

10

Across

The Heterogeneity of Civic Education

David Scobey

The Double Crisis

The Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution famously declares “all persons born or naturalized in the United States” to be citizens whose “privileges and immunities” cannot be abridged. For those of us who share the robust view of civic engagement that runs through *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, however, the Constitution may be wrong. To be sure, it is fundamental to democratic societies that women and men are born into the privileges and immunities of citizenship. Yet, along with these rights and birthrights, citizenship entails the collective work of cocreating and participating in public life; of engaging, overseeing, and challenging government; of naming and solving shared problems, in collaboration with others to whom we are tied by a common fate but not necessarily a common experience. In that larger sense, no one is born a citizen. Citizens have to be made. We become not merely rights-bearing humans but public selves through a complex socialization that endows us with the knowledge, capacities,

4df96572a512c84bd2f299bb76dc2e07
ebrary

values, and habits that we need for the reflective practice of democratic life. “[W]e must *learn* to be free,” argues the political theorist Benjamin Barber:

The literacy required to live in civil society, the competence to participate in democratic communities, the ability to think critically and act deliberately in a pluralistic world, the empathy that permits us to hear and accommodate others, all involve skills that must be acquired. (1992, 4)

Here is the animating assumption of this book: there is no citizenship without education for citizenship.

And yet this is not news. For centuries, philosophers and public intellectuals as disparate as Rousseau and Dewey, Benjamin Barber and William Bennett—not to mention politicians, activists, and ordinary citizens of all stripes—have debated what educational practices should underwrite the making of a public of citizens. The very terms of debate are themselves part of the debate, constitutively up for grabs. Is the goal of civic education to inculcate civic virtue—and what do we mean by virtue anyway? Should civic educators aim primarily to induct apprentice citizens, such as immigrants or the young, into a shared canon of heroic memories and creedal values, or to prepare them for navigating the differences of a multicultural society? *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* thus enters a well-worn discussion. Yet it intervenes at a time in which the old problem of how to educate for citizenship is being revisited in new ways. The book makes an important contribution to that reframing, proposing answers to emergent questions and (like all good interventions) provoking further questions that the book cannot fully answer itself. Let me sketch the historical and intellectual context within which, it seems to me, the authors are working; offer my own map of their contributions to that moment; and finally specify some of the issues that the book opens up for further reflection and action.

Notwithstanding its measured tone of collective reflection and dialogue, *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* is a project catalyzed by urgent and timely concerns; or, more precisely, by the intersection of two sets of concerns. It is first of all a response to what Harry Boyte and Nan Kari have called “America’s civic crisis” (1996, 4). Jeff Bernstein’s essay speaks to this larger context when he laments the “decrease in social capital,” “decline in trust of the political system,” and “low levels of knowledge” that hobble his students’ engagement. Other authors frame the civic crisis in different ways, variously stressing students’ difficulty in bridging differences of ideological commitment or cultural identity, their felt sense of distance between their classroom studies and the larger world, and their disbelief in their own efficacy as political actors. Taken as a whole, their vignettes of disengagement echo concerns that are widespread in American society. Civic culture in the United States seems to have devolved into a privatized,

fractured landscape of poll-driven policy-making, ideological polarization, gated communities, passive consumption of government services and media spectacles, cynicism toward politics, and low rates of participation.

At the same time, the book is part of a robust surge of efforts to renew public life. The yearning for active citizenship and political community, of course, fueled the historic candidacy and election of Barack Obama. Yet the 2008 campaign was itself the culmination of a “civic turn” that had germinated during the previous fifteen years across many sectors of American society. We have seen calls for “civic professionalism” in the media and philanthropy (Sullivan 1995; Dzur 2008; Boyte 2004a; Rosen 2001; www.pewcenters.org),¹ experiments in “citizen-centered” policy-making and public agenda setting (Sirrianni and Friedland 2001; Gibson 2006; www.novemberfifth.org), the proliferation of programs for youth engagement and leadership development (Levine 2007; Kiesa et al. 2008)²—and, more to the point here, a rising movement for academic civic engagement to which *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* belongs and contributes (Stanton et al., 1999; Scobey 2005; Benson, Puckett, and Harkavy 2007; Boyte 2004b). As the editors of *Citizenship* write in their introduction, “there is an emerging consensus that cultivating an enduring ethos of civic engagement is one of the most important things higher education should do.”

