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INTRODUCTION

A new movement in American higher education aims to transform the teaching of civics. This report is a study of what that movement is, where it came from, and why Americans should be concerned.

What we call the “New Civics” redefines civics as progressive political activism. Rooted in the radical program of the 1960s’ New Left, the New Civics presents itself as an up-to-date version of volunteerism and good works. Though camouflaged with soft rhetoric, the New Civics, properly understood, is an effort to repurpose higher education.

The New Civics seeks above all to make students into enthusiastic supporters of the New Left’s dream of “fundamentally transforming” America. The transformation includes de-carbonizing the economy, massively redistributing wealth, intensifying identity group grievance, curtailing the free market, expanding government bureaucracy, elevating international “norms” over American Constitutional law, and disparaging our common history and ideals. New Civics advocates argue among themselves which of these transformations should take precedence, but they agree that America must be transformed by “systemic change” from an unjust, oppressive society to a society that embodies social justice.

The New Civics hopes to accomplish this by teaching students that a good citizen is a radical activist, and it puts political activism at the center of everything that students do in college, including academic study, extra-curricular pursuits, and off-campus ventures.

New Civics builds on “service-learning,” which is an effort to divert students from the classroom to vocational training as community activists. By rebranding itself as “civic engagement,” service-learning succeeded in capturing nearly all the funding that formerly supported the old civics. In practice this means that instead of teaching college students the foundations of law, liberty, and self-government, colleges teach students how to organize protests, occupy buildings, and stage demonstrations. These are indeed forms of “civic engagement,” but they are far from being a genuine substitute for learning how to be a full participant in our republic.

New Civics has still further ambitions. Its proponents want to build it into every college class, regardless of subject. The effort continues without so far drawing much critical attention from the public. This report aims to change that.

In addition to our history of the New Civics movement and its breakthrough moment when it was endorsed by President Obama, we provide case studies of four universities: the University of Colorado, Boulder (CU-Boulder), Colorado State University in Fort Collins (CSU), the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley (UNC), and the University of Wyoming in Laramie (UW).

FINDINGS

NAS has 9 findings about the state of civics education nationwide, and 4 about the state of civics education in Colorado and Wyoming.
National Findings

1. Traditional civic literacy is in deep decay in America. Because middle schools and high schools no longer can be relied on to provide students basic civic literacy, the subject has migrated to colleges. But colleges have generally failed to recognize a responsibility to cover the basic content of traditional civics, and have instead substituted programs under the name of civics that bypass instruction in American government and history.

2. The New Civics, a movement devoted to progressive activism, has taken over civics education. “Service-learning” and “civic engagement” are the most common labels this movement uses, but it also calls itself global civics, deliberative democracy, and intercultural learning.

3. The New Civics movement is national, and it extends far beyond the universities. Each individual college and university now slots its “civic” efforts into a framework that includes federal and state bureaucracies, nonprofit organizations, and professional organizations. Universities affiliate themselves with these national organizations’ progressive political goals.

4. The New Civics redefines “civic activity” as “progressive activism.” It advertises progressive causes to students and uses student labor and university resources to support progressive “community” organizations.

5. The New Civics redefines “civic activity” as channeling government funds toward progressive nonprofits. The New Civics has worked to divert government funds to progressive causes since its founding in the 1960s.

6. The New Civics redefines “volunteerism” as labor for progressive organizations and administration of the welfare state. The new measures to require “civic engagement” will make this volunteerism compulsory.

7. The New Civics replaces traditional liberal arts education with vocational training for community activists. The traditional liberal arts prepared students for leadership in a free society. The New Civics prepares them to administer the welfare state.

8. The New Civics shifts authority within the university from the faculty to administrators, especially in offices of civic engagement, diversity, and sustainability, as well as among student affairs professionals. The New Civics also shifts the emphasis of a university education from curricula, drafted by faculty, to “co-curricular activities,” run by non-academic administrators.

9. The New Civics movement aims to take over the entire university. The New Civics advocates want to make “civic engagement” part of every class, every tenure decision, and every extracurricular activity.

Local Findings

1. The University of Colorado, Boulder possesses an extensive New Civics bureaucracy, but only the fragments of a traditional civics education.

2. Colorado State University possesses a moderately extensive New Civics bureaucracy, but only the fragments of a traditional civics education.
3. The University of Northern Colorado possesses a moderately extensive New Civics bureaucracy, but only the fragments of a traditional civics education.

4. The University of Wyoming possesses a limited New Civics bureaucracy, and the core of a traditional civics education.

THE NEW CIVICS

The New Civics advocates want to redefine the entire American civic spirit to serve the progressive political agenda.

The New Civics movement is a combination of federal bureaucrats, nonprofit foundations, and a network of administrators and faculty on college campuses. It now aims for a broader takeover of the entire university. The goal is to give every class a “civic” component, and to make “civic engagement” a requirement for tenure. The advocates of “civics education” now aim to insert left-wing politics into every aspect of the university, to advertise progressive causes to the student body in every class and every off-campus activity, and to divert ever larger portions of the American university system’s resources toward allied organizations. The New Civics advocates want to redefine the entire American civic spirit to serve the progressive political agenda. This agenda is hostile to the free market; supports racial preferences in the guise of diversity; supports arbitrary government power in the guise of sustainability; and undermines traditional loyalty to America in the guise of global citizenship.

The New Civics at De Anza College in California exemplifies how the national movement operates. There, the Vasconcellos Institute for Democracy in Action (VIDA) directs service-learning students to work for campaigns by progressive organizations to secure federal money for illegal immigrants; impose rent control in San Jose; tack on a “Student Representation Fee” to the tuition bill in order to fund student advocacy; subsidize public buses; and raise corporate taxes in the guise of “phasing out loopholes in Prop. 13.”

Representative New Civics classes around the country include LDSP 2410 Dynamics of Privilege and Oppression in Leadership (University of Colorado, Boulder), EDST 1101 FYS: Citizen Factory (University of Wyoming), and HIST 383 French Existentialism and Marxism (Wesleyan University, Connecticut).

