**In this Reader**

The articles in this issue of the Reader focus on key concerns faculty encounter in civic education. David Cooper addresses a central question of service learning course design, that of placement, in creating the kind of service experience that will allow for political activity at the community level. His essay points to the fact that in a culture of political disengagement, service that promotes individual action to the exclusion of political action that is focused on structural social solutions undermines the ability to meet the social needs that service seeks to address. Judith Ramaley focuses on larger institutional questions surrounding the context for faculty engagement, and Harry Boyte looks at the consequences for faculty and for the institutions of higher education if faculty do not take an active leadership role in advancing the public purposes of higher education. His piece reminds one of the warning Randolph Bourne issued in the early days of America’s involvement in WWII, when he wrote “war or American promise, one must choose. One cannot be interested in both.” In the context of higher education, the warning today could be “the corporitization of higher education or civic promise, one must choose. One cannot be interested in both.”

We welcome suggestions for articles that should be included in future issues as well as inquiries regarding submissions. Contact John Saltmarsh at jsaltmarsh@compact.org.
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**Embracing Civic Responsibility**

by Judith Ramaley

In the past year, there have been several calls for colleges and universities to take up their responsibilities as members of society in order to model the civic virtues and to become instruments of a working democracy. It is becoming clear that a genuine democracy is also a learning society and that good citizenship requires the capacity to form a learning community with others.

As David Mathews argues in “Afterthoughts” in the Fall 1998 issue of Kettering Review, civic societies become democratic when people have the ability to listen to all views, even those they dislike, and the skill to work through conflicting approaches to solving a problem.

R. Dahl explains in his essay “Participation and the Problem of Civic Understanding” in Rights and the Common Good that good citizens exhibit the qualities of moral reasoning. They are open-minded, informed, and empathetic. They also have some understanding of the idea of the public good and a sustained desire to work toward achieving the common good and a common ground. One of the best places to practice these habits of mind and action is at a college or university. The qualities of good citizenship are also the marks of a well-educated person.

For a college or university to accept its civic responsibilities and thus to play a role in generating a renewal of democracy, we must consider three things: (1) the expectations we have of ourselves as scholars and administrators; (2) our aspirations for our students; and (3) the nature and intentions of our own institutional relationships with the broader society of which we seek to be an integral part. There are many reasons why it is worth our while to undertake this reflective exercise.

- In the most recent University of California-Los Angeles Freshman Survey, more students than ever reported that they had participated
in community service during high school, yet only about one-third of the students thought that their involvement would make a real difference. If we are to prepare civic-minded graduates, our students must acquire a sense of personal efficacy through seeing the consequences of their actions in community life.

- It has become clear that intellectual growth must be accompanied by the acquisition of social and emotional life skills in order for knowledge to have meaningful and constructive consequences, both in the lives of our students and in the communities of which they are a part. The demands of good citizenship and the demands of professional work life are very similar. Both require social and emotional maturity, the capacity to communicate well with others, and the ability to work with others towards a common purpose.

- Our institutions are being asked to address the complex social, economic, and cultural needs of our communities. Since most of our students learn best when given the opportunity to address problems that are meaningful to them, it makes sense to link their learning to issues of importance to the community. We can serve several goals at once by opening up the community as an extended learning environment to encourage richer student learning.

- There is a growing expectation that colleges and universities will be good citizens in their communities and assist with economic and community development, and, in many instances, will become players in the revitalization of community and neighborhood life. University-community alliances and partnerships offer powerful learning opportunities for our students. Working together with faculty members, fellow students, and community members, our students can learn what it means to exercise their expertise in a professional, ethical, and responsible way.

During its examination of the future of this nation’s state and land-grant institutions, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities reframed the classic triad of research, teaching, and service into a new framework of discovery, learning, and engagement. The reason for doing this was that the new terms describe shared activities, usually led by faculty, that have mutual consequences. The older terms tend to connote a one-way activity, generally conducted by experts. The new triad works well for describing the range of ways in which a college or university can incorporate good citizenship into its traditional work.

- Discovery can encompass community-based scholarship and the development of new knowledge through collaborations with community participants.

- Learning can be done in a way that links educational goals with the challenges of life. As John Dewey wrote, “Education is not preparation for life. Education is life itself.” Common forms of engaged learning are service-learning and problem-based learning, both utilizing community issues as a starting point for accomplishing educational goals.

- Engagement can be achieved through community-university alliances and partnerships.

All three of these classic elements of campus life can be conducted in an “engaged mode.” Whether it is discovery, learning, or engagement, the activity can be community-based. It can have shared goals that link the mission of a college or university with the goals of the community participants, as well as an agreed-upon definition of success that will be meaningful to the institution and the community. An engaged activity can also be supported by a pooling of resources across sectors of the campus as well as within the community. When these features are present, the resulting partnership is likely to be mutually beneficial and can build the capacity and competence of all parties.

Campus-Community Partnerships and Collaborations

In some cases, it is possible to blend all three forms of intellectual activity into a distinctive whole by combining professional education, research, and continuing professional development in a community site. Familiar examples of this are professional development schools in education, area health education centers in the health care professions, clinical practice sites in the social services, and university-industry partnerships. In Real Questions Real Answers, John Clarke, a University of Vermont faculty member, describes such arrangements in campus-school partnerships. They “gather the energy and talent of a school faculty and focus it on specific and immediate problems that come up during a school reform effort. Conducted over several years, simultaneous team investigations or problems in teaching and learning constitute a method for linking school development to professional development and creating a professional community capable of sustaining long-term educational reform” Clarke writes.

There are a number of lessons to keep in mind when developing sustainable partnerships that can support discovery, learning, and engagement in community settings.

- Each partnership has unique elements shaped by the history, capacity, cultures, missions, expectations, and challenges faced by each participating
There is no such thing as a universal "community" nor are there usually agreed-upon spokespersons for any community you choose to embrace. Often partnerships are fragmented by competing interests within the community, or on campus, or both.

It takes time to understand what elements make up a particular community and how people experience their membership in the community.

A good collaboration will evolve over time as a result of mutual learning. To be successful, a collaboration should be built on new patterns of information gathering, communication, and reflection that allow all parties, including students, to be participants in decision making and learning. This takes time and face-to-face interactions and an ability to learn from both conflict and mistakes as well as from successes.

Some communities are being "partnered" to the point of exhaustion. It is often necessary to identify ways to help community organizations and smaller agencies create the capacity to be an effective partner.

In some smaller communities, there may not be enough volunteer or not-for-profit activities to absorb the energies and interests of a college or university interested in full engagement. In such cases, the campus may need, in cooperation with its neighbors, to create the infrastructure necessary to sustain community-based work.

The early rush of enthusiasm can be replaced by fatigue and burnout unless the collaboration begins early to identify and recruit additional talent, both on and off campus, for the project.

It is important to establish a strong commitment to a "culture of evidence" tracing the progress of a project or a collaboration as it develops, not just at the end. The lessons learned from continuous evaluation can sustain the work and allow it to grow to a scale that can make a genuine difference in the community. Involve students in the integral part of the work of collaboration so that they learn skills of communication, problem solving, and shared learning early.

As many of us have discovered, it is not easy to work in a collaborative way, but the rewards are well worth the effort. No other model affords the same rich context for exercising the habits of good citizenship or for exposing our students to the realities of the complexity of a democratic way of life. It is also true, however, that unless the institution as a whole embraces the value as well as the validity of engagement as legitimate scholarly work and provides both moral support and concrete financial resources to sustain this work, engagement will remain individually defined by the interests of committed faculty and sporadic in nature. Such limited interventions cannot influence larger systems on a scale necessary to address significant community issues. They also will not offer the stimulation and scope necessary to involve a significant proportion of the student body in meaningful public work.

Barriers to Change
In many ways, the approaches that can promote an opening up of a campus to meaningful community involvement are no different from any other kind of campuswide change process. Anyone undertaking such a project must first equip himself or herself with a basic knowledge of what can initiate and then sustain change on your own campus. It is worth taking time to study the lessons learned from institutions that have designed and then undertaken an ambitious change agenda. Over the past year, the American Council on Education's Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation, for example, has published an occasional paper series outlining the lessons learned from the interaction of a number of institutions that were undertaking large-scale change.

