use in a new context what they do remember, and retain fundamental misconceptions that are inconsistent with what they seemed to have learned.

Lecture courses often do not lead to deep and enduring understanding of ideas, and are frequently even less well suited to developing the range of problem-solving, communication, and interpersonal skills that are integral to the American Democracy Project. And the development of the motivational strands of moral and civic maturity – dimensions like a sense of identity as a responsible and engaged person; a passion for social justice; sympathy with others, including those who are different from oneself; and an enduring sense of hope and empowerment – are usually beyond even the aspirations of the most eloquent lecturer, though I well realize that I lecture as I say this.

When we break into small groups in just a few minutes, we can discuss where we are in terms of civic engagement on our campuses, against the background of Dewey and his critics, and where you would like to be on your campuses. I will be back later this morning for a session when George Mehaffy and I will try to sketch out some models of good practice, drawn from the work that led to “Educating Citizens.”

I stress now, however, that there is no single model. Like most issues of planning on your campuses, the journey is often more important than the particular plan that you craft. Almost every AASCU campus, as I said, has multiple planning efforts currently underway. You obviously want to build on those whenever possible as you work to focus on civic engagement of your students. Let me close this morning by outlining briefly one effort at one campus, San Francisco State University, not that it is more than one illustration that may be useful. My colleague at that campus, Brian Murphy, is here and can correct me if I misremember.

We began at San Francisco State some years ago by organizing a yearlong seminar for faculty and staff. We asked a group of about 25 to join every other week for the fall and spring semesters. We chose faculty from each school, including some of the Faculty Senate leadership. In addition, we involved a number of key staff people from the Urban Institute, which Brian heads and serves to link the

campus to the Bay Area communities. We also included several student leaders, and—from time to time—some leaders from the community. But the heart of the group were faculty. In exchange for a very modest honorarium and lunch, each of the 25 promised to come to our sessions, to do the readings in advance for those sessions, and to participate in the discussions. The president's office covered the cost, which was a few thousand dollars.

In advance, the president and provost agreed to take seriously any plan that emerged from the group. The head of the Faculty Senate also agreed to bring the plan to the Senate for its information, and any action that was needed. I also talked to each of the School deans and told them of our design, and—the president and provost having agreed—they also supported it.

Over the course of the fall semester, we read a series of articles about service, service learning, and civic responsibility. Most of these focused on student's civic engagement of students, though others concentrated on the campus as an engaged citizen. All of the readings, I think, are cited in "Educating Citizens," and many were drawn from my earlier book, "Civic Responsibility and Higher Education." After each session, I asked two or three of the participants, in advance, to be prepared to help lead the next session. By the end of the first semester, virtually the entire faculty had shared in leading at least one session.

Everyone knew that our explicit aim in the second semester would be to design a plan to enhance student civic engagement, a plan that we could bring to the president, provost, and Faculty Senate, a plan that each member the group would be invested in supporting. Over the course of the second semester, we continue our regular readings in advance of the bi-weekly meetings, though the readings were now often proposed by group members rather than by me. Some concerned the particular issues facing one or a cluster of schools or disciplines, in the arts and sciences or in the professions.

Early in the second semester, I brought an outline of a campus plan to the group, which we discussed, revised, and expanded. In essence, it called for an expansion of a number of the Urban Institute programs, particularly focused on its Office of Community Service-Learning. It proposed a faculty-development fund to expand the community-service opportunities for students throughout the campus. And it proposed a stronger campus infrastructure to support civic engagement. Again, process was as important as content.

By the end of the semester, we had a draft plan—and it essentially stayed in draft form as it was implemented. The president and provost signed on to the approach, and many in the Faculty Senate applauded it, though it did not need Faculty Senate

action until some years later when the proposal to designate service-learning courses on a student's transcript was brought to the Senate and approved. And the Chancellor of the CSU system publicly referred to the SFSU approach as a model for other CSU campuses. By good fortune, we even persuaded the Governor to encourage the kind of approach we proposed.

In short, this planning process brought a degree of institutional intentionality to San Francisco State that it did not have before. We did not tie the extra-curricular and campus climate as strongly as I might do now, having worked on "Educating Citizens," but it was a start.

In the months ahead, it will be my pleasure to work with you to help ensure that your campus does all it can to ensure that your graduates are active, engaged, responsible citizens of their communities.