The New Civics has replaced the Old Civics, which fostered civic literacy. In consequence, American students’ knowledge about their institutions of self-government has collapsed. According to the Association of American Colleges & Universities’ report A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy’s Future (2012), “Only 24 percent of graduating high school seniors scored at the proficient or advanced level in civics in 2010, fewer than in 2006 or in 1998,” “Half of the states no longer require civics education for high school graduation,” and “Among 14,000 college seniors surveyed in 2006 and 2007, the average score on a civic literacy exam was just over 50 percent, an ‘F’.”
What the New Civics has produced instead is a mobilized cadre of student protesters, ready to engage in “street politics” for any left-wing cause. In November 2016, for example, when high-school students around the country walked out from school to protest the election of Donald Trump, New Civics advocates described “the youth-led walkouts as a highly positive form of civic engagement.”

**Service-learning**

This New Civics began as “service-learning.” William Ramsey established the first “service-learning” program in 1965, at the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in Tennessee. He was joined in 1966 by Robert Sigmon, who explicitly acknowledged that his work with Ramsey was motivated by left-wing politics, and that it used a radical pedagogy that believed education should be a tool to promote revolutionary change.

Service-learning’s pioneers were a mixture of teachers, administrators, and community organizers, all of whom traced their commitment to service-learning to their far-left political commitments. The service-learning pioneers moved into the academy to pursue radical politics by other means. Service-learning drew upon the pedagogical theories of John Dewey and Paulo Freire, and then incorporated the Open-Door Schooling movement of Mao’s China, which sent students out of the classroom into the factories and fields in order to learn proper socialism from workers and peasants. Influential members among the creators of service-learning meant it to be an improved variation of political re-education in Maoist China.

From the beginning, Ramsey’s service-learning depended on local organizations lobbying for government money, with the ready complicity of federal bureaucrats eager to disburse the funds. Ramsey and Sigmon experimented with different terms for what they were doing—“experiential learning, experience learning, work learning, action learning”—and in 1967 they came up with service-learning. The ensuing Atlanta Service-Learning Conference Report of 1970 framed the introduction of service-learning into higher education.

Service-learning feeds off the all-American impulse to volunteer and do good works for others, but diverts it toward progressive causes. For example, service-learning channels the urge to clean up litter from a local park toward support of the anti-capitalist “sustainability” movement. In New Civics programs, students can’t work to feed the hungry without being propagandized about “the root causes of poverty and oppression” and the need for “systemic change.”

Service-learning’s main goals in higher education are: 1) to funnel university funds and student labor to advertise progressive causes; 2) to support off-campus progressive nonprofits—“community organizations”; 3) to radicalize Americans, using a theory of “community organization” drawn explicitly from the writings of Saul Alinsky, a mid-twentieth century Chicago radical who developed and publicized what have now become the standard tactics of leftist political activism; and 4) to “organize” the university itself, by campaigning for more funding for service-learning and allied progressive programs on campus. These allied programs include “diversity” offices, “sustainability” offices, and components of the university devoted to “social justice.”
Public Achievement

The ideas of Saul Alinsky entered into higher education via service-learning, and so have many members of Alinskyite organizations. An even more serious infusion of Alinskyism occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s, via Harry Boyte’s Public Achievement movement. Public Achievement is a separate movement from service-learning, with a harder political edge. Service-learning generally works to forward progressive political ends; Public Achievement works toward these ends with more focus and organization, via the Alinskyite method of community organizing. The Alinskyite tactical model of Public Achievement makes the New Civics formidable.

Public Achievement preserves many aspects of Alinskyite youth-community organization. Public Achievement relies on the Alinskyite emphasis on power, which reduces politics to the use of force to defeat hostile opponents. Public Achievement not only works directly to advance the Alinskyite program but also educates K-12 students to be the proper material for Alinskyite organization as adults. Public Achievement readies community organizers and organizers for Alinskyite action against the government.

Civic Engagement

In 1985, several influential university presidents founded Campus Compact to support student volunteerism and community service. Service-learning advocates took over Campus Compact’s campaign, and from that vantage point inserted service-learning into virtually every college in the nation. They then gave service-learning a new name—“civic engagement”—and used this new label as a way to replace the old civics curriculum with service-learning classes. Service-learning, Public Achievement, and civic engagement together form the heart of the New Civics.

The New Civics Now

The New Civics revolution has been staggeringly successful in the last 30 years. In 1990, Campus Compact’s member universities reported that only “16 percent of their students were involved in service (almost all of it volunteerism); only 15 percent of these institutions had offices to support this work; 59 percent of the presidents characterized the extent of their faculty’s involvement in this work as ‘little’ or ‘not at all.’” The 2014 Campus Compact survey updated these numbers: at the 419 institutions that responded to the survey, nearly 100% had institutional offices coordinating “curricular and/or co-curricular engagement”—and 57% had more than one office. Thirty-nine percent of graduate and undergraduate students, 1,382,145 in total, “served an average of 3.5 hours each week through both curricular and co-curricular mechanisms.” The total number of hours they served in the 2013-2014 academic year was 154,800,240, and their service was valued at $3,490,745,412—almost 3.5 billion dollars.
By a different estimate, about one-half of college students in 2010 “report participating in credit-bearing service learning activities during their time in college.” That number presumably is higher by now.

The personnel devoted to civic engagement have also grown enormously in number. As Campus Compact’s 2014 survey notes, “In 1986, only 33 institutions had a center or office, and only 22 institutions had a paid director or staff member. In 2014, every institution reported staffing for community engagement. ... across all offices at all respondents 2,376 full time staff, 1,184 part-time staff, and 7,027 paid students support the coordination of curricular and/ or co-curricular engagement.”

In 2012, Massachusetts made Civic Learning a requirement in all state colleges and universities. The definition of civic learning is phrased in the language of service-learning and civic engagement: e.g., “The applied competencies component refers to the practical skills and capacities needed to engage effectively in civic activities.”

New Civics is no longer a marginal movement but a central component of American higher education.
The Costs

Campus Compact’s survey not only provides a sketch of the New Civics nationwide but also allows us to hazard a rough estimate of how much the New Civics costs. At these roughly 400 institutions alone, at least some hundreds of millions are being directed annually toward direct support of the New Civics programs, in addition to the billions of dollars of student labor hours being diverted toward progressive causes and organizations. We may add to this the opportunity cost of the New Civics: students at these institutions spent 155 million hours on service rather than on studying just in 2013-14, and the losses to their lifetime knowledge and earning potential must be measured in further billions.

