

**An Evaluation of Center for Civic Education-Sponsored
Professional Development
for College and University Faculty**

Elizabeth Yeager Washington (University of Florida)

Thomas Vontz (Kansas State University)

Terry Mason (Indiana University)

This report summarizes the key elements and findings of an evaluation of the Center for Civic Education's professional development activities for college and university faculty from May 2001 to June 2007. The evaluation consisted of two phases. In Phase I researchers surveyed college and university faculty who had attended one or more professional development events hosted by the Center for Civic Education. In Phase II researchers conducted telephone interviews with a sample of seventeen participants who had completed the online survey and agreed to a telephone interview. Participants in the telephone interview responded to fourteen open-ended questions and were given the opportunity to offer any additional comments.

Evaluated Events

R. Freeman Butts Institutes

- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2001)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2002)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2003)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2004)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2005)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2006)
- R. Freeman Butts National Institute (Indiana, May 2007)

Social Studies Methods Workshops

Methods Workshop (California, February 2003)

Methods Workshop (California, February 2004)

Methods Workshop (California, March 2007)

Critical Constitutional Issues Institutes

Methods Institute (Florida, June 2004)

Methods Institute (Florida, June 2005)

Methods Institute (Florida, June 2006)

Methods Institute (Florida, June 2007)

Civic Content Seminars

Civil Rights Seminar (Alabama, March 2006)

James Madison Seminar (Virginia, October 2006)

History of Center for Civic Education-Sponsored Institutes, Workshops, and Seminars

R. Freeman Butts Institutes

Since 2001, Indianapolis in May has been the site for thoughtful and lively discourse about the how teacher educators prepare active citizens in a rapidly changing world. What is now known as the R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education originated from discussions among a group of civic educators convened by the Center for Civic Education to seek ways to incorporate civic education into preservice teacher education programs. From those discussions, seven national institutes have been held each spring on the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) campus that have addressed a variety of topics and themes aimed at enhancing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs of preservice teachers regarding their role in fostering democratic values in their teaching practice. The central theme of these national institutes was expressed as

education for democratic citizenship in the university-based education of prospective social studies teachers. We assume that improving education for democracy in programs of teacher education is key to improving teaching and learning of democracy in

elementary and secondary schools. If prospective teachers of the social studies would be effective educators for democracy, then they must know what it is, how to do it, and why it is good. (Patrick and Leming 2001, p. v)

The following brief summary of the institutes held to date is intended to capture the breadth and scope of the ideas generated by the more than two hundred scholars who have participated in them, as well as the high level of academic rigor and lively discourse that they have produced.

In 2001 the inaugural institute gathered together teacher education faculty members from around the United States to share ideas about the civic content and methods in the teacher education curriculum. The program included a keynote address by R. Freeman Butts on how citizenship education has shaped the field of education in the United States. There followed several presentations: on efforts to develop an international framework for content standards in civics (Margaret Branson); the key dimensions of democracy education for social studies methods courses (John Patrick and Thomas Vontz); examples of exemplary elementary (Mary E. Hass) and secondary (Diana Hess) social studies methods courses; the promotion of discussion in social studies methods courses (Walter Parker); the link between civics and history education (Lynn Nelson and Frederick Drake); the use of the We the People program in teacher education (Nancy Haas); civic learning through community service (Lynne Boyle-Baise); and current civic education efforts in teacher education in Australia (Murray Print) and Russia (Stephen Schechter and Charles White). A panel of reactors offered critique and analysis after each presentation. Over the course of the institute, working groups met to discuss how to address the need for civic learning in the teacher education curriculum and made recommendations for how to improve teacher education practice.

The second institute, held in 2002, continued to explore issues of content and methods used to teach civics in elementary and secondary schools. Patrick Shoulders's keynote address on why international partnerships in civic education are important set the tone for the international theme that would become a hallmark of the institute for the next four years (2002 through 2006). In addition, participants attended lecture/discussions on a wide range of topics, including the Civitas International Exchange Program (Beth Farnbach); the IEA Civic Education Study (Judith Torney-Purta); using civic education research to improve social studies methods courses (Patricia Avery); a common education for citizenship in a democracy (John Patrick); the

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) economics and civics study (Margaret Branson); the deliberative approach to education for democracy (Walter Parker); and methods of teaching about democracy in post-communist Europe (Gregory Hamot). The international focus of the institute was further reinforced in presentations of examples of civic learning in teacher education from Hungary, Indonesia, Russia, and the Ukraine. A panel of social studies teachers also offered their perspectives on the challenges of preparing highly competent civics teachers for schools in the United States. Finally, as in the first institute, focus groups met to discuss current issues in preparing civics teachers in the United States and in the seven other countries represented among the attendees.

In 2003 the institute was formally designated as the R. Freeman Butts Institute in honor of his contribution to the advancement of civic learning in schools. To launch the institute, Kermit Hall provided a keynote address that both amused and challenged the participants by focusing on the enduring importance of civic learning in the schools with colorful illustrations of his own experiences as an educator and university administrator. In presentations made by John Patrick, Christine Compston, Mary Lee Webeck, Sherry Field, and Patricia Avery, the institute program emphasized the obstacles educators face in the twenty-first century in crafting civic education programs to meet the needs of students in a changing society while adhering to the principles on which both old and new democracies have been founded. In other sessions, Elizabeth Yeager reported findings from a study of preservice teachers' understandings of democracy; Margaret Branson discussed a newly developed international framework for education in democracy; and Robert Leming and Thomas Vontz presented a set of criteria and principles for selecting exemplary civic education teaching materials. Participants also heard about how to use a variety of civics teaching methods, including "docudrama" (Deborah Byrnes), problem-based history teaching (Thomas Brush and John Saye), and instructional technology (Joseph Braun). Civic education programs in Lithuania (Giedre Kvieskiene and Terrence Mason), Latvia (Aija Tuna), and Estonia (Sulev Valdmaa) were presented; an international panel with representatives from Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Montenegro, and Venezuela, and offered commentary on civic education efforts in those countries; and a panel of elementary and secondary teachers provided views from the classroom on how civics should be taught.

In May 2004 the fourth annual institute was held and featured a keynote address by Eugenia Kemble of the Albert Shanker Institute of the American Federation of Teachers. Over the course

of the three-day event, sessions were devoted to content areas related to civic education, such as history (Frederick Drake and Sarah Drake Brown), economics (Phillip Van Fossen), comparative civics (Stephen Schechter), and science and technology (Mary Beth Henning). Methods of civics teaching also were presented in sessions that addressed effective professional development (Robert Leming and Thomas Vontz) and teacher preparation courses (Robert Gutierrez, Janet Alleman, Terrence Mason, Charles White, Gregory Hamot, and Elizabeth Yeager). This institute's international focus was provided in sessions on civic education in the Balkans and the Baltics (Terrence Mason and Nancy Haas) and two panels of international civic educators from Albania, Guatemala, Malaysia, Northern Ireland, Panama, Senegal, and South Africa.

In 2005 the fifth institute continued to focus on the myriad dimensions of civic learning and the ways that it can be incorporated into preservice teacher education. Sessions led by Rob Kunzman and Peter Hlebowitsh addressed the curricular implications of particular philosophical orientations, while the connection between historical thinking and citizenship was explored in presentations by Frederick Drake and Keith Barton. Two exemplary civics programs, the Civics Mosaic Project (Stephen Schechter) and the Civic Mission of Schools Project (Adam Gerston) were presented, along with findings from a study of Cuban-American students' views on citizenship and identity (Elizabeth Yeager and Sevan Terzian) and an examination of the role of educational foundations in the preparation of civics teachers (Robert Green). International civic education was represented on the program by Nancy Haas's presentation on how teacher certification in civics has been developed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and panel sessions that included educators from Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Russia, South Africa, and Malaysia. On the final day of the institute participants heard a report on the Center for Civic Education-sponsored Birmingham workshop on teaching civics and civil rights (Sheri Frouzesh-Bennett, Robert Leming, and Suzanne Soule), which featured a videotape of Mr. Leming delivering a civics lesson in a Birmingham church.

