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ABSTRACT

In this era of unprecedented political acrimony in the United States, the need for an effective national citizen education program has never been more acute. At the same time, the national trend in education ushered in by No Child Left Behind toward holding schools accountable through increased standardized testing of their students has made developing and implementing a robust, experiential citizen education program with broad appeal seem less and less likely. In the face of the difficult political and educational context, this study provides both a philosophical foundation drawn from the writings of Aristotle, John Dewey, and Hans-Georg Gadamer from which to build a viable citizen education program and a practical model, the Citizen Action Project, worthy of emulation. Taken together, the philosophical framework and the practical model also provide a reliable basis from which to evaluate the efficacy of existing citizen education programs.

Adopting educator and researcher Sharan Merriam’s mixed methods case study approach, this study evaluated one such program, the Citizen Action Project (CAP) at Monticello High
School in Charlottesville, Virginia. Data was collected through pre- and post-program open-ended question surveys of students, two on-site observations of student presentations and class work, video observations of the end-of-project seminars, and an array of student work uploaded to Google Sites as required by the program. Qualitative, categorical and quantitative analyses of student responses to the surveys and seminar questions were performed to determine the extent of change in student understanding of the concepts of citizen and citizenship. Qualitative analysis of the student work was performed to further evaluate the effectiveness of CAP at educating for this understanding, as well as in CAP’s ability to teach and assess student proficiency in core citizenship skills.

The results of the study suggest that CAP is generally successful at teaching and assessing citizenship skills and adequate student understanding of what it means to be an effective citizen. Based on the successful evaluation of CAP, the study also suggests that a scalable, experiential citizen education program is viable within the larger national context. Finally, the results also provide some direction and suggestions for future research.
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INTRODUCTION

Democracy is lived. Citizenship in a democracy is therefore active and participatory. Because citizens are not born into being, but rather must be educated to become citizens, a democracy worthy of its name must surely give some thought to what citizenship education should look like. My project is focused on this central question: What is the form that citizenship education should take? This question implies certain other questions that will also need answering: How should we define citizenship? Another way to ask this would be: apart from the act of voting, what knowledge and skills should a good citizen possess; what should a qualified citizen be able to do? If one accepts my premise about democratic citizenship, then one must certainly agree that educating a citizen for participation in a democracy must be experiential in some important ways. Citizenship is not learned from a book or lecture and then assessed by an end-of-year multiple choice test. Finally, I am posing these questions in a certain historical context. And given our current moment in history, I am also prompted to ask: is it possible to craft a citizenship education program with broad appeal, transcending the deep political divisions within our society? Is it possible to bring such a program “to scale” given current political roadblocks? And lastly, can we make such a
program accountable in the contemporary educational setting where accountability has become the measure of all programming?

In a certain real sense, this thesis represents my "yes" answer to all of these questions. In Chapter One, I will establish a philosophical foundation on which a citizen education program with broad appeal could be built. For this foundation, I draw from the thought of Aristotle, John Dewey, and Hans-Georg Gadamer. With their help, my intent is to suggest compelling answers to what the form and content of citizenship education should be. In Chapter Two, I give an account of the current educational context in which my philosophical foundation must operate and to which any solution must apply. In Chapter Three, I lay out the research framework and introduce the specific program, which served as both the focus of my study as well as a possible model for citizen education programs going forward: the Citizen Action Project at Monticello High School in Charlottesville, Virginia. In Chapter Four, I conduct the Data Analysis of the results from the study. And finally, in Chapter Five, I offer conclusions from the study and implications of the work for future research.
CHAPTER ONE

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION

The first task of my project will be to establish a credible philosophical foundation for an understanding of democratic citizenship and citizenship education. As a teacher, I am aware that much of the theory about the purpose of public education is inspired by John Dewey. And even if one is not a committed Pragmatist, most would say that the goal of public education in a democracy is to train good citizens for participation in the political process. We want educated adults making informed decisions in the ballot box and beyond. The obvious questions that follow are: what is the best way to educate such a citizen, and, how can we evaluate the success of our educative endeavor? What content and competencies are essential for such training? What will such a citizen look like? In articulating the philosophical foundation for this project, I am attempting to provide answers to these questions that will have broad appeal. In addition to drawing heavily from Dewey, I will rely also on contemporary philosopher, Hans-Georg Gadamer. At the center of his thought (and consistent with Dewey’s prescription) is the Aristotelian concept of phronesis (practical wisdom) and its application in praxis (practice). A citizen education program concerned with the application of such wisdom would, by definition, be experiential: one that develops within
our students this power of discernment and instructs them in applying their judgments to the practice of democracy — Gadamer’s hermeneutical dialogue and what I will call civil discourse. This philosophical foundation (discussed below) for citizenship education points toward several necessary or core skills with which we must equip every citizen-graduate:

- The ability to both **write and speak clearly**: The ability to make a sustained verbal and written argument is the essence of effective participation in civil discourse.

- The ability to **research and critically analyze information**: The ability to conduct research and analyze information is essential for the citizen to equip herself with the factual support on which an argument is based and distinguishes the worthy argument from the unworthy.

- The ability to **listen empathically**: Civil discourse and the forging of open, democratic solutions to societal problems, requires the citizen’s ability to listen openly to the arguments of other citizens and to discern (applying phronesis) which elements are worthy of further consideration and the basis for possible compromise.

- The ability to **collaborate constructively**: The ability to work openly with others facilitates both the fashioning of the compromise out of the dialogue, as well as the civic action that necessarily follows from the decision.

- The ability to **engage in creative problem solving** (the essential praxis): The willingness and ability to work with others provides the necessary context for the application of the practical wisdom to the problem in question.

I have chosen these skills, in particular, because of my experience in teaching the social studies to adolescents, and because my understanding of the processes described by Aristotle, Dewey, and Gadamer would require competency in such skills for an individual to participate effectively in the civil discourse.
These skills are also consistent with the *Common Core State Standards* (CCSS), a set of competency standards with initial broad bi-partisan appeal and currently adopted by 42 of the United States and the District of Columbia. I will return to a discussion of the CCSS below. A viable citizenship education program must be able to teach these skills, must be able to assess reliably their attainment by students, and ideally must be deliverable (i.e. able to be brought to scale under the current, albeit imperfect, funding scheme — also discussed below).

My project, then, will rely upon John Dewey heavily, because at their core, his prescriptions for educating a democratic polity are as relevant today as they were in his time. A democracy in name must have faith in its citizens, even as it understands that citizens are not simply born, but educated and trained. Democracy’s faith is therefore demonstrated in a robust commitment to the public’s education (this is presumably true regardless of whether or not one is committed to a publically funded education system). If educated correctly, the individual citizen will become competent in the skills of citizenship. And competence, as defined by Dewey, requires that citizens “have the ability to judge of the bearing of the knowledge supplied by others upon common concerns” (*Problem of Method* in Morris 1993, 188). Dewey’s competence is a question of discernment and analysis — not how well one memorizes. Accordingly, the purpose of an education system, argues Dewey, is to train children to be
adult citizens; that is, to be able to think, discern, analyze, and articulate positions that will one day come before them in the public arena. "[T]raining for citizenship is formal and nominal unless it develops the power of observation, analysis, and inference with respect to what makes up a social situation and the agencies through which it is modified" (Ethical Principles Underlying Education in Morris 1993, 102). This training has its place in each of the academic disciplines; both the content of the courses and the faculties of each human derive their meaning from these social ends.

The simple fact is that there is no isolated faculty of observation, or memory, or reasoning any more than there is an original faculty of blacksmithing, carpentering, or steam engineering. These faculties simply mean that particular impulses and habits have been co-ordinated and framed with reference to accomplishing certain kinds of work. Precisely the same thing holds of the so-called mental faculties. They are not powers in themselves, but are such only with reference to the ends to which they are put. . . . We need to know the social situations to which the individual will have to use ability to observe, recollect, imagine, and reason . . . (Ethical Principles in Morris 1993, 97-98)

This has implications not only for contextualizing content, but for employing instructional practices, as well. Education is to be experiential, practical, and practiceable. Such method "trains" citizens. For Dewey, this is the raison d’être of education.

Before turning my attention fully to Dewey's conception of education, I will discuss one other consideration impacting both the citizen and her education: Dewey's notion of intelligence.
Unlike some, for whom intelligence inheres in the individual and is an attribute to be developed often in competition with others and as a matter of self-interest, Dewey believes intelligence to be a collective capacity. An education system educates citizens of a society. In this understanding, the collective is more than simply the sum of its parts. We can imagine its application in a wealth of solutions to contemporary social problems, but we can also see how it has operated historically. To illustrate this point, Dewey mentions but two of many compelling examples – Sir Isaac Newton and Michael Faraday. In citing both, Dewey’s point is that the common citizen now understands as basic knowledge the ideas and discoveries of two men, which were revolutionary and mostly incomprehensible in their day. In contemporary terms, the more educated participants there are, the more perspectives can be applied to societal challenges, and the greater the corresponding range of creative solutions that can be fashioned for those challenges. Increasing the participants exponentially expands the potential of the collective because of the interactive, collaborative nature of the process; that is, democracy. This understanding of intelligence is essential to Dewey’s vision for the democratic system (and, as we will see, very similar to Gadamer’s conception of the same). Democracy is a dynamic process, “primarily a mode of associated living, a conjoint communicated experience” (The Democratic Conception in Education in Morris 1993, 110). For, in such an experience, there
"never is merely majority rule" (The Problem of Method in Morris 1993, 187). In the same passage, quoting Samuel J. Tilden, Dewey continues, "'The means by which a majority comes to be a majority is the more important thing:' antecedent debates, modification of views to meet the opinions of minorities, the relative satisfaction given the latter by the fact that it has had a chance and that next time it may be successful in becoming a majority" (Ibid.). This process is, of course, predicated on the notion that a common interest exists and that citizens are guided by this interest as they engage in the public discourse that considers the issues confronting society. This is a vision that was antithetical to the system existing in Dewey's time; a system that Dewey saw as a democracy subverted by a capitalistic plutocracy, one in which intelligence and wealth were viewed as either innate to individuals or, if not innate, certainly individual accomplishments. Consistent with this, Dewey wrote, "The notion that intelligence is a personal endowment or personal attainment is the great conceit of the intellectual class, as that of the commercial class is that wealth is something which they personally have wrought and possess" (Ibid.). This is the system which Dewey proposed to change and for which his understanding of human intelligence made him optimistic.

In giving full consideration to Dewey's vision for education as a key pillar in the philosophical foundation for my work, it is also necessary to define the key terms experience,
thinking, and method. Dewey gives all three special meaning, and an understanding of them is critical to understanding his entire program. Experience, as Dewey defined it, is two-fold, active and passive, requiring an action first and then the passive reception of the action’s consequence.

The connection of these two phases of experience measures the fruitfulness or value of the experience. Mere activity does not constitute experience. . . . Experience as trying (the active component) involves change, but change is meaningless transition unless it is consciously connected with the return wave of consequences which flow from it. (Dewey 1944, 107)

In other words, for experience to be meaningful, the actions and its consequences must be reflected upon. Two further points are noteworthy here for education. First, “experience is primarily an active-passive affair; it is not primarily cognitive. But (second) the measure of the value of an experience lies in the perception of relationships or continuities to which it leads up. It includes cognition in the degree in which it is cumulative or amounts to something, or has meaning” (Ibid.). For Dewey, experience was true learning because only through experiencing and reflecting could an individual determine the meaning of actions, certainly, but also of ideas.

The second essential term for Deweyan education is thinking or thought. Again, Dewey made clear the significance of reflective thought for experience. “No experience having a meaning is possible without some element of thought” (Ibid., 110-11). For an experience to assume profound meaning, however, a
certain type of deep reflective thinking is involved. Such reflection transforms the experience as well as the act of thinking.

The deliberate cultivation of this phase of thought constitutes thinking as a distinctive experience. Thinking, in other words, is the intentional endeavor to discover specific connections between something which we do and the consequences which result, so that the two become continuous. . . . Thinking is thus equivalent to an explicit rendering of the intelligent element in our experience. It makes it possible to act with an end in view. It is the condition of our having aims. (Ibid., 111)

Reflection is the condition that makes action intelligent, purposeful. When individuals, acting as a community, engage in such reflective action, the results become transformative. Democratic education, then, has as its aim the inculcation of such collective intelligence in its citizenry (Again, we will see this echoed in Gadamer's thought).

The final term needing clarification for Dewey is method. Method in instruction is inextricably bound to the previous understandings of meaningful experience and reflective thought. Appropriate educational method is that which guides, develops, and encourages the student through such experience and reflection.

The sole direct path to enduring improvement in the methods of instruction and learning consists in centering upon the conditions which exact, promote, and test thinking. . . . We speak, legitimately enough, about the method of thinking, but the important thing to bear in mind about method is that thinking is method, the method of intelligent experience in the course it takes. (Ibid., 116)
Such definitions for these terms hold obvious implications for content and instruction. Both must involve participation and engagement on the part of students as they work to create shared meaning in their lives, the construction of identities within the context of a larger community. To this larger point, Dewey claimed the following in the selection of content for study:

It is important that education should use a criterion of social worth . . . The scheme of a curriculum must take account of the adaptation of studies to the needs of existing community life; it must select with the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past . . . . The things which are socially most fundamental, that is, which have to do with the experiences in which the widest groups share, are the essentials. (Ibid., 144-45)

Curriculum then, in a sense, becomes instruction due to its active nature. It is no longer the selection of discrete facts and texts to be memorized and regurgitated for praise or criticism and, ultimately, evaluation on a multiple choice test. And such an understanding of curriculum is clearly consonant with the understanding of citizenship education outlined above. Curriculum choices become experience choices crafted for the learner and tailored to her particular developmental stage. "A curriculum which acknowledges the social responsibilities of education must present situations where problems are relevant to the problems of living together, and where observation and information are calculated to develop social insight and interest" (Ibid., 145). Pedagogical understanding and practice,
then, involve an awareness on the part of the teacher of the particular developmental phases (intellectual, emotional, psychological, and experiential) of his students. And as suggested above, good pedagogy would then craft the presentation of situations to meet the range of needs of one’s students.

A large part of the art of instruction lies in making the difficulty of new problems large enough to challenge thought, and small enough so that, in addition to the confusion naturally attending the novel elements, there shall be luminous familiar spots from which helpful suggestions may spring. (Ibid., 119)

Citizenship education, then could be either a specific strand of Dewey’s more comprehensive view of education generally or, as Dewey saw it, the ultimate goal. Given the current political and educational context, I will argue ultimately that viewing citizenship education as a strand and, therefore a logical province of the Social Studies makes certain pragmatic sense, though Dewey certainly understood citizenship to be the primary training goal of any education system in a democracy. For the purposes of this section and in faithfulness to Dewey’s prescription, it is important to continue by giving full expression to his vision.

In his two short works, *The School and Society* and *The Child and the Curriculum* one finds the most specific and most comprehensive prescriptions for school organization, curricular choices, and instructional practice. In the first, and as the name suggests, Dewey takes up the question of the school’s
relationship to society. Through this exploration and explication, Dewey derives the ideal organization of the primary and secondary school. Given his understanding of experience and its central role in education, Dewey sees the school’s organization as arising organically from life experience and maintaining an organic connection to society. The word organic is important here, because the relevance of the school and its workings to the life experience of its students should be apparent in everything that occurs there. “I wish to suggest that really the only way to unite the parts of the system is to unite each to life. We can get only an artificial unity so long as we confine our gaze to the school system itself. We must look at it as part of the larger whole of social life” (Dewey 2001, 45).

Dewey continues:

From the standpoint of the child, the great waste in the school comes from his inability to utilize the experiences he gets outside the school in any complete and free way within the school itself; while on the other hand, he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning at school. That is the isolation of the school – its isolation from life. . . . So the school, being unable to utilize this everyday experience, sets painfully to work, on another tack and by a variety of means to arouse in the child an interest in school studies. (Ibid., 46)

This question of content relevance to the lives of one’s students is an important one, and one to which most teachers today are sensitive. This does not seem to be the original motivating force behind No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and its aftermath, however, as the measure of the assessment of learning resides in a multiple
choice test that grades a student’s ability primarily to recall discrete pieces of information. Subsequent adjustments brought about by *Race to the Top* (RTTT) and the *Common Core State Standards Initiative* (CCSS) notwithstanding, the current trend in most public schools continues to be academic calendar and curriculum choices driven by just such year-end tests.¹ Such a notion is clearly antithetical to what Dewey is promoting above.

It is important to note further that by *relevance*, Dewey is not suggesting that teachers promote their subjects as preparing students for the business world.

Though there should be organic connection between school and business life, it is not meant that the school is to prepare the child for any particular business, but that there should be a natural connection to the everyday life of the child with the business environment about him, and that it is the affair of the school to clarify and liberalize this connection, to bring it to consciousness . . . by keeping alive the ordinary bonds of connection. (Ibid., 47)

Following this description, Dewey offers some examples of the integrated nature of the education he is proposing:

We all know what the old-fashioned botany was... It was a study of plants without any reference to the soil, to the country, to growth. In contrast, a real study of plants takes them in their natural environment and in their uses as well, not simply as food, but in all

¹ There is hope with the December 2015 reauthorization of NCLB as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), that the “testing bind” will be loosened somewhat as states will regain significant control over their standards and how to evaluate proficiency. Students must continue to be tested, however, in grades 3–8 and once in high school in English Language Arts and Math, and once at each level of elementary, middle, and high school in Science.
their adaptations to the social life of man. Cooking becomes as well a most natural introduction to the study of chemistry. (Ibid., 51)

And a little further:

The same relations with the outside world are found in the carpentry and the textile shops. They connect with the country, as the source of their materials, with physics, as the science of applying energy, with commerce and distribution, with art in the development of architecture and decoration. They have also an intimate connection with the university on the side of its technological and engineering schools; with the laboratory and its scientific methods and results. (Ibid., 51)

The preceding texts give a sense of the extent of Dewey’s vision and recommendations. In The Child and the Curriculum, Dewey provides clear implications for how the child and democratic citizenship fit into his general education program.