These numbers are for only about 400 institutions out of 4,726 total American institutions of higher education. We estimate the expenditures in America on civic engagement as an order of magnitude greater than is reported in Campus Compact’s 2014 survey. Total direct expenditures and diversion of free student labor should be valued at no less than $40 billion dollars in 2014 alone. We have not included the cost of tuition in this calculation, nor the opportunity cost of educational hours used for New Civics rather than for actual learning.

Ambitions

The New Civics advocates aim at the total transformation of the university. A Crucible Moment, and companion pieces from the AAC&U, lay out at length a vision of how the entire university is to be integrated toward “civic ends.” Barry Checkoway, a professor of social work and a notable New Civics advocate, summarizes the program compactly: “Every single course—from anthropology to zoology—has potential for civic learning,” he writes. “There is a need to infuse the civic into all curricular and cocurricular activities and into all disciplines and fields.”

In sum, the New Civics advocates’ vision for the future is: 1) civic mission statements will leverage a total transformation of the universities; 2) every class will have civic content; 3) professors will be judged for tenure based on their civic engagement; 4) civically engaged students will be given authority to forward the New Civics; and 5) the New Civics ultimately will incorporate the workplace and the government.

Total direct expenditures and diversion of free student labor at American colleges and universities should be valued at no less than $40 billion dollars in 2014 alone.

The New Civics reorganization of higher education will be achieved via its advocates who have already entered the university—younger professors, student affairs professionals, and civically engaged students. These New Civics advocates will direct their civic engagement efforts to transform the university. Furthermore, organizations of college presidents will provide a tool for transformation.
from above, and national associations and “local allies”—progressive activists outside the university—will provide assistance.

New Civics is no longer a marginal movement but a central component of American higher education.

Finally, federal regulations to require civics education will secure New Civic control. A Crucible Moment has called for that intervention already. Federal intervention will “Strategically refocus existing funding streams to spur ... civic learning and practice in the curriculum, co-curriculum, and experiential education.” Such funding streams will include financial aid for students, subsidized curriculum development, research support, and perhaps the establishment of “a Civic Action Corps”—government funding for the institutionalization of the progressive advocates on a national scale.

We are not there yet. But many of the building blocks are in place. The New Civics advocates and their progressive allies are entrenched within American universities. The national organizations, the alliance of college presidents, the sympathetic bureaucrats in the Department of Education—they have already begun their work, by means of projects such as A Crucible Moment, and their success provides a model for further campaigns. The New Civics advocates are serious and successful tacticians. They are not all-powerful figures—but they are a real force and must be taken seriously.

CASE STUDIES

The NAS provides case studies of four universities in Colorado and Wyoming—the University of Colorado, Boulder (CU-Boulder), Colorado State University in Fort Collins (CSU), the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley (UNC), and the University of Wyoming in Laramie (UW). We describe four public institutions that are rough proxies for the range of typical American universities, and which exhibit different stages of the growth of the New Civics.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

The University of Colorado, Boulder (CU-Boulder) is the flagship campus of the flagship university in Colorado’s system of public higher education. In 2015-16, CU-Boulder enrolled 27,000 undergraduates. In 2016, U.S. News and World Report listed it in a tie for #89 in its ranking of “national universities.”

The Hollowed-Out Old Civics

The Old Civics ought to be taught as part of a core curriculum—a set of specific courses that all students must take—but CU-Boulder no longer has one. Instead, it has disguised its abandonment of traditional education by calling its distribution requirements a “Core Curriculum.” CU-Boulder students share no academic preparation of any sort, much less one of civics in the traditional sense.

A few of CU-Boulder’s classes provide a traditional civics education, but far more teach the New Civics. By our count at least 60 courses contain civic-engagement or service-learning—but there are probably hundreds. CU-Boulder has only 11 courses that meet a strict definition of traditional civics—survey courses on the history of our country, the nature of its ideals, and
the structure of its government. For every Old Civics course in the curriculum there are at least 5 New Civics courses.

Old Civics courses satisfy three of the university’s ten distribution requirements, but we estimate that no more than one third of CU-Boulder students take a course with significant Old Civics content—and the total proportion could be less than one-fifth. Even fewer take the basic American government course, Introduction to American Politics. In the eight semesters and three summer sessions between Fall 2013 and Spring 2016, 2,830 students took Introduction to American Politics. That is barely more than ten percent of CU-Boulder’s total undergraduate enrollment.

“CU Engage,” How CU-Boulder Organizes Leftist Activism

CU-Boulder has replaced the Old Civics with an enormous New Civics infrastructure dedicated to training a core of progressive activists and extending the New Civics into every corner of CU-Boulder, both inside and outside the classroom. CU Engage is the administrative heart of the New Civics and contains those programs devoted exclusively to propagating the New Civics—including INVST, the Leadership Studies Minor, Public Achievement, and CU Dialogues.

The heart of CU-Boulder’s New Civics is the INVST (International & National Voluntary Service Training) Community Studies Program, a major in progressive activism. INVST provides vocational training to a dedicated corps of New Civics advocates among the CU-Boulder student body—200 students each academic year. INVST was created in 1990 to produce scholar activists with a “lifetime commitment” to apply “direct service” and “social advocacy” in order “to analyze and solve community and global problems.” INVST focuses on providing free student labor for progressive nonprofits, as students learn to “do campaign work, volunteer recruitment, coalition building, resource development, tutoring, tabling, social media ... meeting facilitation, consensus decision-making, conflict resolution, fundraising, grant proposal writing, grassroots organizing, lobbying and public speaking.”

INVST’s original core program is now the INVST Community Leadership Program (CLP), a two-year program that trains 18 students each year in the theory and practice of “transformative service-learning for social and environmental justice.” In this program, students take two theoretical courses and four “skills-training classes.”
The theoretical courses teach the political theory and the craft of progressive activism, encourage students “to examine themselves as potential change agents,” and “Focus on food justice, sustainability, activism and multicultural social justice.” The first two skills-training classes require students to “serve at least 6 hours per week as interns with community-based organizations” such as “Safehouse Progressive Alliance for Nonviolence (SPAN), Intercambio: Uniting Communities, Natural Capitalism Solutions, New Era Colorado, [and] the Philanthropiece Foundation.”