In 2006 the institute again included a broad range of topics related to preparing teachers for their role as civic educators. A keynote speech by Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction Sue Ellen Reed set the stage for three days of engaging and thought-provoking sessions. The first morning of the institute began with John Kaminski's unique and informative reflections on the effect of the period of the American Revolution on the establishment of the principles of democracy that have shaped U.S. history since that time. The recurrent theme of history and

civics was extended to the field of geography (Stephen Thornton), and Gregory Hamot and Thomas Misco shared insights about the role of deliberation as a form of democratic pedagogy in emerging democracies. Matt Gutwein offered an intriguing account of the *Gideon* Supreme Court case to demonstrate how powerful personal narratives can be used to bring history and civics alive for students. Sessions on multicultural education (Tyrone Howard, Patricia Halagao, Kipchoge Kirkland, and Jonathan Miller-Lane), urban schools (Paulette Dilworth), and democracy and diversity (Anand Marri and Jennifer Cutsforth) extended the discussion of civic competence to historically marginalized student populations and examined the role of teacher education in promoting civic engagement to all students. Karen LeCompte reported on how she works with her preservice teachers to gain an understanding of the meaning of democratic citizenship. The final full day of the institute was devoted to the connection between economics and civics in presentations by Stephen Miller, Phillip Van Fossen, David Foutz, and Mark Schug.

The most recent institute, held in 2007, also sought to combine examples of powerful civics content with active teaching methods. In so doing, numerous debates and issues within the field of civic education were addressed as participants engaged in vigorous discussions of the current status of the field of civic education and speculated about what the future holds for educating teachers about democracy. Peter Levine initiated this discussion with a report on the accomplishments of the Civic Mission of Schools Project, for which he serves as director. The first full day of the institute was devoted to presentations covering three fundamental philosophical concepts that represent foundational principles for democracy: classical republicanism (Richard Dagger), classical liberalism (Sue Leeson), and constitutionalism (John Patrick). Diana Hess reported preliminary findings of a large-scale study of how controversial issues are being taught through deliberative methods in high school classrooms, and Linda Levstik presented work that she has done on how students can develop a “usable past” that informs decision-making and civic engagement. Turning to an exploration of how learning about legal systems can inform civic education, William Gaudelli offered perspectives on the global dimensions of legal discourse and the concept of “transjudicialism.” Matt Gutwein led participants through an examination of the process of judicial review, providing a compelling rationale for this critical aspect of our political and legal system. Robert Leming and Matt Gutwein also led participants in a simulation of an actual Supreme Court case to demonstrate how such methods can be used to engage students’ intellect and imagination as they learn about our legal system. Finally, Joseph Kahne reported findings of two studies that examined school

practices that are particularly effective in developing students' political commitments and capacities.

From this summary we can see that the R. Freeman Butts Institute has provided a setting for scholars from the United States and around the globe to engage in sustained dialogue about the critical issues in citizenship education that are so vital in these times. As the effects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reduce the allocation of time and space for civic learning in the curriculum, the ideas that have been generated through these institutes can serve as a beacon for educators who care about the preparation of citizens for democracy. These concepts and ideas were subsequently published in three volumes devoted to the proceedings (Patrick and Leming 2001; Patrick, Leming, and Hamot 2003; Hamot, Patrick, and Leming 2004), as well as a special issue of the *International Journal of Social Education* (Indiana Council for the Social Studies 2002) and other publications and conference presentations, reaching a wide audience of educators. Thanks are due to the Center for Civic Education for funding the institute and to all who have been instrumental in planning and carrying out these valuable events that have enriched the field of civic education and infused teacher education programs with content and methods to promote active civic learning. While springtime in Indianapolis may continue to be more associated with IndyCar racer Danica Patrick than scholar John Patrick, all those affiliated with these institutes can take pride in the fact that their efforts have contributed significantly to advancing the cause of democratic citizenship education in schools here and abroad.

Social Studies Methods Workshops

Many participants in the inaugural R. Freeman Butts Institute expressed interest in organizing and attending workshops that centered on civic education methods and materials. In particular, participants called for a focused, intensive workshop on how to incorporate programs such as We the People and Project Citizen into their social studies methods classes. Robert Leming, director of the We the People program, responded to this need by organizing and conducting three “methods professor workshops” for fifteen to twenty college and university faculty members. Workshops were conducted in California in 2003, 2004, and 2007. Each of the workshops followed a similar format. Each focused on a simulated hearing question—the culminating activity for both We the People and Project Citizen. For example, the following hearing question was used at the first methods workshop:

Justice Louis Brandeis, in his dissent in *Olmstead v. United States* (1928), argued for a right to privacy. “The makers of our Constitution...sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”

Do you agree or disagree with Justice Brandeis? Where in the Constitution do you find support for your position?

Is the “Exclusionary Rule” a good method of enforcing the Fourth Amendment? Can you identify other methods of enforcement that may be effective?

Experienced methods professors, such as Elizabeth Yeager, Terry Mason, and Tom Vontz, provided participants with various models of incorporating We the People or Project Citizen into social studies methods classes. The education professors explained their rationale for incorporating Center materials into their methods classes, explored various models of incorporation, taught example lessons, and conducted a question-and-answer session. Content experts, such as Susan Leeson, a retired Oregon Supreme Court justice, provided an in-depth analysis of key constitutional issues associated with the hearing question. Each workshop concluded with a simulated congressional hearing in which the participants testified as expert witnesses about the constitutional issues that were a part of the question. Participants were given the opportunity to receive We the People and Project Citizen materials to use in their methods classes.

Critical Constitutional Issues Institutes

In addition to the need for increased focus on incorporating civics-specific materials into social studies methods classes, participants at the R. Freeman Butts Institutes also requested additional institutes on the content of civic education. To respond to this need, Robert Leming and Elizabeth Yeager organized and conducted Critical Constitutional Issues Institutes. A series of four institutes have taken place each June since 2004 at the University of Florida in Gainesville. Twenty to twenty-five professors and four or five guest scholars participated each year.

The goal of a Critical Constitutional Issues Institute is to provide social studies methods professors with an opportunity to learn both content and methods related to constitutional issues so that they can better incorporate these issues into the civic education portion of their secondary social studies methods classes. Additionally, they learn about using material from the *We the People* program in their methods classes and receive classroom sets of *We the People* textbooks.

At the first institute in 2004, Kermit Hall, Sue Leeson, and Matt Gutwein addressed a variety of constitutional topics. Participants explored both historical and contemporary examples of constitutional dilemmas and principles. Kermit Hall spoke about his role on the commission that was tasked to select documents from the assassination of John F. Kennedy for release to the public; Sue Leeson discussed the foundations of the Constitution and the tension that still exists in our political system when we try to define “self-interest,” “the common good,” and “civic virtue”; and Matt Gutwein spoke on the Fourteenth Amendment and the incorporation of the Bill of Rights in the states.

In 2005 the focus was on the role of the media in a democratic society and on what kind of media are needed by its citizens. Scholars addressed a variety of topics related to the freedom of expression and freedom of the press clauses in the First Amendment. They included Robert Jensen, a professor of media law and journalism; Robert Peck, a constitutional rights attorney who has argued First Amendment cases before the Supreme Court; and Lucy Dalglish, director of the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press and a practicing journalist. Participants explored both historical and contemporary examples of First Amendment dilemmas and principles, for example, relevant Supreme Court cases, the role of the Federal Communications Commission, media consolidation, the Fairness Doctrine, and historical and current challenges to these freedoms, including those occurring in wartime.