[W]e realize that the child and the curriculum are simply two limits which define a straight line, so the present standpoint of the child and the facts and truths of studies define instruction. It is continuous reconstruction, moving from the child’s present experience out into that represented by the organized bodies of truth that we call studies . . . the various studies . . . are themselves experience – they are that of the race. They embody the cumulative outcome of the efforts, the strivings, and the successes of the human race generation after generation. They present this... in some organized and systematized way – that is, as reflectively formulated. (Ibid., 109)

The teacher, then, must be both an expert in the content as well as an expert in child development with a specific understanding of the child whom he presumes to teach. Remember, too, that by content, Dewey does not mean something static – a printed text –
but an evolving experience to which the learner herself is adding meaning, reconstructing, as she defines her reality in the context of her society (again, we will see clear echoes of this in Gadamer’s thinking shortly). Hence, the “problem” of the teacher is this:

He is concerned with the subject-matter of the science as representing a given stage and phase of the development of experience (italics, Dewey’s). His problem is that of inducing a vital and personal experiencing. Hence, what concerns him, as teacher, is the ways in which that subject may become part of experience; what there is in the child’s present that is usable with reference to it . . . how his own knowledge of the subject-matter may assist in interpreting the child’s needs and doings, and determine the medium in which the child should be placed in order that his growth may be properly directed. He is concerned, not with the subject-matter as such, but with the subject-matter as a related factor in a total and growing experience. (Ibid., 117)

Dewey then ends with this exhortation to the teacher:

Now see to it that day by day the conditions are such that their own activities (italics, Dewey’s) move inevitably in this direction, toward such culmination of themselves. Let the child’s nature fulfill its own destiny, revealed to you in whatever of science and art and industry the world now holds as its own. (Ibid., 123)

Taken with Dewey’s other writings about the meaning of citizenship and democracy, each child’s destiny as a member of the human race would be, at least in part, to take her rightful place as an educated citizen in the public sphere to engage with other such citizens in the good work of fashioning an ever better society. Again, the extent of Dewey’s vision is impressive. In an
attempt to ensure the best chance of success for bringing a program of citizen education to scale, I will argue below for situating the burden of citizen instruction and assessment within the Social Studies.

There is remarkable consonance between Dewey’s writings and those of the twentieth century philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer, and his interpretation of the Aristotelian notions of *phronesis* (practical wisdom) and *praxis* (practice). This consonance is evident first in the understanding of the experience of education and the situating of the student within that experience. The correct positioning of the student, as such, allows one to best develop the practice of citizenship in preparation for taking one’s rightful place in a democratic society. Gadamer’s discussion of these processes helps to support and deepen Dewey’s treatment of them. To begin with, just as we saw in Dewey’s exhortation to the teacher that he should understand the individual’s context in coming to the content and experience of education, Gadamer argues in a similar way for the importance of a particular understanding of one’s historical context. Gadamer held a dynamic view of one’s traditions that will form an almost necessary precondition for successful participation in civil discourse (discussed below). In addition to providing vital context for the human individual, history and tradition for Gadamer are essential for the human understanding of ourselves as contingent beings. This is true in two important ways. First, and
most obvious, coming to understand ourselves as particular historical beings helps us establish real connections to real people and facilitates concretizing our choices and actions in this world. Second, developing the capacity for reflective understanding of our context allows us to communicate with and come to understand those others with whom we live. This second component of human understanding will prove essential to the subsequent consideration of practice to which I will return momentarily. Connected to the first, Gadamer writes: "Just as our total experience of the world presents a process of coming to be at home that never comes to an end . . . even in a world that appears ever more strange because it has been all too changed by ourselves" (Gadamer 1981, 20). Indeed, we "come to be at home" as we understand our context, make sense of it in light of our present reality, and then transform its meaning in the never-ending acting out of our respective futures. Contrary to what some might think, our tradition does not inhibit our understanding of, and our communion with, others. In fact, Gadamer rejects some sterile goal of objectivity as the basis for understanding others or the past in favor of an embrace of one's past as the appropriate starting point for each individual. "[T]he important thing is to recognize the distance in time as a positive and productive possibility of understanding. It is not a

2 See previous discussion of Dewey on p. 11.

3 And again on pp. 7-8.
yawning abyss, but is filled with the continuity of custom and tradition, in the light of which all that is handed down presents itself to us” (Gadamer in Bernstein 1983, 140). Our actions and negotiations with others draw their “vigor” (to use Simone de Beauvoir’s term) from these traditions, which means they are made authentic. If each person can acknowledge and honor every individual’s inevitable unique relationship to and experience of history, the foundation for working out common understandings and shared meanings is laid.

For Gadamer, the key access to our cultural traditions (and, for our purposes here, the key to civil discourse) is language. Language is the universal, which gets concretized every time we think. This concretization occurs in time and place. There is an essential tension between the universal and the particular. In a sense, everyone shares in the experience of this tension, even though the particular concretizations are inevitably different for each individual:

Every actualization in understanding can be regarded as a historical potential of what is understood. It is part of the historical finitude of our being that we are aware that others after us will understand in a different way. And yet it is equally indubitable that it remains the same work whose fullness of meaning is realized in the changing process of understanding, just as it is the same history whose meaning is constantly in the process of being defined. (Gadamer 2004, 366)
It is this shared tension, however, that holds the promise of
dialogue and, possibly, mutual understanding. The understanding
of this tension derives in part from Gadamer's reading of Hegel:

> Neither natural necessities nor caused compulsions
determine our thinking and our intending — whether we
will and act, fear or hope or despair, we are moved in
the space of freedom. This space is not the free space
of an abstract joy in construction but a space filled
with reality by prior familiarity. (Gadamer 1981, 51)

Hegel, Gadamer tells us, used the expression "making oneself at
home." This act is to be understood as empowering: "... it
grounds the freedom for criticism and for projecting new goals in
social life and action" (Ibid.). The need for some understanding
of one's history and tradition, therefore, is real and provides
the basis for, rather than the barrier to, understanding. These
roots confirm our contingent, finite humanity, thereby
establishing a fertile grounding for the choosing of authentic
lives. This is an important point for a philosophical foundation
with broad appeal. For whether one believes in the existence of
an omnipotent god and certain concomitant absolute truths or, on
the other end of the spectrum, rejects such absolutes in favor of
complete relativism of human perspectives and understanding, a
democratic society should be able to accommodate both positions
in the realm of civil discourse. Gadamer's call to a recognition
of the importance of both one's universal use of language,
however particular, as well as an individual's roots, whatever
that term may mean to the individual, can serve as the common
denominator, allowing for productive dialogue between otherwise incommensurate perspectives. A Gadamerian sense of one's history, then, is a necessary component of the notion of civic responsibility in both its function as a strong foundation from which an individual chooses to live out his obligations to others, as well as a precondition for the working out of one's shared existence with others (with clear implications for asserting the need for citizenship education).

Following from this vital understanding of one's history, we must now turn to Gadamer's discussion of knowledge, wisdom, and practice; a discussion, which, again, shares important similarities with Dewey. A primary goal for Gadamer (again, with clear implications for citizenship) is to reclaim the importance of *phronesis* (practical knowledge or wisdom), which historically had become subverted by *techne* (technical knowledge) and by theoretical, scientific knowledge. For Gadamer, the Greek division of knowledge into *episteme* (theoretical), *phronesis*, and *techne* had profound implications for Western Civilization and its subsequent standards for truth. In this division, Gadamer sees the root of a process that would ultimately bring about the ascendancy of scientific knowledge as the measure of truth and the scientific method as the primary mode of problem solving in society. Gadamer is the most explicit in recalling us from this determinism of scientific logic and knowledge to a renewed understanding of ourselves and the world in which we live. In
doing this, he wants to reclaim certain Greek notions of *theoria*, *phronesis*, and *praxis*, using the understanding and approach of Aristotelian practical philosophy. Significantly, connected to this project is also Gadamer’s understanding of Hegel, to which I have already made reference, that accords to each individual human life its appropriate (and, in a sense, insignificant) place in the universe and in human history. This does not amount to a denigration of humanity and human existence — rather, it provides a necessary corrective to the astounding hubris and radical estrangement brought about by the ascendant worldview of scientific determinism that Gadamer sees as so problematic. To this philosophic perspective, Gadamer again links a phenomenological understanding of the role of language in human existence. He writes:

[I]t is the medium in which we live from the outset as social natures and which holds open the totality within which we live our lives. . . . But language as orientation to the whole comes into play wherever real conversation occurs and that means wherever the reciprocity of two speakers who have entered into conversation circles about the subject matter. For everywhere that communication happens, language not only is used but shaped as well. This is why philosophy can be guided by language when it conducts its relentless questioning beyond every scientifically objectifiable realm of objects. (Ibid., 4)

Gadamer believes that this conception of language and its role in human understanding and philosophical questioning can provide the necessary corrective to the current practices in modern society —
practices in modern politics, in the social sciences, and in education.

At the center of this corrective (and consistent with Dewey's understanding of the role of the citizen and citizenship education in a democratic society), is again Gadamer's assertion that we must return to the Greek conception of practical philosophy as the basis for decision making in society and in an individual's life. Such a recovery would have clear implications for educational practice. "It (practical philosophy) has to do with what is each individual's due as a citizen and constitutes his arête or excellence . . . it has to be accountable with its knowledge for the viewpoint in terms of which one thing is to be preferred to another: the relationship to the good" (Ibid., 92).

*Techne*, here, cannot supply the answer to such questions, nor the method by which to get there. The practice of the expert who wields his technical knowledge is the scientific method, and, as such, this method really has nothing substantive to say about the best course of action in human affairs:

[T]he knowledge that gives direction to action is essentially called for by concrete situations in which we are to choose the thing to be done; and no learned or mastered technique can spare us the task of deliberation and decision. . . . It must arise from practice itself and, with all the typical generalizations that it brings to explicit consciousness, be related back to practice. In fact, that constitutes the specific character of Aristotelian ethics and politics. . . . But what separates it (practical philosophy) fundamentally from technical expertise is that it expressly asks the question of the good too — for example, about the best
way of life or about the best constitution of the
state. (Ibid., 92-93)

Gadamer uses jurisprudence as an illustrative example here. In
deciding a case, the judge must apply a general legal principle
to the specific facts of a concrete case. The printed laws cannot
provide for every eventuality in life, and so, the judge must
apply the spirit of the law. Gadamer appropriately points to the
etymology of the term jurisprudence — literally, "sagacity in
legal affairs" noting that Greek practical philosophy had
"considered prudentia the highest virtue of practical
rationality" (Ibid., 127). With heavy irony, he then points to
the shift in the late-nineteenth century from jurisprudence to
legal science as further confirmation of techne's ascendency. The
presumption of a legal science to be able to provide a
determinative method for deciding all legal cases, only serves to
highlight the aptness of the jurisprudence analogy for society —
just as citizens and politicians must be adept at negotiating and
resolving societal questions in their particularity, so too must
the judge be able to navigate

the tension between the universality of the valid
legal framework . . . and the individuality of the
concrete case. . . . That a concrete passing of
judgment in a legal question is no theoretical
statement but an instance of 'doing things with words'
is almost too obvious to bear mentioning. In a certain
sense the correct interpretation of a law is
presupposed in its application. To that extent one can
say that each application of a law goes beyond mere
understanding of its legal sense and fashions a new
reality. (Ibid., 125-126)
To navigate such a tension in politics would seem to necessitate an intentional citizen education program; one that provides practice in confronting and solving real societal challenges.

Similarly, notions of human freedom and obligation, indeed, of citizen and citizenship, must be worked out in the concrete particularities of our lives - a process for which the technical expert can offer little.

'Being habitually understanding toward others' means a modification of practical reasonableness, the insightful judgment regarding someone else's practical deliberations. This obviously implies much more than a mere understanding of something said. It entails a kind of communality in virtue of which reciprocal taking of counsel, the giving and taking of advice, is at all meaningful in the first place. (Ibid., 133)

What Gadamer is describing here is the hermeneutic philosophical practice (Dewey's competence, intelligence, and experience and what I have labeled civil discourse). The vital hermeneutic dimension of the practice resides in the reflection upon, interpretation of, and then understanding of one's position, one's "making oneself at home" (to use again Gadamer's appropriation of Hegel) (Ibid., 51), upon entering into the deliberation at hand. And, as I have noted previously in this discussion of Gadamer, this understanding is not static, it is the particular understanding of one's position vis-à-vis both the particular issue under deliberation and the particular individual(s) with whom one is deliberating at the particular moment in time. The dynamic character of one's position in the
world is essential for practice because it suggests flexibility and a necessary openness to re-working one's position in the practice of dialogue, in the practice of working out shared meanings:

Hence reaching an understanding on the subject matter of a conversation necessarily means that a common language must first be worked out in the conversation. This is not an external matter of simply adjusting our tools; nor is it even right to say that the partners adapt themselves to one another but, rather, in a successful conversation they both come under the influence of the truth of the object and are thus bound to one another in a new community. To reach an understanding in a dialogue is not merely a matter of putting oneself forward and successfully asserting one's own point of view, but being transformed into a communion in which we do not remain what we were. (Gadamer 2004, 371)

The critical skills, then, necessary for becoming a practitioner in this civil discourse would need to be the "citizen" skills identified previously. And if we are serious about educating competent citizens, it is precisely those skills with which we must equip our students through pedagogical methods that, again, build in a good measure of practice with them.

As a final consideration here, this practice for Gadamer is also necessarily philosophical as opposed to technical in the Greek sense, because only this type of thinking takes as its supreme task the working out of the meaning of the good in society and in life. To this goal, practical philosophy then combines the requisite theoretical and practical knowledge/understanding (theoria and phronesis) to deliberating
upon and solving the discrete, concrete issue of the moment.

Richard Bernstein writes the following of Gadamer:

[He] is constantly directing us to a critical appropriation of the traditions that have shaped us, but he is motivated by the practical-moral intention of searching for ways in which he can 'here and now' foster a 'reawakening' consciousness of solidarity of a humanity that slowly begins to know itself as humanity, for this means knowing that it has to solve the problems of life on this planet. (Gadamer in Bernstein 1983, 228).

Educating for the capacity to engage in authentic politics, educating for citizenship, in other words, must necessarily be experiential in some substantive way. This core foundational principle shared by Aristotle, Dewey, and Gadamer, that citizenship education, by definition, must be experiential should not be controversial (whether we call it by that name or phronesis or hermeneutical dialogue). What makes such a commitment difficult, however, is the political context in which current debates about education curriculum choices operate. It is not enough to lay a solid philosophical foundation to justify such an education program. One must be able to demonstrate that the experiential citizenship education program can be brought to scale in such a context. I will now briefly outline both the historical development of US education policy as well as the key governing elements of federal education policy that brings us to this current political context.
CHAPTER TWO
THE EDUCATION POLICY CONTEXT

The project of American Education is one about which most Americans presume to have an opinion. We have, most of us, been part of this project at some point in our lives, some of us for a rather good portion. Having been in it, our opinions are grounded in experience, which "qualifies" us as having something to say on the matter. That such a presumption may be false is largely irrelevant because, valid or not, most of us do participate in the national discourse concerning the nation's education system. And this fact makes the policy debates on American education particularly difficult to resolve. It certainly means that forging a national consensus in such a large, diverse country as ours will be rare. No educational program, of course, exists in a vacuum. And the current political context in the United States makes such consensus on education policy particularly elusive. This reality brings us to the next set of questions that my project must address. In an era of budget-tightening and acrimonious political debate, is it possible to deliver a citizenship education program that is necessarily experiential, but one that can also be brought to scale — both in terms of the number of students taught, as well as in the mechanisms of assessment of those students and their work? Indeed, for those assessments to be brought to scale, they must be affordable,
efficient and reliable. In addition to the very real "scalability" concerns, the current political climate begs the question if it is even possible today to develop and implement a national citizen education program that could transcend the stark divisions within our governing institutions and across the many states with their own particularities. I do believe that there is hope of bridging this divide and of earning bipartisan support for a type of program that is affordable, efficient, and reliable even as it needs to operate within certain very real constraints. In order to better understand these constraints, it is necessary to outline the historical development of U.S. federal education policy, which brings us to our current educational and political context.

Strident political debate and questions of scale are not, of course, new to American public education policy. What is relatively new is a certain understanding of accountability in education — accountability of schools, administrators, and teachers for student learning — combined with a federal mandate for such a system across all of the fifty states. This latest iteration of accountability was inaugurated in 2002 with the then re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). NCLB was a remarkable achievement in American education, requiring substantive compromise by Democrats and Republicans on seemingly inviolate education principles long held by the two parties. The historical
roots of these divisions date back at least to the 1950s; and significantly, it was also in the 1950s that a true federal presence in education emerged for the first time. This section will briefly trace the historical development of both these divisions, as well as the federal role in education through the passage of NCLB to the current educational context.