The **Leadership Studies Minor (LSM)** also trains progressive activists. LSM students are supposed to take a Foundations Course (LEAD 1000 *Becoming a Leader*), a Capstone Course (LEAD 4000 *Capstone*), and three electives. The Capstone course requires students to “Complete a leadership challenge project”—unpaid labor—with partner organizations such as Boulder County Arts Alliance, Immigrant Legal Center of Boulder County, and Women’s Wilderness. LSM’s electives include courses such as LDSP 2410 *Dynamics of Privilege and Oppression in Leadership*, ETHN 3201 *Multicultural Leadership: Theories, Practices & Principles*, and LDSP 4932 *Community Leadership in Action*. A CU-Boulder student can acquire a Leadership Studies Minor while taking electives solely drawn from the INVST program.

CU Engage also oversees a local franchise of Harry Boyte’s Alinskyite Public Achievement. **Public Achievement at CU-Boulder** recruits undergraduate students to organize K-12 students from the third grade up in support of progressive causes. Public Achievement teaches undergraduates to be community organizers, and it softens up K-12 students to be malleable organizers. By channeling progressive activism toward community organizing in local K-12 schools, CU Engage’s Public Achievement program creates a synergy of unpaid New Civics advocacy at the K-12 and undergraduate levels. Public Achievement also provides vocational training for students who wish to make a career mixing teaching with progressive activism.

**Service Learning: Here, There, and Everywhere**

CU Engage focuses on training a cadre of progressive activists, but CU-Boulder also provides “service learning” across the curriculum, in courses hosted by a large number of departments and programs. These courses enlist students to provide labor for progressive organizations while taking courses in Art History, Business, Education, Engineering, English, Environment, Linguistics, The Program for Writing and Rhetoric, Spanish, and Women’s Studies, among others. The **School of Engineering**, the programs concerned with the **Environment**, the **Department of Spanish**, and the **Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR)** provide the largest concentrations of service-learning.
I’m From CU Dialogues and We Need to Have a Conversation

Other classes at CU-Boulder don’t lend themselves so easily to vocational training in progressive activism—but CU Engage provides a way for instructors in these courses to inject a further dose of progressive advocacy. CU Engage does this by persuading instructors to adopt classroom dialogues, which are part of the CU Dialogues Program. In these “facilitated” dialogues, progressives are invited to speak at individual classes and extracurricular events at CU-Boulder. Dialogue guest specializations include discrimination/profiling based on race; feeling excluded or targeted because of religion; transgender identity; living as an undocumented person in the US or elsewhere; experiences related to politics/political activism; and civic engagement or volunteer experiences.

Service-Learning Where You Sleep

CU-Boulder’s New Civics advocates are not satisfied with spreading progressive advocacy in classes and club meetings; they also infiltrate their dogma into the dormitories. The Residential Academic Programs, in which students “live together in the same residence hall, share academic experiences by participating in seminar classes taught in the residence halls ... and engage in residence hall activities that reinforce the academic theme,” also frame student residential life around New Civics. The Communication and Society, Farrand, Global Studies, Leadership, Sewall, and Sustainability and Social Innovation RAPs all contain service-learning and civic engagement classes.

How Much Does It Cost?

In the absence of official figures, we estimate that CU-Boulder spends $25 million per year on New Civics. This number includes $3 million of direct expenditures for CU Engage; another $3 million for further administrative personnel marbled throughout CU-Boulder; $3 million to pay the equivalent of 13 instructors a year to teach several dozen civic engagement and service learning courses; $1 million in administrative support and grants; $5 million of tuition spent on New Civics courses; $7.5 million in housing costs paid by students; and $2.5 million in university subsidy of housing costs. The $25 million New Civics expenditure is more than one third of Colorado’s direct subsidy of $69.4 million to CU-Boulder.

Next We Take Over the University

The New Civics advocates at CU-Boulder have decided to make civic engagement mandatory. CU-Boulder’s strategic plan Flagship 2030, states that “By 2030, CU-Boulder ... will require at least two semester-long experiences tailored to complement academic coursework and cocurricular activities.” CU-Boulder also plans to create a Colorado Undergraduate Academy, where “each student will work with an advisor to construct a unified set of curricular and extracurricular activities, such as civic engagement and international experiences.” These initiatives will make New Civics required for CU-Boulder undergraduates, remold faculty teaching and scholarship around the New Civics, and provide a model for an undergraduate education formed entirely around New Civics.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Colorado State University (CSU) is a more professionally oriented counterpart to CU-Boulder. Located in Fort Collins, CSU is focused on the more technical fields, including science, technology, engineering, veterinary medicine, and agriculture. It currently enrolls about 32,000 students.
The Bored-Out Core

The Old Civics cannot be taught properly at CSU because, like CU-Boulder, CSU has removed the core curriculum within which the Old Civics ought to be taught. CSU’s “All-University Core Curriculum” requires students to take courses in eight different curricular areas, each of which offers students dozens of alternatives. Students can satisfy these requirements by choosing Old Civics courses—but they have a myriad of alternatives that will satisfy their distribution requirements just as well.

Civic Engagement is Progressive Advocacy, No Matter How You SLiCE It

Little remains of the Old Civics at CSU—but CSU has substituted in its place a thriving New Civics complex. CSU’s Student Leadership, Involvement and Community Engagement (SLiCE) acts as the administrative heart of the New Civics on campus.

The first core of the New Civics at CSU is the Community Engagement Leaders (CELS) program. CELS “supports a select group of sophomore and junior level community-engaged students interested in linking their passion for

These initiatives will make New Civics required for CU-Boulder undergraduates.

Nothing But New Civics

We count at least 132 service-learning courses taught each year at CSU, but no more than 5 courses of Old Civics. For every Old Civics course at CSU there are more than 26 New Civics courses.

We estimate that slightly over one half of CSU students take one of the five Old Civics courses—but we doubt that more than 60 percent take even two.

