DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 325 HE 033 080

AUTHOR Stephens, Jason M.; Colby, Anne; Ehrlich, Tom; Beaumont, Elizabeth

TITLE Higher Education and the Development of Moral and Civic Responsibility: Vision and Practice in Three Contexts.

PUB DATE 2000-04-27

NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Citizenship Responsibility; College Role; College Students; Community Action; Democratic Values; Ethical Instruction; Higher Education; *Moral Values; *Partnerships in Education; Public Affairs Education; School Community Relationship; Social Responsibility; Student Development; *Values Education

IDENTIFIERS Air Force Academy CO; California State University Monterey Bay; Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching; *Character Development; *Spiritual Development; University of Notre Dame IN

ABSTRACT

This paper grows out of a project under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which seeks to strengthen the means for American higher education to prepare morally thoughtful, committed, and socially responsible citizens. This study examines the experiences of three institutions that recognize the importance of developing students' moral and civic responsibility. At California State University at Monterey Bay, moral and civic development are central elements in guiding the university and animate all aspects of the institution. The United States Air Force Academy (Colorado) emphasizes development of character and honor in the context of preparing military officers. Its central goal is to produce Air Force officers of integrity, honor, and mutual respect, who will be effective in working together across differences and capable of making independent moral judgments. The University of Notre Dame (Indiana) emphasizes students' moral and spiritual development. Faculty feel free to discuss moral and civic issues, even in classes not traditionally seen as offering opportunities for such discussions. The study finds a strong movement toward reinvigorating higher education's civic and democratic mission, and notes that increasingly colleges and universities are developing community-university partnerships around schooling, discourse about public issues, youth programs, and the like. (Contains 40 references.) (SM)

Running head: MORAL AND CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

Higher Education and the Development of Moral and Civic Responsibility: Vision and Practice in Three Contexts

Jason M. Stephens
Anne Colby
Tom Ehrlich
Elizabeth Beaumont

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
555 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, CA 94026

Telephone: 650/566-5114 (Stephens)
Fax: 650/326-0278
Email: stephens@stanford.edu

Paper discussed at a roundtable session at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 27, 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Higher Education and the Development of Moral and Civic Responsibility: Vision and Practice in Three Contexts

The educational goals of America's approximately 3,500 colleges and universities are many and diverse, but chief among them is development of students' of moral and civic responsibility. Regardless of their size, selectivity, geographic location, or religious affiliation, virtually all institutions of higher education share this fundamental commitment. The centrality of this goal is often made explicit in mission statements, which typically speak of producing graduates who are learned, honest, responsible, and productive citizens. The following excerpt from the founding documents of Stanford University is typical: The objectives of the University are "to qualify students for personal success and direct usefulness in life and to promote the public welfare by exercising an influence on behalf of humanity and civilization...." Even more explicit is Stanford's Fundamental Standard, which "has set the standard of conduct for students at Stanford since 1896." It states:

> Students at Stanford are expected to show both within and without the University such respect for order, morality, personal honor and the rights of others as is demanded of good citizens. Failure to do this will be sufficient cause for removal from the University.

Given that the development of moral and civic character is a long-standing goal of higher education in the United States (Boyer, 1987; Boyer & Hechinger, 1981; Ketcham, 1992; Morse, 1989), the ubiquity of this theme in institutional documents, particularly mission statements and conduct codes, is not at all surprising. However, despite the historic mandate and stated intentions, many contend that our nation's colleges and universities are not effectively meeting this goal. As noted in a Carnegie Foundation report, "If there is a crisis in education in the United States today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most important responsibility of the nation's schools and colleges" (Newman, 1985, p. 31). Except perhaps as a matter of public-relations rhetoric, the development of moral and civic responsibility is not even on the radar screens of most colleges and universities.

Sullivan (1999) has persuasively argued that

> much of higher education has come to operate on a sort of default program of instrumental individualism. This is the familiar notion that the academy exists to research and disseminate knowledge and skills as tools for economic development and the upward mobility of individuals. (p. 4).

Sullivan laments that this "'default program' of instrumental individualism leaves the larger questions of social, political, and moral purpose out of explicit consideration" (p. 4). In short, "narrow careerism and private self-interest" have "abdicated social responsibility" (p. 5). Sullivan points to the University of Phoenix as the epitome of the type of institution he fears might become the future of higher education: a for-profit university, without a permanent campus or faculty, that issues degrees in a variety fields, all of immediate worth in business-related careers.

Levine and Cureton (1998) suggest, however, that this may be what today's increasingly "nontraditional" (i.e., over 25 years of age, employed, and enrolled part-time) college students want: "They prefer a relationship [with their college] like those they already enjoy with their bank, the telephone company, and the supermarket.... Their focus is on convenience, quality, service, and cost" (p. 50). Many other contemporary critics have decried this "consumer mentality" and the excessive individualism of contemporary American culture and its negative implications for our society (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1991; Putnam, 1995a,

1995b, 1996). The consequences of this cultural climate include a growing sense that Americans are not responsible for or accountable to each other; a decline in civility, mutual respect, and tolerance; and the preeminence of self-interest and individual preference over concern for the common good. Goals of personal advancement and gratification dominate our culture, frequently at the expense of broader social, moral, or spiritual meaning. Though this emphasis on individual success has some social benefits, it can also entail high social costs by promoting a world view in which there is no basis for enduring commitment beyond the self.

Another disturbing trend in contemporary American life is the widespread lack of interest in civic affairs, especially political affairs, and a general lack of trust in and respect for American democratic processes. This trend is manifested in an overall decline in civic and political participation and in the ascendence of superficial sloganeering over thoughtful and honest public debate. Demographic data indicate that political disaffection is especially pronounced among youth. Americans growing up in recent decades vote less often than their elders and show lower levels of social trust and knowledge of politics (Putnam, 1995c; Bennett & Rademacher, 1997). These shifts accompany a steep rise in the importance attached to "having lots of money" (Rahn & Transue, 1997). Data from annual Freshman Surveys indicate that American freshmen in the 1990s are strikingly different from American freshmen of the 1960s. In 1996, over 80% first time freshmen (compared to less than 45% in 1966) indicated that "being very well of financially" was an "essential" or "very important" goal in life. Conversely, over 80% of 1966 first time freshmen (compared to less than 50% in 1996) indicated that "developing a meaningful philosophy of life" was an "essential" or "very important" goal in life. In addition, the importance of "Keeping up to date with political affairs" has decline markedly over the past three decades, from nearly 60% of 1966 freshman to less than 30% of 1996 freshman indicating this to be an "essential" or "very important" goal in life.

Many social critics (e.g., Barber, 1984) have written eloquently about these problems and the need for moral and civic renewal if we are to move toward a more cohesive and humane society. A number of national reports have been issued in recent years diagnosing the problem and proposing steps to promote these social goals. We have been struck, however, that many of these reports (e.g., National Commission on Civic Renewal, 1998; Council on Civil Society, 1998) pay minimal attention to the role of higher education in helping to shape the moral and civic lives of students and American culture more generally. Moreover, when higher education is discussed, it is sometimes considered part of the problem rather than part of the solution, a critical perspective that is shared by those writing from within the field along with those from the outside.