Indeed the volume underscores one striking aspect of the current civic turn: how deeply *higher education* has been implicated in the health of American citizenship. Unlike their Progressive or New Deal counterparts, contemporary theorists and activists such as Barber (1992), Boyte (2004a, 2004b), Peter Levine (2007), Kiesa et al. (2008), and Martha Nussbaum (1997) assume academic institutions and undergraduate education to be important settings of civic disengagement *and* civic renewal. This assumption seems to me quite new. To be sure, U.S. colleges have long promoted education for the public good as a core value of their mission statements, and they have fitfully included civics courses as core components of their curricula. Yet, until the student activism of the late 1960s, the campus was mainly a sidebar in the larger story of American democratic movements: either an antithetical space of elite social privilege or (in the case of land-grant universities) a support space of expert training for public service.³ It was not scholars and students, but other social actors—the citizen-worker, the citizen-farmer, and the citizen-immigrant—who embodied the possibilities (for some) and risks (for others) of an expansively democratic public life (Boyte and Kari 1996). Yet, as the courses, community projects, issue briefs, and reflection journals that populate *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* underscore, all this has changed. The campus and the curriculum have come to be regarded as consequential arenas for the making of citizens (Colby et al. 2007).

In one sense, this is not remarkable. The half-century since World War II saw a genuine, if uneven, democratization of U.S. higher education. This had many

causes: the demand for new skills, technologies, and professions in a modernizing economy; the expansion of state university and community college systems; increases in working-class upward mobility; and governmental commitments to tuition aid and affirmative action advancing the novel policy that higher education was itself a public good. As a result, more than half of young Americans now enter institutions of higher learning. It would be surprising if such institutions did *not* serve as crucibles of civic socialization, much as grange halls, union halls, and military barracks did in earlier eras. Yet the movement for academic engagement involves more than just a response to expanded access and expanding diversity. It was catalyzed by concerns and conflicts that were unintended consequences of the expansion of higher education, especially in the past fifteen years or so. With almost startling precision, the civic crisis has coincided with a crisis in higher education, a growing worry that the relationship between the American academy and American society is broken. Here is the other key context for *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*.

Public and academic anxiety over the health of higher education gets expressed at several levels. The first is of course economic. Colleges and universities have faced a perfect storm of fiscal pressures in recent years—rising health and energy costs, declining public investment, more complex programs and missions—that sharply increased institutional costs and public disgruntlement. Budget shortfalls and tuition sticker shock in turn clothe a deeper problem: a legitimization crisis that threatens to undermine the social compact on which our enormous claims to resources and autonomy depends. A decade ago, this was played out in culture wars and critiques of “tenured radicals” (Kimball 1998; Bloom 1988); today we see it in calls for accountability and assessment, often associated with former Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings’s Commission On the Future of Higher Education, that call on (and call out) the academy to justify its effectiveness and value (U.S. Department of Education 2006; Scobey 2006). The editors of *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* situate their project as a response to such concerns, rightly citing “public frustration about the cost-to-value relationship of a college education” and the need to “evaluat[e] just what a college or university graduate has gained from . . . our classrooms” as challenges that the movement for academic civic engagement needs to take seriously. The book speaks even more eloquently to the educational crisis in its pedagogical stories. The essays offer a montage of evidence that undergraduates do not find (or worse, expect) their educational experience to be meaningful, integrative, and transformative. Carmen Werder’s analysis of her students’ metaphor of the “self-as-sponge” is the most vivid testimony to this pattern of alienation and passivity. Yet the lived experience of what I am calling the legitimization crisis of higher education—and students’ sometimes inchoate longing to change that experience—runs powerfully throughout the book. It is also there, just beneath the surface,

in the authors' own vignettes of escape from conventional disciplinary teaching into more integrative, experiential, ethically mindful, and socially engaged pedagogy: "breaking the silence," in Matt Fisher's poignant phrase.