In Fall 2016, CSU offered only three sections of American Government and Politics, with a total capacity of 459 seats; in Summer 2016, it provided a summer class with 30 seats. At that rate, a maximum of 3,792 students could take the course during their 4 years at CSU—not quite 12% of all undergraduates.
service-learning and community action with their academic major.” These students aim to create “a more peaceful, compassionate, and sustainable world through local and global community initiatives,” focusing on issues such as “education, environmental stewardship, public health, civility, justice, youth development, poverty, sustainable development, elder care, etc.” The requirements for a CELS completion certificate include “6 credit-hours in approved service-learning classes” and “150 hours of service in partnership with an approved community organization of your choice.”

CSU students can get the same activism training in the President’s Leadership Program (PLP) and the Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies (IMLS). CSU students in the PLP take six courses; the IMLS requires students to take 2-3 further courses. The Minor defines leadership as “a process of people working together to effect positive change, rather than a position of one person or the powerful elite.” Each IMLS class possesses “a significant service-learning component that addresses pressing societal issues such as poverty and sustainability.” The Minor further stipulates that “experiences in, and commitments to, civic engagement and multicultural competence are required.”

New Civics advocates in the Department of Communication have created yet another pipeline to form radical student activists. The Department of Communication provides a specialization track in Rhetoric and Civic Engagement, which channels students toward progressive advocacy in the guise of learning about “a wide array of communication practices, ranging from political speeches to social movements.” Courses in the specialization track include SPCM 401 Rhetoric in Contemporary Social Movements, SPCM 523 Feminist Theories of Discourse, and SPCM 540 Rhetoric, Race, and Identity.

SliCE also oversees a franchise of Public Achievement, Public Achievement for Community Transformation (PACT). PACT directs undergraduate activism toward community organizing in local K-12 schools and to soften up K-12 students to be malleable organizers. “PACT coaches… guide the youth through the six stages of Public Achievement, ending with a community action project in the spring.” PACT is supposed to teach students to be lifelong activists: “youth can replicate their PACT experience… and continue to make positive, long-lasting change in their own neighborhoods.”

The New Civics advocates at CSU have partially taken over CSU’s University Honors Program (UHP), and made leadership and community service part of the UHP. Honors students can add an “Enriched Academic Experience” to a regular course by means that include a “service-learning activity”—and qualify for an Enrichment Award of $100-$400. In the Upper Division Honors Program, Honors students are required to undertake an “in-depth study” that may include “an applied or civically engaged project.” All HONR 192 courses include “an orientation component,” in which “Peer mentors conduct weekly sessions that emphasize campus engagement, activity, and community.”
Beyond these core programs, New Civics advocates have inserted service-learning classes into a wide variety of disciplines, to direct free student labor toward progressive organizations. CSU’s service-learning is run from both the TILT Service Learning Program within SLiCE and the Office for Service Learning and Volunteer Programs (SLVP). TILT lists 132 courses that “have historically offered experiential, service-learning components.” These include ERHS 498 Independent Study – Improved Cookstove Intervention for Nicaraguan Families and ETST 365 Global Environmental Justice Movements.

On to Alinsky, at All Deliberate Speed

CSU’s Center for Public Deliberation (CPD) provides undergraduates further opportunities to engage in progressive advocacy for course credit, by way of supporting public deliberation initiatives in Northern Colorado. CPD Director Martín Carcasson emphasizes the complementary roles of public deliberation as process and the progressive ends of community organization: “part of the long-term goal for our field is to bring them together and erase the distinction.” Thirty to forty undergraduates at a time work for the CPD. The Department of Communication also provides a Deliberative Practices specialization for undergraduates and MA students who wish to promote public deliberation.

Service-Learning Is the Key to Leadership

CSU’s New Civics advocates also work to put progressive activism into the dormitories. The Key Service Community (KSC) “is a first-year residential learning community developed around the theme of student leadership and civic engagement.” KSC students ideally learn about “the root causes and broader social issues that contribute to community problems,” and develop the skills and attitudes to become “multicultural community builders.” The Leadership Development Community (LDC) gives LDC students “the opportunity to continue the development of their leadership skills through a variety of involvement opportunities and participation in service projects, peer facilitation, and experiential learning.” LDC students also can “strengthen and expand their own knowledge of ethical leadership and civic engagement,” and gain Multicultural and Intercultural Competence.

When We’re Older, We’ll Be Boulder

CSU’s 2016 Strategic Plan indicates that it intends in the years to come to enlarge its New Civics complex. The Plan’s goals include “More active/engaged learning in high-impact practices that promote curricular and co-curricular engagement and integration, service learning, and experiential learning,” via participation in “Honors, SLiCE, OURA [Office of Undergraduate Research and Artistry], Presidential leadership, etc.” In addition, CSU will “improve opportunities for scholarship of engagement,” assessed by “reported scholarship of engagement activity in student and/or faculty portfolios.” When CSU has achieved these goals, its New Civics complex will be at least as large as CU-Boulder’s is now.

The New Civics in Dollars and Cents

Pamela Norris, the Director of SLiCE, oversees “$2 million of office budgets and accounts.” There are further administrative personnel marbled throughout CSU, whose cost we estimate at $2 million. If just 20 instructors teach the 132+ service learning courses taught each year at CSU, we add another $4 million. Miscellaneous administrative support and financial awards add another $1 million. The costs of tuition and fees...
spent on New Civics courses should come to $5.46 million. We may add $658 thousand in housing costs to this total. Round down our total estimate, and that brings the total to $15 million.

$15 million is more than one-tenth of Colorado’s direct subsidy of $134.5 million to CSU in 2016-2017.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) is a comprehensive university that continues to emphasize “its historical role in the preparation of educators.” In Spring 2016, UNC enrolled about 11,400 students, including almost 8,800 undergraduates; 9,000 students are at UNC’s main campus in Greeley.

Coreless in Colorado

Like CU-Boulder and CSU, UNC has also eliminated its core curriculum. It too has disguised this abolition by calling its distribution requirements a “Liberal Arts Core.” UNC’s “Liberal Arts Core” requires students to take courses in eight different curricular areas, and provides students dozens of alternatives in each area. Students may take some of the few remaining Old Civics classes to fulfill these requirements—but there are hundreds of alternatives in total that they may choose instead.