A number of university commentators, such as Alexander Astin (1996, 2000) and Benjamin Barber (1991, 1992) have persuasively argued that the pursuit of institutional excellence in higher education should not be focused primarily on resource-acquisition and reputation-building. That misfocus can recreate at the institutional level the kind of competitive individualism that so troubles us in society at large. It encourages institutions to set standards of excellence based on the qualifications of their incoming students, rather than value added in terms of their learning – academic, moral, and civic – and increased engagement with the world around them.

Despite the aforementioned forces and trends, higher education has the potential to be a powerful influence in reinvigorating the democratic spirit in America. Virtually all political and professional leaders are products of higher education, and the general public is attending college in ever higher numbers. This extensive reach places colleges and universities in a strong position

to help reshape the culture. American higher education has a long and distinguished tradition of serving democracy, upholding the ideals of public service and intellectual integrity, and stimulating students' reexamination of questions of value and meaning. Research over many decades has shown that, in fact, the undergraduate experience does have a socializing effect on political beliefs and other values, and that outcomes such as maturity of moral judgment, racial and religious tolerance, and civic and political participation are positively associated with educational attainment (for a thorough review of the literature, see Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991)

Not only can higher education have a significant impact on students' moral and civic development, but taking these outcomes seriously has the potential to strengthen and enrich other educational goals. We are convinced that when thoughtfully pursued academic, moral, and civic goals will be mutually enhancing. Moral, civic, and political development involve, among other things, the achievement of more sophisticated and conceptually advanced understandings of complex social and ethical ideas, and thus are integral to intellectual growth. When we think about what we hope students will achieve through higher education, we realize it is not a database of facts, but the competence to act in the world, the judgment to do so wisely. A full account of competence, including occupational competence, must include consideration of judgment, the appreciation of ends as well as means, and the broad implications and consequences of one's actions and choices. Education is not complete until students not only have acquired knowledge, but can act on that knowledge in the world, so the scope of learning outcomes must include these values-based aspects of competence, broadly defined. Furthermore, the liberal academic enterprise depends on some core moral values for its very raison d'etre. In fact, the academic enterprise would be fatally compromised if intellectual integrity and respect for truth ceased to guide scholarship, teaching, and learning.

Our inquiries over the past year have shown us that some American colleges and universities do take very seriously their mission statements' references to the moral and civic education of their students. For a few of these institutions, this commitment shapes many or most aspects of the educational experience and constitutes an intentional and holistic approach to moral and civic as well as academic education. For other institutions, strong programs designed with moral and civic development in mind coexist with an overall campus environment that does not have a comprehensive emphasis on these goals.

The colleges and universities that explicitly address the moral and civic development of their students are extraordinarily diverse. They include every category of higher-education institution-- community colleges, four-year colleges, comprehensive universities; and universities with many graduate and professional programs. Some are residential, others are non-residential; some are public, others are private; some are large, others are small; some are religiously affiliated; some are military academies; some are single-sex; and some are primarily for members of a minority group. These and others are represented among those that treat their students' character and citizenship as central to their mission. We have found that while these diverse institutions all take seriously the goals of moral and civic responsibility, they understand those goals differently and concern themselves with different aspects of these broad domains.

Moral and Civic Responsibility: A Working Definition

Before describing particular educational endeavors, it will be useful to outline our working conceptions of moral and civic responsibility and point to general pedagogical tools and strategies that may contribute to their enhancement. We are concerned with the development of

the person, as an accountable individual and engaged participant in society. Responsibility includes viewing oneself as a member of a shared social structure and a fair target of reactive attitudes, such as praise and blame. Virtues such as honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and respect contribute to the development of personal integrity, fostering fair dealing and concern for how one's actions impact others. These are the kinds of virtues that are often the focus of university honor codes, which deal particularly with an individual student's academic integrity and respect for the rights of others.

Social conscience, compassion, and commitment to the welfare of those outside one's immediate sphere are important matters of moral development that go beyond the level of personal integrity addressed by honor codes. Some institutions of higher education seek to enhance a sense of social concern among their students through coursework that focuses on important social or moral issues, while others use programs of community service or pedagogies of active engagement, such as service learning, and still others use a combination of approaches.

Partially overlapping with these two dimensions of personal integrity and social conscience is a civic component: coming to understand how a community operates, the problems it faces, and the richness of its diversity, as well as fostering a willingness to commit time and energy to enhance community life and to work collectively to resolve community concerns. Colleges and universities try to promote civic responsibility through both curricular and co-curricular programs, including service learning programs and problem-based learning courses.

Finally, constructive political engagement, defined in terms of democratic processes, is a particular subset of civic responsibility that has been the focus of substantial concern in recent years. While there is overlap between them, we believe that it is important to distinguish the political domain from non-political civic participation, since psychologically they can be quite independent of one another. For example, even as community service among young people has increased in recent years, for example, political interest and participation have dramatically decreased (Astin et al., 1997). While some institutions of higher education are seeking ways to stimulate political engagement as well as other kinds of civic participation and leadership, thus far we have found that this is the aspect of civic responsibility that is least attended to in higher education, even among schools with strong commitments to moral and civic learning.

Within each of these four main areas, there are a several skills and capacities that are required for mature functioning. Within the domains of individual integrity, social responsibility, civic responsibility, and constructive political participation, a fully developed individual must have the ability to think clearly and in an appropriately complex and sophisticated way about moral and civic issues; the moral commitment and sense of personal responsibility to act, which can also include moral emotions such as empathy and concern for others; moral and civic values, interests, and habits; and knowledge and experience in the relevant domains of life.

Moral judgment or reflection has been the most widely studied moral capacity. Different aspects of the development of moral reflection have been described by a number of theorists, most notably Lawrence Kohlberg (1969). These theorists have described the formal features of individuals' thinking about moral issues and conflicts and the developmental changes in moral thinking that occur over time, leading to more sophisticated approaches to moral issues as development proceeds. While Kohlberg's theory of moral judgment has been criticized on a number of grounds, there is broad consensus, even among those critics (Gilligan, 1977; Noddings, 1984; Shweder, Mahapatra, & Miller, 1987), that moral judgment and an intellectual understanding of moral issues are essential features of moral maturity and appropriate goals of education.

Mature moral judgment, though important, is not in itself a guarantee of morally responsible conduct, however broadly judgment is defined. Moral conduct requires moral commitment, a sense of personal responsibility to act on one's beliefs. A critical mediator between moral understanding and moral commitment is the place of moral values in people's identities. Several studies (e.g., Blasi, 1993) have shown that this integration of morality with the self is the key to understanding moral conduct. In one such study (Colby & Damon, 1992), we found that a close integration of self and morality formed the basis for the unwavering commitment to the common good exhibited by "moral exemplars" who had dedicated themselves for decades to fighting against poverty or for peace, civil rights, and other aspects of social justice. While moral behavior depends in part on moral understanding and reflection, it also depends on how and to what extent the individuals' moral concerns are important to their sense of themselves as persons, and higher education can help to foster students' understanding of themselves as morally committed and civically engaged citizens.

