Engaging the Educators: Facilitating Civic Engagement Through Faculty Development

Sarah Surak and Alexander Pope

Abstract

Incorporating civic engagement into academically rigorous classroom practice requires the retooling of course delivery. In this article, the authors describe an 8-week seminar that acts as a structured, incentivized opportunity for course redesign for Salisbury University (Maryland) faculty who wish to incorporate rigorous and effective civic engagement across the liberal arts curriculum. Lessons learned include the effect of providing space for discussion and pedagogical imagining, the importance of disciplinary literacy and social responsibility, perspectives for dealing with differing faculty expectations of student engagement, strategies for moving beyond roadblocks, and challenges posed by concepts of citizenship and "civic" within the seminar.

Introduction

*C*ivic engagement is an increasingly popular component of teaching, research, and service in higher education. Civic engagement experiences prepare students for active participation in our democracy, promote a sense of community on campus, and help interested faculty to enhance teaching, scholarship, and service. Because of these and other benefits and incentives, faculty may elect to design or redesign courses to include civic engagement as a central component. Translating the idea of civic engagement into successful pedagogical practices, however, requires more than faculty interest in undertaking such efforts. Successful civic engagement activities depend on the ability of interested faculty to provide a structured, authentic, and academically rigorous experience that leverages community assets while also seeking to address community ills. Thoughtful reorganization and rethinking of course delivery is necessary to fully engage students in methods that develop knowledge, skills, and values for democratic participation, and Salisbury University's Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum program (CEAC) seeks to assist faculty in this task.

Salisbury University, a comprehensive public university located on the eastern shore of Maryland, actively encourages faculty to incorporate civic engagement into the classroom experience through these mechanisms. In this article, we describe

a recently initiated effort to assist faculty with the deployment of civic engagement across the liberal arts curriculum through the provision of resources and incentives. Two groups of faculty participated in an 8-week seminar in which they considered the value of and opportunities for utilizing civic engagement as a pedagogical tool. With this new and/or enhanced knowledge, faculty were guided through course redesign and prepared for delivery the following semester.

The efforts at Salisbury University are guided by the American Democracy Project's framing of civic engagement as "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference" (*Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi*). This is a heady challenge and a complex undertaking, even for otherwise accomplished faculty.

In a review of literature pertaining to civic engagement in the university context, we link this to the Salisbury University experience and then utilize data collected during the faculty development workshops to present "lessons learned." These include providing space for discussion and pedagogical imagining, promoting disciplinary literacy and social responsibility, dealing with different faculty expectations for student engagement, moving beyond easily identifiable roadblocks, and resolving challenges posed to the key concepts of citizenship and the category of the "civic" within seminar discussion. Our intent in sharing these broad themes is not to suggest methodological strategies or claim wide generalizability; instead, we seek to advance discourse about early-stage efforts to engage faculty in meaningful civic engagement education. Suggestions for future faculty development initiatives encouraging the facilitation of civic engagement activities as a key component of course design are presented.

Situating Critical Civic Engagement Within the University Context

Civic engagement has been and remains a key concern of colleges and universities, often in the form of service-learning. In her review of civic engagement literature, Finley *(2011)* focused on the dominance of service-learning programs in postsecondary education. Such programs follow progressive-era beliefs that learning should be experiential and grounded in authenticity. But as Finley observes, many of the programs that claim to promote civic engagement are deliberatively nonpolitical. Such programs

can help students understand civic life as an academic exercise but do not necessarily help build genuine abilities needed for active democratic citizenship.

Levine *(2014)* suggested that those nonpolitical engagement programs are a result of pressures that institutions of higher education feel from various segments of society. Because of economic and social pressures, education is often treated as little more than "the gateway to professional and personal development" *(Lautzenheiser, Kelly, & Miller, 2011, p. 8)*. An emphasis on career readiness can prioritize a transactional citizenship based on such traits as "being timely and hardworking" *(Lautzenheiser et al., 2011, p. 8)* that has a close relationship to the more duty-oriented approach that Dalton *(2008)* argued typifies conservative views of citizenship. These systems are based on goals for ordered and responsible life and citizenship. Framed positively, this is preparation for working effectively within the system.

This article and the larger institutional effort from which it stems reflect a more critical view of citizenship. We acknowledge broad social inequalities, and we recognize that citizens adopt alternative patterns of engagement relative to their position in and experiences with society. We embrace these realities as a starting point for civic engagement. This approach to civic engagement strives toward a critical civic praxis *(Ginwright & Cammarota, 2007)*. As a site of civic learning, the university offers students an opportunity to consider and act on efforts for social justice.