University of Northern Colorado, University of New Civics

We count a minimum of 100 service-learning courses taught each year at UNC—more than 10% of the total number of courses offered at UNC. UNC offers only 7 courses that meet a strict definition of traditional civics. There are more than 14 New Civics courses at UNC for every Old Civics course. Our best approximation is that two-thirds of UNC students take at least one of the seven UNC Old Civics survey courses—but we doubt that more than 75 percent take even two such courses.

UNC’s basic American government courses, United States National Government and Fundamentals of Politics, reach only a small fraction of UNC students. In Fall 2016, these two basic government courses could seat 280 students; at that rate, a total of 2,240 of UNC’s 8,800 undergraduates could take these courses during their 4 years—a little more than 25% of all undergraduates.

The New Core Curriculum

While UNC’s old core is fading away, a new core curriculum is rising in its place. UNC requires all students to take 40 hours from its Liberal Arts Core (LAC). Within the LAC, UNC students must take courses in six Areas of Basic Core Courses, as well as at least one course apiece in Multicultural Studies and International Studies. These last two requirements make up the first building blocks of a new, progressive core at UNC.

We count a minimum of 100 service-learning courses taught each year at UNC—more than 10% of the total number of courses offered at UNC.

UNC greatly magnifies the effect of these two requirements by an ingenious stipulation: the university allows students to double-count courses to fulfill both its Basic Core Courses requirements and its Multicultural Studies and International Studies requirements.
Students, therefore, have an incentive to choose cross-listed courses—not least because taking such double-counted courses frees them to take more elective courses to complete their 40-hour Liberal Arts Core requirement. UNC’s decision to allow International Studies and Multicultural Studies to satisfy its other requirements in its Liberal Arts Core makes cross-listed courses the default choice for students. Indeed, it means that UNC has placed International Studies and Multicultural Studies at the center of its Liberal Arts Core—a half-formed replacement core curriculum, which puts a progressive stamp on UNC students’ common knowledge.

The old core curriculum has been replaced. In Fall 2016, 138 students took United States National Government. At that rate, 1,104 of 8,800 UNC undergraduates will take the course during their four years at UNC—not quite 12% of the student body, although summer school enrollments might push the total number to 15%. By way of comparison, Gender and Society, a rival to United States National Government that fulfills both the Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement and the Multicultural Studies requirement, enrolled 184 students in Fall 2016; at that rate, 1,472 UNC undergraduates (17%) will take Gender and Society. More UNC students take Gender and Society than United States National Government—not least because of the way UNC structures its course requirements.

UNC’s New Civic Hydra: A Body with Many Heads

As at CU-Boulder and CSU, UNC has established a large number of New Civics programs at the same time as it has dismantled its Old Civics. UNC’s Center for Community and Civic Engagement runs much of the New Civics, including its service-learning and engaged classes, and the Office of Student Life runs a significant additional portion. The New Civics at UNC, however, is disjointed. Its programs collectively are a hydra, where each separately

Deborah Romero, Director for Engagement, Center for Community and Civic Engagement
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Loree Crow, Director, Center for Honors, Scholars and Leadership
pursues the same radical goals via the same New Civics techniques.

The first head of the New Civics hydra at UNC is the **Social Science Community Engagement** major, which allows UNC students to major in progressive activism: “Through research and civic engagement assignments and activities, students will be introduced to a variety of community-related careers and opportunities.” Community Engagement majors must take SOSC 350 *Community Research and Engagement*. Community Engagement majors must also take 6 courses from a list including AFS 340 *The Black Family*; AFS 399 *Community Study Project*; ECON 365 *Urban and Housing Economics*; ENST 291 *Sustainability and Capitalism*; ENST 355 *Introduction to Environmental Health*; PSCI 203 *Colorado Politics*; SOC 333 *Social Class and Inequality*; and SOC 340 *Juvenile Delinquency*.

The second head of UNC’s New Civics hydra is the **Center for Honors, Scholars and Leadership**, which runs both the Honors and Leadership programs. UNC’s Center has been colonized by the New Civics far more heavily than has CSU’s University Honors Program.

The **Honors Program**’s Lower Division Honors Curriculum requires students to take HON 101 *Introduction to Honors & Critical Thinking* and four courses from a list that includes LEAD 100 *Contemporary Leadership Theory*, LEAD 200 *Risk and Change in Leadership*, HON 492 *Study Abroad*, and HON 492 *International Student Exchange*. The content of these courses is mostly New Civics. HON 101 *Introduction to Honors & Critical Thinking*, required of all Honors students, includes “intercultural competencies,” “engaged learning opportunities,” and “community-based projects.” HON 200 *Connections Seminar* is also “Civic & Community Engagement – an Engaged Course.” The class “provides an engaged learning approach to active citizenry.”

The third head of UNC’s New Civics hydra is the **Leadership Studies Minor (LSM)**. LSM is “firmly committed to the teaching and practice of social justice,” and asks “students to practice advocacy through experiential learning” so as to “promote a just society by cultivating a program and community that fosters inclusivity and challenges injustice.” The minor aims “to develop students to become socially just and ethical leaders,” who “apply social and ecological justice.” Students can engage in applied course work that includes leading “a community awareness campaign.” The LSM requires students to take classes such as LEAD 100 *Introduction to Leadership* (“engaged leadership opportunities”); LEAD 200 *Risk and Change in Leadership* (“experiential learning opportunities”); and LEAD 497 *Senior Leadership Seminar: Global Justice and Responsiveness*. Students then take electives from a list including HESAL 301 *Foundations and Praxis of Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership*; LEAD 250 *Leadership in a Global Community: Living Glocal*; and MCS 101 *Multiculturalism in the United States*.

The UNC Honors Program’s Lower Division Honors Curriculum is mostly New Civics.

**Scads of Service-Learning at UNC**

UNC New Civics advocates in the **Center for Community and Civic Engagement** also arrange for students to provide labor for progressive organizations in **service-learning** and **engaged classes**. CCCE coordinates
“engaged learning opportunities” in more than 62 departments—more than 250 engaged courses, of which 108 are undergraduate and 148 are graduate. Of these courses, 40% (about 100 courses) are service-learning, field-, or community-based. Fifteen percent of all courses at the University of Northern Colorado are labeled Engaged, 33% of the University’s faculty use service-learning in at least one course, and 20% of the faculty “incorporate community-based research into their courses and scholarship.”