In 2006 the institute topic was civil liberties. The scholars included former U.S. Attorney and Congressman Bob Barr, constitutional law attorney Robert Peck, Emily Sheketoff of the American Library Association, and Charlie Savage, a journalist and legal affairs correspondent who has reported on the national level about presidential signing statements. Participants discussed topics such as privacy issues and illegal government surveillance.

For 2007 the focus was on the use of presidential power in the United States. Speakers included

historian John Kaminski, former Congressman Bob Barr, author Glenn Greenwald of Salon.com, and constitutional rights attorney Robert Peck. Scholars addressed a variety of topics related to Articles I, II, and III of the U.S. Constitution and relevant amendments. Participants explored historical and contemporary examples of presidential power dilemmas and principles, including Supreme Court cases, federal laws, and issues currently being debated in Congress.

The 2008 topic was the state of national security in the post-9/11 era. Scholars focused on the role of the National Security Agency (NSA), Congress, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), and the courts in national security issues; civil liberties (especially the Fourth Amendment); and the role of the media in covering national security issues. They included James Bamford, journalist and author of books on the NSA; John Loftus, author and former federal prosecutor; author and constitutional scholar Glenn Greenwald of Salon.com; and Vikram Amar, law professor and former Supreme Court clerk.

Civic Content Seminars

In response to the demand for content-related professional development among college and university faculty, the Center for Civic Education also organized and conducted two Civic Content Seminars. The first, a civil rights seminar held at the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute in 2006, focused on the issues, ideas, and individuals at the heart of the civil rights movement in the United States. The goal of this seminar was to deepen and refine participants' understanding of the civil rights movement. Civil rights leaders, such as the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, Dorothy Cotton, and Janice Kelsey, provided participants with firsthand accounts of the civil rights movement in Birmingham. Participants also were offered the opportunity to visit historic places, such as the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church and Kelly Ingram Park, which served as a staging ground for civil rights marches in Birmingham.

The second Civic Content Seminar, a James Madison Seminar conducted in 2006 at James Madison's Montpelier, focused on the ideas and contributions of Madison. Although Madison is a familiar figure to social studies professionals, this seminar allowed opportunities for in-depth exploration of the man and his ideas. Participants explored various aspects of Madison with renowned constitutional scholars, such as John Kaminski (University of Wisconsin) and Will Harris (Center for the Constitution). In particular, this seminar focused on the ways in which

Madison helped to define American citizenship and what it means to be a good citizen. Participants explored how Madison's ideas about government were shaped and refined throughout his life. Staying on the grounds of James Madison's Montpelier provided participants the opportunity to explore the Madison house and property. Montpelier archeologist Mark Trickett presented new discoveries that have surfaced during the restoration of Madison's house.

Phase I: Survey of Participants

The purpose of Phase I was to survey past participants in Center for Civic Education–sponsored professional development events to evaluate the extent to which participation influenced their attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. Specifically the survey was designed to examine the extent to which participation influenced their 1) ideas about civic education, 2) teaching practices, 3) research agenda, and 4) service activities. Additionally, Phase I was designed to explore the perceived strengths and weaknesses of past events and to elicit suggestions for future events.

The 2008 College and University Faculty Development Survey was developed by the researchers in consultation with the Center. A draft of the survey was sent to eight past participants of Center-sponsored professional development events who provided comments, suggestions, and raised questions about both the style and the substance of the survey. Based on these comments, the survey was modified. The Kansas State University Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation administered the anonymous online survey. The survey was offered from March 10, 2008, through March 28, 2008.

Phase I Participants

A total of seventy-six respondents (of 121 invited) completed the survey for a response rate of sixty-two percent. All college and university faculty members (and graduate students who were studying to become college or university faculty) who attended one or more of the evaluated Center-sponsored professional development events were invited by email to participate in the online survey. (A few former participants were not affiliated with colleges or universities and were not invited to participate.) All the respondents had participated in one R. Freeman Butts Institute and a majority had participated in at least one additional Center-sponsored professional development activity. As the data in Tables 1 and 2 indicate, the survey yielded a broad cross

section of faculty at various academic ranks. However, a large percentage of Phase I participants (81.6 percent) were affiliated with doctoral-granting universities.

Table 1. University Type.

Q1: Please select the words that best describe the college/university with which you are currently affiliated. (Please select all applicable response options.)		
Response	Frequency	Percentage
Doctoral Granting	62	81.6
Masters College/University	16	21.0
Baccalaureate College	8	10.5
Private	4	5.3
Public	16	21.0
Other ¹	3	3.9

¹ Finished master's degree, College of Education, Museum

Table 2. Academic Rank.

Q4: Please select your current academic rank.		
Response	Frequency	Percentage
Professor	19	25.0
Associate Professor	20	26.3
Assistant Professor	23	30.3
Adjunct Faculty	5	6.6
Clinical Instructor	0	0.0
Graduate Student	5	6.6
Other	3	3.8

Phase II: In-depth interviews

The purpose of Phase II was to follow the online survey with in-depth phone interviews of a cross section of participants. Phase I participants who indicated a willingness to participate in Phase II were rated according to their level of participation in Center-related activities.

Researchers attempted to select a cross section of experience and familiarity with Center-related professional development, programs, and materials. Elizabeth Yeager conducted telephone interviews with seventeen participants who responded to fourteen open-ended questions and were given the opportunity to offer additional comments. Each interview lasted twenty to thirty minutes.

Only two private institutions were represented on the list of possible volunteers: one was a professor from a large private liberal arts university and the other was a private Christian college professor. Both were called. The former was interviewed; an attempt to schedule an interview with the latter was unsuccessful. One survey respondent who is not in higher education (public school teacher) was disqualified. Contact was also attempted with another male participant—a “high implementer” from a large public university—but this was unsuccessful. Member checks of all interview data were conducted with each participant. All but one responded with either no changes or minor (for example, typographical) changes. Agreement was inferred from the one participant who did not respond.

Phase II Participants

Seventeen respondents participated in Phase II (see the appendix). Eight participants were male; nine were female. Sixteen participants were college or university professors; one was a doctoral student. All but one worked at public colleges or universities. University size ranged from approximately four thousand students to approximately sixty thousand students. Twelve respondents either explicitly mentioned working at doctoral-granting institutions or at research institutions, whereas the other five classified their institutions as liberal arts colleges or comprehensive institutions with sizeable teacher education programs. Respondents tended to teach more undergraduates than graduate students on average ($\bar{X}_2 \approx 62$ versus $\bar{X}_3 \approx 37$), while most respondents taught some of both. Two reported teaching only graduate students.

Of the seventeen participants, two were full professors, five were associate professors, nine were assistant professors, and one was a doctoral student. In terms of coursework, all the respondents reported teaching social studies methods courses to preservice teachers. Nine respondents reported teaching both elementary and secondary methods courses, while the other eight reported teaching only one of the two levels (evenly split at four apiece between the elementary and secondary). All but two reported teaching other kinds of courses that spanned a wide variety of social studies or social education content as well as classes in curriculum, language arts or literacy, supervision, assessment, special education, and qualitative research.

Findings: Influence on Teaching

Phase I Data on Teaching

Respondents in Phase I taught a variety of graduate and undergraduate courses reaching a mean of seventy undergraduate and thirty-seven graduate students each year. As expected, the course most frequently taught by participants in Phase I was an elementary, a secondary, or a combined “social studies methods.” However, respondents also reported Center-sponsored professional development was highly influential in a variety of other courses, such as undergraduate courses in the foundations of education and graduate courses in curriculum and instruction.

As Table 3 indicates, the majority of respondents agreed that Center-sponsored professional development influenced their focus on education for democratic citizenship.