Through critical civic engagement, the university classroom provides a space to engage course concepts via a focus on social responsibility through forms of civic and political engagement *(Giroux, 2001)*. Following the work of Levine *(2014)*, the initiative detailed in this article is framed by the understanding that colleges and universities need to directly engage in such critical civic education. This article relates one effort to provide effective faculty development in the service of authentic, critical, and politically minded civic engagement experiences.

Salisbury University's Effort: Program Overview of Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum (CEAC)

Salisbury University's Institute for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE) was founded in 1999 as a nonpartisan organization coordinating civic engagement opportunities, citizenship education, and the cultivation of an informed

democratic citizenship. PACE activities are twofold, encompassing both public affairs and civic engagement. Through forums, events, programs, and projects, PACE interacts with issues of public affairs, the intersection of individual and community interests. PACE's academic efforts are an attempt to inspire, inform, and shape learning to influence public affairs through civic engagement education that "explicitly teaches the knowledge, skills and values believed necessary for democratic citizenship" *(Kahne & Middaugh, 2009, p. 141)*. This article concerns PACE efforts in the latter category. We specifically focus on Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum (CEAC), a program begun in Spring 2014 to engage and support faculty in incorporating civic engagement within the classroom.

Two faculty members, one from the Political Science Department and one from the Department of Teacher Education, facilitate the 8-week seminar. Figure 1 outlines the syllabus for this seminar, which was first offered in Spring 2014, then again in Fall 2014. Future seminars will be offered in each fall semester. Participating faculty commit to attending the entirety of each of the eight 90-minute meetings that run October–November. Faculty participants are expected to complete required readings and assignments before each session. The ultimate product of the seminar is a revised course syllabus reflecting a tightly integrated civic engagement component comprising at least one credit hour of the course.

This civic engagement component is generally referred to as an enhancement. According to state requirements, this enhancement may consist of one or more options in addition to the traditional 3 hours of coursework: increased content and/or reading, research, critical thinking assignments, service-learning or civic engagement assignments, study abroad experiences or cultural experiences, and/or additional hours in class, lab, or studio. According to the State of Maryland COMAR regulations, a 1-hour enhancement utilizing a civic engagement assignment requires 45 additional hours per semester of supervised, documented learning.

Figure 1. Seminar Syllabus
Seminar Overview

This seminar consists of nine 90-minute meetings (3:30–5:00 PM) designed to help faculty integrate civic engagement experiences into their existing or planned courses. We approach this work to advance Salisbury University's *(2014)* mission statement, which states in part, "Our highest purpose is to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active

citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world" *("Mission," para. 1).*

In approaching this lofty goal, we follow the definition of civic engagement set forward by the Institute for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement:

> **Civic engagement** refers to those activities by which individuals become informed participants in their surrounding public and private communities. Civic engagement education "explicitly teaches the knowledge, skills and values believed necessary for democratic citizenship" *(Kahne & Middaugh, 2010, p. 141).* The approach inspires, informs, and shapes learning activities to impact public affairs. Those activities also deepen understanding of how social, political, and economic systems work and how individuals can work effectively within those systems as they develop sustained habits of active democratic citizenship.

Faculty participating in the seminar are expected to complete all assignments. The ultimate product is a revised course syllabus, reflecting a tightly integrated civic engagement component comprising at least one credit hour of their course. This civic engagement component is generally referred to as an enhancement. CEAC has set particular requirements for the enhancement:

- Academic rigor

- Relation to a pressing social issue

- Interaction between students and community members outside the classroom

- Sharing of enhancement outcomes in a setting beyond the classroom

Other objectives for this seminar series include:

- Differentiate between civic engagement and other forms of community-based learning

- Describe the goals of civic engagement in the university setting

- Review frameworks and theories useful in guiding civic engagement work

- Develop inquiry-based civic engagement assignments and assessment tools

Seminar Schedule

Week	Seminar topic	Session tasks	Assignments
1	Workshop introduction	• Welcome and introduction from the Dean • Seminar timelines and expectations including data collection procedures • Discuss course selection	• Read Parker (2010) • Post copy of existing syllabus to course management page
2	What is civic engagement: Goals for citizens	• Discuss civic identity • Define and delineate civic engagement • Connect civic engagement and the university mission • Share civic engagement frameworks	• Read Finley (2011)
3	Where/why/how can we introduce civic engagement?	• Identifying issues • What is community? • Developing a course timeline	
4	Civic engagement in the university context	• Working within our constraints • Discuss student positionality • Workshopping assignment ideas	• Read Levine (2011)
5	GUEST SPEAKER	• Identifying community partnerships	• Post assignment drafts to My Classes forum and bring hard copy
6	ONLINE	• Review and post enhancement feedback for all seminar participants by 5pm	
7	IRB Concerns Assessing civic engagement	• IRB presentation • Instrumental outcomes and personal transformations	• Read Westheimer & Kahne (2004) • Prepare IRB questions • Bring updated enhancement with suggested readings