For the entire country, but for education especially, Brown v. Topeka Board of Education in 1954 was a landmark case. Brown provided the judicial imperative for the country generally, and for public schools specifically, to extend the promise of egalitarian democratic citizenship to all of its citizens: “[I]t is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms” (Barone 2007, 3). In order for this mandate to be fulfilled, the federal government would be required to take an unprecedented role in directing a national reform agenda in schools. At almost the same time, an equally powerful force for reform presented itself in the launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union. This fact sowed considerable panic throughout the country and served to demand a federal response, as well. It was concluded that America had lost the space race because of an inferior education system — critics of the then existing differentiated curricula and vocational education could now point to “concrete” evidence of the failings
of American education (Urban 2009, 337). The answer would be found in a more robust curriculum of science, math, and foreign languages. Indeed, these fears prompted the Eisenhower administration and Congress to act in passing the 1958 National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) in which, for the first time, the federal government provided broad-based federal aid to education rather than continuing the practice of enacting narrowly tailored single-purpose legislation.¹ Ultimately, the amount of funding, only $183 million of funding for education at all levels, was rather small, but the NDEA established the foundation for the far more extensive education act of 1965, the ESEA (Ibid., 338).

The federal government’s performance at ensuring that state governments carried out the dictates of the two Brown decisions “with all deliberate speed” was mixed at best. This was particularly true given the “Southern Manifesto” signed by 101 senators and representatives from the South and denouncing Brown as “contrary to established law and to the Constitution” (McGuinn 2006, 27). Furthermore, the lukewarm commitment on the part of the Eisenhower administration to confront the issue allowed states such as Virginia to defy outright the Court’s decisions by practicing “massive resistance” to large-scale de-segregation attempts (Ibid.). The ESEA was conceived as part of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society program and his War on Poverty with the

¹ The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was one such effort, which directed funds specifically to vocational education programs.
purpose of righting the wrongs that the Brown decision had meant to address. Drawing on the earlier established notion of the schools as vehicles for social reform, Johnson pushed through the ESEA as a plan to direct federal funds toward the education of disadvantaged children in the belief that better education opportunities would help to lift them out of poverty. Both the amount of funds, as well as the comprehensive nature of the bill were unprecedented. Furthermore, the bill also broke new ground in its focus on basic academic skills and content, as well as instruction. And significantly, the bill targeted, for the first time, poor and minority children. In order to secure passage, Johnson was forced to make some key concessions — under Title I of the Act, which governed the disbursement of the funds, 95% of the nation’s school districts qualified for funding (Ibid., 31). Furthermore, the specifications for how the monies were to be spent were vague enough and the accountability measures sufficiently lax that virtually any project could be demonstrated to meet the criteria. Concerns over lack of accountability were expressed, but in the end, key forces prevailed. The National Education Association (NEA), the nation’s largest labor union representing public school teachers, wanted funding to be used at the discretion of educators, and conservatives agreed to funding only if the states could make funding decisions without the meddling of the federal government. Finally, the intent for ESEA was that it would be re-authorized every five to six years. Over
the next two decades, reauthorization occurred, maintaining, more or less, its basic form.

In the interim, one key development did occur which would further enhance the federal government's role in education. In 1979, under democratic president Jimmy Carter, a cabinet-level Department of Education was created. Such a department had existed for one year in 1867 in the aftermath of the Civil War, but it was quickly relegated to bureau status within the Department of the Interior. Its creation was anathema to conservatives, and Ronald Reagan made the department's abolition one of his campaign promises as part of his larger ideological commitment to small government.

The Reagan conservative revolution would initiate a protracted period of scrutiny and mounting criticism of the federal "bankrolling" of public education. Part of this concerted attack took the form of a report issued in 1983 by the Reagan administration entitled *A Nation At Risk*. Still in the throes of the Cold War and faced with increasing competition from nations in an emerging global economy, *A Nation at Risk* hearkened back to the days of Sputnik. The report declared that the federal government held "the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest . . . and provide the national leadership" (*A Nation At Risk* in McGuinn 2006, 43).
The publication of the report was remarkable, coming as it did from an administration that had vowed to end federal government’s involvement in education. Some critics have claimed subsequently that the crisis was manufactured to discredit public schools and promote school choice in the form of vouchers (Urban 2009, 403-404). In fact, its unintended consequence was that it seemed to necessitate a federal government response in order to meet what had been deemed a national crisis. If there was to be a concerted federal response, however, there would also need to be accountability for the additional funds spent. In a very real sense, the Excellence Movement\(^2\) and the broad-based accountability movement began with A Nation at Risk. The basic critique became focused on two primary complaints, both of which were connected to the unpopularity of busing remedies for desegregation: 1) federal policy had become too prescriptive and intrusive; and 2) federal policy was too ineffective at improving school quality or student performance (McGuinn 2006, 39). Accordingly, the Supreme Court began to strike down busing as a constitutional remedy for equality in schooling.\(^3\)

Despite his best efforts, Reagan was unable to eliminate the newly created Department of Education or completely gut the

---

\(^2\) The Excellence Movement was begun by the National Commission on Excellence in Education and its publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983.

ESEA in its 1981 reauthorization. But as a result of A Nation at Risk, education was poised to assume much greater prominence on the national stage. And it was Reagan's successor, the first President Bush who, having made the professed desire to be the next "Education President," in 1989 convened an Education Summit at the University of Virginia, bringing together the nation's governors in an attempt to fashion a bipartisan education agenda. The effort was important symbolically, if not substantively, in that the summit generated broad agreement concerning the basic principles of education reform without, of course, allocating any funding or making binding political commitments to the reform. Bush, himself, was unable to enact any substantive policy in this regard, but by articulating this new education agenda in his 1990 State of the Union address, he legitimized the idea of national goals for education—something that would have been impossible for a Democratic President. This point was echoed by Paul O'Neill, Chairman of Bush's Presidential Education Policy Advisory Committee (PEPAC): "There was a threshold crossed with the national education goals; that was really different, to explicitly define national goals for education" (Ibid., 71). Ultimately, the first President Bush was unable to bring about

---

4 Under Reagan, education spending by the federal government did drop significantly, however, - roughly 20% during his administration under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (Ibid., 42).
concrete policy or legislation to establish such standards, but the principle had been established, which would be the centerpiece of ESEA’s 1994 reauthorization under Bill Clinton entitled Improving America’s Schools Act (IASA). This act would put the Education Summit’s goals into legislation. The goals themselves would be non-binding, but the act provided funding to states to develop content standards, accountability assessments, and performance benchmarks for students and schools. The significance of IASA was that it made the accountability and assessment system into permanent federal law. In order to get it passed, however, Clinton had to compromise on a key question of accountability: the disaggregation of data. The final wording of IASA stated that the data from the states’ accountability system had to be able to be disaggregated, but they were not required to disaggregate. As longtime aide to Representative George Miller (D-California and one of the key sponsors of NCLB) Charles Barone noted:

Disaggregation is the key to comparability. Comparability\(^5\) is the key to assessing equal opportunity. Equal opportunity is the key to closing achievement gaps. Disaggregation is, in fact, the single most important linchpin in federal law to leverage both the 1954 goals of the Supreme Court and the 1965 goals of the original ESEA. (Barone 2007, 8)

\(^5\) Comparability is the basic Title I funding requirement under ESEA that schools within recipient districts receive comparable baseline funding regardless of a school’s pre-existing tax base. I will return to the importance of comparability shortly.
Indeed, disaggregation would be one of the key mandates added to the ESEA's reauthorization in 2002 as No Child Left Behind.

In 2002, it seems that a convergence of forces made possible, if not consensus, then at least a remarkable majority in Congress which brought together such unlikely legislative partners as John Boehner, Ted Kennedy, and George W. Bush to pass the most sweeping education reform bill certainly in the last fifty years, and perhaps in the entire history of American education. No Child Left Behind established an unprecedented regulatory role for the federal government in public education by creating benchmark standards for performance to be met by nearly all public school districts and their students, and by specifying measures for holding these schools and students accountable for their results. By linking funding to student performance, the bill also fundamentally shifted the calculation of federal funding from input-based accountability (how the money was spent) to outcome-based accountability. Interestingly, NCLB was hardly the logical outcome of the historical development of public education policy in America. Indeed, the legislation forced both sides of the compromise to abandon traditional bases of support. For the Democrats, it meant turning their backs on teachers' unions and the powerful NEA by agreeing to accountability measures – an issue that was problematic at best for both groups; for the Republicans, NCLB was a near betrayal of its conservative base which held steadfastly to the principles of states' rights,
limited federal government, and school choice (generally meaning a voucher program whereby a family could use the public school funding for their child toward the tuition of a private school). For their part, Republican supporters of the bill agreed to national standards and a significant increase in federal funding to the states. They also agreed that school choice would be limited to the choice of public charter schools, but no private institutions. The language of the bill pledged to eliminate the achievement gap between affluent white students and the nation’s poor and minority students by 2014.

NCLB accomplished two important things; on the one hand, the law made it possible for the first time to think of American education and education programs in truly national terms, while simultaneously enshrining a certain version of accountability, the principal effect of which was to place in jeopardy all non-tested subjects and programs formerly operating at any level of education. Furthermore, due to inevitable scalability concerns, the targeted tested subjects of mathematics and English Language Arts would need to be assessed by relatively cheap standardized multiple choice tests.

Unfortunately, the ambitious rhetoric of the bill and its supporters was not matched by the results in student achievement, but the law’s requirements did prompt a great deal of activity and thought as educators, politicians, and researchers grappled with difficult issues of compliance and analyzed the merits and
shortcomings of the unprecedented policy. At the heart of much of this activity was an important question: is outcome-based accountability with a strong federal role the optimal or even appropriate model for education policy and reform? And more specific to this project, what are the implications for implementation of a robust, scalable citizen education program?

Having outlined the key historical developments that made possible the passage of NCLB, a discussion of some of the law's requirements is necessary to understand fully the specific contextual challenges facing the adoption of citizen education programs today. As enacted, the key points in the final NCLB agreement were as follows: 1) a 20% increase in spending from the previous version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA); 2) a compromise on accountability and annual yearly progress (AYP) whereby states would be allowed to design their own tests and establish their own standards for proficiency, but they would be required to show AYP for all students in twelve years time; 3) the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), originally created under the first ESEA, would be administered to a sample of students in all states in math and
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6 With the December 2015 reauthorization of NCLB as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the extent of the federal role has been reduced, even as outcome-based accountability has been retained. Giving more control to states over the specific standards as well as the nature and timing of the assessments would seem to lessen somewhat the difficulties confronting scalability considerations for citizen education programs.
English as a comparative measure between states and as an effectiveness check for each state (McGuinn 2006, 176-177).

As noted, NCLB represented the culmination of a reorientation in federal education policy that had begun to take shape under the Reagan Administration, and really coalesced under the elder President Bush and President Clinton. Again, the key change was that schools, and not students, were now identified as the key problem in education. Essentially, the implied assumption was that lack of student achievement to this point had been due largely to a lack of will by schools and educators. And rather than hold schools accountable for their spending of federal dollars (the original orientation of the ESEA), they would now be held accountable for the achievement of their students on multiple-choice tests, which in turn were to be aligned with specific standards. The primary problem with this new arrangement was one of capacity at every level of the policy apparatus. Districts and schools had never created the infrastructure for a common curriculum aligned with teacher education, nor was there any substantive technical capacity for assessment and coordinating academic standards. Without such infrastructure, the result was essentially 50 different sets of standards correlated to 50 different state assessments (Cohen and Moffitt 2009, 159). Equally problematic was the federal government’s lack of capacity. NCLB was incredibly prescriptive in its requirements despite almost universal lack of knowledge about how to improve
teaching and learning. Furthermore, the clear importance attached
to the prescriptions was not matched by the additional resources
provided (Ibid., 164). For despite the significant initial
funding alluded to previously, the actual level of per-pupil
Title I funding in high poverty elementary schools for the 2004-
2005 school year ultimately represented a slight decrease from
pre-NCLB levels (Ibid., 149). This was partly because affluent
districts received a substantial portion of the new NCLB funding\(^7\)
and partly due to problematic fiscal practices at the district
level – an issue characterized almost since the inception of the
ESEA as comparability. I will return to this question of
comparability momentarily. And while it is true that the
prescriptiveness of NCLB prompted virtually unprecedented state
and local attention to school improvement, the overwhelming
weakness of instruments at every level of government and
education would create widespread problems for implementation and
program success. Researchers, Cohen and Moffitt frame the central

\(^7\) Since its inception, Title I had served as the primary funding
mechanism for the ESEA. Title I was a basic formula grant whereby the
allocation of dollars to districts was to be determined by the
incidence of poverty in a given district’s schools. In reality,
however, Title I functioned as a near entitlement for all states and
nearly all localities (Cohen and Moffitt 2009, 7). In order to secure
the bill’s passage in 1965, President Johnson had been forced to make
key concessions around this funding. The specifications for how the
monies were to be spent were vague enough and the accountability
measures sufficiently lax that virtually any project could be
demonstrated to meet the criteria. Indeed, under Title I, 95% of the
nation’s schools districts qualified for funding (McQuinn 2006, 31;
Cohen and Moffitt 2009, 45).
problem of NCLB's design and implementation in this way:

The collision among NCLB's rigid regulatory regime, weak technical capacity in measurement, and weak school systems created a policy context marked by high risk and low capability. One result is that an act that championed demanding academic work has promoted something like the opposite in many states and localities; as we wrote earlier, the design of the statute is at odds with its announced aims. Another is that educators are spending enormous effort to achieve goals and correct problems that, in many cases, are likely to be incorrectly defined; NCLB requires action for which adequate technical instruments do not exist. (170-171)

In the face of such seemingly insurmountable obstacles, what were the results? In terms of student achievement as measured by state standards and assessments, but correlated with a random sampling from each state on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), there were large and statistically significant gains in fourth grade achievement for all groups but black students. For eighth grade mathematics, the gains were more modest, but still significant for lower achievement level groups and students participating in the federally subsidized meal program. For reading, however, NCLB appeared to have no impact on either fourth or eighth grade scores. In fact, eighth grade reading results appeared to decline somewhat (Dee and Jacob 2009, 4). There seemed to be additional troubling effects, however, that mitigated the good news in math. Because there was no set of national standards and no national assessment correlated to such standards, states were allowed to set their own standards. This made for great variability in these standards between states.
Furthermore, given both the proficiency and AYP requirements of NCLB, there was a clear incentive for states to set low proficiency standards. As evidence of both of these problems, Thomas Dee and Brian Jacob noted that in Georgia and Arkansas, where both states had instituted standards prior to NCLB, performance on the state tests has not matched performance on the NAEP exam. For example, in 2000 in Georgia, 62% of fourth graders passed the state math exam, while only 17% attained proficiency on the equivalent NAEP exam. Similarly, in Arkansas the percentages were 37% and 14%, respectively (Ibid., 22). These sorts of discrepancies continued to compromise many of the NCLB achievement claims.  

In a separate study examining the relative merits of another such high stakes accountability system (but one with more longitudinal data), Brian Jacob investigated the effects of such a program in Chicago public schools – one that was implemented prior to NCLB in 1997. The general results, once again, were mixed, though contrary to the more general study, there were meaningful increases in math and reading scores at all levels on the high stakes Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) (Chicago tested third, sixth, and eighth grades). Interestingly, the gains were most substantial in eighth grade where passage was the primary criterion for promotion to high school. There was, however, no
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8 Indeed, with the passage of ESSA, these discrepancies would only seem to increase given even greater state control over what constitutes proficiency.
comparable increase on the lower stakes Illinois Goal Assessment Program (IGAP). In conducting test item analysis to determine what, if any, types of questions were responsible for the increase, Jacob found that gains in math were driven almost exclusively by improvement on questions involving test-specific skills rather than items involving more general math skills or critical thinking skills. In addition to the increased time devoted to those question types, there was also evidence to suggest that teachers responded strategically through increased retention of marginal students in non-tested grades and increased numbers of students in special education programs (Jacob 2005, 791). Once again, though proponents could point to some encouraging successes, the results of such accountability seemed to be decidedly mixed. Indeed, Jacob, while acknowledging those gains, concluded by questioning the efficacy of such programs as an effective comprehensive strategy for school reform (Ibid., 792). Echoing this reservation, Helen Ladd concluded from a similar study conducted in 2007, that such outcome-based accountability needed to be accompanied by “research-informed programs” and that the accountability needed to be extended to other levels of the system – namely, the district and state levels. Citing the myriad societal factors impacting student achievement, schools alone, according to Ladd, could not overcome these consequences (Ladd in Dee and Jacob 2009, 37).

Given the decidedly mixed results of NCLB, is this version
of outcome-based accountability reform the right path forward for
the American education system? And, to what extent could NCLB be
considered a success? To be sure, the results of NCLB outlined
above have fallen far short of its original “moon-shot rhetoric.”
But I have a sense, too, that it was precisely the ambitious
nature of NCLB that served to highlight many of the structural
challenges facing our public education system, which, in turn,
prompted action on the part of a whole host of groups in attempts
to devise solutions to these problems. By exposing these
challenges, NCLB pointed the way toward its own substantive,
positive reform. Without its impetus, it seems certain that
neither the breadth nor the depth of reform to date would have
been as great. As we shall see, the development would have both
positive and negative consequences for education generally, as
well as for the prospects of a nation-wide citizen education
program(s). Specifically, the ways in which NCLB altered the
federal role in public education from previous iterations of ESEA
and made individual schools accountable for the learning of their
students helped to sharpen the focus on the various levels of
government involved in a federal education policy and raised the
question anew of what should be the appropriate role for each.
This was invariably a positive development. On the other hand, in
terms of making the case for adoption of a broad-based citizen
education program, holding schools accountable for student
performance on standardized tests of English Language Arts and
mathematics certainly made that task far more difficult.