Although my emphasis here will be on how to enlist the interests of a critical mass of faculty in activities that promote civic responsibility and sustain campus-community engagement, the framework will work equally well in thinking through the challenge of involving faculty in any mission-related work of an institution.

It has been my experience that 10 to 15 percent of the faculty or staff on campus already have a broad repertoire of interests and modes of scholarly and creative work consistent with the full realization of engagement (see Figure). These are the committed faculty.

Another 30 percent or so have a genuine interest in new ways of doing things but want clear signals that the institu-
tion and their colleagues will support them if they venture into new territory, in this case, literally, into the community. These are the cautious faculty.

A comparable number of faculty will take a “wait and see” attitude, certain that the new agenda or way of doing things will disappear when the new president/provost/dean moves on to greener pastures. These are the skeptics.

Finally, a small number (maybe 10 percent) of the faculty or staff are certain that the new agenda or the new modes are not legitimate faculty work. Some of this group fear that if they buy into this idea they will be unable to leave the institution and find a “better job” elsewhere. A small number of people simply believe that all change is bad. For purposes of strategy, all of these views can be lumped into the category of resistant faculty.

In encouraging faculty to consider participating in community-based scholarly work, teaching activities, and community partnerships, it is helpful to approach the task as though you were recruiting volunteers. Each group can be thought of as lying beyond an energy barrier. The boundary between the committed and the cautious is defined by a disciplinary barrier and discipline-based definitions of research and scholarship (line 3 on Figure). The border between the cautious and the skeptical is maintained by the lack of convincing evidence that the new ways or the new agenda works better than the old one. This is the culture of evidence barrier (line 2 on Figure). The resistors are protected by a fear of the risk of change itself, either to themselves or to their programs. This is depicted as a risk management barrier on the Figure. Different strategies are needed to overcome each barrier.

While beginning the process of scaling the various energy barriers to involvement in engaged work, it is important to take care of the needs of the already committed faculty and to make sure that they do not exhaust themselves in conducting the pilot work and initial programs that reflect an engaged agenda. This can be done by identifying and celebrating exemplary work and by providing rewards and support for the work. It is helpful to make sure that the definitions of faculty work incorporated into faculty promotion and tenure guidelines reflect sufficient breadth to recognize work that is community-based, interdisciplinary, and collaborative. Broadening the concepts of scholarly work will be extremely difficult unless a campus devises credible and effective ways to document and evaluate all forms of scholarship and a broad range of pedagogies.

To attract cautious faculty to forms of scholarship and teaching that support civic responsibility, it is important to find ways to bridge the traditional barriers of disciplinary values, modes of inquiry, and standards of scholarly legitimacy. This first requires understanding the importance of faculty culture and peer pressure and the habits and values of each discipline. To demonstrate that the institution places importance on the new work, concrete financial resources must be invested to create an infrastructure that supports and assesses the range of activities that are associated with engaged and community-based scholarly work. It also helps to recognize and reward the accomplishments of faculty who exemplify the full range of scholarly work that the institution values and wishes to support.

It is especially helpful to create or expand faculty development funds for proposals in areas of special interest such as curricular innovation, community-based research, interdisciplinary work, and responsiveness to community and regional needs. Funds for this investment can be obtained through grants and awards from federal agencies and private foundations or donors, through reallocation from less-productive projects or programs, and through the use of effective strategic budgeting. Above all, be consistent in recognizing and hiring faculty with a broad repertoire of interests.

The energy barrier between the skeptics and the cautious is maintained by a curious double standard of proof. Skeptics offer little or no evidence to support their approval of the status quo but hold advocates of change to a very high standard of proof indeed. The only strategies that seem to work in this situation are to engage in a continuous documentation of the consequences and impact of changes being introduced by the committed and the cautious, and to distribute resources on the basis of actual performance as well as contributions to the institutional mission. Many skeptics can be won over by rigorous documentation of the actual
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outcomes of the newer modes and a convincing demonstration of the effectiveness and impact of the work. A clear investment strategy that places resources behind the infrastructure that will support engagement can also be convincing.

To overcome the risk management barrier, it is helpful to connect the institution with other campuses that are undergoing similar changes. This will help demonstrate to those who are concerned about mobility or legitimacy that colleagues at other institutions consider the work valuable and worth doing. It is not necessary to enlist these resistant faculty in your efforts. All that is needed is to convince them that the work is legitimate for others to engage in. Meanwhile, reassure them that their work is valued and will be judged on its own merits, and show them that new standards of performance matched to the institutional mission still include traditional standards of scholarship and teaching, as well as standards and forms of documentation of faculty work that are new to the institution.

As change progresses, it is important to remember that it is not necessary to convince everyone in order to make substantive changes in the intellectual environment and values of an institution. In fact, there is some indication that a turning point is reached when even one-third of the faculty have accepted engaged work as legitimate. By that time, a campus will have established a comprehensive environment that supports engagement. This environment will include the following:

- The possibility of reward or benefit for faculty and staff
- The creation of capacity at all levels of the organization to support and encourage change
- Structural openness to external influence through the research agenda and through the curriculum
- Educational planning and a strategic budgeting model that recognizes the value of active and responsible engagement that has a real community impact
- A willingness to adopt a shared agenda and mutually beneficial collaborations and partnerships with community members
- Rigorous evaluation of the quality and impact of community-based work

Taken together, these strategies should make it possible for an institution to become a good citizen and sustain meaningful relationships with the members of the communities it serves.

[This article is an adaptation of Ramaley’s plenary presentation at AAHE’s 2000 Conference on Faculty Roles & Rewards. Printed with permission from the March 2000 AAHE Bulletin]

Judith Ramaley is president of the University of Vermont and the chair of the board of Campus Compact. She may be contacted at Judith.Ramaley@uvm.edu
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Introducing the AAHE-Campus Compact Service-Learning Consulting Corps

Hands-on Training and Consultation on Service-Learning

Designed to serve as a major disciplinary and regional resource, the Corps can provide technical assistance and professional development to service-learning faculty and engaged campuses. Options include one-on-one consultation, group training, campus workshops, and more.

Each of the Corps’ seventeen tenured teacher-scholars is a respected leader in the service-learning field. Corps members are active in the respective disciplines, and have demonstrated national and/or institutional leadership in exploring the academic and civic potential of service-learning.

Members of the Corps are available for consultation beginning October 2000. For more information or to schedule training contact Teresa Antonucci, AAHE program manager, at (202) 293-6440, ext. 783, or tantonucci@aahe.org.

The Corps was established with generous support from the Corporation for National Service to assist colleges and universities in becoming more effective proponents of social and civic engagement.
Service with Others
by David Cooper

I just finished a forced march through a decade’s worth of service-learning definitions. I did so partly in preparation for a series of conversations with other teachers and partly out of a nagging uncertainty over whether a new generation of courses I had developed fit the exact criteria of “service-learning.” After several years of experimenting with active service-learning strategies in my American Studies and writing classes, I was beginning to understand the limitations expressed recently by Harry Boyte that “most service experiences don’t offer opportunities to address the deeper roots of public problems,” and, still more troublesome, the tools to solve those problems.

My students, to be sure, had been engaged in the kind of service that fulfills the moral, social, pedagogical, and intellectual goals of the service-learning classroom. They were meeting important community needs in a respectful and reciprocal way. I took great pains to insure that the services they were performing in the community were explicitly integrated into course content. And my students had plenty of opportunities for guided reflection on their service experiences.

But were they becoming better, more committed, more effective and experienced citizens? Had these courses “fostered civic responsibility”? Were my students better equipped to undertake the hard work of citizenship embedded in just about every service-learning definition I had come across: namely, to work for positive change in their neighborhoods and communities, toward the larger end of building a better democracy?

The presumed connection between “service” and “citizenship” incorporated into conventional definitions of service-learning, I came to understand, may be more problematic than automatic. Those definitions stress, for example, community service that “enhances the quality of life of people who articulate a need or desire for service.” Appropriate service-learning placements, we are told, are “intentionally designed” as “service to others.”