8	Workshopping final enhancements	• Reflections and next steps • Seminar evaluation	• Bring copies of revised course description • Bring copies of civic engagement assignment prompt and assessment • Draft IRB (if necessary)
Future	**Submit revised syllabus and accompanying documents**		

Seminar enrollment is on a first come, first serve basis, but preference is given to faculty teaching the course in the following semester for two reasons. First, it increases the likelihood of classroom implementation as it immediately follows the faculty development seminar. Second, faculty may opt in to an assessment program run in conjunction with the CEAC initiative. This initiative, which is beyond the scope of this article, assesses faculty's delivery of the course's civic engagement component and the ultimate impact on student learning. Six to eight faculty members participate in each cohort. In the two cohorts reviewed in this study, disciplinary representation included faculty from art, communications, education, environmental studies, history, and political science.

Through the course of the seminar, faculty move from basic considerations of citizenship and what civic engagement is toward the ultimate creation of their course enhancements. Readings, discussions, and external assignments support faculty exploration and learning. The entire seminar is constructed as a deliberation around one question: How can we engage students in their community?

The seminar engages faculty through theories and methods of civic engagement with three main objectives:

1. The seminar differentiates between civic engagement and other forms of community-based learning in the university setting. This standardization of definition on the university level is a goal of PACE, identifying civic engagement as a rigorous, academic underpinning required in the fourth credit hour enhancement per State of Maryland regulations. This includes connection to the campus mission as well as disciplinary responsibilities and objectives.

2. The seminar reviews frameworks and theories useful in guiding civic engagement assignments. This includes extended discussion about moving students from deficit and/or transactional stances towards more critical readings

of social structures surrounding persistent disciplinary problems. With grounding in theoretical concepts faculty draft, revise, and finalize new or enhanced course assignments.

3. Participants integrate new assignments into the structure of existing courses and prepare assessment tools such as rubrics. The program actively promotes four key requirements for the civic engagement enhancement: academic rigor, relation to a pressing social issue, community-based research, and sharing the final outcomes with community members. The process is collaborative and interdisciplinary, though substantially within the liberal arts curriculum at this point.

CEAC implements three key components to successful civic engagement identified in existing literature. CEAC highlights existing institutional structures, incentivizes faculty delivery of civic engagement programming, and provides the tools and enticements to do so in a rigorous manner. We will briefly explore each of these three components.

Institutional Structures and Scaffolding

Salisbury University is among the many colleges and universities that make explicit mention of civic engagement in key documents such as the mission statement. Bringle and Hatcher *(2004)*, among others, argue that such institution-wide statements can create increased institutional interest in and support for civic engagement efforts. Of course, colleges and universities may engage in civic engagement activities without mentioning them in their mission statements, and the presence of such mission statements does not guarantee that campus members are civically engaged. Generally, however, administration provides indications of institutional priorities. Normalizing civic engagement as a form of knowledge creation that connects research, teaching, and outreach may also provide a platform for a holistic campus effort *(Ostrander, 2004)*. This may occur through institutional support of faculty development initiatives, regardless of codified campus mission statements *(Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002)*. That support often begins with direct reference to civic engagement and associated efforts (e.g., citizenship education) in guiding documents.

PACE's civic engagement efforts draw upon the Salisbury University mission and vision statements. The Salisbury University mission states in part, "Our highest purpose is to empower our

students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world." The University's Values Statement continues this civic theme, stating,

> The core values of Salisbury University are excellence, student centeredness, learning, community, civic engagement, and diversity. We believe these values must be lived and experienced as integral to everyday campus life so that students make the connection between what they learn and how they live. *(Salisbury University, 2014, "Values," para. 1)*

PACE leverages such official campus documents to promote a holistic approach to faculty development. We follow others who have found that this approach can lead to program longevity and increased effectiveness (*Bringle & Hatcher, 2004; Holland, 1999*).

Providing Tools and Resources

CEAC provides discrete tools and resources for integrating civic engagement experiences. Incorporating civic engagement within the curriculum requires interested faculty equipped with the knowledge and skills to deliver a rigorous academic experience grounded in *authentic* community situations. Authenticity is the keystone for critical civic engagement, but its inclusion can prove challenging. As Trudeau and Kruse *(2014)* stated, "the need to support via faculty preparation and implementation of civic engagement within course designs is perhaps both the simplest and most crucial" *(p. 12)*. Universities must also provide training for faculty to incorporate civic engagement in an academically rigorous manner within the classroom.

Given this need for improving the quality of the course as well as recruiting faculty participation, Abes et al. *(2002)* suggested that "success stories which highlight service-learning's academic rigor should be shared, when feasible, by faculty in the same discipline" *(p. 12)*. Faculty learn well from their peers (*Bringle, Hatcher, Jones, & Plater, 2006*), and peers often play a key role in encouraging participation in civic-engagement-related approaches *(Abes et al., 2002)*. Building networks within universities to guide less experienced faculty is one possible way to share such information *(Berger & Liss, 2009)*.