Table 3. General Influences on Teaching

Q40. Please respond to the following question using a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)	Scale Responses							Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My teaching focuses more on aspects of education for democratic citizenship than it did prior to my participation in one or more of the Center’s professional development events.	4 (5.3)	4 (5.3)	5 (6.6)	4 (5.3)	18 (23.7)	17 (22.4)	22 (28.9)	5.28 (1.75)

Note: SD = Standard deviation

Table 4 reports Phase I data across a variety of components in the teaching of civic education at the college and university level. Former participants were given the opportunity to rate the extent to which Center-sponsored professional development had influenced specific components of their teaching. Although the mean for each of the components was relatively high ($X > 4$ on a 1–7 scale), participants rated Center-sponsored professional development as most influential on “use of materials” and “use of examples.” Respondents rated “use of assessments” as the component that was influenced least by participation in Center-sponsored professional development.

Table 4. Influences on Specific Teaching Practices.

Q41. Please respond to the following question using a scale of 1 (Not At All Influential) to 7 (Extremely Influential) To what extent did participation in one or more of the Center’s professional development events influence aspects <i>of your teaching</i> practice such as:	Scale Responses							Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
41.1 Time spent on education for democratic citizenship	5 (6.6)	5 (6.6)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.3)	22 (28.9)	23 (30.3)	13 (17.1)	5.09 (1.70)
41.2 Use of examples on education for democratic citizenship	2 (2.6)	3 (3.9)	4 (5.3)	8 (10.5)	19 (25.0)	22 (28.9)	16 (21.1)	5.31 (1.50)
41.3 Use of materials on education for democratic citizenship	3 (3.9)	3 (3.9)	2 (2.6)	7 (9.2)	18 (23.7)	24 (31.6)	17 (22.4)	5.37 (1.54)
41.4 Use of instructional methods on education for democratic citizenship	6 (7.9)	4 (5.3)	5 (6.6)	9 (11.8)	22 (28.9)	13 (17.1)	15 (19.7)	4.87 (1.79)
41.5 Use of assessments on education for democratic citizenship	7 (9.2)	9 (11.8)	10 (13.2)	17 (22.4)	17 (22.4)	6 (7.9)	7 (9.2)	4.05 (1.74)
41.6 Use of research about P-12/K-12 education for democratic citizenship	4 (5.3)	2 (2.6)	9 (11.8)	8 (10.5)	19 (25.0)	19 (25.0)	13 (17.1)	4.99 (1.65)
41.7 Use of research about civic learning and civic engagement in university teaching education programs	5 (6.6)	2 (2.6)	7 (9.2)	12 (15.8)	19 (25.0)	13 (17.1)	16 (21.1)	4.93 (1.72)

Note: SD = Standard deviation

Respondents listed a variety of specific examples of how Center-sponsored professional development had influenced their teaching practices. The most commonly used teaching practices included the following:

- Incorporate a project, lesson, or strategy (32 respondents or 42 percent)
- Use of written materials, texts, or websites (25 respondents or 33 percent)
- Use of We the People materials (19 respondents or 25 percent)
- Demonstration lesson by their students (18 respondents or 24 percent)
- Use of democratic classroom practices (10 respondents or 13 percent)
- Use of Project Citizen materials (7 respondents or 9 percent)

Respondents also were asked to identify the ways in which Center-sponsored professional development influenced the teaching practices of their students. The most commonly identified ways included:

- Use of Center methods and materials, such as We the People and Project Citizen (41 respondents or 54 percent)
- Increased knowledge of education for democratic citizenship (7 respondents or 9 percent)

Phase II Data on Teaching

In Phase II respondents seemed to indicate that their teaching (as compared to research and service) was most influenced by Center-sponsored professional development events. All seventeen said that their teaching had been influenced in substantive ways, and most gave several examples.

The two predominant themes of this influence were as follows:

- Making use of books and materials (14 mentions)
- Using ideas to frame the content and issues addressed in their courses (16 mentions)

Examples of the influence of books and materials included:

- *The Supreme Court of the United States: A Student Companion* by John J. Patrick (Patrick 2006)
- Trial of sailors from Mini-Butts/historical drama
- Materials from Birmingham, including *Letter from Birmingham Jail*
- Materials and lesson ideas from University of Florida institute on civil liberties, executive power
- Materials from Montpelier on the *Federalist Papers*
- *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years 1954–63* by Taylor Branch (Branch 2006)
- *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools* by Joel Westheimer (Westheimer 2007)
- Frederick Douglass's Fourth of July speech
- Use of the Center's website for papers, publications, etc.
- Use of Parker's elementary social studies text because of conversation with him in Birmingham
- Frequent mentions of use of We the People or Project Citizen materials, including providing these to students in methods courses, having students use the materials in their lesson plans, doing hearings, and having We the People coordinators speak to class

Examples of the influence of ideas on course content or issues included:

- Having students do extended essays on civic education issues
- Spending more class time/class periods on civics
- Discussing the concept of citizenship comparatively
- Focusing more on core ideas and people of the founding era (and incorporating these into Teaching American History [TAH] grant activities)
- Going into more depth on the conceptual framework of how to do a We the People hearing
- Using research on student participation and engagement
- Incorporating the “story” element (for example, civil rights, Shuttlesworth and Cotton)

- Reconceptualizing graduate “issues” seminar to focus on privacy versus security, Patriot Act (based on University of Florida institute)
- Organizing discussion around different perspectives on the Constitution and Bill of Rights, based on Montpelier event
- Incorporating Patrick’s ideas on American civic values
- Relating constitutional concepts to current issues such as the war on terror, domestic surveillance, meaning of citizenship (Jose Padilla)
- Using Butts paper topics in designing syllabus and course topics
- Focusing on the civil rights movement within a civic education/constitutional framework

Highlighted comments about teaching included:

“I go into things in more depth, and from a conceptual viewpoint, not just how to do a hearing but the conceptual framework behind that. I have used some of the research the Center has done on student participation/engagement. The other big thing I use is the ‘story’ element—bringing civil rights into the personal sphere by telling stories, showing pictures of Shuttlesworth and Cotton, having students look at the people behind the history. I’m surprised by how much my college students don’t know about the people in these movements. I want them to understand at both intellectual and emotional levels. I probably wouldn’t do this to the extent I do now if it were not for the Center event and meeting the people for myself. Also, my students come back and say they have told stories about Dorothy Cotton to their kids, and the kids were spellbound. I hope it prompts my students to look at other social movements as well.”

“Yes. Two big examples. First, I would never have provided fifth-grade [*We the People*] texts to my students if I hadn’t gone to Mini-Butts. This event was brilliant. We now spend at least two hours on that text, doing lessons, role-plays, comparing it to traditional texts. Also, at the graduate level, when I came back from [the University of Florida (UF)], I reconceptualized my advanced doc seminar in [social studies] in terms of the content. I had been doing it as an issues-centered seminar anyway, but after UF, I used a lot of examples based on the content I gained at the UF seminar. For example, I put in issues such as privacy vs. security, Patriot Act. I would never have done this otherwise. I

really beefed up the content.”

“The biggest one is that after Birmingham I did things with my students on how to teach about the civil rights movement. I found other resources for teaching about civil rights. I used the *Letter From Birmingham Jail*. I recently heard from a former student now teaching third grade and doing social studies in a high poverty school. Yay!”

“The best example is from the Montpelier event—the discussion on Madison and the Federalist papers, how to organize a discussion in ways that students can deeply think about different perspectives on the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, separation of powers, etc. And from UF, I directly took to my graduate class the activity on the increase in executive power over time, and how presidents have interpreted their powers over time (the Emma Humphries activity)—I do this exactly the same as the way she presented it.”