These boilerplate features of good service-learning practices, interestingly, are often at odds with practical realities of actual democratic work. Experience in public life is rarely, if ever, “intentionally designed.” Work in the public sphere is more often emergent, dialogical, and annoyingly unpredictable. It requires cutting through layers of self-interest, negotiating through conflict, conducting careful deliberations in an effort, at best, to inch toward common ground what the architects of the National Issues Forums (www.nifi.org) call “choice work” that requires “moving from individual opinions to the more reflective and shared perspectives needed to inform public judgment.” At the grass roots, democratic work is less often undertaken as a response to an “articulated need” and more of a leap into the flux of everyday experience, into what Jane Addams called “the crowded throng” and the “common lot” whose exact needs and desires are often eclipsed, obscured, indeed co-opted by larger systemic powers and priorities.

Democratic citizenship might be better understood, in short, as service with others than service to others. As such, if we are serious about “fostering citizenship” we need to heed Harry Boyte’s warning that “change-oriented intellectuals’—surely the lion’s share of service-learning practitioners—have a strong utopian bent. Their focus is on ‘the world as it should be.’ By way of contrast, most [public] work is messy, hard, and ambiguous.”

The time is ripe for reshaping our definitions of service-learning with greater emphasis on the pragmatic realities of civic responsibility and civic engagement. National organizations and foundations from the Campus Compact and AAHE to the Kellogg Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts are calling on colleges and universities to renew their civic missions and promote education for democracy. For service-learning practitioners, this means that we must enlarge our definition of service as volunteerism (service to others) to include service as public work (service with others). Harry Boyte and his colleagues at the Center for Democracy and Citizenship (www.hhh.umn.edu/centers/cdc) define “public work” as “tasks of public significance that cultivate larger [democratic] energies, skills, and visions.” Public work of this sort is compatible with service-learning placements across the disciplines since, as Boyte reminds us, democracy itself “doesn’t assume a singular kind of knowledge. It recognizes many sorts of experiences and ways of knowing as important in creating our common world.”

For my part, I have begun to tie my service-learning placements to breaking incidents of local grass roots democracy in action, including the controversial adoption of a hate speech code at another nearby university, a (failed) petition by Hispanic citizens to rename a local street after Cesar Chavez, and, among others, a successful, hotly contested effort to include sexual orientation in a municipal civil rights ordinance. Most recently, my students organized open community forums that encouraged deliberation on difficult topics highly germane to our university and surrounding communities: alcohol use and abuse, juvenile violence, declining public school performance, and meeting the demands of the 21st century workforce. In one of my classes students archived on the World Wide Web their entire
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experience planning, organizing, leading, and reflecting upon a public forum. I welcome you to visit it at www.msu.edu/~cooperd/nif/forum.htm. You can review other nationwide efforts to use deliberative democracy as a teaching and learning practice at www.lhup.edu/teachingdemocracy.

While my students were not directly involved in the moral richness of intimate service to others, they were serving the community in important and needed ways. Civic values and democratic aspirations became central to my students' explorations of diversity, commitments to equity, and respect for the difficult work of resolving conflicts within a local neighborhood and community. Experiences such as these also gave students extensive experience in practicing public discourse and engaging in constructive conversations over American pluralism, public life, and the common good. Above all, my students entered into the ways democracy works or fails to work, all for the sake of teaching them what is at the heart of any service-learning definition worth its salt: to be more practiced, effective, responsible, reasonable, and articulate participants in the realization of democratic values.

[This essay originally appeared in the Learn and Serve America North Central Exchange Newsletter]

David Cooper is a Professor of American Thought and Language at Michigan State University.

### Food for Thought

We often assume that political activism requires an explanation, while inactivity is the normal state of affairs. But it can be as difficult to ignore a problem as to try and solve it; to curtail feelings of empathy as to extend them; to feel powerless and out of control as to exert an influence; to stop thinking as to think. There is no exit from the political world, no possibility of disengagement; human, political decisions permeate human life, whether we like it or not. Few Americans vote, yet many tell survey interviewers that they have little faith in government, many are astonishingly ignorant about the most basic political issues: yet all are touched by this untrusted, ignored government...

... Participation in voluntary associations is supposed to help citizens create democracy... by generating a kind of civic power. The public sphere is very different from the kind of citizenship advocated by some politicians, who treat voluntary associations as the panacea for all social ills - former President Bush's “thousand points of light” and its British equivalent (Speaker's Commission on Citizenship 1990) are two examples. These officials ask apolitical citizen-volunteers to fill in for underfunded charity and welfare agencies, saying that such “citizenship” is more necessary now, in times of cutbacks. But the politicians do not ask the citizen to discuss the political decisions that made the cutbacks. Such citizens are asked... to convince themselves that regular citizens “really can make a difference,” without addressing issues that they would consider “political.”

The Struggle Against Positivism

by Harry C. Boyte

In recent years, the world of academia has re-discovered civic education, a once-vital tradition in American higher education, especially at public and land-grant universities. At the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, where I am a senior fellow, civic education has been at the center of our work since 1987, when the institute asked me to establish a project on “the problems in democracy.” We have generated what we call a “public work” philosophy of civic education, which stresses the civic skills and sense of civic selfhood that can develop in sustained efforts by a mix of people who make a lasting contribution on questions that concern them.

In our youth effort, Public Achievement, for example, more than ten thousand young people from the ages of eight to eighteen have created public projects on issues they care about (the issues have to be legal and nonviolent, and they have to “make a public contribution”). In teams coached by adults and based in schools and community centers in four states and Northern Ireland, the young people address problems such as gun violence, racial conflict, school change, teen pregnancy, and “saving the rain forest.” They often choose issues that affect the overall climate of their schools or communities, and they learn skills such as negotiation, public speaking, letter writing, interviewing, and dealing with those in authority.

Public Achievement has made clear the immense untapped public talents and hidden passions of young people. It has also helped generate a concept of the citizen not simply as a voter or a volunteer but as a “co-creator” of the common world and democracy itself. Young people are seen as citizens today, not just as citizens in preparation.

Our efforts at the Humphrey Institute are not unique. Campuses and communities across the country have formed partnerships to promote community service, citizenship, and democratic renewal. An important partnership has developed between Trinity College and the city of Hartford, Connecticut; a university-wide citizenship curriculum is in place at Tufts University; and there is new attention to public scholarship at Oregon State University and at the American Association for Higher Education. Since the early 1990s, Campus Compact, an organization of college and university presidents founded to promote community service, has shifted its focus to fostering citizenship and democratic renewal.

These changes are welcome in a time of falling voting levels and wide feelings of civic powerlessness. But they are still just beginnings. If they are to amount to much, faculty members need to take sustained leadership roles. We must do so partly for reasons of self-interest: only through a recovery of our public purposes can we resist the forces pushing us toward reorganization according to the dictates of the market and toward distance education as the basic paradigm on the premise that teaching is, at bottom, simply “instruction.”

Yet we face a great obstacle. The stance of the “outside expert,” woven into the fabric of our work and sustained by a discredited theory, positivism, weakens us tremendously in political terms. As intellectuals in the Eastern bloc had sounded the death knell of communism by 1989, we need to put an end to an outdated philosophy in which few believe any more, but which holds us all in thrall.

Predecessors

Our work at the Humphrey Institute, based at the University of Minnesota’s Center for Democracy and Citizenship, builds on the tradition of citizenship education of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), for which I worked as a field secretary in 1964 and 1965. The SCLC sponsored hundreds of “citizenship schools” across the South in church basements, beauty parlors, and community centers. Southern blacks, struggling against the brutal weight of segregation, developed a transformed sense of “somebodyness” as they explored the question, what is a citizen? Our work also draws from my own and other studies of American democratic social movements and citizenship that have argued for a populist, democratic political tradition in America, different from either socialism or unbridled capitalism. In addition, we have tried to adapt the lessons of effective community organizing networks to the challenges of renewing public life in institutions such as schools, settlement houses, cooperative extensions, nursing homes, and colleges.

Barriers

At the Humphrey Institute, we engage in “action research” in which community partners are co-builders of knowledge. Our theory-building experiments in Public
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Achievement and elsewhere have highlighted the promise of civic education, but they have made evident the barriers to this kind of endeavor.