Central to establishing the current education policy context (and at the heart of the policy question above) is the need to first clarify the proper tasks for the entities assuming the role of funders of education and for those assuming the function of providers of education. This is the subject of Marguerite Roza’s national study of public school funding and accounting practices and another vital contextual consideration for my study. According to Roza, at its most basic level, the guiding principle for any policy that incentivizes change through funding should be that no agency/school/level of government should be filling both of these roles simultaneously.

Additionally, following the passage of NCLB, an equally important principle emerged in that given its accountability for student learning, the individual school should have control over a significant portion of its budget and spending. In an accountability regime like the one established by NCLB, following these principles is particularly important since the stakes became so high for schools as the primary providers of education. As the primary provider, the school, which is being held solely accountable (as opposed to the district) for the academic achievement of its students, should have considerable discretion over the way it uses its funds. Only with such discretion is it then reasonable to hold the school accountable in this way.

Conversely, without control over its own budget, it makes no
sense to hold the individual school accountable since it has virtually no control over the funding of programs and staffing in its buildings. Currently, most schools in the United States have very little control over their budgets and resource allocation. To take an example from Roza, an analysis of Delaware’s budget structure estimates that fully 83% of the budget of every district in the state is inflexible at the district level (Roza 2010, 63).

In terms of the general structure of NCLB and the allocation of Title I funds, the roles should have broken down in the following ways. First, the federal government operates as the primary funder to the eligible school districts in each state. The districts then become the initial providers of services; namely, the equitable resource allocation to schools based on the number of eligible pupils per school, adequate accounting of these dollars, data collection and disaggregation, and finally, the reporting of student and school results back to the federal government. In this equation, the districts are, in a sense, secondary funders, since they allocate the funds to the schools. The schools then serve as the primary providers of education, which includes programming, services, and instruction to the students. As noted above, clarifying these roles is crucial particularly in the context of an accountability regime. As the primary providers of education, each school should have had control over a significant proportion of its funds. Again, this
is the only reasonable (even ethical) arrangement if the school is to be the locus of accountability. As an intermediate provider of funding disbursement and managing the data infrastructure, the primary accountability of the district is for demonstrating equitable distribution of funds to schools on a per pupil basis. As primary funder, the federal government assumes certain regulatory roles. To insist on the kind of accountability for districts and schools as NCLB did, the federal government should have assisted in a robust way in funding and advising the process of building data infrastructure capacity. Such infrastructure would be the essential first step in any system that requires extensive data and data disaggregation as its measure of true accountability. Once such an infrastructure was in place, insisting on equitable per pupil distribution would become feasible. Sophisticated data infrastructure would also allow the federal government to measure and insist on efficiency of fund allocation in evaluating the relative success of programs and services.\textsuperscript{9} Once NCLB was enacted, the way this federal role had evolved in its relationship to state and district roles simply made funding the non-tested programs more difficult. Indeed, the district level funding scheme with the comparability loophole made it most difficult for the schools supposedly targeted to receive federal funds since ESEA's inception to contemplate a

\textsuperscript{9} The basis for these recommendations for the proper roles of funders and providers is derived from Roza's "Multidimensional Solution" for fixing the education finance system (Ibid., 96-98).
"luxury" like citizen education. One can imagine the difficulties facing a program (citizen education) that does not "count" explicitly as one of the tested subjects even when such a system is functioning as it should. Without the requisite clarity of funding roles and data infrastructure, the challenges are simply magnified.

In response to the exposure by NCLB of the nation's vast data infrastructure incapacity, the Obama Administration made correcting this national deficiency one of the core categories of evaluation in its Race to the Top (RTTT) education grant competition for states. The scrutiny that such attention brought has helped to identify long-standing structural problems in the way public education has been funded and delivered. Of all the structural problems (and the final contextual variable that needs to be discussed here), perhaps most significant for serving the disadvantaged students that ESEA purported to help is what Roza and others have called the "comparability loophole" to which I alluded above. Again, comparability, here, refers to the requirement attached to Title I funds that schools within districts, regardless of pre-existing tax base, must be receiving comparable baseline district funding; otherwise, the Title I schools would never be able to catch up with more affluent schools in terms of services provided. Despite its inclusion in
the 1969 ESEA amendments\textsuperscript{10}, the comparability requirement for states and districts remains largely unfulfilled. This is particularly troubling given that the inability to enforce the requirement is one of the greatest barriers to equity in education funding. And although the federal and state administrative resolve (and funding) has not generally been behind enforcement, it is questionable whether either would have made much difference. Further, this issue does not seem to be (at least primarily) due to the intentional obstruction by state and district officials. The primary problem has resided at the district level and has been partly a result of deficient data infrastructure and partly a result of hiring and staffing practices. In terms of data, schools do not have the capacity, and therefore do not track much of the fiscal information in ways that would allow for better and more intentional patterns of resource allocation (Ibid., 2-3). More specifically, most such fiscal data that does exist is reported in Full Time Equivalency (FTE) units and in district average figures. This means that intra-district allocations among schools are inevitably almost wholly obscured; hence the "loophole."

Roza gives numerous examples whereby the reporting of district average FTE expenditures serves to obscure existing

\textsuperscript{10} The inclusion of the comparability requirement was the result of the damning Martin-McClure Report from the same year which pointed to numerous problems in the allocation of federal funds to Title I schools (Cohen and Moffitt 2009, 58).
discrepancies between funding for individual schools within a
given district. Within New York City, for instance, there are
individual schools, which receive $6,000 more per pupil than
other schools in the same district (Roza 2010, 20). In another
example, citing a 2004 Texas A&M study, which indicated that
roughly $6,200 per pupil was needed to provide an adequate
education to students in Texas districts, Roza reported that in
Houston, 121 of the district’s 260 schools received more than
this amount. In one of these schools, the district actually spent
$9,400 per pupil, while another school in the same district
received only $3,750 (Ibid., 23). Currently, Title I dollars and
other revenue are driven by per pupil dollars, but the allocation
of these funds is determined by a different calculation. Roza
claims that 54% of all salary dollars are spent on automatic wage
increases simply for longevity on the standard step and ladder
pay scale (Ibid., 59). This fact significantly skews the
comparability of salaries between high and low-poverty schools.
In one analysis of salaries in Baltimore County, it was revealed
that teachers in one high-poverty school were paid an average
salary of $37,618, while in another low-poverty school in the
same district, the average salary was $57,000 (Ibid., 52). Note
this salary effect on two Seattle elementary schools: one high-
poverty and one low-poverty, as illustrated by the graph on the
following page.
How Salary Averaging Obscures Funding Differences between Low-Poverty and High-Poverty Schools, Seattle

(Roza 2010, 53)

Such vast discrepancies in intra-district funding are due to existing teacher compensation plans employing the step and ladder scale to which I alluded above. Because seniority is rewarded above all else in pay and preferable teaching assignments, the more affluent schools are most often staffed by the most experienced teachers, while high-poverty schools tend to be staffed by the least experienced hires. This fact translates into almost uniformly higher per pupil expenditures in low-poverty schools relative to the funding of their higher-poverty counterparts in the same district.

The troubling effects of these pervasive standard pay practices have complicated the accountability process by incentivizing the wrong thing. Roza and other reformers claim
that restructuring teacher pay practices to incentivize performance rather than years of service and advanced degrees and credentials, is a more efficient and responsible method for distributing funds for salaries. Numerous studies have, in fact, demonstrated that teacher knowledge on competency exams like the National Teacher Exam (NTE) have negligible effects on standard outcomes (Podgursky and Springer 2007, 913). Results are similarly mixed for the effects of longevity. The evidence is even starker for the efficacy of Masters degrees for teachers. These degrees have actually been shown to be negatively correlated with student performance (Hanushek 2003 in Podgursky and Springer 2007, 931). Finally, in a Chicago Public Schools study, 90% of teacher effects are not explained by any of the standard measured teacher characteristics (Ibid., 931). The dubious relation of these standard performance measures\(^\text{11}\) to student performance has simply exacerbated the difficulties of evaluating program and teacher efficacy. Indeed, yet another effect of NCLB, this fact prompted calls for a shift to the use of Value Added Measures (VAM) as at least a component of teacher evaluation processes responsible for awarding tenure. A major criticism of early VAM calculations was the significant variability in the accuracy of these measures. Studies cited cases where ten percent of bottom quartile teachers in one year

\(^{11}\) As of 2007, 96% of public schools followed this single salary pay structure with uniform pay steps based on years of experience and education level (Ibid., 912).
would appear in the top quartile the next. Or in a different instance, one third of teachers ranked in the top quartile one year did not appear there the next. (Brookings 2010, 7) In recent years, however, and largely as a result of the pressures applied by NCLB, major advances in data systems have allowed for substantially increased sophistication of VAMs (Podgursky and Springer 2007, 927). Additionally, those advocating the use of such measures are careful to insist that VAMs should provide a complement to processes of observation and evaluation of teachers by principals rather than serve as the sole measure of a teacher’s competency. Indeed, Podgursky and Springer note the reliability of these subjective evaluations by principals in identifying the highly effective, as well as the least effective teachers, and that there is a “significant positive relationship” between VAMs and these evaluations (Ibid., 933-934). The concern over mis-identification seems valid, but given the considerable reliability of such measures in identifying just the top and bottom five percent of teachers, one could limit the use of VAMs to this small population of teachers and still make a substantial positive impact on the level of instruction, particularly if such information could be used to incentivize effective practices and remove the least effective from the profession. If such a practice could be adopted as part of accountability reform, Podgursky and Springer maintain that substantial student achievement gains could be realized by altering the mix of low
and high performing teachers. Teacher turnover and retention could then become "part of a virtuous cycle of quality improvement" (Ibid., 933). It would then begin to be possible to isolate and study the efficacy of individual programs. The difficulty in adequately addressing such salary arrangements is that in addition to their pervasiveness, most are also the result of collective bargaining agreements by local teacher union affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the NEA. Attempts at changing such practices will continue to be met with certain stiff opposition from these unions and the teachers they represent.

The significant structural challenges to NCLB and its further reform posed problems both for the stated measures for success of NCLB as well as for the possibility of implementing a robust citizenship education program. Solving these challenges has been critical to the success of both, even as both aimed at radically different (potentially) measures of success. Again, better systems of data collection and analysis combined with school control over funding for its students and programs would allow schools and districts to evaluate reliably the efficacy of their programs. Setting aside for a moment the question of what sorts of student learning should be the accountability target, greater efficiency and reliability at evaluating programs (whatever the programs) will always benefit schools and student learning. This should be true, whether achievement is defined by
NCLB-type measures or some other measure. So, what are the prospects for meaningful, sustained, and positive change? If we accept the logic of an outcome-based accountability system, what elements of the NCLB program needed altering in order to ensure success as measured by student achievement? The first key would seem to be delineating roles for funders and providers similar to those proposed by Roza. Under her scheme, the schools serving as providers of the education for which they were being held accountable should have control over the funding and design of this education. In turn, the federal government’s role as primary funder should have been to help in the establishment of meaningful standards and assessments, and to guide and fund the building of data infrastructure, while holding accountable states and districts for the equitable distribution of the federal dollars. Given the increasingly difficult federal political context in which national education policy operates, three subsequent developments since 2008 would seem to be provide cause for cautious optimism.

The first was the Race to the Top (RTTT) program, which was run by the Obama Administration under the Department of Education and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. The purpose of the grant program was to incentivize further reforms by states under its modified vision of NCLB. Duncan’s four stated criteria for
awarding grant money to states were as follows:

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;

2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;

3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and

4. Turning around our lowest-achieving schools. (RTTT Executive Summary 2009, 2)

It is noteworthy that the first three criteria dealt explicitly with capacity building in the schools and districts in order to give educators the necessary tools to address the fourth criterion.

The notion of incentivizing creative approaches to improving teaching and learning is a sound one. A vital consideration for the success of this approach, however, was whether or not RTTT would come to be a permanent part of the next reauthorization of the ESEA – ESSA. We will see below that RTTT was continued only in part. Until the election of Representative Paul Ryan as Speaker of the House by Republicans, prospects for reauthorization under the Obama Administration were bleak at best.\textsuperscript{12} Reauthorization has extended at least partial critical

\textsuperscript{12} As a condition of becoming Speaker, Ryan insisted that his Party largely cease its role in Congressional legislative dysfunction. Evidence of this can be seen not only in the passage of ESSA, but also the recent budget deal.
funding to allow for the further development and implementation of these systems, although the extent to which this will occur is now largely up to the states themselves. Significantly, the urgency at the time of meeting NCLB benchmarks, combined with the promise of significant infusion of critical funding meant that a number of states undertook substantive structural changes in the interest of capacity building, the likes of which would have made possible for the first time states’ ability to address Roza’s concerns. Indeed, in an effort to qualify for some of the original $4.3 billion available under RTTT, state legislatures literally re-wrote laws to enhance the chances of their applications. Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, and Tennessee lifted restrictions on the number of charter schools they would allow to operate. In January 2010, Michigan enacted a law requiring teacher and administrative evaluations to be tied to student performance. Similarly, California eliminated a legal data restriction that prevented student achievement data from being linked to individual teachers. Just prior to the deadline for second round applications, New York, Colorado, and Oklahoma all passed laws revising their tenure and evaluation rules for teachers (McNeil 2010). These were real commitments by systems in an effort to secure badly needed funding. The passage of ESSA (discussed below) should allow states to continue such initiatives if they so choose. If they do not, it is unclear
whether data and other infrastructural improvements will be maintained.

The second promising reform proposal was the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSS). The initiative officially began in July 2009 when an impressively diverse group of state governors, politicians from both political parties, superintendents, school administrators, teachers, assessment experts, and parents came together both to press for higher academic standards geared toward critical thinking skills (as opposed to narrow test-taking skills and discrete pieces of content) across the country, as well as to leverage their numbers in the practical concern for lowering the cost for all of the participants in the development of pedagogically-sound standards and, ultimately, assessments that would align with them. The project began with English Language Arts and mathematics due to their “favored status” under NCLB. But standards have since been developed for other disciplines as well, again, in an effort to expand beyond the problematic confines of NCLB and asserting the importance of achievement in the other disciplines. The federal government (Obama and Duncan) in its turn came out in support of the initiative and provided meaningful funding for development of the standards. RTTT also incentivized participation in the CCSS, naming it specifically as an example of legitimate standards to which states could adhere in order to earn points for their grant applications in the RTTT funding competition. The largest source
of funding for CCSS was from the Gates Foundation – roughly $200 million since 2008\textsuperscript{13} to various organizations (such as National Governors Association, National Teachers Association, and National PTA), governmental entities (such as the Kentucky Department of Education and the Tennessee Department of Education) and companies (such as BetterLesson and the Achievement Network) (Gates Foundation website) involved in the development and implementation of CCSS.

One other feature of the initiative is worth mentioning. The CCSS has now turned to the development of common assessments that will align with these standards. For this project, CCSS has begun working with the Department of Education’s National Center for Educational Statistics (the creators of the NAEP assessment) to align their standards with the NAEP assessments. Consistent with CCSS principles, and unlike many current state multiple-choice proficiency exams, the NAEP exams test critical thinking and other core skills such as writing. Given that the NAEP are well-developed assessments (Dee and Jacob 2009, 24) and have been administered for over 40 years, they would seem to be the perfect standardized assessment choice. Again, it places states and the federal government in their appropriate roles within the binding federalist policy context. Such a strategy makes it much more likely that these standards and assessments can be brought to

\textsuperscript{13} It is notable that these figures have been cited prominently in detractors' pieces (Layton 2014; Ravitch 2014), though they cite the Gates Foundation website where the figures are made publicly available.
scale on the national level. Further, the power of national standards freely chosen by the constituent states means that for the first time, education policy and the education system could begin to address disparities in funding and achievement on an inter-state basis, which had heretofore been an impossibility.

More recently, the CCSS have experienced some setbacks – first, as they became drawn into the political vortex in Washington and more recently under ESSA, as standards specification and their assessment have been de-centralized. In terms of the first, critics questioned the massive support from the Gates Foundation as amounting to buying support for the standards, and its promotion by the Obama administration and RTTT fueled claims by Obama’s political opponents that the administration’s support for CCSS was just one more example of the federal government’s usurpation of states’ rights (a la the Affordable Care Act). Despite these claims and some notable states (Indiana, South Carolina, and Wisconsin) withdrawing their initial adoption of the CCSS, 42 states and the District of Columbia remain in various stages of implementation of the Standards. It is unclear whether the politicization of the CCSS and now their official de-emphasis under ESSA will ultimately derail the project. The fact is, despite the political rhetoric, the CCSS provided the first viable path for states to come together and leverage their collective numbers to share the considerable costs of standards design, implementation, and
assessment. Such cooperation by states also enhanced significantly the data management capacity building project. For my own project, the fact that the standards remain a truly national initiative, thereby assisting greatly in addressing the scalability concern,\textsuperscript{14} and that they have identified rough equivalents to the skills I have identified for competent citizenship, I will be using CCSS-aligned rubrics from the Buck Institute for Education (BIE) as the basis for the metric evaluating the student work of the particular citizen education program to which I have already alluded: the Citizen Action Project (CAP) at Monticello High School in Charlottesville, Virginia.