“I’ve gone to a lot of conferences, but this one was really above and beyond anything I’ve been to before, because the materials I got were things I could really use with my students. One of the books we got was Westheimer’s *Politics of Pledging Allegiance*, which had a critical perspective on patriotism and talked about citizens who have challenged the status quo over the years. I used a lot in class, including a quote from Frederick Douglass’s 4th of July speech. I got my students thinking about how they could use this in class, especially in the context of the war on terror, domestic surveillance—just to think critically about what their government is doing at home and around the world... Also there were great models of research, and an emphasis on the importance of continuing to research civic ed given the challenges of NCLB, etc.”

Findings: Influence on Research

Phase I Data on Research

The data presented in Table 5 indicate that a majority of respondents agreed that Center for Civic Education–sponsored professional development influenced their research agenda.

Table 5. Influences on Research.

Q44. Please respond to the following question using a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)	Scale Responses							Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My research agenda focuses more on aspects of education for democratic citizenship than it did prior to my participation in one or more of the Center’s professional development events.	6 (7.9)	10 (13.2)	6 (7.9)	14 (18.4)	12 (15.8)	12 (15.8)	11 (14.5)	4.38 (1.89)

Note: SD = Standard deviation

Specifically, respondents reported ideas from Center-sponsored professional development activities had influenced the following research-related products:

- 164 conference papers/presentations
- 59 published journal articles
- 24 published book chapters
- 17 published books
- 47 grant proposals

Phase II Data on Research

Of the seventeen respondents in Phase II of the study, six reported a direct influence on their research. While no prominent themes or categories emerged, respondents mentioned research on the civic education preparation of elementary preservice teachers, effects of state standards on teachers’ practices, a database compilation in conjunction with a state bar association, conditions of democracy in elementary schools, immigration, and the impact of new technologies on

students' perceptions of citizenship. One also mentioned her work in the creation of a new center on campus that focuses on civic education and leadership to increase the profile of civic education in schools around the state.

Five respondents reported no influence on their research, saying that their research focus necessarily is elsewhere (e.g., history, content reading/literacy, teacher quality enhancement).

Six respondents mentioned a potential, limited, indirect, or tangential influence (for example: affects their work on a TAH grant; affects their thinking and how they look at others' research; facilitates collaborations they are planning for the future; contributes to their literature reviews; makes them more informed overall; serves as jumping off point for international research projects; helps their students ask deeper questions; provides new ways of gathering information).

Highlighted comments about research include:

“I find classroom applications from [the Center for Civic Education's] materials that are applicable to my TAH grant.”

“I am more attuned now to look at others' research on civic ed (e.g., in TRSE [*Theory and Research in Social Education*]).”

“I was really inspired by the Butts presentations to shape my research agenda more around civic ed. They were wise to invite young assistant profs to this. If you want to have a long term influence on people's research, that's the way to do it.”

“I can speak with more authority and with more background knowledge on civic ed.”

“I met someone at the UF institute that I developed a project with, and we did a CUFA [College and University Faculty Assembly] presentation and submitted an article to a teacher ed journal.”

“Technology wasn't really a focus of Butts, but I knew I wanted to explore this in terms

of controversial issues... I realized how technology is being use to impart a lot of core citizenship values and am doing a big research project on this now.”

“It’s more of an effect in terms of discussions I have that give me critical feedback.”

“The content and philosophy frame the questions I ask.”

Findings: Influence on Service

Phase I Data on Service

The data presented in Table 6 indicate that a majority of respondents agreed that Center-sponsored professional development influenced their service activities.

Table 6. Influences on Service.

Q50. Please respond to the following question using a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)	Scale Responses							Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My service activities focus more on aspects of education for democratic citizenship than they did prior to my participation in one ore more of the Center’s professional development events.	13 (17.1)	6 (7.9)	4 (7.9)	19 (18.4)	14 (18.4)	7 (9.2)	9 (11.8)	4.00 (1.93)

Note: SD = Standard deviation

Specifically, respondents reported ideas from Center-sponsored professional development activities have influenced the following service activities:

- Center-supported service activities such as involvement in K–12 programs, We the People, and Project Citizen (25 respondents or 33 percent)
- Involvement in university-level civic education programs or committees (12 respondents or 16 percent)
- Use of Center materials in professional development activities (8 respondents or 11 percent)
- Expanded the role and influence of the Center on campus (6 respondents or 8 percent)

Phase II Data on Service

Of the seventeen respondents in Phase II, twelve stated a definite influence, four said no influence, and one noted a limited influence.

The types of influences are categorized from the seventeen respondents as follows:

- Involvement in We the People or Project Citizen workshops or competitions (11)
- Participation in discussion or evaluation related to local and campus politics, state policy, and state social studies standards (5)
- Encouragement of student political activism or political awareness (1)

Highlighted comments about service activities include:

“My service is defined by Center events.... [T]hey are the most prominent aspect of my service to the community and to teachers.”

“I help sponsor a monthly community forum with civic leaders.”

“I helped write a policy brief for state legislators that led to the creation of a task force on strengthening civic ed in my state.”

“I work with the state bar to help them align their programs with the state civics standards.”

“Because of my involvement with [Center] events, I’m now being called upon for my knowledge in the area of civic ed.”

“I’m now the state social studies council president.”

“I’m on my university’s Constitution Day planning committee.... I’m now known as the only person on campus with expertise in civic ed, and this influences what I’m asked to do both on campus and in schools.”

“I do a lot of awareness sessions on [Project Citizen] and [We the People] at state conferences and district meetings.”

“I feel I should participate more in civic ed activities.... I have more of a responsibility to raise awareness of civic ed issues.”

“I use a lot of information from the UF institutes to get my students to read the news, register to vote, keep up with court decisions.... I do a lot more ‘get out the vote’ activities.... I’m trying to get people to pay more attention.”

Overall Satisfaction and Influence on Ideas

Phase I Data on Overall Satisfaction and Influence

The data presented in Table 7 indicate that a majority of respondents agreed that Center-sponsored professional development influenced their service activities. In fact, a majority of participants (52.6 percent) were “extremely satisfied” with Center-sponsored professional development compared to other professional development activities.

Table 7. Comparison with Other Professional Development.

Q52. Please respond to the following question using a scale of 1 (Extremely Dissatisfied) to 7 (Extremely Satisfied)	Scale Responses							Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Compared to other professional development activities of which you have been a part, how would you rate your experience in one or more of the Center’s professional development events?	0 -	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.9)	11 (14.5)	16 (21.1)	40 (52.6)	6.19 (1.14)

Note: SD = Standard deviation

Phase II Data on Overall Satisfaction and Influence

All seventeen respondents stated that Center-sponsored professional development events had influenced their thinking or ideas about civic education, with most responding “yes,” “absolutely,” or “definitely yes.” Only one reported that the Center’s professional development programs influenced the ideas and thinking about what civic education should look like only “somewhat”; this respondent expressed that she already had strong ideas about what civic education should look like and found that the Center broadened and strengthened her ideas.

The main types of influences can be categorized as follows:

Five specifically reported increases in their understanding of civics and government content knowledge (also referred to as “substance”).

Ten of the respondents mentioned philosophical, conceptual, or issues-oriented influences (some mentioning specific influences on their ideas about diversity, current events, or assessment).

Three mentioned shifts in their whole philosophy of incorporating civic education into their teaching and the fact that civic education had moved to the forefront of their teaching.

Nine mentioned or alluded to practical applications for their teaching (e.g., We the People and Project Citizen materials, scripted trials, other books and materials from the events, primary sources, court cases).

Highlighted comments about overall satisfaction and influence included:

“Keeps me in touch with the content, helps me take a step deeper into it.”

“These events are a godsend for small institutions like mine.”

“Gives me a chance to be a student again.”

“Gives me more substance to think about.”

“I’m now more comfortable with civics content and don’t short-change it anymore.”

“Very intellectually rigorous and thoughtful activities.”

“I’m able to see my students do some of the same things I teach in methods class.”

“Introduces me to more and better resources.”