Likewise, Youniss and Yates (1997), Flanagan and Gallay (1995), Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) and others have written about the development of political or civic identity in a way that parallels this conception of moral identity. For example, Youniss and Yates present data showing that the long-term impact of youth service experience on later political and community involvement can best be explained by the contribution these service experiences make to the creation of an enduring sense of oneself as a politically engaged and socially concerned person. In their view, civic identity--which entails the establishment of individual and collective senses of social agency, responsibility for society, and political and moral awareness--links certain kinds of social participation during adolescence and young adulthood with civic engagement by these same people later in adulthood. It is for this reason that we have been particularly interested in examining the ways in which service learning and community based learning can be used by higher education to promote students' civic engagement.

Yet another reason we cannot rely wholly on sophisticated moral thinking as sufficient for moral and civic maturity is that not all moral or socially responsible conduct is preceded by deliberation or conscious reflection. Most moral and ethical action, in fact, is habitual. Whereas moral reflection is closely tied to intellectual competence, moral habits are embedded in emotional and behavioral systems that are bolstered by the cultural context and years of practice. (Citation?). The content of one's values and interests, and the nature of one's routine practices derive from socialization within the family, the community, the peer group, and the schools, the cultures of these institutions, and the ways those cultures are transmitted. This too, suggests an important role for higher education, pointing to the need for schools to create cultural contexts that support a concern for others and for the common good. Few would dispute that universities ought to represent and embody not only the values of intellectual integrity and concern for truth, but also tolerance and respect for others, interest in civic and political issues, concern for equity and other aspects of social justice, and civil discourse as a means for resolving differences. While some colleges and universities make these moral and civic goals a very high institutional priority, approaching them in a very intentional and broad-based way, others have approaches that are less comprehensive, more mixed, and can sometimes give conflicting messages to students about these issues.

In addition to a mature understanding of moral issues and personal moral commitment to act on those beliefs, people who are truly effective in their moral and civic engagement also need substantive expertise in the complex issues with which they are grappling. An emotionally-driven concern for the environment or international human rights, for example, is unlikely to lead

to effective action unless the actor is knowledgeable as well as concerned. While much of students' content knowledge clearly comes from books and lectures, it also comes from class discussions and extra- or co-curricular experiences outside the classroom. For example, experience living and working with people from diverse backgrounds can yield a kind of expertise and knowledge that is particularly useful for effective moral and civic engagement, and many programs at the college level include efforts to provide this kind of experience.

There is a full body of developmental theory and research about the conditions under which moral capacities develop (e.g., Turiel, 1997). These studies show that intellectual engagement and challenge around moral issues and dilemmas leads to the development of more sophisticated moral judgment. Participating in political or community service activities often entails such moral challenges, and can also expand the range of people for whom one feels empathy and responsibility and foster the capacity to understand others' perspectives. This kind of active learning experience can also lead to a change in the way students see themselves, with moral values becoming a more central part of their self-definitions. This, in turn, can generate a greater willingness to take action on moral and political issues. Empirical studies of service learning and other service activities show that in order for the experience to have this kind of developmental impact, there must be a "reflection" component in which participants think about and discuss the meaning of their service experiences, connecting it with broader social issues and personal values.

Another powerful influence on one's moral development is identification with people one admires, which can influence one's ideal self, and efforts to bring one's actual self more in line with one's ideal lead to changes in identity and character over time. Finally, participation in a moral community, with strong norms of contributing to the good of the whole, and coherence among the messages about moral issues conveyed by the various members of the community, help develop a sense of personal responsibility and a tendency to act in accordance with one's moral beliefs. Working together, these various processes underlie all of the educational programs we have seen that seek to nurture moral and civic development.

Vision and Practice in Distinct Contexts

Under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, we began an effort to review and eventually to help strengthen the means for American higher education to prepare a morally thoughtful, committed, and socially responsible citizenry. In this project, we have been observing the range of approaches American colleges and universities are using to pursue these goals, attempting to learn what makes some of these especially engaging and effective. As we began our review, it became clear to us that there is a great deal going on in this arena. In fact, there has been a groundswell of interest in returning higher education to its broader public mission, which includes preparation of students for responsible citizenship. There are so many colleges and universities that have made very serious commitments to this kind of work that it has been difficult to limit our on-campus visits to a manageable number.

Most of the campuses that are making these commitments, however, have focused their efforts on a particular programs or activities that do not affect most undergraduates, and the institutions usually do not centrally coordinate those efforts. Examples of these programs include academic centers and institutes, freshman seminars, and senior capstone courses. While major research universities are least likely to embrace a comprehensive approach to these student

outcomes, there are some even in this category with significant programs designed to foster moral and civic development.

In contrast, relatively few colleges and universities have made broad institutional commitments to the development of all students' moral and civic development. We sought out some of these campuses with a comprehensive and intentional approaches to moral and civic learning for our initial site visits. All of the campuses we have visited have shared several important institutional features. First, these schools' public statements of institutional purpose stress the importance of character, social responsibility, and civic and political engagement and leadership. Second, the upper levels of the administration in both academic and student affairs endorse the importance of these educational goals and allocate resources to programs designed to promote them. Third, multiple approaches are used in each setting, and there are mechanisms in place to facilitate communication among the different programs in order to strengthen the coherence of the student experience.

While the campuses we chose for site visits are a diverse group and represent a range of unique adaptations to a common task, their approaches also share a number of assumptions, programmatic elements, and challenges. For example, they share some assumptions about what kinds of educational approaches are likely to make a difference, assumptions which are consistent with recent developmental theory and research. Their programs target many of the moral and civic capacities we outlined earlier in this paper. In particular, they address the cognitive or intellectual dimension of moral and civic development, and seek to connect general capacities for sophisticated and analytical judgment with substantive issues of real moral and social significance. Finally, they attempt to create a shared culture of concern for moral issues; they offer opportunities for engagement and action; and they provide a variety of means for shaping the positive development of students' moral and civic identities.

At all of the campuses, we saw widespread incorporation of moral and civic issues into academic teaching and learning. For most campuses, though not all, this integration was deliberately planned as a part of the curriculum and often included both interdisciplinary courses and courses within a large cross-section of disciplines. The consideration of moral, civic, or political issues in course work was often tied with efforts to foster critical thinking and effective communication, since these are widely recognized as important features of civil discourse. As one faculty member said, "Students in my class are encouraged to express their opinions on political issues, whatever those opinions are, just as long as they back up their claims with arguments and are respectful of others' points of view."

Most of the campuses we visited also placed strong emphasis on the processes of teaching and learning, and many of them had Teaching and Learning Centers which provided help with curriculum development and course assessment, sponsored such programs as interdisciplinary faculty reading groups, and seminars on technology in the classroom. In addition to the emphasis on teaching and learning, and often in conjunction with it, service learning is used on all the campuses we visited and prevalent on most of them. The idea behind service learning, also called community-based learning, is that academic study can be linked to community service through structured reflection so that each enriches the other. Service learning courses are now offered at virtually every college and university in the country, and cover almost every academic discipline in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and professions. Some of the schools we visited require all students to take at least one service learning experience. Many more encourage, but do not require, such an experience.