The signing into law of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on December 10, 2015 by President Obama marks the latest chapter in the story of American education. It is too early to tell what the ultimate effects of the new education law will be; and much of the effects will certainly hinge on the outcome of the 2016 Presidential election. On balance, however, the law would seem to hold some promise for the continuation of the positive reforms initiated by NCLB, while lessening the burden of proof for meeting scalability requirements for a citizen education program.

\textsuperscript{14} If a particular citizenship education program — CAP, for instance — can be shown to prepare students for the CCSS-identified skills, this fact would go a long way toward giving the program credibility.
The key points of ESSA are as follows:

• in general, the role of the U.S. Department of Education in holding states accountable is significantly scaled back, with a corresponding increase in autonomy for states in several key areas;

• states must still submit accountability plans to the Education Department, but they now have much greater control over determining their own goals and specifying the standards for measuring their work towards those goals;

• states are still required to test students in reading and math in grades three through eight and once in high school, and they must disaggregate their data for whole school and key subgroups, but they now may also choose from a wide range of testing options and with greater control over the frequency and timing of test administration;

• states must still identify and intervene in the bottom 5% of performing schools and in any high school, which has a graduation rate of 67% or less;

• finally, the law provides for a block grant of $1.6 billion to states, consolidating funding to over thirty programs and expanding access to early-childhood education. (The Every Student Succeeds Act: Explained 2016, 17)

To be clear, ESSA does not by itself resolve definitively the comparability loophole or the other problems associated with the current national school-funding scheme. ESSA also does not ensure the final implementation or continuance of nascent state and district data systems that are critical to tracking student progress and which would support more responsible student- and school-focused funding arrangements. ESSA merely provides for the possibility of these changes to continue. Significantly, ESSA also removes education policy as one more source of acute
political discord between Democrats and Republicans. Again, it remains to be seen what ESSA may mean for the prospects of education reform generally, and the implementation of citizen education programs specifically.

The purpose of the extended discussion above is to identify the specific challenges that exist within the current educational context and which serve to complicate or support any new programmatic initiative. Indeed, extending the work of RTTT and CCSS (ESSA may or may not ultimately do so) could improve the educational context for new programmatic initiatives. Failure of one or both would only serve to complicate the challenge.

There is an important tension here that needs acknowledging. On the one hand, the eventual success of the CCSS could benefit a citizenship education program like CAP, if the program can be shown to require and assess a student's proficiency in core skills common to both a notion of citizenship and to the baseline curricula (like CCSS) and the standardized tests to which NCLB gave rise. On the other hand, both curriculum and instruction as understood by Dewey and Gadamer would most certainly not culminate in a NCLB-type silent, individualistic performance on a multiple choice test or even the more robust NAEP-aligned standardized tests, which are being developed with the CCSS. Indeed, what could such a standardized test like this ultimately tell us about the capacity and learning and competencies of an individual student, her teacher, her
principal, or her school? For Dewey and Gadamer, such a proposition would be questionable at best. But the relative absence of a contemporary concrete and scalable alternative presents a daunting challenge to educators and policy makers who found NCLB (and even ESSA) problematic. Given that the current political climate outlined above has typically accentuated the attractive fact that such uniform "objective" measures of assessment are comparatively inexpensive, what are the cost implications for a true Deweyan-Gadamerian overhaul (for an overhaul it would be) of the current national public education system? What would it cost, for instance, to educate and assess for Dewey's competent citizens who are able to engage effectively in Gadamer's hermeneutical dialogue? What is the cost to employ teachers who are not only trained in child development and psychology, but also as experts in their subject area with time to keep abreast of ongoing developments in the field, as instructors, *par excellence*, and with facilities and a teacher-student ratio that makes possible the presentation of Deweyan experiences at the level appropriate for each child? Ideally, the general education project and the citizen education project should be one and the same. Understood in this way, I should be urging a return (if such a curriculum ever really existed) to an interdisciplinary Liberal Arts curriculum, whose purpose is the education of the whole human in the Humane Letters; once
educated, this fully formed human would, of course, be the
citizen, par excellence.

Yet another problem lurks — one to which I alluded in my
attempt to build a broadly acceptable philosophical foundation
for the adoption of a broad-based citizen education program. The
questions raised above as part of the discussion of our current
education policy context imply that such definitions of
citizenship and democracy are not contested, that they are givens
in a democratic society. This, of course, is not true. Such ideas
are widely contested, as is the notion that government-run public
education for all is a desirable thing. Exploring this final
difficulty of definition and understanding is potentially the
most vexing because certain of these beliefs often go unspoken.
What does equal access to education mean? Setting aside whether
or not we could agree, should everyone even be entitled to it? At
least one assumption of the Accountability Movement has seemed to
be that economic markets offer a better model for delivering
quality education. One of the stated goals for over a decade now
has been that accountability can help insure that individual
taxpayers are getting their money's worth because markets are
presumed to be better than the government at achieving the most
cost effective means of delivering the product that people want.
In one response to this argument, David Bridges claims that free-
market proponents obscure "the distinction between the positional
advantages that education can bestow and that can only be
achieved by one child at another’s expense (e.g., higher grades
in a norm-based assessment system, better preparedness for
employment) and the nonpositional benefits that education can
contribute to a community and that can be spread widely without
loss to anyone (e.g., understanding of history or the natural
environment, enjoyment of the arts, intellectual curiosity). The
problem,” he continues, “is that there are differences between
the rational course of action that parents and schools might take
depending on which of these sets of benefits they focus on”
(Bridges and Jonathan 2002, 131-32). The effect of NCLB-
accountability has been to shift the considerations from
nonpositional to positional ones, to use Bridges’ terms,
particularly when the consequences of being a failing school mean
that parents get a voucher equivalent to the funding spent on
their child to use toward a private school of the their choosing.

Dewey’s call for the implementation of his educational
philosophy grew at least in part out of a critique of capitalism
and its bedfellow classical liberalism in his time. Gadamer’s
commitment to a vital hermeneutical dialogue that privileges
connection to community implies a similar critique of
liberalism’s rugged individualism and its privileging of
“rights.” Dewey believed, and I agree, the two (capitalism and

---

15 These nonpositional benefits or even goals of education are entirely
consistent with those I have cited in Dewey and Gadamer – an understanding of
active citizenship whose goal is participation in democratic processes
designed to bring about the Good for and in Society.
classical liberalism) worked to privilege the individual above all else, certainly above community considerations. As I have attempted to show, Dewey’s and Gadamer’s is an educational system that schools its students in participatory democracy — how to impact the political system with the goal of creating substantive equality of participation in the marketplace of ideas; an arena in which individuals interact and negotiate around issues of social import and see themselves as much more than radically individualistic, but as members of a community dialogue. I worry about the capacity of schools to train such citizens, however, if our nation makes the choice to abandon the schooling of those citizens to the “laws” of the capitalist marketplace. It seems to me that the motivations behind and the relative ascendancy of NCLB’s student outcome-based accountability present a sore challenge to Dewey’s vision for democratic education.

What will be the consequences for the students of the failing schools across the country? Will they find their salvation in charter schools or vouchers? Or will education for the rural and urban poor continue to deteriorate, calling forth the kind of violent transformation of society that some in Dewey’s time predicted? Dewey believed that a democratic transformation of society could be affected without resorting to violence. Such a belief was grounded in his faith in education and the capacity of the collective human intelligence as he conceived of them. Dewey’s vision seems the one worth fighting
for. As a high school history teacher, I confess to the need for believing in Dewey’s and Gadamer’s vision of citizenship and education. At the very least, I aspire to teach as if I believe in it. And I agree with Dewey, that the purpose of education and “the task of democracy is the creation of a freer and more humane experience in which all share and to which all contribute” (Dewey 1939, 244). What this might look like as a national education system, and indeed, how such a vision might be “sold” to the American public have been a primary concern motivating my research. Because of these considerations, a massive overhaul of the education system in favor of the Liberal Arts to which I alluded above seems impractical.

In every sense, my project is a Pragmatist Project. Returning to my guiding questions, given the current political context, given the historical development of education in the United States, what is the best (read: most effective) way to teach robust citizenship – its requisite skills and understandings – explicitly to children? My own education has been steeped in the Liberal Arts at every level – from my public high school experience to Bowdoin College to St. John’s College and now to Georgetown. I believe in the rightness of a Liberal Arts Education for all people, and I believe this in large part (as did Jefferson and Plato before him) because its interdisciplinary approach to educating the whole human is, fundamentally, citizenship education, as I understand the term.
From my reading of Dewey and Gadamer, both of them would agree that an integrative approach to teaching citizenship would be best. And yet, given the political and educational context in the United States today, is it meaningful to urge the (re-)adoption of a robust national Liberal Arts Program with all the requisite funding as the best path to educating our citizens? Philosophically, it might make a certain sense, but pragmatically, a whole host of factors would seem to make the robust national Liberal Arts–Citizenship Program a non-starter. Indeed, the particular combination of the following factors would not allow it: the current school and program funding scheme (the comparability loophole and persistent funding control at the district level); the current accountability regime (school accountability without funding control); the current curriculum context (Common Core versus State control versus NCLB and the privileging of Language Arts and Math); and the current political climate (at the federal level and the tension between federal and state policy, even with the recent passage of ESSA). Any one of these factors would not, by itself, preclude hope; taken together, however, these factors would seem to make robust citizen education beyond the individual classroom or individual school level nearly impossible. The United States is simply not in a place from which national leaders could first fashion a compromise on what such a program should look like and then coerce, compel, and cajole the various states to adopt it.
Although fully supportive of an interdisciplinary Liberal Arts approach, Dewey's Pragmatism and Gadamer's hermeneutics would also urge us to consider a realizable solution. Programs like CAP, operating within the narrower context of the Social Studies and specifically, the U.S. Government course, allow us to teach and assess robust citizenship explicitly now, while allowing for some future broadening of the curriculum to embrace the Humanities as the more appropriate citizenship curriculum. Significantly, too, there is a national consensus of sorts on the need for civics or government education in a specified course, which every public school student in the United States must pass in order to graduate from high school (Education Commission of the States 2016). As we will see momentarily, the CAP Program, structured to privilege student political participation in local public policy issues and consonant with the broadly appealing notions of citizenship outlined above, may well provide a viable model for vigorous and broad-based citizen education despite the myriad challenges of the day.

Indeed, the work of the US Government teachers and their students at one public high school in Virginia represents a promising attempt to create a citizenship education program that meets all of the key criteria outlined above. CAP is an experiential program by which students are asked to identify a public policy issue of interest, to research the sides of debate on the issue (to qualify as an "issue", students must be able to
demonstrate two viable sides in the debate), adopting a position vis-à-vis the issue, and then designing and implementing an action plan to impact public policy on the issue. CAP also has been “brought to scale” in that every senior at Monticello High School is required to participate in the project by virtue of their enrollment in US Government, a required senior grade level course. Accountability for successful project completion resides in the fact that the project is the major assessment for this course, which is a graduation requirement. Significantly, however, US Government has not been a specified subject to be tested under both NCLB and now ESSA, even though the skills, which the project assesses, are all represented in some form in the CCSS. The key criterion for the relative success of CAP is whether or not the program sufficiently prepares these senior level students for the requirements of citizenship outlined above. Accordingly, we should be able to see concrete demonstrations of student proficiency in the core citizenship skills and appropriate assessment measures that identify adequate student acquisition of these skills. In addition to providing a compelling philosophical foundation for citizenship education, the ultimate purpose of this project is to develop a reliable metric for evaluating the success of citizenship education programs generally through the evaluation of the specific Citizen Action Project at Monticello High School. As indicated above, the basis for the metric will be CCSS-aligned rubrics developed by
the Buck Institute for Education (BIE). As a nationally renowned leader in education research, particularly in project-based learning (PBL) and project and rubric design, BIE’s rubrics are a natural choice for evaluating citizenship skill acquisition under CAP. As for the choice of the CAP program – as opposed to some other case study – it is necessary to acknowledge that my previous connection to Monticello High School and its teachers made CAP a convenient choice. Indeed, I chose the project because I was familiar with the school and its faculty, having taught there from 1998 to 2001. I know of CAP from these former colleagues who have shared stories of its implementation with me since its inception in 2005 as part of the Annenberg Foundation’s national Civic Education Project. Ultimately, Monticello’s Social Studies Department decided to forge its own path due to Annenberg’s focus on community service as the project outcome. Instead, the Department wanted a student generated action plan designed to address a contentious public policy issue. Through their reports and my own research with the project, the students, and student work, I know that CAP both has as its explicit goal the teaching of citizenship skills, and that these teachers have effectively brought this program to scale. Every high school senior participates in this program as part of her required U.S. Government class. For these reasons, CAP is an ideal program for the focus of my study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH FRAMEWORK: DESIGN AND METHODS

The research was designed as a case study approach, choosing a high school program, the Citizen Action Program (CAP) at Monticello High School in Charlottesville, Virginia, whose explicit purpose is to teach and equip its students with citizenship skills. The intended use of this case study was four-fold: first, as a means of evaluating the suitability of my proposed philosophical foundation for all such citizen education programs; second, to evaluate the relative success of CAP in achieving its stated goals through an application of the Buck Institute for Education (BIE) skills rubrics to student work submitted for the CAP projects; third, to evaluate the relative success of CAP through an analysis of student responses to pre- and post-project surveys aimed at gauging student understanding of citizenship; and fourth, evaluating the utility and appropriateness of the BIE rubrics generally from their use with the CAP student work.

Case Study Framework

For the basic framework of the case study approach, I have drawn heavily on Sharan Merriam’s work on qualitative research generally, and case studies specifically. Merriam begins by noting the importance of the researcher and the central
requirement that he identify up front his own orientation toward the "nature of reality" and the purpose of one's research (Merriam 2001, 4). I have addressed much of this in the discussion of my choice of the three philosophers in constructing the philosophical foundation for the project. It will be enough here to note the elements that I draw upon from two general philosophical orientations toward research and education identified by Merriam - the interpretive and the critical research perspectives. Of the two perspectives, Merriam writes:

In interpretive research, education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience. Understanding the meaning of the process or experience constitutes the knowledge to be gained from an inductive, hypothesis- or theory-generating (rather than a deductive or testing) mode of inquiry. Multiple realities are constructed socially by individuals. In the third orientation - critical research - education is considered to be a social institution designed for social and cultural reproduction and transformation. Drawing from Marxist philosophy, critical theory, and feminist theory, knowledge generated through this mode of research is an ideological critique of power, privilege, and oppression in areas of educational practice. Some forms of critical research have a strong participatory, action component. (Merriam and Simpson 1995, in Merriam 2001, 4)

From my treatment of Dewey and Gadamer above, it should be evident that I see education both as lived experience, negotiated by individuals through the medium of language (Gadamer's hermeneutical dialogue), as well as an institution designed for the social transformation of children into Deweyan democratic citizens. In short, and to quote Merriam again, "the key philosophical assumption . . . upon which all types of
qualitative research are based is the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds" (Merriam 2001, 6). This is the philosophical orientation from which I chose qualitative research as the general method with which to approach my project.

Within this larger frame of qualitative research, I have chosen case study as the ideal method for pursuing my research questions. In identifying reasons for the suitability of the case study method, Merriam quotes Reichardt and Cook (1979):

Case study is a particularly suitable design if you are interested in process. Process as a focus for case study research can be viewed in two ways. ‘The first meaning of process is monitoring: describing the context and population of the study, discovering the extent to which the treatment or program has been implemented, providing immediate feedback of a formative type, and the like. The second meaning of process is causal explanation: discovering or confirming the process by which the treatment had the effect that it did. (Merriam 2001, 32-33)

I am interested in the process by which we educate and train citizens. As such, the choice of Monticello’s CAP program as the case study and its evaluation is consistent with both senses of process quoted above. I am interested in the extent to which CAP is fully functioning – in other words, bringing to scale an experiential citizen education program – as well as in whether or not CAP is accomplishing its goal of training students to be effective citizens. In this sense, the carrying out of the project will provide formative feedback for CAP; it will also provide feedback for use of the rubrics themselves.
 Appropriately, Merriam’s qualitative analysis framework guided the choosing and application of the BIE rubrics (which will serve as the citizenship metric), the analysis of student work, the construction of the student survey, and the collection and analysis of the survey data.

In a similar vein, Merriam offers support from two other researchers, Kenny and Grotelueschen, for the case study approach: “Case study is appropriate when the objective of an evaluation is ‘to develop a better understanding of the dynamics of a program. When it is important to be responsive, to convey a holistic and dynamically rich account of an educational program, case study is a tailormade approach’" (Merriam 2001, 39). Merriam herself echoes these sentiments, writing, “Educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice. Case study has proven particularly useful for studying educational innovations, for evaluating programs, and for informing policy” (Ibid., 41). Clearly, the choice of the CAP program was consistent with these goals because my interest was in studying the optimal process for educating citizens, while also evaluating and providing feedback for the CAP program itself. In discussing the choice of CAP, as opposed to some other case study, it is again necessary to acknowledge (discussed fully in the previous section) that my previous connection to
Monticello High School and its teachers makes CAP a convenient choice.