“Big influence on my frame of mind/way of thinking.”

“Helps me with bigger ideas/issues, and with critical thinking.”

“We can debate constructively.”

“Helps me make more informed decisions.”

Perceived Strengths of Center for Civic Education–Sponsored Professional Development

Phase I Data on Perceived Strengths

Respondents identified a number of strengths of the Center-sponsored professional development. Some of the most frequently identified strengths included:

- Collaboration, discussion, or debate with colleagues (46 respondents or 61 percent)
- Quality of materials, resources, and content (38 respondents or 50 percent)
- Quality of presentations and presenters (29 respondents or 38 percent)
- Quality of Center staff or professional development providers (22 respondents or 29 percent)
- Environment—collegial yet academic, stimulating, engaging (22 respondents or 29 percent)
- Variety of ideas and perspectives (19 respondents or 25 percent)
- Networking (16 respondents or 21 percent)
- Enhancement of knowledge or increased understanding (13 respondents or 17 percent)
- Organization (10 participants or 13 percent)

Phase II Data on Perceived Strengths

In the follow-up telephone interviews respondents most frequently mentioned the content, the quality of the guest speakers, and the opportunities for networking as the greatest strengths of Center-sponsored professional development.

Other responses varied, including:

- Quality of participants from a variety of institutions
- Locations of “site-based” events
- Plenty of time to engage and talk in depth with a variety of people who have diverse

perspectives

- Focus on key ideas with both depth and scope
- High quality of accommodations (food, lodging)
- Opportunities to learn from so many other people
- Clear objectives that are always met; thoughtful and purposeful planning
- Always a lot of “take away”
- Balance between activities and conversations
- Professional air of respect and civility (valuing of everyone’s voice)

Highlighted comments about the perceived strengths included:

“The objectives are very clear and are always met. The events are all different but they all meet their objectives. They are thoughtfully and purposefully done so we can have a lot of take-away. The events provide opportunities to deepen professional relationships. They are not junkets; they are legitimate learning and growth experiences that deepen knowledge and professional relationships.”

“The Center provides great opportunities for us to be students again and to really immerse ourselves in the content. It’s an amazing gift. They take care of everything and make it easy and convenient.”

“The Center seems to want people there for learning, so the infrastructure is set up to make things as seamless as possible for people to show up and participate. This alleviates a lot of frustration and makes things more meaningful. Also, the opportunity to spend real time with others who are interested in the same things, in addition to spending time with scholars (learning plus social networking). There is a lot of new info to process, and we have the opportunity to reflect and follow up with more conversation.”

“We get so much background material to read to whet our appetites. I love coming home with books to read. It’s also tailored and sensitive to the group. I remember one of the Butts where we were talking about enslavement and the impact of it—and John Patrick recommended a couple of books on this topic, and when we got home, the books were sent to us. I had thought about buying them, but John took care of it for us. We are so

well taken care of both physically and intellectually.”

Suggestions to Improve Center for Civic Education–Sponsored Professional Development

Phase I Data on Suggestions to Improve Center for Civic Education–Sponsored Professional Development

When given the opportunity to suggest improvements to Center-sponsored professional development for college and university faculty, the most frequent response was a general positive comment (34 respondents or 45 percent) followed by no suggestions for improvement (21 respondents or 28 percent). Some of the more common suggestions for improvement included:

- More time and more events (6 respondents or 8 percent)
- More practical examples of translation of big ideas into the classroom (6 respondents or 8 percent)
- More breakout sessions and group time (5 respondents 7 percent)
- Involvement of new people (4 respondents or 5 percent)
- Increase focus on collaborative research projects (3 respondents or 4 percent)

Phase II Data on Suggestions to Improve Center for Civic Education–Sponsored Professional Development

In Phase II respondents who mentioned weaknesses pointed most often to insufficient pedagogical or practical applications (4), lack of ethnic and gender diversity in the presenters (4), and issues related to the Butts Institutes (7). Two mentioned no weaknesses. Three mentioned a weakness but said they could not think of much to critique.

Other responses included the following:

- Need more perspectives on some of the issues (at University of Florida institute specifically)
- Need stronger ongoing faculty network through web-based seminars, online

discussion, etc.

- Need more emphasis on pedagogical applications for the elementary level
- Butts too much “shotgun” approach with too many topics; would rather have an entire weekend with Diana Hess on controversial issues
- Butts had too much reading of papers, some boring speakers
- Lack of consistency among Butts Institutes (hit or miss in terms of topics/speakers)
- Butts too much like CUFA or AERA [American Educational Research Association]—not focused enough on one issue, too many topics, not enough interaction
- Did not get reading materials in advance for Butts
- Butts not as dynamic or engaging—formal structure less helpful than the networking
- Some of Butts speakers were not that good or engaging

Ten participants reiterated highly complimentary remarks about the Center’s professional development programs, emphasizing, for example, that they are more beneficial than CUFA, that they are helpful to someone new to the field, that they are unique in our field, that it is an “honor” to participate, and that the Center is very professional in all respects. Two also complimented the initiative and risk undertaken by the Center in expanding its professional development focus to the university level. Five specifically asked to be invited to future events. Other comments included:

- Use more technology for networking and online content resources
- Disseminate the survey results
- Serve as clearinghouse/repository of civic ed research; support collaborative research
- Do more “location” institutes
- Have more activities and resources that connect the Center with TAH grants
- Include more younger (newer) people in our field
- Include more diverse participants (e.g., faculty from HBCUs [Historically Black Colleges and Universities])
- Focus more on assessment issues (including authentic assessment, high stakes testing)
- Focus more on the impact of immigration and demographic changes on civic ed

Many of the Phase II respondents couched their suggestions in encouraging the Center to modify

an aspect of their college and university professional development:

- More regionalized programs to take advantage of relevant locations and to help grow the programs
- More follow-up discussion on “how we bring it back to the classroom,” how content translates into activities/practices/methods
- Seminar on “research and practice in civic ed” that features a few scholars like Diana Hess who can talk about research that has been done, connections between theory and practice, exchange of ideas about what others have done and what works
- More events like Birmingham, but delve more deeply into citizenship issues around ethnic minority groups
- Get Walter Parker and Diana Hess to do something on discussion/controversial issues, Socratic seminars
- Something on immigration where we go to a border region and work with groups involved in this issues (INS [Immigration and Naturalization Service], humanitarian agency, etc.)
- More site-based events (sites are integral to topic)
- More locations and pedagogical focus for elementary, especially in terms of integrated curriculum and civic literacy
- More things like Birmingham with “players” in the events, in addition to scholars
- More Mini-Butts to introduce more people to We the People
- A Navajo event
- Do more Butts Institutes, but make them as diverse as the United States
- Have more UF-type institutes in different locations
- Focus on the assessment issues that teachers have to deal with on a daily basis, not just on performance assessment

Recurring themes in the suggestions included:

- More “special topics” that are very in depth (either new topics, or “Part 2” of Birmingham and Montpelier) and site-based
- More institutes in more locations
- Focus on immigration

- Focus on diversity and inclusion of ethnic minorities at both the events and in the topics
- More explicit attention to connecting theory and content to practice/pedagogical implications
- More offerings/relevance for elementary social studies faculty

Highlighted suggestions for improvement included:

“Maybe the greatest strength is also a weakness—the content. Maybe we need more experts on methodology/pedagogy. But this is minor. The strengths overwhelm the weaknesses.”

“Because I’m an elementary person, I think there is sometimes an overemphasis on advanced content knowledge and not enough on pedagogical applications, esp. at the elementary level.”

“I feel like the diversity of participants could be greater, in terms of race and ethnicity. There are the same few minority participants at every event. We could have broader participation of racial and ethnic minorities. We are also not pushing the envelope in terms of making gender and sexual orientation issues an important part of civic education.”