Many faculty teaching these courses expressed the belief that their students' learning of the course material was significantly enhanced by tying it to community service. As reported by Eyler and Giles (1999), service learning is an important means of enhancing critical thinking skills. This was confirmed by the students with whom we spoke, many of whom told us how much their service learning experience had enriched their learning of the course content as well as changing their perspectives on moral issues or on groups of people they had encountered for the first time during these courses. As Eyler and Giles conclude, "one of the things that jumped out at us was that almost irrespective of the type, intensity, or quality of the service or service-learning experience, students report that involvement in community service has a powerful impact on how they see themselves and others" (p. 24).

Other programs of volunteer community service, such as alternative spring break, in which students perform service work either in their home community or in a community to which they travel, were also ubiquitous. These programs varied, however, in the extent to which they included opportunities for reflection and integration with course work and other intellectual endeavors.

Student leadership programs were important on all of the campuses, providing opportunities for sustained collaborations with faculty and participation in student government, campus judicial systems, and student involvement in campus and community issues. The students who participate in these programs often mentioned their opportunities for leadership as among the most powerful of their college experiences, leading to a strong sense of their own capacities to effect change and a wide range of civic skills, including negotiation, consensus building, public speaking, fiscal management, and the like. For example, on most campuses, student leaders provided critical logistical support and teaching assistance to faculty who were teaching service-learning courses by establishing and maintaining relationships with community organizations. Students also gain leadership skills at many of these schools through peer mentoring programs, in which students who are more advanced in their academic careers provide guidance and support to their peers. These mentoring programs provide a powerful experience for students on both sides of the mentoring relationship.

In addition to peer mentoring, on every campus, we saw a conscious effort to provide other types of mentoring relationships and positive role models for students. Often faculty whose research integrated important social issues served this function in informal ways, inspiring students through their own commitment to socially responsible work and often involving their students in that work. Students who have taken leadership roles also provide admired models. On many campuses, there are special programs to bring speakers to campus with compelling stories of moral courage, integrity, or commitments to social justice. For example, a recent conference at the U.S. Air Force Academy included two Viet Nam veterans who had been present at the My Lai massacre and were among the few to disobey orders to shoot civilians, orders which were later determined to be unlawful. At the College of St. Catherine, the Core Convocations program brings to campus a series of speakers and events that focus on social justice.

We also found that on every campus we visited, issues of diversity and multiculturalism were closely linked to concerns for student moral and civic development. While all of these schools faced challenges in this area, either with attracting a diverse student body or faculty, or with promoting full integration of the student body, they all expressed strong commitments to the ideal of diversity, and recognized explicit linkages between living in a diverse society and the strength of our civic and democratic ideals. Developing increased understanding of cultural

traditions other than one's own and promoting respectful engagement across differences were central goals for both academic programs and student affairs. Often these goals were incorporated into the core curriculum, and they were almost always central to community service and service learning experiences. In many cases, efforts to foster mutual respect across racial, ethnic, religious, and other differences were joined with efforts to develop a global perspective on social issues. The conviction that students must be educated for participation in a pluralist and multicultural society and a world that extends beyond the boundaries of the United States was present on every campus.

Another challenge we saw at all of these campuses was the problem of developing, funding, staffing, and maintaining such ambitious programs. Mounting programs of this sort is institutionally difficult, given the many other challenges colleges and universities are facing. Limited resources make it hard for most places to support the team-teaching that interdisciplinary courses require, and faculty often see an elaborated core curriculum as draining resources from the disciplinary departments. Generally, this kind of work is labor-intensive, and faculty time is a scarce resource on all campuses.

While teaching for moral and civic as well as intellectual development can be extremely demanding, the impact of these efforts on faculty morale seems to be very positive. On several campuses, faculty who are taking on this challenge said that it has led them to be more reflective about their teaching and to talk with their colleagues more about teaching. They also said that this work, which is often collaborative across departments, helps to create a stronger sense of intellectual community and adds new challenge and meaning to their professional lives. Faculty report that they are also rewarded by their students' greater engagement and deeper understanding of the subject matter. Many faculty, however, also expressed some concerns about whether their participation in service learning courses and other time-intensive and non-traditional programs would negatively affect their ability to win promotions and tenure from departments and administrations that continue to measure academic worth largely, if not entirely by scholarly publication.

Many campuses have centers that assist faculty who are attempting some of these new approaches to teaching, such as service learning and problem-based learning, and coordinate the range of other activities designed to promote student moral and civic development. These centers differ greatly from one campus to the next but in most cases provide a focal point of activity and a means of communication across disparate programs. They include the Center for Character Development at the U.S. Air Force Academy, the Center for Academic Excellence at Portland State University, the Service Learning Institute at California State University at Monterey Bay, and the Center for Social Concerns at the University of Notre Dame.

At each of the campuses we visited, as in higher education as a whole, assessment of student outcomes is the least developed component of the overall effort to foster student moral and civic development. Adequate assessment instruments do not exist for most of the desired outcomes, and costly experimental and longitudinal designs would be required in order to control for program selection bias and to evaluate whether programs have any long-term impact. Research using self report questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups has been able to document the positive effect of service learning on attitudes, civic behaviors, and academic performance, but very little research has been done on the effectiveness of the other kinds of programs we observed.

If we are to go beyond participation rates and student self-assessments, we will need to develop observation procedures that document the processes of influence and instruments that

capture more fully the important but less tangible psychological constructs such as moral identity and commitment, and performance variables such as critical thinking, negotiation, and effective communication.

Among the campuses we visited, the one that has done the most work on assessment is Portland State University (PSU), which has been developing methods for the assessment of community-based teaching and learning. Their assessment project attempts to document the impact of teaching that includes partnerships with community organizations on students, faculty, partner organizations, and the university. Instruments include interviews, focus groups, surveys, observations, student journals, contact logs, and faculty syllabi and curricula vitae. At this point, most of the indicators of student development are self-reports, but work to develop more direct indicators of outcomes is under way.

Most campuses lack the resources to do any assessments of their moral and civic education programs beyond student evaluations of teaching in particular courses. In the absence of such evaluations, we can get some baseline sense of the programs' potential effectiveness by talking with students and faculty and gathering anecdotal evidence. It is fairly easy to distinguish between programs and courses that students see as poor quality and do not take seriously and those they describe as deeply engaging and, in their view, transformative. We have found that both students and faculty on the campuses that we have visited are quite willing to point out programs that do not seem to be working well, as well as to recognize those that do.

Although the work being done on these campuses is impressive in its scope, quality, and impact on students, the programs are all very much "works in progress." Developing courses and other programs that are both intellectually rigorous and personally transformative is extremely difficult, and the programs we saw both within and between campuses varied in the extent to which they were able to achieve their goals. Many of the offerings we observed will be revised and improved as experience accumulates and better assessment tools are developed .

Beyond these general conclusions, our campus visits revealed the distinctive approaches of the particular institutions we observed. These unique approaches reflect each institution's mission, goals, history, and student body. The particularities are of interest because each is a seed-bed of new ideas that can be adapted for use in different contexts. We will highlight just a few features of three of the colleges and universities we visited. Each uses a richly multi-faceted approach that we will not be able to capture fully in this brief account.