Citizenship Across the Curriculum, in short, seems to me prompted by two intersecting urgencies: mounting disquiet over the devolution of civic life and mounting disquiet over the failures of higher education. The book is animated (like the larger movement for academic engagement) by the notion that we will meet these challenges most effectively by joining them together; each crisis has spurred the development of ideas and strategies for engaging the other. New pedagogies enable the campus to serve as a crucible for the making of citizens. The movement for civic renewal offers an important catalyst for making our educational practices deeper and more consequential—and in the process, reweaving the frayed social compact between the academy and the larger society. These essays translate that rather grandiose double project into rich and grounded stories of teaching and learning.

Teaching Citizenship in the Plural

How, then, does the book contribute to these aims? In thinking about its achievement, I want to start with a fact that may be so obvious as to escape notice: *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* is an anthology. It comprises an exploratory and wide-ranging collection of studies that documents the community of inquiry forged by an exploratory and diverse set of scholars. The book's genre represents more than just the inertial result of a scholarly convening or academic publishing habits. Its "anthology-ness" is organic to its goals and context: to the complexity of the problem of educating for citizenship, to the breadth of practice wisdom the collaborators bring to bear, to their collective process, to the unfinished quality of the historical moment to which they are speaking. Of course, we have (and need) books that assert focused, even polemical claims about civic engagement in a singular voice: Boyte and Kari's framing of citizenship as public work in *Building America* (1996) or Nussbaum's argument for the centrality of the narrative imagination in *Cultivating Humanity* (1997) come to mind as indispensable examples. Yet *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* is right, it seems to me, in *not* privileging some particular model of engaged pedagogy or civic competence. Its achievement is precisely to map a domain of work that is irreducibly heterogeneous and to offer a network of pathways—intersecting but not unidirectional—across that domain.

The range of settings and approaches through which the book explores the teaching of citizenship is not simply broad, but multidimensional: a plurality of pluralities. The authors' home institutions are diverse in sector, location, size, and mission, from Rebecca Nowacek's urban Jesuit university to Mike Burke's com-

munity college to Rona Halualani's comprehensive public university to David Geelan's research university (the sole non-U.S. institution in the mix). The essays bring together an expansive mix of fields—some disciplinary, others interdisciplinary—and an array of topics from the literary history of the Shoah to U.S. environmental history to mathematical modeling. Even more striking is the panoply of pedagogical approaches described in the essays: not only the issue briefs, community projects, and reflection journals that one might have expected in a book on civic learning, but also simulations, interview projects, dialogue exercises, kinetic games, and visual productions. The collaborators model a commitment to ongoing, reflective experimentation in their teaching that is inspiring.

Perhaps the most important dimension of the book's plural imagination is its treatment of civic education itself. Some authors—Jeff Bernstein and Mike Burke, for instance—place informed citizenship at the heart of the project; they focus on the nurturing of students' capacity to assimilate data, produce publicly useful knowledge, and engage conflicting viewpoints with attentive civility. Other essays theorize what might be called the characterology of citizenship, using developmental and ethical categories—"self-authoring" for Carmen Werder, "vocation" for Rebecca Nowacek—to sketch models of public personhood that civic educators ask our students to inhabit. Still other chapters foreground the urgency of key "meta-issues"—ecological citizenship for Michael Smith, intercultural engagement for Rona Halualani—that no contemporary agenda for civic renewal can ignore. The authors make clear that these are importantly different but not conflicting emphases; indeed, the essays do a wonderful job of putting their diverse approaches in dialogue, and I will have more to say about the through-lines that seem to me to connect them. My point here is that the "anthology-ness" of *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* is an important part of its argument. The book maps citizenship as a complex practice that integrates various forms of knowledge, core values and competencies, and capacities for reflection, collaboration, and action. It maps higher education as a complex field of institutions and disciplines, in which different settings are apt for different aspects of civic socialization. As the title underscores, this sort of citizenship cannot be distilled or inculcated from some singular, Archimedean point. It must be taught "across" the whole educational landscape.⁴