All Your Campus is Belong to Us

UNC plans to enlarge its New Civics complex, and has devoted an entire administrative document to outline its strategy: **UNC Community and Civic Engagement Plan.** UNC’s goals and strategies include: “develop[ing] clarity, expectations and criteria for recognizing engaged scholarship as it pertains to the annual review, and promotion and tenure guidelines”; “identify[ing] ways to support and infuse community and civic engagement to further enrich students’ academic, social, cultural, ethical, and intellectual growth”; “Collaborat[ing] with Housing and Residential Education, especially with Diversity Mentors, to support leadership and engagement opportunities on main and extended campus and beyond”; and “develop[ing] plans to intentionally infuse engagement criteria into new hiring plans.” **UNC is committed to integrating the New Civics into its entire academic and administrative structure.**

The New Civics: What’s in Your Wallet?

We calculate that UNC’s Center for Community and Civic Engagement (CCCE) directs about **$600 thousand** in expenditures. We add another **$1.9 million** for an estimated 8 further administrators throughout UNC. There are about 100 service-learning courses taught each year at UNC: the salary costs of 15 instructors a year teaching these courses are **$3 million** more. Miscellaneous administrative support and financial awards should easily add another **$500 thousand**. Tuition and fees should come to another **$3 million**. We estimate total New Civics expenditures at UNC at **$9 million**.

**$9 million is more than one-fifth of Colorado’s direct subsidy of $39 million to UNC in 2016-2017.**

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Wyoming established its University in 1887, as a land-grant institution. The main campus is in Laramie, and there is an additional campus at Casper. The University of Wyoming (UW) has almost 14,000 students, some 10,200 of whom are undergraduates.

A Remnant Core

The University of Wyoming requires all students to take one course in civics—to obey a 1925 mandate by the state legislature. UW used to require students to take or test out of just one course: **American and Wyoming Government**. The university has begun to loosen the rigor of this requirement, and has turned it into a **U.S. & Wyoming Constitutions** distribution requirement. Students now can satisfy **U.S. & Wyoming Constitutions with Economics, Law, and Government; US to 1865; or US from 1865**, so long as they can pass a multiple-choice Wyoming Government Exam. Students also have two opportunities to take a “Challenge Exam” on American and Wyoming Government to satisfy UW’s civics requirement. Students who fail this exam twice must take a course on Wyoming government. UW minimizes its commitment to its legal mandate to provide a civics education for its students.
Old Civics vs. New Civics

We believe there are at least 25 service-learning courses a year at UW; New Civics courses probably outnumber the 6 courses in UW’s U.S. & Wyoming Constitutions requirement by at least four to one.

New Civics at UW: Small, but Growing

UW’s Office of Service, Leadership & Community Engagement (SLCE) is the New Civics’ administrative kernel at UW; SLCE runs much of the New Civics complex, including its service-learning classes. UW’s Honor’s Program has also begun to integrate itself into the New Civics. The Honors Program advertises itself as providing “co-curricular opportunities,” “the breadth of knowledge needed by citizens,” and instruction in “how to become engaged citizens and to understand the ethnic and cultural diversity of America and the world.” The 2014 External Review Report of the Honors Program also stated that “With the WHO [Wyoming Honors Organization] community service activities and study abroad programs, the Honors Program has embraced the concept of participatory, experiential honors education. In addition, several honors courses incorporate hands-on, experiential elements.”

Courses in New Civics: Kernels of Programs to Come

New Civics programs are present in embryo at UW, as service-learning or civic engagement courses. EDST 1101 FYS: Citizen Factory will “appeal to any student with an interest in the public schools or schooling for democracy.” Citizen Factory presumably is the seed of a Public Achievement franchise. UWYO 3000 Student Leadership in Supplemental Instruction teaches students “peer leadership, best practices in supplemental instruction, and student reflection.”

It appears to be the core of a Leadership Studies Minor. In Fall 2015, students could take UWYO 1101 Ignite Your Passion: Creating Change Through Service and Action, in which students provided “service in the local Laramie community,” and acquired “a foundation for understanding the role of public scholarship, community engagement, and social action.” This course will be the core of a Wyoming program to train radical activists, the equivalent of CU-Boulder’s INVST program.

I’m Growing Bigger and Better in Every Way

In its draft Strategic Plan 2015-2020, UW states as one goal among many that it wishes to “Expand the engagement of undergraduates in faculty scholarship and service learning experiences.” This is to be done by expanding “the funding opportunities for research and creative activity internships,” considering “the inclusion of undergraduate research in majors as a capstone experience” and creating “a budget line-item of $250,000 per biennium supporting undergraduate research,” and by expanding “the funding and
credit-bearing opportunities for service learning and community engagement.” In Wyoming as in Colorado, the New Civics is growing.

**UW Still Spends on New Civics, Even as It Tightens Its Belt**

A state funding crisis in the summer of 2016 reduced UW’s budget by at least $30 million for that fiscal year, from $270 million to less than $240 million. UW received $187 million in direct state funding in FY2015-16; as of this writing the numbers are not yet final for FY2016-2017, but direct state funding should be no greater than $157 million (65%).

UW’s Office of Service, Leadership & Community Engagement (SLCE) may dispose of $500 thousand. Further support to the New Civics from administrative personnel throughout UW should cost another $500 thousand. We believe that the equivalent of 4 instructors teach 25 service-learning courses a year at UW; this would add another $1 million in faculty salaries and $366 thousand in tuition. Miscellaneous administrative costs should add $150 thousand; the total is $2.5 million—spent in a year when UW cut spending by $30 million dollars. This is less than the expenditures on New Civics by the three Colorado institutions—but it is $2.5 million that the University of Wyoming can ill afford.

**NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

NAS makes ten recommendations about how to change civics education nationwide.

1. **Restore a coordinated civic literacy curriculum at both the high school and college levels.** States should design their high school and college civics educations as a coherent whole, and make sure that undergraduate civics provides more advanced education than high-school civics.

2. **Mandate a course in traditional American civics as a graduation requirement at all colleges and universities that receive public funding.** If the institution itself is unwilling or unable to offer such a course, students must be permitted without penalty to meet the requirement by taking a qualified civics course at another institution.