“One overriding weakness—and I talked to a few professors about this—I guess the stereotype about social studies (SS) education is that it’s dominated by white males, and this (Butts) was still pretty much white males, with some females. But I was very disappointed by the lack of racial/ethnic diversity. If we’re talking about citizenship, you have to have this perspective. This perspective has been silenced for too long. There needs to be a stronger attempt to bring more racially and ethnically diverse participants in so we can have the serious discussion of citizenship that we need to have.”

“The Center has such a great program. I don’t know of anyone else in other fields who meet like we do at these events.”

“The Center’s events have really been formative in my work as a new professor in the field. I commend their efforts and hope they will continue including me.”

“Kudos. This is the first time I’ve seen an organization move from K–12 focus to a K–20 focus, including faculty who can support those K–12 teachers. Fabulous job. I hope the Center can continue to run institutes and think about how to garner more funds or personnel who can expand the work through technology (networking, online content resources, etc.).”

Contextual Factors that Promote or Hinder Civic Education

In Phase II respondents were asked to share their insights about contextual factors that promote or inhibit civic education. Respondents consistently identified high-stakes testing in reading, writing, and mathematics (omitting social studies) as a major barrier (13). Because of the high stakes attached to these particular subject areas, respondents noted that time is being taken away from social studies instruction. Related to the high-stakes testing environment is No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which six respondents mentioned specifically as a barrier. This is a challenge at all levels of schooling but especially at the elementary level. Other barriers included:

- Pervasive view of civic education in moral terms (prescribing behavior, lack of strong discussion)—conservative vs. liberal views of civic education
- Citizen apathy
- Lack of civic knowledge/understanding among college preservice teachers (specifically political science majors)
- Lack of social studies/civic education colleagues in state and/or university
- Use of “character education” programs as substitute for civic education
- Lack of opportunities for federal grants because of the STEM [Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics] emphasis
- State funding issues that disadvantage high-poverty schools
- Libertarian political climate in state that entails distrust of government institutions
- Respondents also identified contextual factors that promoted civic education.

Contextual factors that promote civic education included:

- Powerful nonprofit coalitions advocating civic education at the state level (especially

- state bar or law-related education organizations)
- Specific legislation providing state funds for civic education
 - Local and/or state education officials who push civic ed materials and standards
 - University courses that promote civic issues/critical issues and/or service learning
 - Strong We the People coordinators (district and/or state)
 - Eighth-grade mandated Constitution test
 - Robust state civics standards
 - We the People materials written into state and/or district standards and curriculum

Highlighted comments about factors that promote or hinder civic education included:

“The main barrier is the high stakes test. Elementary social studies is really neglected, especially in poor schools. Also, there is not much support for teacher professional development in social studies. It’s not all because of NCLB, but that makes it worse.”

“A lot of teachers here don’t get/use the WTP materials because of NCLB issues. If the Center could find ways to show teachers how WTP helps elementary kids do reading and writing, that would really make a difference.”

“Testing is killing us. Because my state does not test SS, we’re adrift. I have to work hard to recruit for institutes. People want literacy, tech, and math workshops. It’s hard to get people interested.”

It is important to note that the most positive comments came from Ohio. These participants all mentioned the high-stakes testing problems but also said:

“My state has done a lot to try and get students involved and active. I’m working with the state historical society as a consultant to align lessons to state standards. One of the great things about the state standards is that a lot of the citizen skills we advocate are a part of the standards. For example, students are supposed to have the skills of detecting bias, providing evidentiary support for their arguments, and thinking critically about the media, texts, etc. Holding students accountable for this can be a positive thing.... One of the great things about schools in this state is that there is a strong community presence.

Teachers tend to harness that with a lot of service learning, getting students out into the community, etc., so that they can make a difference.”

“Barriers are the state graduation test—not much is on civic ed—it’s math and reading. But we do have a strong contingency in the state of civic educators who really keep it in the forefront (state [social studies] council, for example). We watch what’s going on with legislation, and we talk to each other and work to pass things on to teachers in the field. We’re not doing too poorly, given the testing situation. We’re having some conversation about putting the old-fashioned civics course back in the curriculum.”

“The state law-related education organization has great outreach. The state standards are very specific about civic ed and are a good framework, although some teachers seem unaware of them and may not actually use these resources.”

Between Participant and Institute Comparisons

Phase I Data Comparing Participants and Institutes

Data from Phase I were reviewed to examine the extent to which certain demographic factors, such as university affiliation and academic rank, seemed to influence overall satisfaction with Center-sponsored professional development as well as to influence teaching, research, and service. In addition, data from each institute were analyzed separately to investigate the extent to which participant perceptions varied across certain models or institutes. However, because of the small number of participants from private institutions, public and private comparisons were not possible.

Across demographic variables a majority of respondents (52.6 percent) were “extremely satisfied” with Center-sponsored professional development compared to other professional development activities in which they participated. In terms of teaching, research, and service, both the Phase I and Phase II data indicate that the greatest influence was on teaching (mean of 5.28), followed by research (mean of 4.38) and service (mean of 4.00). Respondents from baccalaureate institutions rated their overall satisfaction as well as the influences of Center-sponsored professional development on teaching, research, and service slightly higher than did

their counterparts at masters or doctoral-granting institutions. Professors' ratings (both overall and with regard to teaching, research, and service) were slightly lower than their counterparts in other academic ranks and lower than graduate students.

All the institutes were highly rated (both overall and with regard to teaching, research, and service), but the methods professor workshops, critical constitutional issues institutes, and content seminars received slightly higher ratings than did the national R. Freeman Butts Institutes. However, respondents who attended multiple Butts Institutes reported increased ratings—both overall and with respect to teaching, research, and service.

Phase II Data Comparing Institutes and Participants

All seventeen respondents seemed to indicate that they were pleased with the Center-sponsored events and believed that these programs compared favorably with others—as good as or better than other professional development programs in which they had participated. The strongest themes that seemed to differentiate the Center-sponsored programs related to networking opportunities and community building (4 mentions), depth and quality of content (6), depth of engagement or interaction (4), and overall high level of quality (7).

Specific examples of areas of favorable comparison included:

- High quality of speakers
- Great accommodations and food
- More relevant/useful, focused, and well-planned
- Smaller and more intimate, with time for conversation
- All expenses covered
- More sustained, not “one shot”

Highlighted comments about comparisons with college and university faculty professional development included:

“The [Center institutes] on a scale of 1–10 are an 11. I haven't experienced anything else like this—theory, research, lived experiences—the best of all worlds. Birmingham was a

life-changing experience. I did not expect such a profound impact. There is nothing like it.”

“They are far superior. They hit on the things that you can’t get elsewhere, can’t get from journal articles. How could you beat that Birmingham experience? You get to interact with scholars and with people who were there. Also, interacting with everyone else who is there for the same reason. You just can’t get this anywhere else. This rarely comes along.”

“I do a lot with National Geographic, and theirs are excellent but just not as democratically engaged. The difference is that Center events have a lot more deep thinking and are content rich. Both are interested in participation and making a difference, in advocacy, and this is especially important because of NCLB so we can make sure social studies stays in the schools.”

“The [Center institutes] are top notch, excellent. They are focused, and they do a nice job of bringing in supportive research and ideas, not just having a bunch of people opining. Good use of data to support ideas. Good practical take-home value as well. The food is great, and covering expenses really helps. I get the benefit of the Center bringing people together from around the country. I can connect and reconnect with people I’ve met through the Center.”

“Butts was intimate, personal. Even after the sessions, we were socializing together, and I had the opportunity to talk to people whose work I respect and kind of grew up with. This was amazing. You don’t usually get to do this at other conferences. Even people who’ve been in the field a long time who were at the conference seemed to enjoy this too. It was almost like a think tank.”