This stress on the heterogeneity of the problem may seem commonsensical to us. Yet it reflects quite recent changes in practice and attitude among American academics, changes that eroded older strategies of civic education and catalyzed new ones. The most important change was the decline of civics itself. Until the 1960s, calls for civic education meant, with few exceptions, proposals for civics courses. There were important disagreements, both educational and political, about what that entailed: perhaps a primer on government, or an introduction to core problems of American life, or a survey of civilizational history or canonical

texts that were taken to teach civic virtue. Yet advocates and critics shared the assumption that teaching “civics” meant investing particular faculty at a particular curricular address with title to the issues, materials, and methods required to lead young Americans into citizenship. All this changed with the transformation of higher education after World War II. The expansion of public systems and student access, the proliferation of specialized fields, and the professionalization of scholarly communities to oversee them worked together to undermine confidence in a unitary model of civic preparation and the willingness of the professoriate to teach it. By the 1960s, civics had become a disreputable curricular category, redolent of patriotic boosterism or stale models of character-building.

Yet, as I have discussed, these changes generated a sense of crisis about the divide between higher education and the larger society—concerns that led academics and academic institutions back to the issue of citizenship. Beginning some twenty-five years ago (we might take the founding of the Campus Outreach Opportunity League in 1983 and Campus Compact two years later as benchmarks), a new movement for campus-based community engagement revitalized interest in the public purposes of higher education. The first wave of the movement saw a proliferation of campus volunteerism and service-learning pedagogy that was impressive in its energy but often neglectful of larger issues of social change and democratic politics (Stanton et al. 1999). Over the past decade, spurred by critique within the movement itself, many academic institutions have launched ambitious centers and community-learning initiatives, committed to more sustained, intellectually rigorous, and socially transformative work. This second wave of engagement has tended to reframe the discourse of community service into one of collaboration and citizenship, to reconnect community work with systemic issues of policy, power, and justice, and to work for change not only in individual courses, but at the level of the curriculum and the campus as a whole (Scobey 2005). To be sure, such efforts still struggle for legitimacy among mainstream academics, disciplinary associations, and campus administrators, but their stature has risen steadily. If “civics” once connoted the musty practices of dead wood, “civic engagement” now evokes an insurgent claim to the future of undergraduate education—the kind of claim that leads national foundations to convene faculty innovators in projects like this.

Moreover, the civic turn has coincided with and drawn on other initiatives that have made the past twenty years an extraordinary, if unheralded, era of institutional creativity in undergraduate education. The editors rightly cite “writing across the curriculum” as a success story from which they borrow not only a title but a strategic model. I would add the efforts to institutionalize learning communities, experiential education, interdisciplinary programs, and diversity requirements in U.S. colleges and universities. These initiatives (all roughly contemporaneous) are characterized by a similar, transcurricular model of change and a deep

ambivalence toward disciplinary authority. They all work strategically within the disciplines, even as they propose learning goals and teaching methods that problematize field-bound definitions of knowledge, methods, and skills. *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* evokes the same creative tension with disciplinarity. The essays take shifting, multiple stances toward the professional communities of inquiry within which the authors work and teach. The result is to situate civic education at once in, across, and against the disciplines.

The book, in short, belongs to a larger moment of civic energy and programmatic creativity in U.S. higher education. It is within that moment that its commitment to heterogeneity, its synthesis of large themes, grounded stories, topical diversity, and exploratory practice, makes sense. I do not mean to imply that the collection is “merely” eclectic, a grab-bag of good local stories. Quite the contrary: the essays are interwoven in a rigorously collaborative practice. Not only in the formal inclusion of coauthors’ commentaries but also in the skein of internal conversations that criss-cross the essays, *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* enacts the ideal of dialogical citizenship proposed by Carmen Werder. The result, we might say, is a kind of “federal writers’ project,” where diverse, interconnected approaches to a complex problem coalesce around a relatively integrated conceptual frame. *E pluribus unum*.

Or rather, *e pluribus duo*. For to my mind, there are two persistent through-lines, two key “meta-claims” about education for citizenship, that align the essays together. The first is that the crux of civic education lies in the pedagogical encounter between teacher and student. It is striking that, although these essays teem with illuminating glimpses into the architecture of particular syllabi and assignments, they are not fundamentally focused on the craft of designing courses or assembling curricula. We do not find generalized discussions about, say, how to embed community partnerships in departmental courses of study or develop capstone projects using participatory or policy research. This is not a matter of neglect; the authors have other issues on their minds. They are thinking across the curriculum, but not so much about it.