3. **Establish a public body to set the guidelines for the required civics course.** This course should at a minimum teach the history, nature, and functions of our institutions of self-government, and should aim to foster commitment to our form of self-government. The public body should also be charged with reviewing and approving civics textbooks to be used in these courses.

4. **Require that the traditional civic requirement be met only through classroom instruction.** Colleges and universities should be required to define civics education as specifically as possible, so as to limit the ability of progressive activists to substitute the New Civics. Civics education should be defined explicitly as a way to learn testable material in class—such as the structure and function of the different parts of the Federal Government, and landmark Supreme Court cases and their consequences—and be defined equally explicitly not to include service-learning, civic engagement, or any other activities besides reading, writing, classroom discussion, and classroom examinations.
5. **Redefine civic ideals in non-progressive language.** Colleges and universities should strip progressive language and code words from their definitions of inspirational civic ideals and actions. The definition of civic ideals should emphasize un politicized education for participation in government, and distinguish between civic activity and participation in extra-governmental pressure groups.

6. **Freeze or curtail all federal and state funding for service-learning and civic engagement.** No matter how well-intentioned these programs, they now are used to advertise progressive causes, support progressive community organizations, and provide jobs for progressives in academic administration. The progressive takeover of these programs can only be kept in bounds by more oversight than it is realistic to expect from a legislature. Public money for service-learning and civic engagement should be capped immediately.

7. **Remove the service-learning and civic engagement bureaucracies from the universities.** No further personnel should be hired; as New Civics bureaucrats retire or resign, their positions should be eliminated. In due time, these programs need to be defunded and closed. Attrition will thin the ranks of these administrators before their positions are finally eliminated. The public will support this effort when it learns that the cost savings will be substantial.

8. **Legislators should mandate full and detailed fiscal transparency by all public educational institutions.** College administrators hide New Civics expenditures to conceal its expansion, and they will hide New Civics expenditures so as to thwart any effort by legislators or trustees to cap the New Civics. Colleges and universities must have transparent finances, so that college administrators can be held accountable by legislators and the public.

9. **Foster a genuine culture of volunteerism.** Many colleges now define volunteer activities as civic engagement. This conflation should be stopped at once. Moreover, all volunteer activities ought to be genuinely volunteer activities—done without financial support or class credit. Colleges and universities should state explicitly that a “volunteer” activity for which you receive remuneration is really an internship as an administrator of the welfare state.

10. **Create a rival national alliance of educational organizations dedicated to countering and replacing the national alliance of service-learning organizations.** An alternative national alliance of civics organizations needs to promote un politicized civics education, focused around traditional civic literacy. This alliance should work to promote traditional civic literacy and dislodge the New Civics by rallying public opinion and informing federal and state legislators.
DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Reform of civics education will go nowhere without first finding clarity of purpose. The place to begin is for each state to forge a declaration of the principles that should guide civics education.

Model Declaration Of Principles: Civics Education

Because self-government is based on citizens who know what is best about their country and seek to preserve it, students at all levels need to be educated in civics. Civics education in America should teach the history, the ideals, and the structure of government of the United States. Civics education should, in the first instance, aim to create Americans: American citizens who have affection for their country as well as knowledge of how its public institutions work, including the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of government; the divisions of power and responsibility among federal, state, and local authorities; and the rights and responsibilities of individuals.

Because non-citizens also attend American schools and colleges, civics education must also teach those who may become citizens and those who simply seek an American education. These non-citizens benefit from learning about this country’s history and ideals. Civics education should be a self-confident presentation of how Americans have sought to realize our country’s commitment to liberty and justice.

Americans often vigorously disagree about political goals, but are united in love of their country. Civics education should respect differing interpretations of America’s ideals, favoring none, and emphasizing what we hold in common: a free republic under the rule of law, and a political culture in which all sides accept compromise and the realization that their own views, no matter how cherished, will not always prevail.

Civics education does not seek to prepare “citizens of the world,” but citizens of the United States. American students should know about other nations’ governments, laws, and cultures, and about the roles of international bodies, but these are not the substance of civics education. Civics education should prepare Americans for the tasks of participating effectively in their own government. It is not a curriculum meant to provide the whole of a liberal education.

Civics education should prepare students for a life of civic action, which includes such things as voting, running for public office, serving on juries or grand juries, enlisting in the military or the National Guard, paying taxes, volunteering for public service such as fire departments, and demanding accountability from public officials. Preparing students for a life of civic action, however, should not be confused with forcing them to engage in such action. The habits of volunteering are valuable, but cannot take the place of acquiring the background knowledge and values necessary to participate in our form of self-government. Moreover, programs that marshal students into “voluntary” civic activities fail in the primary goal of civics education, the cultivation of independence of spirit.

America has been blessed with free and independent government—gained at no small cost by generations who sacrificed to preserve the ideals of our republic. Civics education is what we undertake to ensure that generations to come will continue to enjoy freedom and independence.
MORE FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

The full text of Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics, along with shorter commentary and research, is available at www.nas.org/makingcitizens. It is also available in print.

The NAS’s previous reports on higher education include

- The Disappearing Continent (2016), a critique of the College Board’s Advanced Placement European History Standards.
- The Architecture of Intellectual Freedom (2016), a statement on the principles and institutions that undergird academic freedom.
- Inside Divestment (2015), a study of the fossil-fuel divestment movement on campus.
- Sustainability: Higher Education’s New Fundamentalism (2015), an examination of the sustainability movement on campus.
- What Does Bowdoin Teach? (2013), the first top-to-bottom examination of a contemporary liberal arts college.
- Recasting History (2013), a fine-toothed examination of freshman history courses at the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

The National Association of Scholars is a network of scholars and citizens united by a commitment to academic freedom, disinterested scholarship, and excellence in American higher education.

We uphold the standards of a liberal arts education that fosters intellectual freedom, searches for the truth, and promotes virtuous citizenship.

We expect that ideas will be judged on their merits; that scholars will engage in disinterested research; and that colleges and universities will provide for fair and judicial examination and debate of contending views.

We publish reports and commentary on a number of topics related to higher education; they can be found at our website, www.nas.org.