College presidents, such as the distinguished group of more than three hundred who signed the 1999 Presidents’ Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education, have made eloquent calls for civic engagement and education. Yet whatever their philosophies, administrators experience enormous pressures that push them in other directions.

A November 5, 1999, article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, “Restoring Sanity to an Academic World Gone Mad,” by James Carlin, past chair of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, points to these pressures. Carlin’s complaints are what administrators hear all the time: “Faculty members do ever more meaningless research while spending fewer and fewer hours in the classroom during an academic year that we have shortened in recent decades,” he writes. Speaking as “a businessman who has learned something about management and controlling costs,” Carlin states that “never have I observed anything as unfocused or mismanaged as higher education.” Presidents must “take charge,” he admonishes. The power of “faculty unions” needs to be broken; tenure must be seen as an idea “whose time has passed”; and classroom hours must increase sharply.

As draconian as Carlin sounds, his proposals pale beside the predictions and prescriptions of some within the ranks of administrators themselves. On March 13 Arthur Levine’s lead op-ed in the New York Times, “The Soul of a New University,” sketched a chilling future in which students truly turn into customers. Levine, president of Columbia Teachers College and once known as a progressive reformer, calls on higher education to wake up or get left behind. Leaders need to recognize the enormous pace of technological change and take action “not only to adapt our institutions but to transform them.”

“Why do we need the physical plant called the college?” he asks. Most students of the future will acquire what they need in “on-line instruction, with education at home or in the workplace.” He cites as an example the for-profit University of Phoenix, which provides distance education. He quotes a corporate executive who says higher education is “the next health care: a poorly managed nonprofit industry which has learned something about management and controlling costs.”

Levine calls for leaders to recognize “the convergence in knowledge-producing organizations,” from television and book publishing to universities, and go all out for distance education and new technology as rapidly as possible. “In the years ahead, every knowledge-producing organization will begin to produce similar kinds of products,” he predicts. Unless higher education gets on the bandwagon, it will go the way of the railroad, which lost out to the airlines when it failed to recognize that “it was in the transportation industry,” not rail travel. “The reality,” he says, is that “colleges and universities are not in the campus business but the education business.”

I am not a technophobe. New technologies may have the potential to create in higher education parallels to the more craft-oriented, human-scale environment that Jason Epstein envisions for books in a recent issue of the New York Review of Books: “once more a cottage industry of diverse, creative, autonomous units” in which the ties between writer, editor, and audience will again become close and interactive.

But this transformation is certainly not inevitable. Effecting it will require us to reclaim power over technological change and over the marketplace. Yet a sense of human agency is precisely what is missing from the world view of Levine, and feelings of collective powerlessness, in my experience, afflict many faculty. We live with a fatalism fed by the dominant, if hidden, operating philosophy that structures our lives and work, a silent world view that disempowers us by isolating us just as surely as it turns our students into Levine’s customers.

Dangerous Philosophy

As the sense of how things were fades from awareness, we may be oblivious to what we’re losing in the quality of our world… what we’re talking about is preserving our humanity in a world whose forces and pressures and seductions tell us to believe in technology and technological solutions.

-Shoshana Zuboff, Harvard Magazine 1988

Shortly after her book, In the Age of the Smart Machine, appeared, Shoshana Zuboff argued in Harvard Magazine that in the world of new technologies, active, informed, thoughtful citizens are indispensable. Higher education must function as the craft-oriented, human-scale environment that Jason Epstein envisions for books in a recent issue of the New York Review of Books: “once more a cottage industry of diverse, creative, autonomous units” in which the ties between writer, editor, and audience will again become close and interactive.

But certain roadblocks prevent us from carrying out this task. One important barrier is faculty members’ disengagement from public life, a pattern that infuses our practices and culture, and that disempowers us politically and intellectually. Sustaining this disengagement is the philosophy of positivism. Positivism structures our research, our disci-
plines, our teaching, and our institutions, even though it has long been discredited intellectually. It is a genre that academically let loose long ago, now lurking below the surface and threatening our destruction.

Faculty members undergo an insidious socialization, especially in graduate school. We learn a stance of ironic detachment from our fellow citizens, seeing ourselves outside what Jane Addams, cofounder of the Hull House settlement in Chicago, called “the common lot.” We embody such aloofness in different ways. The image of the detached and objective scholar and teacher leads to the expert stance of “fixing problems,” “discovering truths,” and “dispensing knowledge.”

This image has roots in the influence of German universities on American scholars in the late nineteenth century, as the historian Daniel Rodgers has argued in Atlantic Crossings. Based on the German model of the pursuit of knowledge only for its own sake—without regard for social value or consequences—American graduate students in economics learned an ethos of scientific “objectivity” and a model of policy making in private consultation with political leadership, far removed from public involvement.

The ethos of detachment was further fed by an uncritical celebration of science, and especially by the philosophers of positivism, who argued that science rested on the discovery of permanent, atemporal standards of rationality that could be found and then applied. Scientific method was purposed to be pure; its aim was to find abstract, universal truths “out there” that could be brought back to enlighten the masses, like the philosopher king who returns to Plato’s cave.

Its overwhelmingly male practitioners were considered men of objectivity. “The miracles of science seem to be inexhaustible,” wrote Walter Lippmann in 1922. “The men of science,” he urged, “should have acquired much of the intellectual authority which churchmen once exercised.” As Lippmann’s observation illustrated, for many public intellectuals, science was the new religion.

Such views triumphed after World War II in the context of the Cold War and the arms race. Positivism identified the detached, rational observer as the highest judge of truth and the most effective problem solver. Whatever its justifications in the struggle against communism, today the philosophy of detachment feeds a crisis in democracy. People “hate politics,” as the journalist E. J. Dionne has put it. They feel that public institutions are outside the citizenry—that they are “they,” not “us.” In addition, many people sense that technological change is beyond human control.

Problems of Content and Perspective

Science asks “how” questions, but it neglects questions of meaning, purpose, and value. As a result of the burgeoning authority of science, America has come to focus on efficiency and technology rather than on the meaning and significance of what is created, the work process itself, the definition of “wealth,” or the uses of technology. We have lost “wisdom” in “knowledge,” and knowledge in “information,” as T. S. Eliot warned in his 1937 poem, The Rock.

Our implicit theories of knowledge assume the specific understanding of scientific inquiry that derives from Positivism, for a time the dominant philosophy of science. This model delegitimizes “ordinary knowledge” and deprecates the capacities, talents, and interests of the nonexpert and the amateur. It is antagonistic to common sense, folk traditions, and craft and practical knowledge mediated through everyday life experience. Of course, “common sense” is not always right, nor “science” always wrong. I argue only that many different kinds of valuable knowledge support public life and that conventional academic approaches slight the nonexpert.

Contemporary philosophers of science have shown that science itself is a process full of trial and error, messiness, ambiguity, and social interaction and cooperation; it is far different from what positivists imagined. Thinkers from a range of fields—from pragmatic philosophy and interpretive social theory to women’s studies and action research—have recently shaped an alternative pragmatic ground for knowledge theory. They argue that sound knowledge of any kind is communally generated and public in nature. Provisional, open-ended, and evolving, it best emerges from real-world problems and needs constant testing through practical action. Apprenticeships and experiential learning are often used to communicate it. (Under this theory of knowledge, the “anecdote,” decried in mainstream social science, becomes key, because it is the touchstone for testing theory.)

As Richard Bernstein, a past president of the American Philosophical Association, put it in Beyond Objectivism and Relativism, knowledge of any kind, whether “scientific” or not, is part of the human experience, and made by a continuing community: “A community or a polis is not something that can be made or engineered.... [It involves] the coming into being of a type of public life that can strengthen solidarity, public freedom, a willingness to talk and to listen, mutual debate, and a commitment to rational persuasion.”

The ideal of the detached scholar may be discredited in theory but it would be a mistake to minimize the challenges of overcoming it in practice. As Steve Elkin, a political theorist at the University of Maryland who edits A PEGS Journal: The Good Society, argues, “Our disciplines absorbed positivism in the 1950s when it was at its peak of influence, and then they stopped thinking about the foundations.”