What they are thinking *about*, it seems to me, is the power of pedagogy, the relational dramaturgy of teaching and learning, in the making of citizens. Nearly every essay includes—in fact, turns on—some powerful, moving, and complex scene in which the transaction between teacher and students serves to model, theorize, or problematize some aspect of citizenship. Rona Halualani’s kinetic game, in which students array themselves according to the perceived norms of their ethnic cultures, playfully surfaces their sometimes inert assumptions about cultural identity and intercultural judgments. Howard Tinberg’s iterative use of journaling, audio-memoir, and oral history, through which his students (and he himself) respond to, resist, and reflect on the literature of the Shoah, enacts a space of “intimate citizenship,” a kind of ground-zero for nurturing compassion

toward strangers. Mike Burke and Jeff Bernstein rework (seemingly traditional) analytical assignments into little dramas of disruption through which students experience the difficulty of producing accessible policy knowledge and engaging divergent viewpoints with critical, but fair-minded scrutiny. Each of these teachable moments, of course, carries important “content lessons” for civic learning. Yet running through all of them is a belief in what might be called (borrowing from Freud) the transferential power of engaged pedagogy. Civic learning takes place through scenes and moments in which teachers and students relationally enact, make visible, and reflect on the power, pleasures, and problems of being a public self.

This attention to the development of what I have called the public self, to civic education as the achievement of a kind of personhood, seems to me the second overarching theme of the book. Students do much important public work in these essays: they test and demystify policy debates, apply scientific analysis to social problems, research and interpret local environmental history, work in a variety of community organizations. Yet the book is fundamentally focused less on the change they make than on the change they undergo. I do not mean to imply that the authors dismiss the significance of the engaged research, policy analysis, and community partnerships in which they immerse their students. What I mean is that the essays tend to present such public action less as the *telos* of civic education, sufficient unto itself for a goal, than as catalysts for the student’s development as a public person. This emphasis is clearest in Werder’s rich appropriation of the psychology literature on “self-authoring,” or Nowacek’s equally rich appropriation of the Jesuit category of “vocation,” as ways of theorizing civic learning. Yet, even with the more issue-oriented studies of the scientists and social scientists, the narrative center of gravity remains the blossoming of students into public selves—committed, compassionate, collaborative, critical, self-critical. Taken together, the essays offer a portrait of the student as a young citizen.

Or perhaps, a cubist collage. For like the book as a whole, that portrait is marked by the tension between heterogeneity and integration. The student-citizen who emerges in these pages will have learned to bring together capacities, values, and habits that are sometimes in tension with one another, and she will have learned to bring them to bear across a public sphere that is itself plural, complex, and conflicted. From Howard Tinberg (and others) she will have learned the civic necessity of moral empathy; from Mike Burke (and others) the demystifying power of critical analysis. Jeff Bernstein will have emphasized the need to bring civility, epistemological modesty, and a tolerance for ambiguity to political dialogue; Carmen Werder will have stressed the claiming of voice as both a precondition and an outcome of such dialogue. From all of these teachers, she will have learned that the public sphere is a complex, fractured domain, full

of significant others with divergent experiences, interests, and values. David Geelan, Matt Fisher, Mike Burke, and Rona Halualani will have underscored the range of literacies (scientific, quantitative, intercultural) needed to talk with those others, to argue with them, to work with them. Conversely, Rebecca Nowacek will have taught her to listen for the personal call to responsibility and compassion in the midst of the cacophony. Finally Howard Tinberg, Rona Halualani, David Geelan, and Michael Smith will have enlarged her sense of the distances and scales at which civic peers must engage one another, challenging her to cross not only ethnic and national boundaries, but also ecological and existential divides. She will have had, in short, an extraordinarily complex, dialectical education for citizenship—bracing, at times daunting, but exhilarating too.