Merriam addresses the suitability of a case study choice, when one of the factors in the choice is the program's convenience, by quoting Patton (1990): "While some dimension of convenience almost always figures into sample selection, selection made on this basis alone is not very credible and is likely to produce 'information-poor' rather than information-rich cases" (Ibid., 63). In issuing this warning, Merriam goes on to write that the surest way to guard against the temptation of succumbing to convenience factors alone is to have pre-established criteria against which the researcher should measure the suitability of the program in question. Given the considerations identified above, I think it is clear that Monticello's CAP program is an ideal case study for reasons of project suitability as well as for convenience.

This research project is a case study of one public school's attempt to implement a successful citizenship education program for all its students. This study focuses on the school's process of delivering such a program and the extent of the program's success. A combination of evaluating student work for demonstration of core citizenship skills and an analysis of student responses to pre- and post-project surveys for demonstration of a transformed student understanding of
citizenship were determined to be the most effective way to gauge the program’s success.

The Skills

The so-called citizen skills were identified as necessary for an effective citizenship practice and as evident of a robust understanding of citizenship – an understanding that extends beyond the legal requirement of paying taxes and the basic responsibility of voting in elections. These are skills deemed necessary for informed, civic action and consistent with the philosophical foundation established in Chapter One.

- **The ability to both write and speak clearly:** The ability to make a sustained verbal and written argument is the sine qua non of effective participation in civil discourse.

- **Research and critical analysis of information:** The ability to conduct research and analyze information is essential for the citizen to equip herself with the factual support on which an argument is based and to distinguish the worthy argument from the unworthy.

- **The ability to listen empathically:** Civil discourse and the forging of open, democratic solutions to societal problems, requires the citizen’s ability to listen openly to the arguments of other citizens and to discern (applying phronesis) which elements are worthy of further consideration and the basis for possible compromise.

- **Constructive collaboration:** The ability to work openly with others facilitates both the fashioning of the compromise out of the dialogue, as well as the civic action that necessarily follows from the decision.

- **Creative problem solving (the essential praxis):** The willingness and ability to work with others provides the
necessary context for the application of the practical wisdom to the problem in question.

Buck Institute for Education Common Core State Standards-aligned Rubrics

Since this study’s inception in 2011, project-based learning (PBL) has become a wide-spread movement in education. The recognition of the need for learning opportunities designed with a significant measure of student choice, that are experiential in nature, and that employ multiple modes of assessment in which students can variously demonstrate their learning is now commonly accepted in schools, even though the process and assessments are often in tension with year-end standardized tests. As such, the choice of Buck Institute for Education (BIE) Common Core State Standards-aligned (CCSS) rubrics of the requisite skills was an easy one. BIE has long been at the forefront of the PBL movement and is recognized for having high-quality research-based rubrics for the assessment of such skills. The following rubrics were used for assessing student CAP work:

- Collaboration
- Creativity and Innovation
- Presentation (Oral and Written)
- Critical Thinking (Research)

See Appendix A for the full rubrics.
Research Questions

The following questions served as foci for gathering data and information in this study:

What are the components of a successful citizenship education program?

What are the essential citizenship skills or competencies?

What does proficiency in each of the skills look like? In other words, what must a student be able to do in order to act like a competent citizen?

Selection of Sample

At the time of this study – spring of 2012 – Monticello High School was operating on a four-by-four block schedule. Under this configuration, roughly half of the senior class (approximately 275 total students) takes U.S. Government each semester. The school also divides its courses into the following levels: Advanced Placement (AP), Dual Credit with the local community college, Advanced, and Applied. All levels are offered each semester. The government teachers then combine their classes during the given class periods for the purposes of the CAP project and create heterogeneous or mixed ability groupings from the combinations. The teachers also consider personality compatibility, but the primary goal is to have students from the different levels work together. From the roughly twenty groups created during the spring semester of 2012, I worked with the three government teachers to choose three sample groups. The
three groups with whom I worked drew from one of Ms. Emily Dooley's AP U.S. Government class and one of Ms. Hannah Bailey's Applied Level U.S. Government class. In making the choice of groups, the only difference in the project's three sample groups was that the teachers ensured that all students were eighteen years of age at the time of assignment. Adding this additional variable expedited the process of obtaining the informed consent documentation by the participants consistent with Georgetown's Institutional Review Board guidelines for the use of human subjects in research.

Data Collection

Two primary instruments were used in this study. The first was a questionnaire entitled Citizen Action Project Survey. It was constructed with advice and assistance from Dr. Nora Gordon, Professor at Georgetown University in the Public Policy Institute and Dr. James Huneycutt, Social Studies Department Chair at Monticello High School. The survey was administered to students twice during the spring of 2012, once prior to the start of the project in February, 2012 and once after the project was complete in May of the same year. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the extent to which students' reported understanding of citizenship changed over the course of the project. As such, the survey was comprised of five questions; the first question asked for the student's definition of citizenship. Questions two
through five were open-ended questions, asking for student knowledge and opinions of responsibilities and competencies needed by an effective citizen.

The Questions:

2. What actions, if any, are required of a citizen?

3. When a person acts in his/her capacity as a citizen, what sorts of things does s/he do?

4. What skills, if any, must a person possess to be an effective citizen?

5. What knowledge, if any, must a person possess to be an effective citizen?

The choice of open-ended questions was intended to give students the widest latitude in giving voice to each one’s own understanding of citizenship. Standard Likert Scale type questions were not used so as not to prejudice or guide student responses toward certain types or gradations of answers. While more difficult to analyze because of their inherent messiness, the open-ended questions were deemed to yield more authentic responses from the students.

The second instrument involved the application of BIE skill acquisition rubrics to a variety of collected student work associated with the CAP project. Most of the student work was submitted digitally to each student group’s Google Site and shared with the group’s teachers. Each Google Site was set up and
organized according to a template created by the teachers. Work submission categories were the following:

- Public Policy Issue (Naming of the Issue to be researched by the group)

- Proof of Debate (Documentation of Debate — at least two sides of the Issue of Choice — demonstrated through an annotated bibliography of the sources consulted)

- Group’s Stated Position or Thesis with respect to the Issue

- Documented Action Plan to Affect the Policy Debate

- Action Plan Outcomes and Next Steps

In addition to the digital work submitted, students participated in a final paideia (graded seminar) discussion during which the groups were asked to formally reflect on the CAP process. Participating groups were video-ed in their discussion, a transcript created and the content of the participation coded and analyzed for evidence of student understanding of active citizenship and its processes.

Analysis Procedures and Confidentiality

As noted previously, The Citizenship Action Project Questionnaire was administered twice during the spring of 2012, once prior to the start of the project and again after the project work was complete. In both cases, the classroom teachers
administered the survey to their own classes and assigned a completion grade to the task for each student in an attempt to ensure greater student participation and investment in providing answers to the survey questions. Next, the handwritten student responses were input into an Excel Spreadsheet by a hired assistant. The student responses were then analyzed for evidence of understanding of various meanings of the term "citizenship." Using CAP’s own distinction between two basic understanding of citizenship – the passive, legalistic version on the one hand and the more active, participatory version on the other – responses were categorized accordingly. In looking for evidence of a change in understanding, survey responses were grouped and analyzed from both the sample groups, as well as the entire cohort of U.S. Government students for the semester, to see if there was any qualitative difference between the two.

In addition to the pre- and post- surveys, video was taken of the two final paideia-style reflective seminars. Similar to the recording and analysis of the student survey responses, transcripts of the seminars were created and the student seminar responses were analyzed for evidence of understanding of the two versions of citizenship.

Names of students were recorded in both the spreadsheet and in the video transcripts and cross-referenced, but both the tallying of types of responses as well as any reference to a
specific student response within the write up of the study were made anonymously.

**Assumptions of Study**

It was assumed that the understanding of citizenship would change over the course of the project from a more passive and superficial definition of the term to a more robust and action-focused understanding of the term. The change should be reflected in the responses from the pre- to post- survey responses as well as in the seminar responses. It was also expected that that this evidence of changed understanding would be reflected in the student work submitted on the Google Sites, particularly in the documented Action Plans designed to impact policy on each student’s and each group’s chosen policy issue. Similarly, it was assumed that students would be able to demonstrate the acquisition of, or proficiency in, at least some of the identified citizenship skills through their work required by the CAP project; and further, evidence of these skills would be reflected in the application of the independently created BIE rubrics to the student work.

**Limitations of Study**

In terms of the evidence of understanding, the study relied heavily on student survey responses and student responses during an end-of-year paideia seminar. All participating students were
second semester seniors. There was no formal requirement that students complete the surveys beyond a simple completion grade (there was no penalty assigned for failure to complete the survey) and second semester seniors, particularly in their last month of high school are often less engaged in their school work and class activities than at any other time in their schooling. These factors may have worked against full investment by the students in completing these surveys and in their participation in the final seminar.

I made two visits to Monticello High School to observe the U.S. Government classes in question during the spring of 2012. Additional visits to the classes during the life of the CAP project, had they been possible, undoubtedly would have been beneficial to this study. Similarly, no individual student interviews focused on the CAP project or student understanding of citizenship were conducted due to time constraints. While the year-end paideia seminar responses did include thoughts and feelings of the students about CAP, thereby yielding some evidence of understanding of action-oriented citizenship, responses from individual interviews could have provided useful comparison data to those collected from the student surveys and the seminar and would likely have provided a greater level of depth and reliability to this study’s analysis.

Finally, the study is confined to three sub-groups during a single semester. A comparative longitudinal study covering
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

The Citizen Action Project

The Citizen Action Project (CAP) at Monticello High School (MHS) is a program that explicitly purports to teach and assess every student's understanding of the concept of active citizenship and each student's ability to demonstrate a mastery of the requisite skills associated with such an understanding. Above all, CAP is a multi-layered process — not a single, discrete assessment or assignment. The project is run within the context of all sections of the U.S. Government course for seniors — a graduation requirement for all seniors by the Commonwealth of Virginia. As with most courses, students read from an approved text book (in this case, a U.S. Government text), listen and take notes from some lectures by a teacher licensed by the Commonwealth to teach the course, and take tests and complete written assignments that help them to learn about the creation, evolution, and workings of the U.S. Government. Apart from this more traditional course context, however, CAP requires that students do certain things. Assigned to a small working group, students are asked to follow the news daily (MHS actually subscribes to the local daily paper, The Daily Progress, providing a class set for each of the U.S. Government classes) and, from this daily reading, come to consensus on a choice of a
particular political issue worthy of further research. Once chosen, students in the group contribute to establishing what CAP terms the *Proof of Debate*. An *Issue*, by CAP's definition, must have at least two documented opposing sides, with the opposition centering around possible solutions to the issue. Accordingly, students research the issue and post articles within a Google Site, demonstrating the presence and viability of the two sides in the debate. To help with organization of the information and the process, the CAP teachers create a structure for the student Sites. Each group has its own Site with access for each individual in the group and shared with the teachers for monitoring and assessment purposes. Once the "debate is proved," the group must then decide which side in the debate it finds most compelling based on the merits of each side’s arguments, and then develop an *Action Plan* to help positively impact the policy debate in favor of the side it has chosen. As a rare exception (I was aware of only one instance in the spring of 2012), students who could not come to consensus within their group are permitted to adopt different positions with respect to the chosen issue. Once the action plan is approved, the group commences enacting its plan. The actions of the individuals in the group constitute the bulk and primary substance of the CAP process. As the groups enter this phase of the process, the U.S. Government classes cease to function as traditional courses with teacher-directed learning. The classrooms are open, phones and computers (if
needed) are made available to the students as they make contact
with local, state, and national leaders, and students come and go
(all students obtain parental permission to leave campus, as
needed) as they work to implement the action plan. Students are
required to document their actions taken on behalf of the plan;
documentation can take the form of posted email exchanges,
transcripts of phone calls or in-person interviews, drafts of
letters to the editor of various publications, and links to
educational websites or social media sites created by the
students as examples of action. Each group is also required to
give a summative presentation of their work and its effects to a
panel of teachers at the end of the semester. It is important to
note that the focus of this presentation assessment is on the
quality of presentation and on the quality of the process and
actions taken by the students, not necessarily on the specific
outcomes of the actions. In other words, students can achieve
grade success on their CAP performance even if their bill is not
passed by the state legislature or their policy change rejected
by the municipal government.

By comparison to a more traditional teacher-directed
classroom experience, the CAP process is messy. Many students,
like adults, are inefficient in such an open work setting having
been given significant choice in determining one’s own process.
There is quite a bit of floundering, particularly in the
beginning of the project, as students struggle to identify an
issue about which most in the group care and about which there is legitimate debate. Even in the action plan stage, students inevitably aim too high or too low in their proposed plans and are then asked by their teachers to revise down or up their action goals (handing out handwritten fliers in downtown Charlottesville versus testifying before Congress on behalf of a National Clean Water Bill) to make them more realistic and appropriately impactful. One often observes students sitting around in casual conversation and procrastinating. But for all the messiness and inefficiencies, CAP, on balance, accomplishes its goals. Students did demonstrate a more robust action-oriented understanding of the concept of citizenship. Students did take real actions on behalf of a policy issue and, as a result, participated in real politics. Whether the group and its individuals achieved the desired outcome or not, their participation gave them an enduring understanding of general political processes and how they (the students) can be an effective part of these processes. They emerge from the CAP experience knowing what to do and how to do it. This combination of understanding a notion of citizenship that all democratic leaders would presumably endorse (and consistent with the philosophical foundation proposed in this project), understanding the processes in which to apply such an understanding, and the development of and practice in the skills that allow for efficacy in such processes make CAP an unqualified success in its
purported aims and, more importantly, as a model for other
citizen education programs in its results and in its scale.

Evidence of Student Understanding

The data support a substantive positive shift in student
understanding of a robust meaning of the concepts citizen and
citizenship. The language used by students in their responses to
the pre- and post-CAP surveys (administered on February 27, 2012
and May 17, 2012, respectively) indicate this shift in
understanding from a more passive view of citizenship as both a
"spectator sport" of legal requirements and voting as the
principal voluntary duties and the simple legal belonging to a
nation in the pre-CAP survey to a more ethically responsible,
action-oriented practitioner view of Gadamer's phronesis and
praxis. Though less conclusive, the paideia seminar discussions
also bear out this shift. Despite the fact that a number of
students noted stress and annoyance associated with the project
requirements in their senior year, many also noted much greater
understanding of policy processes and feelings of self efficacy
associated with their new-found ability to impact said processes.
Significantly, key moments (site visits conducted on February 27,
2012 and March 29, 2012) during the life of the project confirmed
the presence of both the frustration on the part of the students
over the perceived lack of direction from their teachers as well
as a palpable sense of empowerment from successful communications
with issue "experts" (such as an email response, a confirmed in-
person interview, and an extended phone call). Finally, most
students submitted substantive work and documentation indicative
of more than a passive understanding of the roles and
responsibilities of a citizen. Most students researched and
adequately characterized two sides of a real policy debate. Most
students made contact and held extended discussions with more
than one community leader as part of their research and/or action
plan. Most students fulfilled the action requirement in a way
that positively, if not conclusively, impacted the policy debate
around their chosen issue. Given that all high school seniors
participated in the CAP experience, and given that all but a
handful\(^1\) passed the key CAP assessments, one would have to
conclude that CAP is a worthy citizen education program.

From the first set of survey responses (the pre-CAP
surveys), students consistently wrote of citizenship and its
responsibilities as "voting or registering to vote," "paying
taxes," "doing jury duty," and "following the laws." Indeed,
references to one or more of these duties were made 214 total
times, with every pre-CAP survey containing at least one such
reference (63/63). And while these terms also appeared in the
post-CAP survey responses (87 total specific references to one or

\(^1\) Of 134 total students participating in the CAP project by virtue of
their enrollment in the U.S. Government course in the spring of 2012, 11
earned a failing grade on one of the major project components, but still
earned a passing grade on the overall project. Only two students earned a
failing grade for the overall project.
more of these duties in 42 of 88 surveys), every post-CAP survey (all 88) contained multiple references to some form of "taking action" and "positively impacting one's community through such action" for a total of 464 specific such examples. By contrast, the pre-CAP surveys contained 143 specific references to robust citizenship from only 38 of the 63 completed surveys.

Examining these responses, it is important to acknowledge that knowing what to say is not the same as believing or even understanding what one is saying. Evidence from student action (discussed below) is consistent with the participatory language used by students in the surveys. Still, it is possible that students were merely acting out of compliance with the assignment expectations in order to earn a particular grade. Even if this is the case, the fact remains that, generally, students initially defaulted to the more static understanding of citizenship prior to embarking on the CAP process and subsequently, used the more action-oriented language once the project was complete. Whether or not students fully internalized the latter understanding of citizenship, the results represent a significant accomplishment by the CAP process and its teachers. To cite a more familiar example for comparison's sake, in teaching a student to write a standard five-paragraph expository essay, the student may or may not fully appreciate or even understand the worth of the form and

---

2 The discrepancy in total number of pre- and post- surveys reflects the number of students who completed and submitted the survey to their teacher on the respective days in February and May.
the fact of having mastered it. It is still a great accomplishment by teacher and student when the student leaves high school able to competently execute the form.

In response to the first survey prompt, “Define ‘citizenship’ as you understand the term,” the following were typical of pre-CAP survey responses:

Paying taxes, voting, etc.

Being able to vote, pay taxes, and be a proud American.

Citizenship is when someone not born in the US files to be part of the US.

Citizenship is when you were born or have lived in an area for a certain amount of time.

By contrast, the following were typical of the more action-oriented post-CAP survey responses:

Citizenship means that you do your part in the community to educate people and stand up for things you believe in.