California State University at Monterey Bay

California State University at Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is a new university, established only six years ago, in 1994. CSUMB has an unusually high degree of institutional intentionality in regard to the moral and civic development of its students, because these goals have been central elements of the vision that guided the establishment of the university, animating all aspects of the institution since then, including hiring of administrators and faculty. This image of what the university stands for is captured in its Vision Statement, which states a commitment to provide students with "the critical thinking abilities to be productive citizens, and the social responsibility and skills to be community builders," and Core Values, which include cultural pluralism, globalism, ethical reflection and practice, and service to community. CSUMB's Vision Statement is posted in virtually every office on campus, and faculty discussions of curricular and other matters frequently refer to it as the central and guiding text: "Is this approach consistent with the Vision Statement?" "Does that requirement further a goal of the Vision Statement?" And so forth. For students no less than faculty and staff, the Vision

Statement is a central organizer of experience, and it acts as a touchstone for the whole campus community. In fact, in an annual ceremony symbolizing the power of these unifying ideas, a giant copy of the Vision Statement is used as a backdrop for the stage. As new faculty and staff members are introduced to the campus community, they actually sign that copy as a public commitment to the shared campus goals.

The Vision Statement serves not only to illuminate and integrate aspirations, but also to recruit faculty. For some students and most faculty, the unusual nature of the university's moral aspirations was an important factor in attracting them to the institution. As a result, the faculty's passion for and commitment to the shared vision is exceptionally high. Faculty are self-conscious about their role as models for students, and exceptionally strong personal relationships between students and faculty are common and seen as important by both.

Partly as a result of the goals expressed in the Vision Statement, the faculty, staff, and students at CSUMB form an unusually cohesive community, with widely shared values that highlight tolerance and respect across differences, mutual concern and active participation in the campus community, and responsibility to contribute beyond the university. This culture of broadly shared values reinforces the aims of students' academic and service experiences and helps to shape their behavior and moral understanding.

An incident that occurred shortly before our visit illustrates the nature of community support for these shared values. A disaffected student had made a racist comment in an email that became public and, in response, a group of students organized an anti-hate rally, with eight speakers, each from a different ethnic group, all talking about the importance of being respectful, compassionate, and committed to social justice. Both faculty and students were very proud of this collective response, particularly that it was student initiated and led, and the story was told several times during our visit.

The risk that a strong consensus on values and moral norms might suppress dissenting opinions is mitigated by the central role played at CSUMB by the concept of "ethical communication" (also called "invitational communication"). Due primarily to the influential work of Josina Makau, a faculty member and dean who played a leadership role in developing CSUMB's approach to moral and civic education, the concept of ethical communication is important as both a goal of and a mechanism for moral development. Ethical communication refers to exchanges characterized by cooperative, responsive attempts to understand each others' points of view, "open-heartedness," and non-manipulative intent rather than efforts to win the argument or gain control over others, subjugating alternative points of view. Ethical communication entails a degree of open-mindedness that will facilitate students' ability to learn from the experiences they encounter while at CSUMB and beyond.

During our visit we found that explicit efforts were made to practice this form of ethical communication in classroom discussions, administrative meetings, and public discourse on campus. The other educational goals and methods at CSUMB assume that this capacity to communicate not only effectively, but compassionately and respectfully even during disagreements is an important quality of an ethically mature person. Faculty and staff are self-conscious about their responsibility as role models of ethical communication and mutually respectful treatment both with each other and with students. The perception among faculty is that people "really listen to each other" to an unusual degree in faculty meetings, Deans' Council meetings, and even budget meetings.

CSUMB's vision statement and core values reflect a conception of development in which the intellectual, ethical, civic, and political domains are all of central importance. Although each

has distinct value, educationally they are treated as thoroughly interconnected. This integration is supported by the unusual structure of the academic programs and departments, all of which are interdisciplinary. Rather than having departments of biology, physics, and chemistry, for example, the university has a Center for Science, Technology, and Information Resources, within which students major in programs such as Earth Systems Science and Policy or Mathematical Sciences and Applications. Project and problem-based learning are widely used, with students drawing on knowledge and skills from science, mathematics, public policy, and ethics to address complex, real world problems. Courses often include a service component as well.

One setting for work that integrates science, public policy, and service to the community is the Watershed Institute, which is a research, public outreach, and service component of the Earth Systems Sciences Program at CSUMB. The Watershed Institute provides opportunities for joint faculty-student research, offers applied projects for student learning about ecological systems, water quality and management, biodiversity, public policy as it relates to land and water use, and a host of other issues. With the assistance of CSUMB students, the Institute sponsors an educational program for local schools on restoration of native plants, called "Return of the Natives" as well as programs for community participation in land restoration and other projects.

This kind of problem-based learning is useful for helping students to understand the complexity of ethical and public policy issues and potential conflicts among competing positive values. One recent course project, for example, involved tensions between environmental protection and economic justice, as well as complex scientific and policy questions. Students were asked to investigate the impact of particular kinds and amounts of fertilizers and pesticides on surrounding water quality and on agricultural production, using mathematical modeling to project outcomes and examining biochemical processes, water management issues, and differential economic impact on large and small farmers. In the end, students had to make policy recommendations that involved hard choices about an issue that affects the local region of the Monterey Peninsula, which is largely agricultural and for which the water supply is problematic.

The United States Air Force Academy

The United States Air Force Academy focuses on the development of character and honor as they are understood in the context of the academy's mission: the preparation of military officers. This understanding informs all of the Academy's programs for cadet character development. The central goal of these programs is to produce Air Force officers of integrity, honor, and mutual respect who will be effective in working together across differences in background and capable of making independent moral judgments while working within the military authority structure.

Because of its emphasis on the preparation of military officers, the AFA's approach to character development (even the choice to call the goal character development) is focused particularly on the areas of personal morality and professional ethics and on the ability to work closely with people from different racial, gender, and religious groups, rather than on civic and political engagement and social justice. Of course, military service is itself understood as service to the nation, and "service before self" is one of the core values around which all of the character development activities are built.

The Center for Character Development at the AFA coordinates the various programs for moral education at the Academy. Directed by a senior Air Force officer, the Center has four divisions: the Honor Division; the Character Development Division; the Human Relations

Division, which provides programs around diversity issues, and; the Curriculum and Research Division. The Center is quite well funded and very active, with a large staff and an endowed visiting faculty position in moral education.

The Academy's assumptions about "what works" in fostering character is distinctive among the colleges we visited in its focus on the critical importance of developing and practicing virtuous habits. As one officer said, "Years after they leave here, the graduates find themselves rolling their socks and organizing their drawers the same way they did here." The focus on habit is discussed in explicit reference to the Aristotelian emphasis on virtue as the accumulated effect of moral practice over time.

The emphasis on moral habit is most evident in the Cadet Honor Code: "We will not lie, cheat, or steal, nor tolerate among us anyone who does." Along with the Air Force core values-- Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do-- the Honor Code forms the centerpiece of the Academy's conception of character. Both the core values and the Honor Code are posted in virtually every location on the campus. The Honor Code is strictly enforced and a more salient part of the cadets' daily experience than is true of most college honor codes. The AFA's approach draws from the belief that high expectations for honesty and other aspects of moral behavior such as mutual respect, consistently enforced over the course of four years will result in virtues -- persistent habits of character that become a part of the person.