Discussion

The data from this evaluation suggest that Center-sponsored professional development for college and university faculty has had a positive effect on the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of university faculty. As a result of their participation, respondents reported an

increased understanding of civic education, the pedagogies associated with civic learning, and ways in which they can make civic education a more prominent theme in their courses, at their institutions, and in their states. Respondents rated Center-sponsored professional development events favorably when compared to other professional development experiences and perceive these events as influences on their teaching, research, and service. According to most respondents Center-sponsored professional development events have been well organized, thoughtfully executed, and meaningful. The events have not only influenced their ideas and perceptions of civic education but also their professional practices. A few of the more significant findings included:

- Center-sponsored professional development not only influenced positively college and university faculty, it also influenced positively the teaching practices of their students and civic learning in K–12 schools.
- Fifty-four percent of participants reported that their students use Center materials such as *We the People* and *Project Citizen* in their teaching.
- A majority of participants at Center-sponsored professional development were extremely satisfied when comparing their experiences to other professional development events.
- Center-sponsored professional development has positively affected participants' teaching, research, and service.
- As a result of their participation, civic education has become a more prominent theme in the college and university classes of participants.
- A majority of participants have used ideas, methods, materials, and programs that were a part of the institute.
- Sixteen of seventeen Phase II respondents indicated that they use ideas from Center-sponsored professional development to frame issues and class discussions in their course.

- Fourteen of seventeen Phase II respondents indicated that they use books and materials distributed at Center-sponsored professional development in their classes.
- Ideas from Center-sponsored professional development have influenced 164 conference papers or presentations, fifty-nine published journal articles, twenty-four published book chapters, seventeen published books, and forty-seven grant proposals.
- Thirty-three percent of respondents report an increase in Center-related service activities, such as participating in local We the People or Project Citizen programs.

Comparisons between participants (university type and academic rank) revealed few differences in the attitudes, perceptions, or behaviors of respondents. Clearly Center-sponsored professional development has targeted full professors from larger research institutions, presumably leaders in their institutions, states, and profession. However, given their standing and experience, it is not surprising to find that participants below the rank of full professor generally rated Center-sponsored professional development higher than their full-professor counterparts.

Both Phase I and Phase II data suggest that more specialized and focused Center-sponsored workshops, institutes, and seminars are slightly more influential than the national R. Freeman Butts Institutes. A number of possible factors may help to explain this finding. Of course, the goals and activities of the national institutes and specialized workshops, institutes, and seminars differ. The first is intended to be broad, whereas the others are intended to be focused; the first emphasizes theory, whereas the others emphasize practice; and the first is often a participants' first experience with Center-sponsored professional development, whereas experience is a prerequisite of the others. In our view these factors mitigate against making too much of this finding. Still, the Center may consider tightening the focus of R. Freeman Butts Institutes on some aspect of civic learning in colleges and universities.

While the prevailing attitudes about Center-sponsored professional development were positive, several respondents suggested ways the Center might consider improving future professional development events. Many respondents expressed a desire to have “more”—more time, more events, more research, and more people involved. Many respondents also commented that they

would like to see an increased topical focus at the R. Freeman Butts Institutes and additional opportunities for colleges and universities to collaborate on civic education research projects. Many respondents said that the Center should consider using more practical examples of the issues related to the curriculum, instruction, and assessment of civic education and to use technology to connect a network of college and university faculty members committed to promoting the cause of civic education. Finally, a few respondents suggested that the Center consider attempting to provide additional diversity at their events—both in terms of speakers and participants.

Remaining Issues and Questions

In spite of these mostly positive perceptions, attitudes, behaviors, and suggestions, several issues and questions remain. These issues and questions can be categorized in two ways: 1) “internal” issues related to the nature of Center-sponsored professional development events, participants, topics, and programs; and 2) “external” issues related to what is going on in the outside world affecting university faculty that the Center may need to address in future events.

Internal Issues

- Relationship between attendance and level of implementation
Does there seem to be one? Is this important?
- Diversity among participants
How do we broaden the diversity and reach more minority and female colleagues?
- Influence on participants’ research
Should the Center do more to facilitate and disseminate faculty research?
- Influence on service activities
Should the Center develop more service activities for university faculty, perhaps with a focus on creating a cadre of civic education “experts” around the country?
- Use of technology

How can the Center use technology to facilitate community/networking for university faculty?

- Nature and focus of Butts Institutes

Does this event need to be reconceptualized?

- Possibilities for more events, more locations

What resources does the Center currently have for university professional development?

What will it have?

What possibilities exist for doing more “location” events and more “in-depth” seminars?

What topics should be next?

- Practical and pedagogical applications, especially for elementary level

How can the Center make these more prominent and useful?

External Issues

- High stakes testing and NCLB

How might the Center help faculty members make explicit connections between civics and reading/writing in ways that would be useful and relevant to the testing issues their students will face?

- TAH grants and Center programs

How might the Center help faculty members make explicit connections between civics and TAH content?

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this evaluation, the researchers recommend the following:

The Center should continue and expand its program of professional development for

college and university faculty members.

The Center should provide means (technology) to connect past participants with each other, with other professional development opportunities, and with developments in the field of civic education.

The Center should diversify the speakers and participants of its college and university professional development.

The Center should provide opportunities for college and university faculty members to collaborate on original research that will advance the knowledge base of civic education generally and collegiate civic learning specifically.

Appendix

Once participants volunteered to be a part of the follow-up, the authors, in consultation with Center administrators, rated each participant on the criterion of implementation, i.e., the extent to which the participant had implemented ideas and materials from the institute or workshop. Our goal was to gather the ideas and perceptions of a cross-section of participants.

Participants were labeled as follows (A–Q) with researchers’ initial ratings on implementation levels and revised ratings (when appropriate) based on interview data:

- A. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer but seems like a very high implementer from the interview.
- B. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer. This seems to be the case from the interview.
- C. We ranked this participant as a “low implementer.” The participant is relatively new on the scene. The participant has participated in only one Center event (has been in academia for four years; University of Florida institutes 2007 and 2008 are only events invited to so far and has done both). This participant would like to continue doing more Center events.
- D. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer. This seems accurate from the interview.
- E. This participant was ranked as a high implementer. This seems to be the case.
- F. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer but seems like a high implementer from the interview.
- G. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer. This seems accurate.
- H. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer. This seems to be the case.
- I. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer but seems like a high implementer from the interview.
- J. This participant was rated as a medium implementer. This seems accurate.
- K. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer. From the interview I would characterize more as a low implementer because the participant is still a grad student and has been to only one event.
- L. This participant was rated as a medium implementer. This seems accurate.
- M. This participant was ranked as a high implementer. This seems accurate.

- N. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer, and this seems to be the case from the interview.
- O. This participant was ranked as a low implementer, and this is true with regard to Center professional development events at university level. Participant is a high implementer when it comes to doing WTP training for teachers at state level.
- P. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer, but from the interview I would characterize as low.
- Q. This participant was ranked as a medium implementer, but from the interview I would characterize as high.

Bibliography

Branch, Taylor. *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years 1954–63*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith Publisher Inc., 2006.

Hamot, Greg, John J. Patrick, and Robert S. Leming, eds. *Civic Learning in Teacher Education*. Volume 3. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 2004.

Indiana Council for the Social Studies. Citizenship education. Special issue, *International Journal of Social Education*, 17, no. 1. Muncie, IN: Ball State University, 2002.

Patrick, John J. *The Supreme Court of the United States: A Student Companion*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Patrick, John J. and Robert S. Leming, eds. *Principles and Practices of Democracy in the Education of Social Studies Teachers: Civic Learning in Teacher Education*. Volume 1. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 2001.

Patrick, John J., Robert S. Leming, and Greg Hamot, eds. *Civic Learning in Teacher Education*. Volume 2. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 2003.

Westheimer, Joel. *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press, 2007.