In the most literal sense: being a legal occupant of a country which is identified as your home country. Otherwise, the actions of participating in ones [sic] government to change aspects of it for the betterment of the government.

Citizenship is the duty of a citizen of a county/town. Its [sic] being part of your community and being active in the place you live in.
Similarly, the responses to the other survey prompts, which asked students to identify actions, skills, and knowledge that they associated with citizenship (whether required or not), revealed a similar shift in understanding. The following were typical of the pre-CAP surveys:

To be registered to vote and vote.

A citizen is responsible to pay taxes.

A good person follows the laws and helps others not break the law.

Not break the law.

By contrast, the following were typical of the post-CAP survey responses:

They would need to be able to learn about what is happening around them so they could execute whatever it is they are going to try to do.

When a person acts in her capacity as a citizen she is involved with different organizations or interest groups and doing all that she can to make positive changes.

Good citizens are active in their community. They are informed about issues, they vote, and they educate people on their opinions.

Consistent with the survey results, the thoughts shared by students during the final, reflective paideia seminar echoed an understanding of citizenship that involves informed participation, that understanding of citizenship in this way was
new for them and that explicitly linked the CAP project to the development of this understanding in themselves, and that CAP helped them develop necessary skills that would allow them to translate this new understanding into action. All of this significant growth was acknowledged despite the presence of a fair amount of expressed frustration with anxiety caused by the CAP process over completing the final project during the students' final semester of high school, as well as stress resulting from participation in a CAP process that, like real life, was often messy and inefficient. One student characterized these tensions in this way:

I would say there were a lot of frustrations with the CAP project, but in the end it was outweighed by, like, there was a really good outcome because we did teacher tenure and presented to the Albemarle County School Board and they were, like, really supportive of the idea and presenting the idea to people who were really high up and it was really satisfying.

Another student's summary followed a similar pattern, ultimately expressing a sense of efficacy and satisfaction as a result of her work in the CAP project:

I definitely remember the frustration of trying to contact people. Other things I remember, how much I've kind of improved on my independence - like how much I can actually help others, and I was able to do. I didn't have much say over my topic, but I was actually able to be a lot of help [to my group] . . . and also that if our action plan pulls through we might actually do some really good things, like, for the environment.
A number of students noted increased community engagement by
themselves as a result of the CAP project:

I know I was making phone calls – we had to make
calls. It taught us to talk to professional people.
Like actually, it was easier because I was never going
to see them so it was ok. Also, like before I wasn’t
really involved in the community and I didn’t really
care, and now I will be more involved.

Another echoed these same sentiments: “No, I agree with that,
too, because I never used to really watch the news or anything
and now when I hear people talking about the School Board or
teacher tenure I get really excited because I’m involved in it.”
And one final student stated:

I think it’s cool because a lot of teenagers are not
really interested in – a lot of kids don’t really or
have little inkling of what’s happening. Maybe [they
do] nationally, like national elections and stuff, but
the local news, which has the biggest impact on them
is – people don’t know about it; I mean I don’t know
anything about half this stuff. It’s really cool, like
you said, now that you see some of this stuff – the
newspaper, [channel] 29 or whatever, you actually know
what they’re talking about. Obviously, it’s not
everything, but part of the news – if you did a
project on something that’s pretty relevant around
here, I think it’s really cool to see on the news that
you’re involved with that and you’re educated on
what’s happening.

For others, self-efficacy was attributed to newly acquired
skills seen as relevant in the real world.

I guess it’s the first one where I’ve been given
something and the teacher . . . left it all up to our
group and forced us to go out and talk to people and
do stuff on our own without strict guidelines and
order, and this was just like, ‘go out and research
and come up with everything yourself and find this
information through other people.’
Another student expressed a similar sentiment: "a lot of things are like this in everyday life and you have to just sort of put yourself out there and to research and when you go into a job interview and tell them — you have to get along with other people in order to even pass and take other ideas. I think it helped a lot." And finally:

It definitely helped me be more independent because you know that when you choose a topic you’re like, the government teachers weren’t always going to know the big topic that’s going on that you want to do — know anything for that topic. You definitely have to get more of your own info, do a lot of your own research.

As part of my research, I was able to conduct two site visits during the project timeline: one on February 27 during which the CAP project was introduced and the initial survey was administered, and one on March 29 after the project work was well underway. My observations were consistent with the student reports in the reflective seminar; I witnessed multiple instances of frustration and “floundering” on the part of the students as a result of the open-endedness of the project, and I witnessed multiple instances of a clear sense of self-efficacy experienced by students in reporting successful communication with community and state leaders.

Particularly on the first day of the project in February, students struggled with the perceived lack of direction. On that day, students were placed into groups that brought together
students from an AP-level class and an Applied level class. There was evident discomfort in some of the groups, as students were now teamed with peers whom they did not know or know well. Typical of any school with tracking, by senior year, students of different ability level (often corresponding to relative levels of affluence) had long been separated into different course tracks. It is beyond the scope of this project to include an analysis of tracking’s effects on students and student achievement; it is simply worth noting that the somewhat divisive effects of tracking at the very least were evident on that first day because it had created separate course paths for students, such that the different groups rarely mixed during their respective academic days. Added to the inevitable discomfort of getting to know unknown peers with whom one was now expected to work closely, students were charged with identifying an issue of interest that could really be anything as long as a group could show documented disagreement about the issue. Beyond the necessity of having two sides, the only other guidance for choosing an issue was that the more “local” the issue, the better. An issue of national importance, students were told, would be more difficult to impact through student action due to the scale of the national issue and the physical and relational distance separating the students from the political processes and leaders associated with that issue. During the course of that 90-minute class period, I witnessed numerous examples of student
complaints, both within their groups and to their teachers, about real and perceived difficulties. Quite simply, it was easier to direct the initial general discomfort toward the project and one’s teachers than to begin getting to know one’s fellow group members and wading into the work of choosing a common issue. Comments such as: “I don’t know what we’re supposed to do;” and, “we need help” were repeated throughout the period and by all groups.

When I returned in March, group focus and group dynamics were much improved. In addition to the fact that students had now spent a good deal of time working on the project, informal presentations of each group’s proposed action plan to the three government teachers had also been scheduled for the day. Thus, group focus was certainly improved by the presentation event. Still, three separate student reports of successful communication on behalf of an action plan betrayed a real sense of accomplishment and empowerment. Indeed, one student reported that he had secured an interview with a local leader, one student relayed that after several attempts she had conducted a phone interview with another local politician, and a third student had received an email response to questions from a state official. In each case, a clear sense of efficacy was evident from the students. For each of these accomplishments, there were many more frustrations and false starts, but what was clear — even in the challenging moments — was that students were figuring out or
being challenged to figure out the more useful avenues through which to impact policy and the more useful strategies to bring to bear on these processes. In this regard, the presentations that day were particularly instructive. As groups continued their work in the two classrooms, the commons area in between, and two nearby offices, one group at a time would be called upon to present to the three government teachers: Dr. Jim Huneycutt, Ms. Emily Dooley, and Mrs. Hannah Bailey. For these presentations, the groups had been asked to draft their respective action plans and submit them for teacher approval prior to undertaking the actions, though, as the reports to which I referred above attest, some students had already begun reaching out to local officials for interviews. The "feel" of each presentation was rather informal – the three teachers and I sat in the corner of the room and Jim called the groups over in succession. Other groups continued their work around us and paid little attention to the group presenting. In addition, no group employed the use of a visual aid, such as PowerPoint. The draft action plan had been documented in each group’s Google Site, which Jim accessed through the classroom desktop computer and used for reference as the group members talked and when he asked questions of them. Most groups did not use notes. All of the nine proposals were modest in scope and focused on educating a community or key segment of a community to gain support for the group’s position on its chosen issue. Some, like the group focused on the school’s
responsibility for bullying by students outside of school, also
hoped to influence or help write new official policy. Much of the
"give and take" then between the presenters and the panel focused
on refining the group's choice of the education "instruments."
Five of the groups had identified a number of targeted actions
that included creating an educational website, a Twitter account
and Facebook page through which to drive traffic to the website,
submission of editorials to local print papers, The Daily
Progress and The Independent, and then proposed attendance and
speeches at open meetings held by various local municipal bodies
(like the Albemarle County School Board). Notably, three of the
groups lacked adequate preparation for the proposals. Each of
these three groups proposed a primary action of handing out
educational fliers at a number of public areas in Charlottesville
(the Downtown Mall and Fashion Square Mall were the principal
target areas on all three lists). With each of these groups, Jim
took the lead in questioning and began with essentially the same
question: "How do you react when a stranger approaches you in a
parking lot and hands you a flier? How likely are you to read the
flier?" Each of these three groups went away from the
presentation with a new range of education actions similar to the
other groups who were more prepared.

One question to which the CAP teachers (and I) kept
returning was the relative importance of a successful action
outcome or product in determining the grade. Must the policy be
changed or newly adopted at least as a partial result of the group’s actions? Must the editorial be published in the local paper or the student speaker make it onto the public agenda of the committee meeting? The teachers’ answer was always “no.” And I, too, believe it to be the correct answer. The focus in CAP is always the authenticity and substance of the process. Students are challenged to undertake real actions with the potential for real impact. The phone calls and emails to local officials, the editorials submitted to newspapers, the websites and Twitter feeds were all certainly prompted by the CAP assignment, but they also amount to the same actions that one would undertake prompted solely by one’s personal belief that a societal practice or policy needs changing. This seems to me to be the essential focus of the CAP project and the vital service it gives its participating students: students are taught the process of active citizenship by participating in that very process. They can only fail by not becoming credibly informed, not being able to credibly communicate one’s understanding of one’s position, and not undertaking credible action on behalf of one’s position or a combination of these. One’s position may suffer defeat (perhaps often), or submit to compromise or deferral, or may win outright; indeed, all are possible in a democracy. Demonstrating an understanding of this process in high school regardless of outcome of one’s action plan enables a student forever more to
act constructively on behalf of one's positions. This, again, is the enduring value of CAP.

**Evidence of Skill Acquisition and Proficiency**

 Ideally, a robust understanding of active citizenship would be accompanied by the skills allowing the student to put into competent practice such an understanding. This, after all, is the essence of *phronesis* or practical wisdom and the corresponding *praxis* or practice – the ability to translate the wisdom into effective action. Knowing what needs to be done, however, is not the same as being able to do it. And so, another measure of CAP's effectiveness must be an assessment of the degree to which CAP teaches and assesses the critical citizenship skills or, at the very least, requires the student to demonstrate proficiency in the critical skills as part of the project process. This last sentence implies an additional important distinction in terms of the role CAP plays in skill assessment. CAP could be deemed successful as a citizen education program either as a process that both teaches a student the citizen skills and then assesses the degree to which the student has learned those skills; or, as more of a summative assessment of the student's proficiency in the skills, the teaching of which may have occurred over a longer period of time and in experiences and classes that may include, but also fall outside of the dedicated senior U.S. Government course. In other words, for the second scenario, the project
could assess a skills outcome of the student's broader high school educational program. In both scenarios, CAP's at least partial success lies in its effectiveness in requiring the student to perform the skills and then in its reliable assessment of that "performance."

CAP does require students to perform all of this project's identified critical skills, and teachers formally assess the skills of writing, oral presentation, research, and, to a certain extent, creative (or at least effective) problem solving in the actions students choose to undertake on behalf of their public policy position. Apart from the student's and her group's oral presentations, the primary vehicle for documenting and assessing the student's work and skills is through an individual Google Site. To help with organization, CAP teachers pre-load each student's site with an organizational template, indicating the required project components and guiding the student in her documenting and posting of work for each component to the site.

The Sites' template includes the following categories or pages, each with specified criteria:

**News Journal**

Students are required to document the reading of roughly one news article per class period. The local Charlottesville paper, *The Daily Progress* is provided for the students for this purpose. Until the CAP project commences, students can choose any article to
read and document, creating various public policy categories of interest to organize their article postings. Once the project begins, students create a CAP category for posting of their project-related articles. Each posting must include the title, the name of media outlet, author of the article with relevant contact information, the date, and an annotation, which is defined as an article summary.

Overview of the Issue

On this page, students provide background on their chosen Issue.

This post will be a long one. You will need to write a narrative that explains why this topic has become a public policy issue. You may need to include some history of the issue. You may need to include some explanation of the controversy. You may need to include some of the potential options available to address this issue. You may need to add maps or pictures or links to other web pages. The bottom line is you need to tell the story of your issue so that someone who has not done the research clearly understands why this policy decision is difficult to make at this time.

Contacts

This page serves two purposes. Initially, it contains a list of and contact information for the individual's group members. Once the project is fully underway, students are also asked to include official contacts
made as part of the student's research and Action Plan.

Debatable Question

As the title suggests, students need to frame their Public Policy Issue of interest as a question, for instance: "Should the deer population (in Albemarle County) be controlled by hunting?" For an Issue to be worthy of the CAP project, it must have two viable sides - an "Affirmative" and a "Negative."

In this post, write the debatable question that will direct your research. Remember that a debatable question includes at least two clear and distinct points of view. If your research takes you in a new direction, keep your existing question and add a new post.

Your debatable question must be presented and defended in front of a panel of teachers in order to have passed this stage. There is a time-value date attached to this requirement.

Proof of Debate

Each student must document the existence of two sides for the Debatable Question. This category has three sub-pages: the Affirmative, the Negative, and Current Policy and Legislation. For the two sides, the student must research and document evidence for each side of the argument. For the Current Policy and Legislation sub-page, the student must research and document the
existing "current policy or legislation directly impact(-ing the) debatable question."

Students are given this direction for their documentation of evidence:

Add a post for each new piece of evidence you obtain in your research that helps explain this side of the issue. You should have at least five pieces of evidence. Use the template to correctly format your posts.

**Title of Post**

- Date you are making the post

- Summary of the post

- Link to original material or attachment or artifacts

- Quotes you found particularly useful

**Action Plan**

Students must provide a narrative-overview of the proposed action and must then document the actual actions.

In this post, write a narrative explaining what your action is and how this action is connected to your informed decision. Your Action Plan should come as a result of the research you conducted during your Proof of Debate. Your Action Plan should be detailed and thorough. Your Action Plan should demonstrate informed participation.

Your action must take place outside of Monticello [High School]. Your Action Plan must take place with
an authentic audience. An authentic audience is the actual group of people who are impacted by your action and with the help of whom will help you carry out your action. (i.e. If you are requesting legislative action from the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, you will need to go to them and talk with them.)

Your action should incorporate the following three steps appropriately:

- Legislate

- Educate

- Participate

Reflective Journal

As the name suggests, students are asked to reflect on the CAP process throughout the semester. In some cases prompts are given to the students; in other instances, the students may choose their own focus.

The reflective journal gives the student a place to document conversations with group members, thoughts on the process in general, feedback to the teacher, etc. You should make at least one post to this journal per week. The format for the post must include the date, a topic and your comments. See the template and examples below to guide you.

Student Work: Demonstrated Proficiency in the Citizenship Skills

Generally speaking, and using the Buck Institute for Education project skills rubrics, the quality of the student work mostly fell into the “Approaching Standard” category (see explanation below). I tracked three student groups most closely:

Deer Population Control in Albemarle County, School Bullying
Policy, and Drug Testing of Welfare Recipients. Seventeen total students were in one of these three groups. Of the seventeen, thirteen ultimately shared their Google Sites with me. Of these, all documented at least some research through their News Journal and Proof of Debate submissions. In both categories, students were supposed to cite and annotate their source material. The News Journal entries came from either the students’ reading of The Daily Progress or from online news sources. Proof of Debate entries documented interviews and other source materials; for instance, the Affirmative Action group documented some of the federal case law on the subject. In both categories, students tended to provide article and source material summaries rather than annotations, which would have involved analysis of the quality of the given source.

The following are typical of the student News Journal entries:

Gona Con is a new method of controlling female deer. Its [sic] a shot that is given to the deer and it prevents them from wanting to mate. Its [sic] says that the drug will have no affect [sic] to the meat and that its [sic] a protine [sic] so it would maybe help the meat. This one single shot can last up to 5 years. Its [sic] also registered with the EPA. Scientises [sic] are working to make an oral form of the drug because [sic] now it has to given by hand into the tissue or mussle [sic].

A poll taken in recent highschools [sic] revealed that 50% of highschool [sic] students agree there is bullying or teasing about sexual topics/sexuality. Recently, teens and students in local schools have been getting together and raising awareness for sexual abuse crimes involving teens in central Virginia
[sic]. They've teamed up with Sexual Assault Resource Company (SARA) and began fundraising to reach their goal, stopping teen sexual crimes cold turkey. Last Saturday, the activist teens held a book fair to raise funds for the sexually abused. They were successful, and raised money to support 550 survivors. The other procedures went to the SARA emergency program."
From Teens Step up to Fight Sexual Abuse Crimes NBC29, Mike Dunleavy, February 12, 2012

Summary: A man has been arrested in northern Mississippi for gunning down two strangers on an interstate. Sheriffs claim that they have substantial evidence and will be bringing the man to trial by Monday.
From www.cnn.com 5.20.2012 CNN Wire Staff

Similarly, the following were typical of the Proof of Debate entries:

She believes that if the bullying that occurs outside of school causes disruption inside the school then it is the school's issue.

If the actions of the bullies step over the lines of any laws it also becomes part of the school's problem.