Although there are serious limitations to this approach if it is divorced from larger moral inquiry, programs that engender virtuous habits can be very effective components of a multifaceted approach to moral education that also provides a means for developing moral understanding and independent judgment. At the AFA these means are provided by discussion of moral issues that arise in connection with courses and military practice, a program of lessons and discussions about honor that extends across the four years, an annual conference on character, community service and service learning experiences, and a major program around cultural diversity, known as "human relations."

Of course, enforcement of standards for moral behavior is critical to their impact, and enforcement implies sanctions for violation. At the AFA, cadets accused of violating the honor code go through an extended process of investigation that includes a hearing before a board of cadet "honor representatives." A conviction requires the judgment by two thirds of the members that the evidence demonstrates guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The consequences of Honor Code violations are severe -- "disenrollment" (expulsion) and loss of officer standing in the military.

A recent adaptation of the Honor Code policies introduces greater flexibility into the system. In the "developmental approach" recently introduced, a first or second year cadet found in violation of the code is not automatically disenrolled. In many instances, depending on severity of the offense and other factors, the cadet will be put on probation instead. The probationary activities constitute an intensive program of coaching that is designed to be a positive developmental experience for the cadet as well as a punishment. The program includes the establishment of an ongoing relationship with a mentor, regular journal writing, and participation in leadership activities that relate to honor and the development of personal integrity. Cadets who have experienced this program generally describe it as an extremely positive experience and often see it as a turning point in their moral development.

Even though honor codes may not play as central a role in most civilian colleges as they do at the Air Force Academy, they can serve as important mechanisms for moral education. Research (McCabe & Trevino, 1996) indicates that cheating is significantly lower in institutions

that have and enforce honor codes and in those where faculty take academic integrity seriously and talk about it with their students. The Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University provides descriptions of some of the more innovative uses of honor codes and academic integrity issues more generally for promoting the character of college students. The most interesting approaches (e.g., Cole & Conklin, 1996) use discussions of academic integrity as opportunities to talk with students about the nature of intellectual integrity and its place in scholarship and scientific research. Discussions include consideration of what it means to be "a community of inquiry" and the ways that members of such communities legitimately use and build on each others' work. The goal is to help students understand that by participating in academic work they are part of this scholarly enterprise. In a similar way, the AFA uses the Honor Code to foster in the cadets a sense of honor that goes beyond the rather narrow proscriptions the code enumerates.

Another explicit strategy used to promote character development at the AFA involves the recruitment of all members of the Academy community into a common effort to provide a clear and consistent set of messages to the cadets. The Center for Character Development uses a number of methods to encourage faculty, staff, and student leaders to share in the responsibility for the cadets' character development. They include group meetings with segments of staff such as dining hall workers, who are encouraged to speak up if they are treated disrespectfully, and campus police, who are urged to be creative in finding ways to treat violations of base rules as opportunities for learning as well as discipline. The Center for Character Development also sponsors a day-long workshop on moral issues called the Academy Character Enrichment Seminar (ACES), which is attended by all faculty, staff, and cadet leaders such as the Honor Representatives. The seminar includes discussions of motivations to be moral, moral dilemmas faced by the participants, and approaches to mentoring cadets.

Research on community characteristics that support the positive development of youth (Furstenberg, 1993) demonstrates the effectiveness of cooperation among members of a community in setting and upholding standards for the behavior of their young people. Damon (1995; 1997) has called this kind of cooperation a "youth charter." A youth charter requires all of the adults in a community who have roles in the lives of the young people to negotiate a consensus around standards and expectations and to maintain close communication with each other about individual students in order to help the young people achieve these standards. Although they do not use this language, in essence, the AFA creates a youth charter on campus.

The University of Notre Dame

Notre Dame is a Catholic university in South Bend, Indiana, founded in 1842 by the Congregation of Holy Cross. Although governance was legally transferred to a predominantly lay board in 1967, the president is always chosen from the Holy Cross order, and the strong Catholic character of the institution has been maintained. Of the 7800 undergraduates, 85% of the undergraduates are Catholic, and many attended a parochial high school. Further, a majority of the faculty are Catholic, though the percentage has been declining in recent years. All freshmen must live in one of the 27 residences, and most students continue to live in the same residence for all four years. Each residence is led by a Rector, usually a priest or nun, with responsibility for the spiritual and moral life of the residents.

The University places particular stress on both the moral and spiritual development of its students. In marked contrast to most institutions, many of the faculty members with whom we talked felt free, even encouraged, to discuss moral and civic issues in their classrooms, even in courses which are not traditionally seen as offering opportunities for these discussions, such as

engineering and business. While this was particularly true of older faculty, it was also true of many of the younger faculty with whom we spoke. We were stuck by an atmosphere that seems to expect faculty members to raise issues that relate directly to moral and civic concerns in their classes, and by the frequency with which we heard from students that just this happened in their classes. Many students stressed that moral and intellectual issues were integrated into their classroom learning.

The stress at Notre Dame on moral and civic development is evidenced in the Mission Statement and the Academic Code of Honor. It appears in a range of programs under the ambit of Student Life, particularly the Center for Social Concerns and programs involving the residences. The Mission Statement emphasizes that the University "seeks to cultivate in its students not only an appreciation for the great achievements of human beings but also a disciplined sensibility to the poverty, injustice, and oppression that burden the lives of so many. The aim is to create a sense of human solidarity and concern for the common good that will bear fruit as learning becomes service to justice . . . ." The Academic Code of Honor provides that the University is a "community of students, faculty, and administrators who come together to learn, work, and grow in moral character. Central to this concept of community is a belief in the importance of honorable behavior for oneself and for the community as a whole." The University Bulletin underscores that Notre Dame gives special attention to Student Life because "values, character and leadership are developed as often in the context of caring relationships as in selected readings from various textbooks . . . ."

The development of the spiritual life of Notre Dame students is considered to be integral to their full development as human beings generally and to their moral development particularly. The residences are seen as the primary fora for the development of that spiritual life, as well as for the development of a strong sense of community. Mass is said every Sunday night about 10:30 p.m., and although no student is required to come, many do, including some who are not Catholic. Each residence has its own character and atmosphere, but the primary role of each, beyond serving as housing, is to provide the basis for a cohesive community. Students are members of the same residence for their entire stay at Notre Dame, and maintain their connection to their residence hall even if they move off campus. Each residence has scores of teams, clubs, and other organizations.

The residences are powerful centers of moral learning, and priests, nuns, and others chosen for their spiritual and moral commitments act as both Rectors and student mentors, though naturally not all Rectors are as strong role models as others. But we were struck by how little linkage there was between the residences and academic study–two different worlds for most students, or so we heard. The residences are learning communities, though not particularly intellectual ones. Numerous efforts have been made to bridge the gap between the residences and the classrooms, but so far they have not succeeded. As a result of our visit, a new effort is being proposed for next year. In addition to the spiritual life fostered in the dorm, all students are also required to take two courses in theology, which are courses on *Catholic* theology.