CEAC centers on discussion of civic engagement pedagogies and incorporates modeled examples of such pedagogies. For instance, faculty are asked to bring in popular media examples

of civic engagement relevant to their field. This initiates a group discussion of what civic engagement can look like in a given discipline. Such an activity can be directly integrated into a course.

Encouraging Through Enticements and Incentives

CEAC incentivizes faculty participation. A variety of influences such as university mission statements, tenure and promotion, or monetary incentives may encourage faculty to incorporate civic engagement into the classroom setting. Faculty interest is key to encouraging civic engagement incorporation as individual faculty decide how to approach a particular topic within the classroom *(Bringle & Hatcher, 1995)*. No matter what type of support is provided, without faculty interest, civic engagement activities will not develop.

As faculty juggle teaching, research, and service responsibilities, institutional clarity of the value of engaging in a time-consuming redesign of a course may be necessary to encourage such efforts *(Bess, 1998; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000)*. Enticements and incentives for participation may provide both encouragement and persuasion regarding the nonmonetary benefits of participating in civic engagement efforts. Teaching civic engagement is often unfamiliar, as faculty may have little to no prior experience of their own *(Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007)*. In her findings of local factors that support the facilitation of civic engagement, Ostrander *(2004)* identified faculty needs for "a compelling reason to alter core curriculum to integrate civic engagement and a willingness and a capacity to utilize established knowledge about how students learn" *(p. 84)*. Faculty with little familiarity and knowledge of civic engagement, for example, may fail to see how it is relevant to their course *(Abes et al., 2002)*. University initiatives encouraging civic engagement must consider how to communicate the benefits of participation to faculty.

In a survey of more than 500 faculty members at 29 institutions, Abes et al. *(2002)* found that given the time required for course design, offering incentives such as release time or funding is a necessary component of encouraging course redesign. Interestingly, they also found tenure and promotion concerns to be minimal, making only a slight impact for untenured faculty members working at research universities. Faculty are more interested in participating in civic engagement activities when they think their efforts will be rewarded or aligned with institutional structures *(Bringle et al., 2006)*.

As an incentive, faculty who complete CEAC receive $500 in professional development funding. Successful completion primarily consists of submitting a revised syllabus and civic engagement assignment that meet the criteria of the program. Faculty can use the funds for purchasing materials, traveling to conferences, or other initiatives that may or may not relate to their civic engagement enhancements. This financial incentive seems effective in encouraging faculty to take on this additional task that leads to a more time-consuming form of course delivery.

Educating the Educators: Lessons Learned

There were five key findings or lessons learned from the first two seminars, held in Spring and Fall of 2014. We initiated Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum as a professional development program, not a research intervention. Our foremost intention was—and still is—the delivery of useful experiences to aid faculty in redesigning their courses to incorporate rigorous and effective civic engagement opportunities. However, we also recognized the potential to share our experiences with others interested in introducing civic engagement initiatives at their institutions. We maintained detailed notes during seminar sessions and secured participant consent to analyze submitted work and culminating evaluative surveys. As mentioned, this research agenda extends to the civic engagement courses resulting from the CEAC seminar, including student outcomes, but these are beyond the scope of this article.

The five broad lessons we relate reflect our understanding of the most important points of the seminars. We open each with a representative quote from one or more of the participants that captures the message of the overall lesson. Our intent is to explain the topics in detail, including negative aspects of the seminar that emerged. The lessons are sympathetic and overlapping, with both intended and unintended relationships. For instance, we could likely reduce some faculty concerns by altering the interdisciplinary nature of the seminar.

1. Creating a safe discussion space

I value the shared community the workshop creates. I found the chance to share the perspectives of faculty in other disciplines and specializations most useful. That dedicated time to workshop ideas with colleagues in different disciplines.

The above quote captures the tripartite benefit of our seminar format. Our primary pedagogical goal was creating a community in a conference room in which faculty from different disciplines and at different career points could openly explore civic engagement praxis. Faculty participants reported that they valued the incentivized opening of a space for discussion of teaching methods and strategies. This is consistent with much of the academic literature describing faculty development initiatives. A common complaint of faculty is the increased time needed to plan and implement civic engagement initiatives that is unrewarded or unacknowledged *(Liss & Liazos, 2009)*. A study by the Pericles Project found, for example, "the most common challenges… involved civic education's demands on time and energy, which are always scarce resources" *(Berger & Liss, 2009, p. 35)*.