In 1989 Donna Shalala, who was then chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, illustrated the difficulties in the David Dodds Henry Lecture she presented at the University of Illinois. Shalala made an impassioned plea for public service and social justice, for struggles against racism and sexism, and for environmentalism and peace—and she wed these
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improvements to an unvarnished expert model. She upheld “the ideal of a disinterested technocratic elite” fired by the moral mission of “society’s best and brightest in service to its most needy.” The imperative, she said, was “delivering the miracles of social science” to fix society’s social problems, just as doctors cured juvenile rickets in the past.

The political consequences of such a stance have been played out in Shalala’s career as U.S. secretary of health and human services. Thus she made not a murmur of public dissent when the Clinton administration abolished welfare, with no substantial public work program to take its place. Although she probably disagreed with the policy (as did her special assistant Peter Edelman, who resigned in protest), her self-understanding as a leader of the “disinterested technocratic elite” radically limited her political options.

The positivist perspective is at work in many ways. As Davydd Greenwood, an anthropologist at Cornell University, and his colleague, Morten Levin, have pointed out in An Introduction to Action Research, positivism structures most social science research. It assumes that research agendas are best developed by detached researchers outside public settings, and it puts a premium on mathematical and quantitative approaches, predictive theories, and abstract formulations.

Positivism also shapes contemporary patterns of professional education, credentialing, and continuing education, as theorists and historians of professionalism, such as Donald Schon and Ellen Lagemann, have demonstrated. I would argue that positivism is at work in the purportedly “blind” (and excessively specialized) peer review of journal articles. Positivism, by example at least, also molds the position of sharp critics such as deconstructionists, whose inaccessible language is a measure of their distance from the public.

Isolation

Everywhere the sense of detachment and the stance of “objectivity,” which are positivism’s legacy, lead to isolation and competition. As part of a research project for the Kettering Foundation, I interviewed faculty members at research institutions such as the Universities of Minnesota and Michigan and Cornell, Duke, and Brown Universities; I also spoke with professors at liberal arts and community colleges such as Augsburg College and Kansas City Kansas Community College. I heard many stories about lost community and the disappearance of public purpose. Faculty recounted experiences of isolation and said they never discussed such things with colleagues. Countertrends at colleges like Augsburg seek to create a vital campus culture of public conversation and civic engagement. But the overall movement is toward disengagement. “I talk more to the fifty members of my subdiscipline over the Internet than I ever do to my colleague next door,” said one faculty member. He spoke for many. For me, these discussions recalled C. Wright Mills’s argument in The Sociological Imagination that people in “mass society” experience trouble in personal terms disconnected from social structure, and have lost the sense of “genuine publics.”

The positivist mind-set is a silent civic disease. In 1993–95, the Center for Democracy and Citizenship coordinated, in association with the White House Domestic Policy Council, the New Citizenship Project to examine the citizen-government divide. We heard again and again some version of positivism from federal employees: “We’ve lost the civil in civil service. We no longer think of ourselves as citizens. Now we’re outside, providing services to citizens.”

Positivism structures patterns of evaluation, assessment, and outcome measures, as University of Minnesota theorists Michael Patton and Michael Baizerman have detailed. It sustains patterns of one-way service delivery and the conceptualization of poor and powerless groups as needy “clients,” not as competent citizens. It infuses funding patterns for government “interventions” to fix social problems. It shapes the market, the media, health care, and political life. Professionals imagine themselves outside a shared reality with their fellow citizens, who are seen as “customers” or “clients,” objects to be manipulated or remediated.

An Alternative Tradition

Despite its omnipresence, the positivist genie can be put back in the bottle. The intellectual foundation for broad opposition to logical positivism—and for a pragmatic, publicly grounded alternative view of knowledge creation and learning—is astonishingly diverse. It includes neopragmatists such as Cornel West, Richard Rorty, and Richard Bernstein, as well as democratic theorists like Sheldon Wolin, Mary Dietz, and Jeff Isaac. It numbers communitarian philosophers such as William Galston, Amital Etzioni, Stephen Carter, Mary Ann Glendon, and Charles Taylor. It encompasses feminist philosophers like Elizabeth Minnich, theorists of moral development such as Carol Gilligan, scholars of knowledge such as Mary Belenky, and action researchers like Davydd Greenwood and Morten Levin. Social theorists of the left and the right, from James Scott and Andrew Polsky to Robert Nisbet, Peter Berger, and William Schambra, have shown the devastating impact on living human communities of positivism wedded to state policies. The very diversity of these public intellectuals in politics, outlook, and discipline suggests the profound challenge that can be mounted to the disengaged academic enterprise.

In my late teens and early twenties, when I worked for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, I gained an intuitive sense of democracy as the great and unfinished work...
of the people that comes alive only when individuals struggle to make it real. I gained hopefulness. As Dorothy Cotton, director of SCLC’s Citizenship Education Program and my boss in those years, often says, if you had lived through the experience of seeing so many illiterate, powerless, and brutally oppressed people rise up and remake the world, you would never again doubt at least the possibility of democracy. In addition, I learned the usefulness of democratic history. In his “Letter from a Birmingham jail,” Martin Luther King, Jr., ties his fierce denunciations of segregation to a call to remember the richness of American democratic and religious traditions as resources for the struggle. In his words, the freedom movement was “bringing the whole nation back to the great wells of democracy dug deep by the founding fathers.”

We have sought for more than a decade to develop and elaborate such themes in the action research projects of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship. The search for democratic history has also led us to uncover an alternative democratic tradition in higher education.

This tradition was well articulated by Jane Addams, who saw education as being about “freeing the powers” of people for public creation and contribution. In her 1902 volume, Democracy and Social Ethics, Addams argued that the educator has a role beyond simply informing the student: “We are gradually requiring of the educator that he shall free the powers of each man and connect him with the rest of life. We are impatient to use the dynamic power residing in the mass of humankind, and demand that the educator free that power.”

Giola Diliberto’s recent biography of Jane Addams, A Useful Woman, makes vivid the context of such craft by describing the “civic community” of Toynbee Hall, in the East End of London, on which Hull House was modeled. Diverse people worked and learned together at Toynbee Hall. Diliberto writes:

The distinctive reform spirit of the Victorian era—an earnest combination of self-improvement and duty toward others... a conviction that all people, regardless of class, birth, or wealth, have the capacity and indeed the duty to “evolve” into their best selves... was epitomized by Toynbee Hall.

Toynbee Hall teemed with courses, projects, meetings in one month, classes for writing, math, chemistry, drawing, music, sewing, nursing, hygiene, composition, geography, bookkeeping, citizenship, and evening courses in geology, physiology, botany, chemistry, Hebrew, Latin and Greek, European and English history, and literary subjects from Dante to Shakespeare to Molière.

Addams’s Victorian language of “uplift” can sound descending. But what is remarkable is her underlying conviction that ordinary people-poor and working class people, without money, of varied backgrounds, with little social status—had wonderful buried talents to contribute to the public conversation. “She was throwing in her ‘lot’ with the rest of the population,” writes Diliberto, “struggling with them toward ‘salvation.’ “That salvation was just as much in the self-interest of the college-educated settlement workers as it was in that of the Poor immigrants.

Hull House created strong partnerships with higher education, pioneering in extension classes and helping to shape the scholarship at leading academic centers such as the University of Chicago. The most important aspect of these efforts was their public, open, diverse quality. This public quality included recognition of the need for political range: “The Settlement recognizes the need of cooperation, both with the radical and the conservative, and... cannot limit its friends to any one political party or economic school.”

Contrasting the Settlement philosophy with cloistered colleges, Addams argued that residents of Hull House “feel that they should promote a culture which will not set its possessor aside in a class with others like himself, but which will... connect him with all sorts of people by his ability to understand them as well as by his power to supplement their present surroundings.”