We saw some of the most compelling examples of moral and civic learning at Notre Dame's Center for Social Concerns. The Center is a remarkable, perhaps unique, focus of moral development on the campus. It started in the late 1970s, with much of the impetus coming from students, and it combined a number of disparate campus programs that promoted experiential learning and volunteer services. It has been in a building near the center of campus since 1983. From the outset, it has been led by Father Don McNeil. The Center is at the heart of service and social awareness for students particularly, but for faculty and staff as well. It is part of the

Institute for Church Life, an umbrella organization, and moral and civic development are a key mission, along with spiritual development. McNeil views Catholic doctrine as requiring a deep commitment to social justice through active engagement in moral and civic concerns, and this view gives the Center a special character.

About 2000 students per year are involved in the Center's courses and other activities– some more than others, of course, but on a campus of 7500 undergraduates, that is an impressive number. Particularly impressive is the way in which the Center leadership is working to integrate its efforts into the academic life of the University. In recent years, the numbers of service learning courses sponsored through the Center has increased substantially. Currently, about one-third of all students graduate having taken at least one service learning course, and most are sponsored through the Center or in collaboration with it. A high percentage of Notre Dame students is involved in service activities after graduation, and the work of the Center is a key reason.

The very strengths of the University are also limitations in the realms of moral and civic learning, or at least its special challenges. Notre Dame is a strong community of students, as much as or more than other universities we have seen, and its residences are particularly cohesive communities. The University as a whole places a strong emphasis on moral development under the mantle of its Catholic tradition, and that emphasis is both individualized and focused on a small community in the residences. The moral development is linked to civic development as well in terms of community service, service learning programs, retreats, and a wide range of co-curricular and Church related activities.

At the same time, the primary cohesive factor–a Catholic university with 85% of its students being Catholic– also poses a limitation because so much of civic learning involves learning to understand diverse cultures, backgrounds, races, religions, and ways of life. That understanding cannot be gained solely in books and class discussions. Coming to know individuals of different religions and races is a powerful educator, but it is one that Notre Dame can offer only in limited ways. Even multi-cultural courses are a relative rarity. The University stresses that "all are welcome," and makes substantial efforts to make that promise a reality. But those among the 15% of non-Catholic undergraduate students with whom we talked said that they often feel isolated. This is particularly true among some non-Catholic women, who feel that the Catholic Church and the University is dominated by men, and for African-Americans.

Encouraging Developments and Tentative Conclusions

At the beginning of this paper, we reviewed some of the barriers to realizing the potential of higher education to influence students' moral and civic development. These barriers are reinforced by cultural trends in the broader society and by pressures, constraints, and forces in the system of higher education that go beyond any individual campus. At the same time, however, there is a strong and growing movement in this country to reinvigorate higher education's civic and democratic mission. Increasingly, many colleges and universities are taking seriously their responsibilities to their local communities and developing community-university partnerships around schooling, discourse about public issues, programs for youth and families, land use, and the like. Within individual campuses, many colleges and universities have made serious commitments to programs of moral and civic education of their students, as we have seen in our campus visits.

We are now beginning to see growth in efforts to coordinate and foster communication about this work and to enact change on a wider scale. Campus Compact, an organization of college and university presidents, has been particularly successful in this role. It was begun in 1985 by a small group of presidents who thought that while "the 'me' generation" was an unfair label for their students, those students nevertheless needed active encouragement to engage in community service. While the organization initially focused on service generally, by the beginning of the 1990s the focus shifted to service learning as it became clear to the Campus Compact leadership that important advantages are lost unless community service is linked to academic study though structured reflection. Without that reflection, community service often has little lasting impact on students, and community service that is unconnected to the curriculum is often viewed by faculty members as simply one more extra-curricular activity, like sports, not central to the educational mission of the institution. As a result, Campus Compact shifted its attention to providing materials and other support for community service learning programs throughout the country. More recently, Campus Compact has expanded its attention to the whole array of concerns related to higher education and civic engagement. It is sponsoring an invitational conference this summer at Aspen, Colorado, with the hope of gaining endorsement for a bold declaration of responsibility for enhancing civic engagement on the part of participating college and university presidents, and an assessment tool to measure success. A number of other higher-education organizations are also active in this arena, including the American Association of Higher Education, the American Council on Education, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

In addition, regular conferences on college student values and moral development, such as those sponsored by Florida State University and Duke University, provide opportunities for people who are working on moral and civic education at the college level to meet and share information with others about their experiences. Some of these meetings also provide opportunities for cross-fertilization between people working at the college level and those working in elementary and secondary schools, which have been pursuing moral and civic education for a long time. This is of obvious importance, since students entering college will be differentially receptive to activities such as service-learning depending on their previous school experiences. In fact, community service has become very widespread in elementary and high schools in the past several years, and this has important implications for programming at the college level.

Efforts to respond to the kinds of critiques of higher education that we reviewed in the first section of this paper are even beginning at research universities. For example, representatives from major research universities met last year at Wingspread Conference Center in Wisconsin. One result of that gathering was a "Wingspread Declaration for Renewing the Civic Mission of American Research Universities." The Declaration urges research universities to prepare their students for engaged citizenship "through multiple opportunities to do the work of citizenship today through real projects of impact and relevance, learning the skills, developing the habits and identities, and acquiring the knowledge to contribute to the general welfare." The Declaration is accompanied by a set of planning documents to further its goals. A second session will be held this July, and steps are underway to institutionalize the goals expressed in the Declaration.

New approaches to institutional accreditation are also highlighting the moral and civic development of undergraduate students. A trend toward greater emphasis on outcomes-based accreditation criteria is reflected in the recent report by the National Project of the American

Academy for Liberal Education, "The Re-visioning of Accreditation in the Liberal Arts." This report lists "civic virtue" as one of the five categories of student achievement that liberal education should provide. "Civic virtue' is defined to include interest in and consideration of the public good, a tangible concern with the moral implications of technical knowledge, and the ability to think critically and empathically.

We are still in the first year of what we envisage as a three-year project, with some follow-on efforts likely after that period. It is too early, therefore, to say anything definitive in terms of recommendations. But we do have some preliminary insights based on our work to date.

1. A high degree of institutional intentionality in fostering the moral and civic responsibility is the hallmark of those colleges and universities that lead in this arena. These campuses not only have mission statements that include this goal, but the statements are well known and understood by most students, faculty members, and staff. The administrative leadership speaks and acts in ways that promote the goal, as does faculty leadership.
2. A wide range of programs can contribute to moral and civic learning–both curricular and extra-curricular. Without limiting those programs, campuses should build conscious connections between them with the goal of making the campus whole more than the sum of its parts. Those connections should be documented, publicly discussed, and open to review and revision.
3. An effective program in this arena needs a clear conceptual framework, and too often program developers fail to make explicit the theoretical assumptions and educational philosophies underlying their approaches.
4. Active pedagogies that engage students in the practice of grappling with tough moral and civic issues, as well as examining them in theory, are essential to the full development of informed, committed, socially responsible, and politically engaged citizens.
5. A network of scholars is needed to take leadership in assessment and research concerning undergraduate moral and civic education. Longitudinal studies on programs being developed are important if we are to learn what kinds of educational approaches are most effective and have long term impact. A coordinated effort in the area of instrument development would be extremely beneficial since adoption of some common measures would allow for comparison across programs. It is not necessary or even desirable for each campus to develop its own measures. The development of assessment tools will be a very challenging task, however, and we need to be very cautious about trying to capture complex and subtle developmental phenomena with superficial instruments.
6. Additional mechanisms are needed through which campuses can learn from each others' experiences, even across very different kinds of institutions. These mechanisms could include visits to each others' campuses, regional and national conferences, as well as web-based communications systems.
7. More inter-institutional efforts such as the Wingspread and Aspen Conferences, referred to above, are needed. Ideally, in our view, the success of colleges and universities in promoting moral and civic responsibility should part a part of the higher-education accreditation processes.