CEAC provides a dedicated weekly space for discussion encouraged through incentives. In order to receive the incentive of faculty development monies, faculty must participate in face-to-face and online seminar discussions. In both seminars, faculty noted numerous reasons why they found the space for discussion a beneficial component of the program beyond the monetary benefit of participation. These can be characterized within the following categories:

- Safe space to think about teaching and curriculum design
- Interactions with faculty from diverse perspectives
- Critique and feedback on assignment development

Both authors (who also designed and led the seminars) are early-career faculty and while coordinating the two initial seminars, neither of us held an administrative position. The seminars were attended by tenured and nontenured faculty, but there was little oversight beyond peer review and general requirements outlined in the syllabus. Although we do not know definitively that this absence of administration altered discussions, the group had no reason to filter their work due to an administration presence. Combined with genuine faculty desire to participate in the seminar, that aspect promoted a sense of shared purpose and community.

Abes et al. *(2002)* suggested the importance of intradisciplinary communication regarding successful civic engagement experiences, but we found greater value from interdisciplinary communication. The interdisciplinary groups were not without tension, which we describe later, but participants responded favorably to the chance to work with faculty from other specializations. Readers are familiar

with the vision of "siloes" in academia, and Salisbury University is not immune to this effect. Particularly because civic engagement is inherently multidisciplinary, faculty were clearly pleased to be working with colleagues from other programs, departments, and schools. This format promoted sharing of content knowledge and pedagogical strategies that benefited all participants.

Interdisciplinary discussions also opened opportunities for broaching critical civic engagement. What can seem normal or be hidden from one perspective is often shown to be systemically flawed from another perspective. Each faculty member brought a particular worldview to the group discussions. As participants shared their understanding of society, these differing worldviews enabled a more comprehensive image of the university, our students, our work, and the larger communities we ultimately wish to impact.

Faculty also shared clearly positive reactions to working with colleagues at different points in their careers. As Berger and Liss *(2009)* advised, we attempted to create relational networks within the university. Each semester deliberately included at least one first-year faculty member and at least one full professor, with the remaining participants at various points in their careers. This combination of institutional memory and ideas fresh from graduate school yielded greater diversity when discussing pedagogical efforts and the realities of life at Salisbury University and in the surrounding community.

2. Disciplinary literacy and social responsibility

Colleague 1: What does civic engagement look like for a philosopher?

Colleague 2: To get students to think about not just what is but what ought.

One of the great benefits of the CEAC structure is the opportunity for faculty to engage in sustained interdisciplinary communication around a central theme. Faculty clearly enjoyed these discussions, which necessarily broadened the group's understanding of civic engagement and even the purposes and methods of university education. Seminar leaders, however, wanted to avoid generating homogeneous, standardized work. To avoid this, we incorporated specific opportunities for the real differences in our group to emerge. These opportunities represent another example of modeling good pedagogy. Identifying and promoting

ideological diversity in the classroom is a key tool for effective civic education *(Hess, 2009)*.

Though we explored shared understandings of civic engagement, faculty were encouraged to work with a definition of civic engagement that is particular to their discipline, as indicated in the quote at the beginning of this section. This definition is framed as what Youniss and Yates *(1997)* have called *social responsibility,* or the responsibility that certain people have to their communities. Faculty are protective of their disciplines and rightfully defensive of their expertise within those disciplines. Framing civic engagement in this way—as a shared societal goal but with disciplinary particularities—allows faculty to maintain their sense of expertise and control. It conveys to faculty that civic engagement is something we all care about, and it is your role, through your discipline, to help prepare citizens in this particular way.

Each discipline brings what educators commonly call a disciplinary literacy to the table. The language, questions, and purposes of the disciplines differ according to the ontology, epistemology, and goals of a particular discipline. Thus, civic engagement demonstrated in a sociology class will differ from that demonstrated in an art class. Sociologists would focus more on investigating and understanding social behaviors, whereas the artists would form presentations that respond to and/or seek to shape responses to events.

3. Different expectations based on course level

> I want my students to conduct participant observations and interviews but their skill level might not be high enough in a 101 level course.

Some of the most interesting conversations also concerned the distinctions in course level and student ability. Faculty expressed real concerns—often framed as a sort of deficit model—that their students were not capable of certain types of thinking, particularly when described in disciplinary terms, as in the above quote. For example, one of our political science colleagues described frequently encountering challenges when trying to elicit thinking about institutional or systemic impediments to change from entry-level students. Deep awareness of such issues came only with greater exposure to political science concepts, which were not available to his introductory students. We detail these and other

impediments in the next section. But here, we want to focus on a beneficial outcome of this discussion.