This understanding, we have discovered, flourished and expanded in once-vital traditions of public and land-grant education, which espoused a philosophy of reciprocal partnerships and “public work” to build rural democracy. It conveyed much more of a “craft” view of scholarship and teaching than of an “expert” one. The University of Minnesota, said Lotus Coffman in his 1922 inaugural address as president, “breathes the spirit of the social order... is constantly engaged in an attempt to understand the meaning of the age... inculcates the craft spirit of the profession [and is] dominated by a philosophy of helpfulness” to the commonwealth. This tradition took shape in many private and liberal arts schools as well. Powerful leaders such as Liberty Hyde Bailey, dean of the College of Agriculture at Cornell; Mary Mims, a pioneering rural sociologist at Louisiana State University; and the African American anthropologist Zora Neale Hurston helped develop the tradition. As late as 1948, the Presidential Commission on the Future of Higher Education titled its report Education for Democracy.

This theory and practice of civic education and knowledge creation radically deteriorated in the last half of the twentieth century. Today we are captives of an invisible philosophy that few would profess and many would find difficult even to name. To break free will require a sustained, powerful intellectual movement, as well as practical strategies and action for change. We have isolation and powerlessness to lose, and a public world to gain.
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Putnam’s America

by Garry Wills

In 1995 Hal Salwen released a movie, Denise Calls Up, about people who conduct their lives on the telephone, living so entirely on that instrument that the characters who share their most intimate thoughts on the phone pass each other by, unrecognized, on the street. The fear that technology will somehow disconnect us from reality has haunted the modern world ever since Emerson claimed that the telegraph would have us nattering into space without real human contact, or since Ruskin said that railroads would rush us past nature and each other, unable to see them. Robert Putnam picked up that lament and decked it out with statistics in his famous 1995 article “Bowling Alone,” which appeared in the Journal of Democracy.

According to Putnam, TV, the Internet, and other technologies have speeded up our lives to the point where we no longer invest “social capital” in each other by means of overlapping memberships in clubs and other organizations, which are essential to human trust and mutual support.

Putnam’s book advances the same argument with further statistics and with the catchy symbolic examples of disconnectedness that appealed to people when the article appeared. We are told, for instance, that people entertain less in their homes, not gathering there for bridge or poker. When they eat out, they eat as they bowl, alone—at fast-food places, in anonymous lines, not at neighborhood bars or restaurants where people know each other. Putnam blames these trends mainly on a vague “generational change.”

Instead of relying on odd statistics (he claims that television watchers give other drivers the finger more than those who do not watch television), Putnam should look harder at major social and economic reconfigurations affecting urbanization, education, professionalization, information technology, the family, and the work force. The ties formed with others by working women link them to women and to men. Putnam, moreover, does not emphasize that women are working at higher levels of professionalization, mingling with their peers and their clients as lawyers, business executives, professors, doctors, preachers, military officers, and so on. Though Putnam thinks of social mobility mainly as a solvent of social capital, women’s increased professional mobility carries them into varying social clusters.

Putnam’s imagined good old days, which have a roseate Norman Rockwell glow about them, include a Duffy’s Tavern, where everybody knows your name. But that tavern, like Cheers, had mainly male customers—so that everyone knows Norm, but no one knows Vera. The modern equivalents—the omnipresent Starbucks and other coffee shops—have a clientele that is both male and female. In the coffee shop where I meet my friends, the Unicorn in Evanston, Illinois, people know each other, hang out together, and even receive phone calls as the regulars did at Duffy’s—but not from wives complaining about their husbands’ absence. Some of the coffee shop activity is clustered around campuses. Though Putnam admits that education offers new arenas for social grouping, he says that just deepens the mystery that those with higher education partake in fewer of the old clubs and activities. What is mysterious? The new ties supplant the old.

Since urbanization and professionalization require higher levels of schooling, the family structure is altered. The costs of college and graduate school require that parents limit the number of their children, and they each must hold a job just to finance the education of those children they have. The delay before children enter the work force creates a youth culture that reshapes the years of training, producing the generational change Putnam calls the great disconnector of our time. It is true that the young live more with their peers than with the family during this interval—just as the wives spend more time with their working partners than in their homes. There goes the family game of monopoly and the women’s bridge clubs that Putnam pines for. But the new patterns of association bring their own forms of social interchange.

Putnam underestimates these new groupings, not because they are not productive of social capital, but simply because they are new. The clubs and activities whose decline he quantifies have a comfortable air of stability because they...
were the fixtures of a prior world—4-H clubs, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Jaycees, Shriners, the American Legion, the Lions Club, the Y. By contrast, the new social clusters are unsettling to some because they are brought about by change, and change is seen as disorienting. Women's professional organizations create new kinds of connectedness, but they are resented by those who think the only place for a woman is in the home. Very few people resented 4-H clubs.

Theda Skocpol, co-editor of Civic Engagement in American Democracy, an anthology devoted to this topic of social capital, is in partial agreement with Putnam; but instead of seeing a decline in voluntary organizations, she sees a change in their character—from horizontal ties of members interacting with each other (like labor unions of the past) to vertical structures in which “participants” send money to a central cadre of professional lobbyists (like the Sierra Club). But Everett Ladd, in The Ladd Report, produces evidence that Putnamites overstate the participatory activity of unions and underestimate that of environmental groups (where the Adopt-a-Highway program is just one of many participatory activities).

More pointedly, Ladd offers examples that reverse Skocpol's horizontal-to-vertical pattern. Putnam made the shrinking of PTAs a major part of his argument, but Ladd shows that this reflects a rebellion against the central structure and ideological leftist of the PTA as a national structure, which is being supplanted by local and self-started organizations in the schools, involving parents to a greater extent than ever. Charter schools and the voucher movement are just part of this grass-roots activity.

The same trend can be seen in the decline of hierarchical “mainline” churches and the explosive growth of horizontally membered evangelical churches and para-churches (e.g., Promise Keepers, Prison Fellowship Ministries, Focus on the Family, Concerned Women for America). Membership in the Episcopal Church declined by 26 percent between 1980 and 1995, but Pentecostals grew by 469 percent, Jehovah's Witnesses by 286 percent, and Baptists by 73 percent. The most participatory forms of religion are now the most popular ones—a fact that is reflected in other social forums, like the blossoming “interactive” aspects of education, entertainment, museums, radio, and the Internet.

These correspond to the large social changes already referred to, which depart from a vertical structure of authority patterned on the patriarchal family. The young now have a relation with their peers that matches the new ties, outside the home, of women with fellow workers, giving the “lower” strata of the patriarchy a horizontal mobility that the father alone enjoyed in the past. The same loosening of hierarchical structure has taken place in churches, colleges, corporations, and even (despite resistance) the military. Students now not only grade their teachers, but have a greater say in the development of the curriculum; they participate in faculty meetings and even in university board meetings. Teachers are no longer in loco parentis—or rather, they are in the role of parents who have themselves become less autocratic. Integration of the genders in the public sphere has created a paradoxically separate mobility of spouses. Seen in this light, a rise in the divorce rate is not the inverse of a shift from hierarchical religions to evangelical ones, but an aspect of the same process. Both produce new kinds of participation in society, but not any less participation.

Putnam worries about the Internet's tendency to separate people. But it brings them together as well—as it did the demonstrators in Seattle, who were mobilized by the Internet. Here, too, individuals range out from local and familial structures to pursue their own interests. In one case I know of, that of a man with an extremely rare disease, the Web put him in touch for the first time with others, all around the world, who were suffering from the same disease.

The loosening of ties within the self-centered family has been matched with a rise in volunteer social service and in charitable donations. Putnam himself has to admit that volunteer activities are up, even in visible ways—and some of these are invisible, like the networks of helpers in the 12-step programs, where older members give many hours weekly to helping the newcomers. The campus religious groups I’m familiar with have a far higher level of volunteer activity than in the past: working at soup kitchens, teaching in literacy programs, and other activities. At Northwestern University, every dormitory has a “philanthropy chair” devoted to volunteer work, and many of the dorms' regular meetings are taken up with that chair’s programs. The new president of the MacArthur Foundation tells me that he cannot believe the Putnam thesis when he considers all the non-government organizations (NGOs) that have sprung up and are asking his staff for funds. Our nation has never been more caring for the previously disadvantaged or excluded, from ethnic and religious minorities to gays, battered women, and children.