New Questions

Even the best answers—especially the best answers—beg new questions. Precisely because *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* offers such a wide-ranging response to the double context of civic and educational crisis, it opens up issues that the book cannot fully engage. Let me end by pointing to three issues that invite further thought.

The first has to do with what seems to me the one real lacuna in the book's disciplinary range: attention to the role of the arts and humanities in civic life and civic education. The humanities are of course richly represented here in Howard Tinberg's discussion of reading as empathetic practice, Carmen Werder's analysis of the poetics of students' self-descriptions, Rebecca Nowacek's analysis of citizenship as vocation. Yet, along with such modes of ethical pedagogy, I would argue that the interpretive and creative disciplines offer an essential arena for modeling and theorizing the centrality of story-telling and meaning-making in civic life (Scobey 2007). We cannot become a democratic community, a "we the people"² (whether that "we" is local, national, or planetary), except through the cocreation of stories about our commonalties, our divisions, and our problems. Culture, then—the practice of collective meaning-making—is an indispensable medium of citizenship; and the cultural disciplines are equally essential to civic education. Our students become public selves in part by learning to practice a kind of story-telling in which listening, interpretive discernment, and collaboration are deeply integrated.

A second issue concerns the role of non-academic peers. As I have noted, *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* explores with depth and passion the trans-ferential power of the student-teacher relationship in civic education. That relationship unfolds largely on campuses that constitute spaces of separation and sometimes privilege within a diverse democracy; indeed such set-apartness is part of what makes possible the playfulness and risk of the pedagogical encoun-

ter. At the same time, however, preparing students to engage significant others who have quite different experiences, values, and interests means breaching that separation *within* the educational process. A pedagogy that remains too exclusively focused on the dramaturgy of the teacher-student encounter, or the community of students in a classroom, may inadvertently send the message that students will remain the center of their own civic experience. Community partners have a crucial role to play in this de-centering process, not simply as fellow citizens, and certainly not as objects of academic expertise or philanthropy, but as interlocutors and coeducators. The authors clearly know this: the essays include powerful stories of community projects, oral history interviews, and other extramural public work. Yet the importance of such practices—the inclusion of the community partner as a “third party” in the pedagogical encounter—raises a host of new questions. How does the partner change the dynamics of teaching and learning? What kinds of pedagogical roles can he or she appropriately play? How can faculty and community partner best work together? How do they negotiate the connections between their project partnership—with its own goals, responsibilities, and frictions—and their division of labor as teachers and mentors? The partnership practices spawned by the community-engagement movement, in short, offer both opportunities and complexities for civic pedagogy that deserve fuller attention.

Finally *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* touches suggestively on the complex issue of the *geographies* of citizenship, and this too, it seems to me, cries out for further thinking. The book’s stress on the heterogeneity of civic life and civic education speaks in particular to one of the most vexed questions in current citizenship theory and practice: the relationship between citizenship and nationality. To many theorists and activists, the dominant association of civic life with national membership seems blinkered and ethically problematic in a globalized and multicultural world. For some, the very category of citizenship is exclusionary, a legal means for nation-states to marginalize internal minorities and demonize immigrants. For others, national borders prevent effective responses to global-scale problems like climate change and North–South inequality. Still others defend the resilience and value of civic nationalism, arguing that democratic politics flourishes best in a public sphere that is neither particularist nor abstractly universal, but grounded in a shared but expansive way of life (Hollinger 2006; Scobey 2001).

The authors of *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* speak to these debates with varying degrees of explicitness. David Geelan strongly objects to equating the civic with the national, arguing that the ideal of citizenship is “almost antithetical to nationalism,” while the editors offer a gentler transnationalism: “[M]any of the issues and problems we must deal with in the twenty-first century . . . require that we be citizens of the world rather than a nation-state,” they exhort in the

introduction. “While we may be citizens of towns, cities, states, and nations, we are also citizens of the planet.” The book as a whole models this notion that civic educators prepare students for multiple geographies of affiliation—even as the authors tacitly accept the primacy of U.S. institutions and policy agendas for their students’ lives. More generally, however, I would argue that the book’s focus on the diversity of engaged pedagogy and its ambivalent relationship to disciplinary authority proposes a potentially important contribution to the debates over citizenship and national authority. Just as civic education needs to work at once in, across, and against the disciplines, so civic agency in our (globalized, multicultural, nationally organized) world must work simultaneously in, across, and against the nation-state (and at the same in, across, and against the racial, religious, and regional subcommunities that divide and compose nation-states). By exploring the teaching of citizenship across the curriculum, in short, the book offers a suggestive map of the workings of citizenship across all the geographies and attachments that claim our attention as democratic actors.