Thinking about civic engagement in the context of one university class resulted in fairly fatalistic views tightly aligned with what Hollander and Burack *(2008)* termed instrumental outcomes, which they used to represent measurable civic acts such as voter turnout or the number of letters citizens send to their representatives. CEAC faculty were framing civic engagement solely in terms of achieving particular, discrete, measurable ends. They were thinking in terms of midterms and finals. Focusing on the particular course level helped faculty think about their civic engagement enhancement as part of their students' progressive course sequence. The 100-level course lays conceptual foundations and encourages students interested in asking disciplinary questions about their world. Building upon this foundation, a 200-level class could extend that questioning and begin to develop more critical or incisive investigative tools. Courses at the 300 and 400 level would further hone and refine those skills or involve deeper interaction between students and community members.

As mentioned, we value a critical approach to civic engagement. We also recognize, however, that critical civic engagement does not happen immediately. It is not something to be rushed into. Reflection and scaffolding help students develop a more comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms and structures at play around the issues they care about. Considering civic engagement as part of a larger process, approached over multiple courses, helped faculty accept critical civic engagement as a realistic target.

At the time of this writing, three out of four philosophy faculty have participated in the CEAC seminar. That program is the closest to realizing such a holistic, scaffolded approach to promoting civic engagement within a particular discipline. The ultimate hope is that all programs at Salisbury University can provide their students that same opportunity. Focusing on the process of student growth, what Hollander and Burack *(2008)* referred to as personal transformation, prioritizes a fundamentally different process than the outcome-driven strategy several of our faculty held initially. We believe this personal transformation is the key to unleashing critical civics across the university.

4. Moving beyond concerns and into practice: Roadblocks are easy to identify

I feel daunted to think about this in my discipline because people come to art with expectations.

Providing space for faculty to share their thinking openly was important, as is evident from the sections above, but the opportunity for honesty also meant faculty were able to air their concerns about incorporating civic engagement into their courses. Though pointing out deficiencies is not a skill reserved for academics, we may be particularly adept at describing, defining, and arguing over complications and other reasons something may not work. The CEAC seminar was no different and in many ways, it opened new opportunities for faculty to voice concerns such as what is and is not appropriate coursework in any class, as the quote for this section illustrates.

We were initially stunned by many of these concerns. Two related concerns were particularly surprising: that our version of civic engagement was presenting a negatively Westernizing mode of thought and that faculty should not ask leading questions of their students. In our private weekly planning meetings, we agreed that any education is colonization of the mind—that is unavoidable. University faculty make moral judgments: Simply designing a course syllabus involves numerous judgments about what is valuable, right, or necessary. We also held firm in our belief that leading questions are necessary if faculty are to promote critical thinking and, ultimately, critical civic engagement.

Other concerns were more predictable, such as concerns that students lacked critical thinking skills but would also notice even slight faculty biases in assigned work. But though we knew to expect many of these concerns, we were still surprised by the amount of time devoted to such discussions. Several of our sessions felt more like opportunities for faculty to vent about their students or pick narrow semantic fights within their particular specializations, rather than the structured discussions we wanted.

Eventually, we decided to make these concerns categorically explicit. We developed a list of concerns voiced with each meeting of the seminar and presented these to the faculty in the form of a PowerPoint slide. We openly acknowledged the roadblocks. We then reviewed some of the big ones dominating our conversations and invited faculty to add any others to the list. The ultimate list was comprehensive and could be taken to cover nearly every aspect of our planned enhancements:

- Time constraints (e.g., single semester)
- Skill sets of students (e.g., critical thinking)
- Colonization of the mind (e.g., Westernized modes of thought)

- Faculty requirements (e.g., time, oversight)
- Types of citizenship (e.g., law-abiding, critical)
- Moral judgments (e.g., "leading" questions)
- Legal barriers (e.g., IRB, citizenship)
- Student interactions (e.g., offending community members)

With the list before us, the group discussed which of the concerns were specifically relevant to civic engagement. Faculty quickly acknowledged that many were concerns about education more generally. Faculty always face time constraints and feel limited by student skills, so we could accept that those were generalized issues applicable to teaching any content at any level. We agreed to move beyond those concerns in the context of our CEAC discussions. CEAC was not designed to help faculty become better overall instructors, but to help faculty design and incorporate civic engagement enhancements. CEAC is also not able to alleviate the increasing pressure of teaching, research, and service in the neoliberal university.

Faculty ultimately identified the final four concerns as most pressing and inextricable to meaningful civic engagement experiences. We dedicated two sessions to discussions of key citizenship constructs, such as the typology offered in Westheimer and Kahne *(2004)*. In much the same way as the necessity of progression through course levels was recognized, the group agreed that a more critical form of citizenship was ultimately desirable but not necessarily possible throughout an entire course. One participant summarized, "You can't be justice-oriented all the time about everything; it's just not practical." This relates to the concern over moral judgments. Though we believe faculty inherently make and impose moral judgments in their teaching, we do not believe we successfully assuaged all faculty concerns in this area. Interestingly, faculty in the first semester were leery of overtly leading students with assignment questions, whereas those in the second semester were genuinely excited by such provocative questions as "What aspect of your community needs a feminist intervention?"