Putnam, like many social critics, finds in America's lower voting rate a deficit of social trust. But Ladd argues that the turnout is not as low as it seems. Absentee ballots are not counted (which have been reaching over two million votes in California alone), and the pool of potential voters is overstated by failure to exclude from it the ineligible (8.5 percent of the population, mainly convicted felons). Moreover,
most of the low turnout is caused by the nature of a compromising two-party system that does not reward those outside the mainstream. His points are buttressed in Roderick Hart’s Campaign Talk. One study shows that, even when only 55 percent show up to vote, 75 percent of those questioned afterward claim that they did vote. This destroys the notion that there is widespread disillusionment with a system people are proud to claim (unjustifiably) a part in.

Even more stunning evidence that people are not made cynical by the electoral system comes from a National Election Studies project reported by Wendy Rahn, John Brehm, and Neil Carlson in the Skocpol/Fiorina collection of essays. In a study of five national elections (1980-1996), the same people were asked the same questions about social trust before and after the vote, and the responses showed a growth in trust during the campaign. In the 1996 election, for instance: “Before the election, only 40 percent of those interviewed reported that most people could be trusted, while over half of the postelection respondents offered a trusting response.” Hart also quotes polls by Larry Bartels to show that, despite all the talk of negative campaigning, respect for both presidential candidates increases in the course of a campaign. Hart argues that American elections, precisely because they do not have the issue-sharpening dynamic of a parliamentary system (where minority parties articulate strong ideological positions and bring out the votes of those with minority views), have a social-ritual effect of reuniting community ties. The country is never more united than in the “honeymoon” period of a newly elected president.

Ladd, who until his death last year was director of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, also shows that we must make certain distinctions when dealing with polls that express a low opinion of politicians, Washington, or the government. Those asked their opinion of local government often express a high regard for it, and those who despise Congress in general have great enough esteem for their own representative to reelect him or her continually. John Henry Newman contrasted “notional assent” with “real assent.” The former is an agreement with some abstract statement, while the latter deals with concrete realities within a person’s experience. In that sense, the view of Congress as an abstraction is notional, but the judgment on one’s own representative is a real assent.

Given these facts, why was Putnam’s thesis greeted with a kind of instant recognition and affirmation? We are all subject to good-old-daysm. In our personal life, a psychic mechanism lets us function by tending to dim or even obliterate unhappy memories, while we treasure (and magnify) happy ones. On the social level, a piety toward forebears strengthens this tendency. Intrusive change in the present has not had time to undergo these softening or enhancing effects. That is why the newer forms of social capital do not have the stabilizing feel that the old ones did (Putnam’s bridge clubs and bowling leagues). But the adjustment to change is itself formative of new resources for dealing with it. Putnam indicates this fact when he points to the Progressive Era as a time when weakened social ties were re-established after the effects of immigration, industrialization, and technology had depleted social capital at the end of the nineteenth century. But many of the Progressives’ new forms of social work and ethnic grouping (much of it assisted, as Skocpol notes, by government) were considered radical in their day, as destabilizing society rather than restabilizing it—much as new social activities are seen today.

To deny that there is a social-capital crisis doesn’t mean that we have solved our society’s problems. We still have vast income disparity, poor schooling, inadequate health care; an obscene proliferation of guns, a political system dependent on fat-cat interests. Other developed countries are able to provide decent wages and health care and schools; they can limit the length and costs of elections and the presence of guns. Much of our inability to do the same comes from a distrust of government—a belief that it should not interfere with the economic or political markets, or “socialize” medicine, or limit guns or political donations. I have argued elsewhere that this is not a new development but the result of historical myths about the Constitution as itself distrustful of government, meant to be inefficient as well as unintrusive, to check itself to the point of paralysis. This kind of ideological antigovernmentalism can co-exist with, can even encourage, volunteerism, NGOs, professional organizations, and cause-related social groupings. After all, the governmental problem of gun-related crime is, for one kind of social-capital formation, a plus—the NRA is a bonding group for millions of people, just the sort of club that Putnam prizes.

By focusing on the kinds of non-governmental social ties that have actually increased in recent years, Putnam chases the wrong phenomena. In this realm, despite our good-old-daysm, we must brace ourselves to bear the good news that America has never been more participative, interactive, inclusive, or charitable.

[Reprinted with permission from The American Prospect, Volume 11, Number 16, July 17, 2000]

The 2000 Ehrlich Faculty Award

Selection Committee Issues Call for 2001 Nominees

Last year, more than 80 educators were nominated for the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award. The award recognizes one faculty member whose teaching, scholarship, and leadership—on campus and in the community—exemplify exceptional service-learning practices. The individual and collective work of the nominees is a testament to the impact of service-learning on teaching and learning, community renewal, and the academy.

John Wallace
Professor of Philosophy, University of Minnesota

The 2000 recipient is Dr. John Wallace of the University of Minnesota. In many ways, Dr. Wallace embodies the diverse landscape of service-learning. Dr. Wallace became involved in service-learning (although he hadn’t initially heard that term) in 1983 when he was serving in a new administrative position at the University of Minnesota dealing with, among other things, university outreach. He believed that getting students out into the Twin Cities to work, and then linking that work to academic study would be a “powerful way to improve both undergraduate education and the university’s contributions to the wider community.” What he would later come to call service-learning was a top priority in his agenda.

As one of four co-founders of the Jane Addams School for Democracy, a community-based center for learning and community action located in St. Paul’s West Side neighborhood, Dr. Wallace helped establish a community agency with strong ties to the university. Since then, faculty, students, and individuals from the community have explored a variety of disciplines while learning, serving, and teaching one another.

Dr. Wallace’s interest in learning circles has also been a very important focus of his career. In fact, a colleague, Dr. David Droge, notes that “the most important legacy John initiated... is the incorporation of learning circles into service-learning pedagogy.” Learning circles, an approach to teaching and learning in which all members of a group are both teachers and learners, is now used in many settings. Among these are the Jane Addams School for Democracy and the Invisible College, the creation of which was spearheaded by Dr. Wallace.

Along with Dr. Wallace, Campus Compact would like to call special attention to the ten Ehrlich Award finalists:

Ralph L. Corrigan
Professor of English at Sacred Heart University

Dr. Corrigan was the first professor at Sacred Heart to integrate service-learning into his classes. He was also a founding member of the Service Learning Steering Committee in 1994, two years after a trip to El Salvador inspired him to bring the “spirit of hope” he saw there into the local Bridgeport community. His many teaching awards and long list of publications are evidence of a long and successful academic career, but Dr. Corrigan’s dedication is better illustrated by the words of his colleagues. The president of Sacred Heart, Anthony J. Cernera, describes Dr. Corrigan as a “pioneer” and praises his commitment, saying, “His motivation and energy are consistently renewed by his witnessing the transformation of his students in their social consciousness, in their academic motivation, and in their maturity.

Edward J. Coyle and Leah H. Jamieson
Professors of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Purdue University

Drs. Coyle and Jamieson are co-founders of Engineering Projects in Community Service (EPICS), a service-learning program created to provide a service-learning structure that enables undergraduate students and community agencies to work together on long-term projects that are mutually beneficial. The program is the first and only project of its kind in engineering. “This is notable,” they say, “because engineering has been far behind other disciplines in embracing service-learning.” The program and its co-founders have received much recognition, and the program has been emulated by at least four other institutions. Drs. Coyle and Jamieson have co-authored articles and chapters on service-learning in engineering and continue to serve as two of EPICS’ three co-directors.

Margaret Dewar
Professor of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Michigan

Dr. Dewar has taught courses that incorporate service-learning for over twenty years. She has a strong interest in campus/community partnerships. Her work has been influential within her department, moving the
focus of scholarship, field work, and placement from commercial planning toward community development, particularly underserved, urban communities. She has been a recipient of the Michigan Campus Compact Faculty Award for Community Service Learning and the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs Outstanding Teacher Award.

Sandra L. Enos  
Professor of Sociology, Rhode Island College

Dr. Enos has almost twenty years of experience in service-learning scholarship and activity. She has pursued this work in a variety of settings, from academic to administrative positions in the public and non-profit sectors. Dr. Enos is particularly interested in “how ideas spread throughout communities and how communities are created by virtue of these ideas.” This interest has informed her research, writing, teaching, and the work she has done at the national level to advance service-learning. She is also engaged in examining how service-learning can be integrated with other higher education movements. Dr. Enos is a co-editor of the AAHE monograph on service-learning in sociology.