These observations constitute an agenda of issues for a sequel to take up, however. As it stands, *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* makes an important intervention in the double crisis with which I started this chapter. The authors are exemplary in the creativity of their pedagogy, their compassion for their students, the three-dimensionality of their vision of the civic, and the intentionality of their commitment to collaborative reflection. I am hungry for more.

Notes

1. Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE) has been a leading voice for the development of civic professionalism among foundations and grant-makers.

2. For an introduction to the extraordinary array of youth leadership initiatives that have emerged over the past fifteen years, see the social-enterprise coalition America Forward (www.americaforward.org).

3. Scott Peters’s historical scholarship (2007) helpfully complicates this overall understanding of the land-grant system, pointing to populist traditions of community-based scholarship that ran counter to the model of expert “outreach” to the public. This remained, I would argue, a counter-tendency within the larger, technocratic land-grant tradition.

4. It is worth noting the resonances between the authors of *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, brought together under the aegis of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Carnegie Foundation’s Political Engagement Project. Both initiatives reflect Carnegie’s interest in using the scholarship of teaching and learning to investigate the role of civic and political engagement in undergraduate education; both include a diverse array of projects and practices in their inquiry. For an account and analysis of the Political Engagement Project, see Colby et al. (2007).

Works Cited

- Barber, Benjamin. 1992. *An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benson, Lee, John L. Puckett, and Ira Harkavy. 2007. *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bloom, Allan. 1988. *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Boyte, Harry. 2004a. *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2004b. *Going public: Academics and public life*. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation.
- Boyte, Harry, and Nan Kari. 1996. *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Colby, Anne, Elizabeth Beaumont, Thomas Ehrlich, and Josh Corngold. 2007. *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dzur, Albert W. 2008. *Democratic professionalism: Citizen participation and the reconstruction of professional ethics, identity, and practice*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Gibson, Cynthia. 2006. *Citizens at the center*. Washington, D.C.: Case Foundation.
- Hollinger, David. 2006. *Postethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kiesa, Abby, Alexander P. Orłowski, Peter Levine, Deborah Both, Emily Hoban Kirby, Mark Hugo Lopez, and Karlo Barrios Marcelo. 2008. *Millennials talk politics: A study of college student political engagement*. Medford, Mass.: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, Tufts University.
- Kimball, Bruce. 1998. *Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education*. New York: Ivan R. Dee.
- Levine, Peter. 2007. *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens*. Medford, Mass.: Tufts University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997. *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Peters, Scott J. 2007. *Changing the story about higher education's public purposes and work: Land-grants, liberty, and the Little Country Theater*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Imagining America (Foreseeable Futures Position Paper #6, published by Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life. www.imaginingamerica.org [accessed June 6, 2009]).
- Rosen, Jay. 2001. *What are journalists for?* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Scobey, David. 2001. "The specter of citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 5: 11–26.
- . 2005. "The second wave of engagement: Learning from West Coconut Grove." In Samina Quraeshi, ed., *Re-Imagining West Coconut Grove*. Washington, D.C.: Space-maker Press.
- . 2006. "Legitimation crisis: The Spellings Commission and the civic engagement movement." Plenary, Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life national conference (Columbus, Ohio).

- . 2007. "The arts of citizenship in a diverse democracy: The public work of the arts and humanities." Lecture, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
- Sirianni, Carmen, and Lewis Friedland. 2001. *Civic innovation in America: Community empowerment, public policy, and the movement for civic renewal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stanton, Timothy K., Nadinne I. Cruz, and Dwight Giles. 1999. *Service-Learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sullivan, William. 1995. *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- U.S. Department of Education. 2006. *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. A Report of the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.