The final two concerns (legal barriers and student interactions) were likewise connected. Legitimate concerns about Institutional Review Board (IRB) and other administrative oversights required careful attention within the structure of such seminars. We included a question and answer session with the chair of the IRB committee so faculty can discuss their planned community

interactions and possible IRB requirements. These discussions invariably raised concerns for how students would handle such community interactions. Some of those concerns were revisions of earlier concerns regarding student skill sets (e.g., conducting accurate observations), but others were more specifically related to civic engagement.

In the most interesting example from the first two seminars, a history colleague worried about her students' treatment of Native Americans in the region. The planned civic engagement enhancement involved students' "developing a plan to help promote a better understanding and appreciation of a tribal nation's history in our class and campus community." There was legitimate concern about how students would treat and present the experiences of such a historically marginalized group. We dedicated several discussions to that concern, ultimately agreeing that careful planning and ongoing feedback remained the best course of action.

5. Challenges of concepts of citizenship and the role for faculty in addressing values in the classroom

Colleague 1: Do we need to reformat the definition of civic and civil? Does globalization and the state lead to new identifications of citizenship? As we move forward, what does this mean for how we are preparing students for the future?

Colleague 2: This is why we need to inform ourselves of the literature in our discipline so we know how to grapple with this information in the classroom. It is a personal decision of what content we present in the classroom and how we present it. This is not the forum for a broad discussion of the definition of citizenship.

We found faculty participants to have surprisingly diverse definitions of and concerns regarding knowledge, knowledge formation, and citizenship, as the above dialogue between two seminar participants indicates. For one faculty member, this was grounded in a concern about the presentation of Western modes of thought as dominant. She was concerned about the validation of knowledge and experience as leading to a normalized acceptance of a Western mode of thought, "othering" other forms of thought. This concern was rooted in the very terminology often taken for granted, the use of the term "civic" and its connection to citizenship, a decidedly Western construct. The faculty member touched on a point

missing from civic engagement discussions: asking whether we should engage in the political within a Western construct or think more broadly regarding multiple concepts of the role of oneself within one's various forms of community.

The point of context eventually led to a discussion of the role of guiding discussion within the classroom: "There are a variety of ways of knowing and judging the validity of knowledge. How do we bridge the gap between these?" the same faculty member asked. Faculty participants in the seminar provided various responses as to how they present "truth" within the classroom and encourage students to question and critique the material. The diversity of disciplines crafted an intelligent and thoughtful conversation regarding knowledge and truth production, as well as the positionality of professors in teaching. One faculty member was initially bothered by an article discussing moral judgments and value commitments in the classroom. She responded that she did not want this type of discussion in the classroom as it "may open the door to a variety of responses. Students need to be informed before you ask them what they think." The discussion concluded with another participant pointing out the importance of showing students that we all struggle with knowledge and that engagement means questioning our own positionality.

Although concepts of citizenship and the presentation of knowledge were a reccurring concern in the first seminar, the participants of the second seminar did not find this point interesting or problematic. They were more concerned with how to channel students into engaging with the underlying themes and values of the course. One faculty member expressed it this way: "I have a clear vision but I want them to be free. But I want them to do what I want." Faculty then turned to questioning the acceptability of actions students may undertake. One participant commented, "I don't want them to be uncritical but I realize there might be backlash," to which another responded, "I think it is good that our students want to engage in civil disobedience." The appropriateness of student action and the nature of faculty liability was of great concern to the second-seminar participants.

Both sets of conversations illustrate the attention garnered by issues of critical civic engagement. A truly critical civic praxis might enable students to go where they will, identifying social ills and inequalities based on their own experiences and understandings. CEAC faculty took seriously their professional role as intellectual shepherds, wishing to help guide their students through the development and deployment of critical civics.

Overview of Lessons Learned

As with most courses, the CEAC seminar tried to structure conversations around particular topics. And as with most courses, the actual conversations spilled over the planned topics. We believe the fluid movement of conversations across the key lessons described above highlights additional benefits to this type of professional development opportunity.

Faculty were eager to participate in heady considerations of the purpose of social contracts and just as eager to discuss the challenges posed by irregular student attendance. Their ability to simultaneously attend to such disparate concerns is suggestive of the type of critical civic engagement we ultimately wish to promote in the student body.

Critical civic engagement involves acknowledging multiple, potentially contradictory, beliefs. For example, the knowledge that systemic social inequalities are maintained through focused effort of certain parties can coexist with a young person's unwavering belief that *they* can be an effective change agent. In a similar way, participating faculty were able to describe the value that civic engagement experiences would bring to their coursework, their concerns for student success, and their belief that the work could become feasible.