It has become a commonplace to bemoan a loss of moral and civic responsibility, particularly among young people, and to urge increased attention to moral and civic education among students at every level. If the issue is viewed solely as one of information transfer, the

role of higher education is inevitably a modest one. This is no less true if the issue is seen solely as proselytizing students not to cheat or to pay attention to politics. Like John Dewey, we have much more in mind. We believe that democracy and education, like moral, civic, and cognitive learning, are inexorably intertwined. This is not simply because our citizenry must be educated to deal honestly with each other and to choose responsibly our political leaders and hold them accountable. Much more important, a democratic society is one in which citizens interact with each other, learn from each other, grow with each other, and together make their communities more than the sum of their parts. Dewey (1916) urged that a community of learners is the primary mechanism through which this democratizing process can best occur. To be successful, the community must be both interactive and collaborative, a place where the processes of decision-making are at least as important as the decisions themselves. And it must be a diverse community, reflecting the diversity of the larger communities into which students will move on graduation.

To translate this mandate into effective institutional programs, we must attend to many questions. What are the essential elements of moral and civic character for an American in the next century? What specific knowledge, skills, and values contribute to those elements, recognizing that there may be a range of different ways to be a good citizen? What contribution can higher education make in developing these qualities in sustained and effective ways? What evidence is there about the types of civic educational efforts that are most effective in preparing for responsible citizenship? What are the problems that confront colleges and universities that attempt to engage in sustained civic education, and what are the best strategies to help overcome them?

These are the kinds of issues that we are addressing in our project for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. We seek not only to clarify approaches that work well, but also to encourage the expansion of those approaches throughout American higher education. Toward that goal, we seek advice and counsel from all who share our concerns and commitment.

References

Astin, A. W. (1996). *Democracy at risk: What higher education can do.* College Park, MD: Eisenhower Leadership Programs at the University of Maryland.

Astin, A. W. (in Press). Higher education and civic responsibility. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Higher education and civic responsibility.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Astin, A. W., Parrott, S. A., Korn,W. S., & Sax, L. J. (1997). *The American freshman: Thirty year trends.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barber, B. (1991). The civic mission of the university. In B. Murchland (Ed.), *Higher education and the practice of democratic politics* (pp. 160-169). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Barber, B. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R, Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1991). *The good society.* New York: Vintage Books.

Bennett, S. E., & Rademacher, E. W. (1997). The "age of indifference" revisited: Patterns of political interest, media exposure and knowledge about Generation X. In S.C. Craig & S.E. Bennett (Eds.), *After the boom: The politics of Generation X.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Blasi. A. (1993). The development of identity: Some implications for moral functioning. In G.G. Noam & T. E. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 99-122). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E.L. & Hechinger, F.M. (1981). *Higher learning in the nation's service.* New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancment of Teaching.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment.* New York: Free Press.

Cole, S., & Conklin, D. (1996). Academic integrity policies and procedures: Opportunities to teach students about moral leadership and personal ethic. *The College Student Affairs Journal, 15* (2), 30-39.

Council on Civil Society. (1998). *A call to civil society: Why democracy needs moral truths*. A report to the nation from the Council on Civil Society. New York: Institute for American Values.

Damon, W. (1995). *Greater expectations: Overcoming the culture of indulgence in our homes and schools*. New York: Free Press

Damon, W. (1997). *The youth charter: How communities can work together to raise standards for all our children.* New York: Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flanagan, C., & Gallay, L. S. (1995). Reframing the meaning of "political" in research wiht adolescents. In M. Hepburn (Ed.), *Perspectives in political science: New directions in political socialization research* (pp. 34-41). New York: Oxford University Press.

Furstenberg, F. (1993). How families manage risk and opportunity in dangerous neighborhoods. In W. J. Wilson (Ed.), *Sociology and the public agenda*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conception of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 47,* 481-517.

Ketcham, R. (1992). A rationale for civic education. *Educational Record, 73*, 19-22.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J.S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change, 28* (1), 28-33.

Morse, S.W. (1989). Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8*. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University.

National Commission on Civic Renewal. (1998). *A nation of spectators: How disengagement weakens America and what we can do about it* (Final Report). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Newman, F. (1985). *Higher education and the American resurgence.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancment of Teaching.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring : A feminine approach to ethics & moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pascarella, E. T, & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Putnam, R. P. (1995a). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6,* 65-78.

Putnam, R. P. (1995b). Bowling alone revisited. *The Responsive Community, 5* (2), 18-33.

Putnam, R. P. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *American Prospect, 4,* 24.

Rahn, W. M., & Transue, J. (1997). *The decline of social trust among American youth: The American economy, value change and social capital.* Unpublished Manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Shweder, R. A., Mahapatra, M., & Miller, J. G. (1987). Culture and moral development. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of moral concepts in early childhood.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sullivan, W. M. (1999). *The university as citizen: Institutional identity and social responsibility.* Occasional Paper, Council on Public Policy Education. Washington, D.C.

Turiel, E. (1997). The development of morality. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 863-932). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wahlke, J.C. (1991). Liberal learning and the political science major: A report to the profession. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 24,* 48-60.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

035 080

AERA

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Higher Education & the Development of Moral & Civic Responsibility: Vision & Practice in Three Contexts	
Author(s): Stephens, J.M., Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., & Beaumont E.	
Corporate Source: ?	Publication Date: Unpublished

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Jason M. Stephens

Printed Name/Position/Title: Research Assistant

Organization/Address: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
555 Middlefield Rd
Menlo Park, CA 94026

Telephone: 650 566 5114

FAX: 650-326-0278

E-Mail Address: stephens@stanford.edu

Date: June 2, 2000

(over)

ERIC®

Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation

University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742-5701

Tel: (800) 464-3742
(301) 405-7449
FAX: (301) 405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
http://ericae.net

March 2000

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation would like you to contribute to ERIC by providing us with a written copy of your presentation. Submitting your paper to ERIC ensures a wider audience by making it available to members of the education community who could not attend your session or this year's conference.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed, electronic, and internet versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available **full-text, on demand through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service** and through the microfiche collections housed at libraries around the world.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse and you will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria. Documents are reviewed for contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality. You can track our processing of your paper at **http://ericae.net.**

To disseminate your work through ERIC, you need to sign the reproduction release form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. You can drop of the copies of your paper and reproduction release form at the ERIC booth (223) or mail to our attention at the address below. **If you have not submitted your 1999 Conference paper please send today or drop it off at the booth with a Reproduction Release Form.** Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 2000/ERIC Acquisitions
The University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Lab
College Park, MD 20742

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

ERIC/AE is a project of the Department of Measurement, Statistics and Evaluation at the College of Education, University of Maryland.