Sam Marullo  
Associate Professor of Sociology and Director, Volunteer and Public Service Center, Georgetown University

Since he began teaching, Dr. Marullo has aimed “to educate students in such a way as to promote their values development and introduce them to social justice advocacy.” In addition to teaching several popular service-learning courses, Dr. Marullo has led the development of the “Increase the Peace” program, through which students learn mediation and conflict resolution skills and work with D.C. youth on violence reduction and prevention. He also planned a research project called “A Day on the Color Line” in which teams of students actively studied the degree to which race influenced taxi drivers’ decisions about whether or not to accept potential fares. Dr. Marullo’s extensive scholarship in sociology and service-learning has been widely published and recognized with awards and grants. President Leo J. O’Donovan of Georgetown praises Dr. Marullo’s work and dedication, noting that “his commitment to service is inspiring, and he urges other members of the University community to take on what he considers an ‘enviable job: to do the greatest amount of good that we can for the people who are in great need.’”

Jill C. Miels  
Associate Professor of Elementary Education, Ball State University

Dr. Miels is keenly aware of the influence she carries in her role as an educator of future teachers: “Each teaching major that I work with will in turn multiply that influence with many children and their families.” The elementary education curriculum she has developed places 530 students in service roles in the local community. The curriculum, in the words of Ball State University President John E. Worthen, “has proven to be successful in the development of community partnerships to encourage our students to be active citizens.” Dr. Miels’ professional experiences, as an elementary school teacher and as a faculty member, provide a strong foundation for her extensive scholarship in the areas of elementary education and service-learning.

P. Elizabeth Pate  
Associate Professor of Elementary Education, University of Georgia

As a member of the faculty at the University of Georgia since 1989, Dr. Pate has demonstrated her commitment to the practice and institutionalization of service-learning in many ways. She served as a representative on the Task Force of the College of Education’s Service-Learning Initiative, successfully petitioning the Faculty Senate to formally endorse service-learning activities in the college. Dr. Pate has collaborated with other departments to integrate and advance service-learning and been involved in several projects that bring service-learning into the local secondary school curriculum. She has published extensively and been the recipient of numerous teaching awards.

Kathleen L. Rice  
Coordinator of Service Learning Instruction and Lecturer, California State University - Monterey Bay

According to CSU - Monterey Bay President Peter Smith, “Dr. Rice is an inspiring service learning instructor, a scholar committed to the integration of service learning and multiculturalism, and a leader and mentor to students and faculty alike.” She led the development of the required service-learning component at CSU - Monterey Bay, a course focused on the connection between individual identity and engagement in the community. In addition, Dr. Rice has pioneered campus-wide initiatives in the areas of faculty development and student leadership development. Her extensive experience and scholarship extend Dr. Rice’s influence beyond the perimeter of the Monterey Bay campus.

Linda J. Simmons  
Associate Professor of History, Northern Virginia Community College

Northern Virginia Community College president Belle S. Wheelan says Professor Simmons “wants more than hours of service; she wants students to realize that...”
engagement in the political world is the means of solving problems in a democratic society.” In fact, her frustration over her students’ disengagement from public life is what led her to service-learning. When she read an American Association of Community Colleges brochure on how service could lead to citizenship, she knew she “had found [her] academic home in service-learning.” She has since been an outspoken advocate for service-learning, received numerous grants and awards, and published and presented extensively on the topic.

Mary L. Tucker
Assistant Professor of Management, Ohio University

Dr. Tucker has been a leader in advancing service-learning, both in her current position at Ohio University and in her prior position at Colorado State University. Ohio University president Robert Glidden says Dr. Tucker’s “involvement in service-learning combines effective teaching with an engaged scholarship that benefits students, colleagues, university, and community.” Her scholarship has been published extensively in journals such as the Journal of Management Education and Business Communication Quarterly. Dr. Tucker says of her students, “It is always easy to be proud of university students; but to experience their unselfish willingness to give that something extra brings indescribable admiration.”

Selection Committee Issues Call for 2001 Ehrlich Nominations

Campus Compact would like to encourage nominations from member institutions for the 2001 Ehrlich Award. Candidates must be nominated by their president and demonstrate the following criteria:

• Experience in teaching service-learning: evidence of innovative ways of employing a reflective teaching methodology to connect community and public service with academic study.
• Evidence of engaged scholarship: published community-based action research, scholarship on the pedagogy of service-learning, or research on the impacts of service-learning on students, campuses or communities.
• Evidence of institutional impact: demonstrated leadership that promotes service-learning on one’s campus, within higher education, or in one’s discipline, and efforts aimed at redesigning curriculum and faculty development.

All nomination materials, including a presidential letter of support of the nominee must be received by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, December 15, 2000. More information is available on the Campus Compact website at www.compact.org.

The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement

The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement has been created with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to review and evaluate the scholarship of engagement of faculty who are preparing for annual review, promotion, and tenure. The board is composed of individuals who represent varied institutions of higher education and a wide range of disciplines, as well as the roles of program directors, vice presidents, vice provosts, presidents, and tenured faculty. The board members are leaders in the institutionalization of community engagement, service learning, and professional service.

For those institutions requesting review of their faculty’s scholarship of engagement, the process of submission requires a preview letter to inform the board of intent to submit materials. Institutions are encouraged to do so one month in advance of actual submission. The identification of reviewers well in advance of submission will insure a timely and informed review of faculty materials. Guidelines for preview letters and portfolio development are available from the following portfolio submission contacts:

Lorilee R. Sandmann, Vice Provost
Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Partnerships
Cleveland State University
RT 1217, 1860 East 22nd Street
Cleveland, OH 44114-4435
216 687-6915
Fax 216 687-9290
L.sandmann@csuohio.edu

Amy Driscoll, Director
Teaching, Learning, & Assessment
California State University Monterey Bay
100 Campus Center
Seaside, CA 93955-8001
831 582-4517
Fax 831 582-4545
amy_driscoll@monterey.edu
Introductory Service-Learning Toolkit: Readings and Resources for Faculty

Designed as a resource for faculty and others who are new to service-learning. Includes definitions, principles of good practice, a summary of service-learning research, bibliographies, and lots of essential reading on theory, pedagogy, reflection, tenure and promotion, model programs, and more. Also includes a list of on-line service-learning resources. 2000, 200 pgs. $35.00

Service Matters 1999: The Engaged Campus

In-depth profiles of a wide range of campuses engaged with their communities and the work they are doing toward educating their students for citizenship. Also includes service statistics from our 1999 member survey. Serves as a companion to Service Matters 1998. 1999, 205 pgs. $27.50, special Campus Compact member price: $15.00

Establishing and Sustaining an Office of Community Service

A comprehensive guide to assist community service directors in creating and sustaining a campus community service office. Student recruitment and training, liability and risk management, program assessment, and funding are some of the topics covered. Also contains an extensive appendix of forms for working with faculty, students, and community agencies. 2000, 198 pgs. $40.00

Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships

Outlines the essential features of successful campus/community partnerships as defined by campus and community representatives at a 1998 Wingspread conference. The publication describes partnerships in terms of three ongoing processes – designing partnerships, building relationships, and sustaining partnerships over time. 2000, 45 pgs. $10.00

You can order publications online, or by fax or e-mail. Materials will be shipped upon receipt of payment. Phone: 401 863-1119, fax: 401 863-3779, e-mail: campus@compact.org, website: www.compact.org.

Campus Compact, Box 1975, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.
Campus Compact is a national coalition of college and university presidents committed to the civic purposes of higher education. To support this civic mission, Campus Compact promotes community service that develops students' citizenship skills and values, encourages collaborative partnerships between campuses and communities, and assists faculty who seek to integrate public and community engagement into their teaching and research.

The Campus Compact Reader is published three times a year in Spring, Fall, and Winter at a three year subscription rate of $45. Current and back issues can be purchased directly from Campus Compact at a cost of $6.00 per issue (includes postage and handling).

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the American Association for Higher Education, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Council on Public Policy Education for permission to reprint.
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