This belief in the inherent need to try in the face of extreme challenges embodies the approach to critical civic engagement that we wish to promote through programs like CEAC. The institutional roots of PACE require this difficult work from all university members. We believe the early lessons explored above suggest the potential of CEAC and similar programs to assist universities as they move toward such goals.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Efforts

Incorporating successful and active civic engagement activities within the classroom requires faculty who are prepared to undertake such a task. CEAC is a new attempt to leverage institutional commitments, incentivize faculty participation, and provide tools to enable thoughtful and academically rigorous engagement situated in a particular context. Monetary incentives were useful, particularly during recruitment, but faculty were most responsive to the time and space that CEAC afforded for course planning. Early results suggest that faculty utilized those opportunities to convene with their colleagues in a dedicated and structured space,

particularly when that space promoted disciplinary and career diversity.

At the time of this writing, five faculty members have delivered revised courses, and four more were slated to do so during the Spring 2015 semester. These civic engagement activities have taken a variety of forms including written reports, formal presentations, and a fascinating three-part debate about animal ethics. We are documenting and analyzing these efforts as part of our ongoing effort to hone the CEAC seminar.

The current focus of our ongoing research project is faculty members' delivery of their designed or redesigned civic engagement assignment. Specifically, we ask: To what extent does participation in a faculty development seminar change faculty's approach to civic engagement? We are currently analyzing data from our first cohort of faculty, who delivered their courses in Fall 2014. This data includes classroom observations, student surveys, and student interviews. In this ongoing project, our overall goal is to use this data to provide the most effective faculty development seminar possible.

These initial results provide a starting point for our continued analysis as well as an overview of a singular effort that we hope will advance discourses of early-state faculty development efforts. We are not suggesting methodological strategies or widely generalizable descriptions of faculty development initiatives; many unknowns remain. We hope that future research will yield greater understanding regarding the role that faculty professional development plays in promoting civic engagement experiences in postsecondary education.

References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5-17.

Berger, B., & Liss, J. R. (2009). *The Periclean diamond: Linking college classrooms, campuses, communities, and colleagues via social and civic high engagement learning* [White paper]. New York, NY: Project Pericles.

Bess, J. L. (1998). Teaching well: Do you have to be schizophrenic? *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1353/rhe.1998.0019

Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(2), 5-18.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*(1), 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2004). Advancing civic engagement through public service learning. In M. Langseth & M. W. Platter (Eds.), *Public work and the academy* (pp. 125-145). Boston, MA: Anker.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., Jones, S., & Plater, W. M. (2006). Sustaining civic engagement: Faculty development, roles, and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities, 17*(1), 62-74.

Dalton, R. J. (2008). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Westport, CT: Rowman & Littlefield.

Finley, A. (2011). Civic learning and democratic engagements: A review of the literature on civic engagement in post-secondary education. *Unpublished paper. Accessed March, 12, 2012.*

Ginwright, S., & Cammarota, J. (2007). Youth activism in the urban community: Learning critical civic praxis within community organizations. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(6), 693-710.

Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Hess, D. E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 4*(1), 37-43.

Hollander, E., & Burack, C. (2008). *How young people develop long-lasting habits of civic engagement: A conversation on building a research agenda.* Spencer Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/spencerconversationresearchagenda1.pdf

Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2009). High quality civic education: What is it and who gets it? In W. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research & practice* (pp. 141-150). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lautzenheiser, D. K., Kelly, A. P., & Miller, C. (2011). *Contested curriculum: How teachers and citizens view civics education* (Policy Brief 1). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Levine, P. (2014). A defense of higher education and its civic mission. *The Journal of General Education, 63*(1), 47-56.

Liss, J. R., & Liazos, A. (2009). Incorporating education for civic and social responsibility into the undergraduate curriculum. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42*(1), 45-50.

Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(4), 454-475. doi:10.2307/2649148

O'Meara, K. (2009). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177-198). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ostrander, S. (2004). Democracy, civic participation, and the university: A comparative study of civic engagement on five campuses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*(1), 74-93.

Salisbury University. (2014). Salisbury University Mission Statement 2014. Retrieved from http://www.salisbury.edu/about/mission.html?r=yes

Trudeau, K., & Kruse, T. P. (2014). Creating significant learning experiences through civic engagement: Practical strategies for community engaged pedagogy. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education, 4,* 12-30.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269. doi:10.3102/00028312041002237

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

About the Authors

Sarah Surak is assistant professor of political science and environmental studies at Salisbury University. Her research interests include civic engagement, environmental political theory, public policy, public administration, and modern social theory. She received her Ph.D. from Virginia Tech.

Alexander Pope is assistant professor of education specialties at Salisbury University. His research interests include civic engagement pedagogies and the ways that teachers and students come to know their communities. He received his Ph.D. from Columbia University.