It belongs to the parents and the police until it comes to school. (from interview with Albemarle County Superintendent of Schools, Pam Moran)

4th amendment argument:
A federal judge in florida [sic] has halted the law in florida sighting [sic] that it may infringe upon people's 4th amendment rights. This may indicate that even if a law of similar content is passed in Virginia it may not be around for long (perhaps not worth the time).

Effectiveness argument:
Florida has reported that only 2% of people who are tested in its new welfare drug testing plan. This means that, assuming the 2% of people who do not take the test all test positive, 96% of the drug tests are payed [sic] by Florida (a $30 per test tab).

Drug Court is more effective in dealing with drug offenders (better stats in future arrests) and saves
more money (jail costs far higher compared to drug court).

Virginia Deer Hunter’s Association: “Why You Need to Join the VDHA: Antihunters are threatening deer hunting throughout the country, each year the VDHA needs to fight local and state laws which would restrict your hunting privileges, more and more land is being put ‘off limits’ to hunting.
vdha@virginiadeerhunters.org

Here is the pertinent language from the BIE Critical Thinking (Research) Rubric for the “Approaching Standard” criteria:

for Analyze Driving Question and Begin Inquiry

- identifies some central aspects of the Driving Question, but may not see complexities or consider various points of view

for Gather and Evaluate Information

- attempts to integrate information to address the Driving Question, but it may be too little, too much, or gathered from too few sources; some of it may not be relevant

- understands the quality of information should be considered, but does not do so thoroughly

for Use Evidence and Criteria

- recognizes the need for valid reasoning and strong evidence, but does not evaluate carefully when developing answers to the Driving Question
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• evaluates and revises ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions based on incomplete or invalid criteria

for Justify Choices, Consider Alternatives & Implications

• explains choices made when answering the Driving Question . . . , but some reasons are not valid or lack supporting evidence

• understands that there may be alternative answers to the Driving Question . . . , but does not consider them carefully

Again, the language for this "Approaching Standard" category of demonstrating proficiency in the critical thinking or analysis of information described nearly all of the student work. The "better" student work tended to be expressed in greater volume of sources cited and the quality of the sources, but not in explicit analysis of the source material by the student. There was no evidence of explicit analysis of sources in the Google Sites by any of the students from the three groups in question.

In terms of proficiency in Writing or Written Expression, students were not required to submit any formal pieces of writing as part of their project work. The sampling of student posts above for News Journal and Proof of Debate is representative of all of the writing on the student Sites. Even for the Overview of the Issue section, which the teachers described for the students as "a long one" and "a narrative that explains why this topic has become a public policy issue," requiring them "to tell the story of your issue so that
someone who has not done the research clearly understands why this policy decision is difficult to make at this time," the student posts, if submitted, were short (none longer than a paragraph) and not particularly polished (many had typos). Indeed, no student from the School Bullying group submitted an Overview for their issue, raising the question of whether or not the group members were even aware of this requirement. Students from all other groups, even those not serving as a focus of this study, did submit something for this Overview requirement.

Of those who did submit, the following was fairly typical in length and quality of the student posts:

Drug testing for the welfare [sic] has brought many arguments [sic] and questions. Many people have stated that it violates the 4th amendment of the constitution. Many are for the bill because they do not want their tax money going to drugs. They say that there is a way that we can control that. Others say that the bill needs to be amended and have some treatment plans to go along with it. Some also say that it is a way to just spend more money and raise more taxes. There has [sic] been multiple states that have tried to go through with the same bill and it has come back unconstitutional. Other states like Florida has [sic] passed the bill and that the reports do not show that this is an actual problem. 94% passed the test and they said that it was a waste of money to do if over half of the people are passing the test.

These two additional Overviews represent the weakest and strongest (from a fourth group studying teacher tenure in Albemarle County) of the student submissions, respectively:

The overview of the deer population is that their [sic] are to [sic] many deer and we need to control them better. People say that hunting is the solution to control it and others say that we need to find a
humaine [sic] way to controll [sic] them or just leave them as if the deer are no problem.

Here in Virginia we have continuing contract plans. When a teacher is hired they are put on a three-year probationary period where they are evaluated and judged. During this probationary period they can be fired for any reason, whether for budget cuts or not doing a very good job. When they are fired during the probationary period they do not need a specific reason behind the firing. If after the three years is up and the teacher has had good evaluations they can be given a continuing contract. A continuing contract is the state of Virginia’s method for teacher tenure. Continuing contracts allow teachers to have due process if they are fired, so this means if they were fired for no reason they can fight it in court to get their job back. There is a misconception that teachers who are on teacher tenure cannot be fired unless they do something illegal, but this is not true. It is harder to get rid of a teacher on tenure, but it is still possible if they are not doing their jobs and are bad teachers. My CAP group studied this public policy and tried to see whether teacher tenure in Virginia should be revised.

Given that the teacher instructions for the Overview seemed to require a formal piece of writing from each student, application of the BIE Presentation Rubric to the student work would place all of the work in the “Approaching Standard” or “Below Standard” categories.

Here is the pertinent language from the rubric for “Approaching Standard”:

for Explanation of Ideas and Information

- presents information, findings, arguments and supporting evidence in a way that is not always clear, concise, and logical; line of reasoning sometimes hard to follow
• attempts to select information, develop ideas and use a style appropriate to the purpose, task, and audience but does not fully succeed

• attempts to address alternative or opposing perspectives, but not clearly or completely

for Organization

• meets most requirements for what should be included in the [written] presentation

• has an introduction and conclusion, but they are not clear or interesting

Here is the pertinent language for "Below Standard":

for Explanation of Ideas and Information

• does not present information, arguments, ideas, or findings clearly, concisely, and logically (if at all); argument lacks supporting evidence; audience cannot follow the line of reasoning

• selects information, develops ideas and uses a style inappropriate to the purpose, task, and audience (may be too much or too little information, or the wrong approach)

• does not address alternative or opposing perspectives

for Organization

• does not meet requirements for what should be included in the presentation

• does not have an introduction and/or conclusion
The other major writing component for the student CAP Sites was the Reflective Journal. As the category title suggests, this form of writing was intended to promote reflection by the students on the CAP process and was, thus, informal in nature. As such, applying a rubric meant to assess the skill of formal expository writing would be inappropriate.

This is similarly the case for the CAP presentations, all of which – the Proof of Debate Presentation, the Action Plan Presentation, and the Final Presentation – were informal in nature (presented to the three teachers, while other students were working in their groups throughout the room) and, while graded by their instructors, seemed to function more as an update on the group’s progress than as a formal, summative presentation “event” for the CAP project.

In terms of Creative Problem Solving, students’ action plans were the closest expression of this core citizenship skill within the CAP project design. For CAP and its teachers, the better term for a worthy action plan would be its effectiveness (as opposed to creative or innovative) as judged by its ability to reach a critical mass of the right people and persuade them to adopt one’s position in order to affect change or enact policy on behalf of one’s position. As such, while the BIE Creativity and Innovation Rubric works well with this project’s initial framing of the skill, it does not align particularly well with the CAP expectation for the action plan. It is worth noting that while an
action plan's creativity or innovation may indeed contribute to its overall effectiveness, neither creativity nor innovation is necessary for a plan to be effective. Still, much of the rubric's language is useful for evaluating these action plans. As with the previous skills, the student work tended to fall into the “Approaching Standard” category.

Here are the three action plans from the groups in question:

**School Bullying Policy**

Letter to Albemarle County School Board followed by meetings with Billy Haun, Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning, Pam Moran, Albemarle County Superintendent, and Carol Fox, Project Leader for Safe Schools/Healthy Students Project for Albemarle County

Text of letter:

Dear School Board Members,

We are a group of seniors from Monticello High School looking to spread the word about bullying. The question we have studied is “Should bullying that occurs outside of school be punishable inside school?”

We took several months to research bullying policies throughout the country, state, and county. Our research showed that most teachers would rather not get involved in bullying that occurs outside the school, because there are liability issues. If the School Board’s policy was more specific, teachers could not be jeopardized by intervening in bullying issues that occur outside of school.

We would like to propose that the School Board makes their policies relating to bullying more clear. In doing our research we looked into Albemarle County’s bullying policies and found that they were difficult to access. Once we were able to find the information for our own county we found that the guidelines were vague and underdeveloped. See attachment for the current bullying policies under Policy Code JBA. The guidelines need to be specific so that administrators,
teachers, and students all know what is to be expected in any case involving bullying.

There should be a specific policy for each type of bullying. There should be a section for physical bullying, social bullying, and even cyber bullying. If the school does not want to include consequences for or be involved in cyber bullying, the school board should not just neglect the issue. The school board should specifically say that cyber bullying and other types of bullying that happen outside of school will not be addressed in school because it is not within the school board’s jurisdiction.

Though bullying is not necessarily a cause for most suicides in teens and young adults, our research showed that it is often a contributing factor. We would rather have our students safe, than have the parents, staff, and other students sorry. In our research we also found some things that seem to be working in other localities. We could use these ideas to build our own fight against bullying. In Boston, a cyber bullying hotline has been set up to offer help to victims of bullying. (Attachment 2) In Seattle, they set up a bullying prevention program that specifically targets cyber bullying.

We understand from the results of our school’s survey that our school does not have a huge problem with bullying. However, we would like to cut down on bullying as much as possible and we feel that our school could be an example to other schools, just as schools in Boston and Seattle have been an example to us. We hope these ideas will be taken into consideration and that our school board can use some of these tactics to cut down on the amount of bullying in our schools.

Sincerely,

[names withheld]

Deer Population Control

A PowerPoint Presentation detailing a plan for immuncontraception of the city deer population, including implementation costs and proposed benefits delivered to Charlottesville City Council Members
Produce and share informational flyer promoting safe hunting in Albemarle County and the surrounding areas – target City Council Members (Andrew Lowe and Deirdre (Dede) Smith and Virginia Department of Game and Fisheries (David Kocka)

**Drug Testing for Welfare Recipients**

Create Google Site https://sites.google.com/site/drugcourtinfo/ to educate illegal drug offenders about the benefits of “Drug Court”; targeted Public Defenders and other community resource agencies for sharing of website with the hope that these attorneys would then share the site with potential beneficiaries of the Drug Court system

Joe Weaver, Monticello High School Social Worker; Phoebe (no student provided her last name), Director of Blue Ridge One Step; Jeff Gould, Director of Charlottesville-Albemarle Drug Court; Commonwealth of Virginia Delegate Rob Bell

Here are some key categories from the BIE Creativity and Innovation Rubric and the corresponding indicators for work that would be considered “Approaching Standard.” Again, for the purposes of CAP, it is useful to replace the terms “creativity,” “creative,” and “innovation” with the term “effective” and “effectiveness.”

Here is the pertinent language from the rubric for “Approaching Standard”:

**for Define the Creative Challenge**

- understands the basic purpose for innovation but does not thoroughly consider the needs and interests of the target audience
for Identify Sources of Information

- offers new ideas during discussions, but stays within narrow perspectives

for Generate and Select Ideas

- develops some original ideas for product(s), but could develop more with better use of idea-generating techniques

- evaluates ideas, but not thoroughly before selecting one

- shows some imagination when shaping ideas into a product, but may stay within conventional boundaries

for Originality

- has some new ideas or improvements, but some ideas are predictable or conventional

for Value

- is useful and valuable to some extent; it may not solve certain aspects of the defined problem or exactly meet the identified need

- unclear if product would be practical or feasible

In assessing these various actions plans, all three rely on educating a relatively small number of community officials about an issue and recommending to them a particular course of action. Beyond the in-person sharing of information and the proposal, no group proposed, much less undertook, a next step on behalf of one’s position. Clearly, the fact that the entire life of the CAP
project – from introducing students to the assignment to the
final presentation by each group – took place in less than four
months works to significantly constrain the possibilities for
extended action. On the other hand, a robust action plan would
seem to need to demonstrate some thought for pressuring the
pertinent officials beyond the scope of a single meeting.

In terms of the final core Citizenship Skill, no formal
assessment of Collaboration was present in the CAP project
design. To be sure, some measure of collaboration is part of the
CAP experience by virtue of students being assigned to groups and
the stated expectation that they will work together, that each
group will come to consensus on an issue, the group’s position on
the issue, and the group’s action plan to promote its position.
At no point, however, is a student evaluated on her ability to
work effectively with other students. In fairness to the CAP
teachers and the CAP project, Collaboration is the most difficult
skill to teach, to provide effective structure for, and to assess
of any of the core Citizenship Skills. All of the others can be
demonstrated in discrete production moments, whether it be the
submission of one’s written analysis of a source, or one’s
written presentation of an argument about or understanding of
certain content, or the delivery of one’s oral presentation, or
one’s action product and the product of one’s action; all of
these skills can be demonstrated relatively easily in tangible,
discrete moments or products in a way that Collaboration cannot.
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Collaboration is more exclusively a process that is much more difficult than the others to reduce to a moment or product for evaluation; hence, it is the skill most often neglected or simply taken for granted by placing students in a group and "turning them loose." More recently, good work has been undertaken by teachers and educators to bring Collaboration into the processes of formal instruction and assessment – the BIE Rubric for Collaboration is but one piece of evidence of this work. Ultimately, a complete citizenship education program needs to require student demonstration of proficiency in this skill, in equal measure with the others.

Teacher Assessment of Student CAP Work

The BIE Rubrics use four gradations in assessing skills and work: Above Standard for which no indicators are provided, At Standard, Approaching Standard, and Below Standard. Of the thirteen students who shared their CAP Project Google Sites me, all of the submitted work earned Approaching Standard or Below Standard grades. Such modest work quality would predict that a majority of student project grades in these Monticello High School Government classes would fall below the "A" range. While perhaps a larger number of A's were awarded than would be suggested by the BIE rubrics, student performance was decidedly mixed, suggesting some level of rigor and accountability in the CAP teachers' assessment of student work.
While the grade-to-performance discrepancy as measured by the BIE Rubrics is less significant, a more pronounced, and therefore more troubling, discrepancy exists between work and performance that was actually assessed and the work one would want to see assessed in a project that claims to assess citizenship. AP students were assessed exclusively on their Proof of Debate Presentation, a Final Presentation, and one’s participation in a summative Paideia (graded) Reflective Seminar discussion on the CAP process. Website documentation informed the grading of the group presentations, but there was no real grading of a student’s writing or collaboration. The Research skill was addressed implicitly in the evaluation of the quality of the presentation, the quality of research evidently contributing to the overall quality of the students’ presentation or action plan. For the Applied level students, there were more grades, but a similar discrepancy exists between the named basis for the assessments on the one hand and the citizenship skills on the other. In these classes, students received four different grades for their News Journals, documentation and presentation grades for the Proof of Debate, two grades for general quality of a student’s Google Site, and one grade for one’s preparation for (not participation in) the paideia seminar. Given that CAP does explicitly purport to teach and assess competent understanding and practice of citizenship by students, it seems a reasonable assumption that the CAP project would incorporate assessments
that adequately assess both one's understanding as well as one's skill proficiency. The fact that such assessments seem to be lacking points to the need for their development and implementation.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Quality of Student Work and CAP’s Effectiveness

To what extent can the CAP project be held accountable for student work that was uniformly Below or Approaching Standard? Another way to ask this question is: is it possible to raise the quality of student work by making improvements to the CAP project design and assessments? Given the stated requirements of the project in 2012, the recorded assessments in teacher grade books associated with the project, and the paideia seminar responses and the actual student work submitted, my answer would be a cautious, but optimistic “yes.” Explicit documentation for students of CAP requirements largely exists within the SITES template created for students by their teachers. What is lacking would seem to be more rigorous assessments explicitly targeted toward the fulfillment of the stated requirements. Presumably, these assessments would be accompanied by BIE-like rubrics distributed to students at the time of the project’s introduction. Of course, simply requiring more and higher level work of students and then reliably and consistently applying a corresponding rubric to the work in order to derive a grade do not automatically guarantee the student production of such work. Incorporating such assessments into the project, however, would seem to be the necessary next steps for teachers of CAP in order
to bring the results of the project closer to the project's stated purpose.

**Utility of BIE Rubrics for Use with CAP**

The BIE Rubrics assessing proficient demonstration of the core citizenship skills are adequate to the task and their adoption would benefit the CAP project. In terms of the Presentation Rubric, and despite the fact that written and oral presentation differ in some important respects, use of the same language to evaluate the substance and organization of presentation is helpful to students and teachers alike as both strive to hit common targets: for students, the production of the written work and the oral presentation; for teachers, assessing both the content and effectiveness of each form of presentation. For both modes of presentation, the key considerations in these areas are the same or similar enough. In terms of the Creativity and Innovation Rubric, a number of the assessment categories may not be relevant to such a project; indeed, for this reason, I simply chose not to apply the following categories to the CAP student work:

*Present Work to Target Audience/Users*

*Style*

Similarly, within the following categories that were applied to student work, I elected to omit certain indicators or criteria of evaluation:
**Identify Sources of Information** — omitted criterion finds one or two sources of information that are not typical

**Generate and Select Ideas** — omitted criteria evaluates ideas, but not thoroughly before selecting one; asks a few new questions but may make only minor changes to the selected idea; shows some imagination when shaping ideas into a product, but may stay within conventional boundaries; considers and may use some feedback and critique to revise a product, but does not seek it out

**Originality** — omitted criterion may show a tentative attempt to step outside rules and conventions, or find new uses for common materials or ideas

Although the assessment of Collaboration was absent from the formal evaluation of student work, the Collaboration Rubric would provide useful guidance for the CAP teachers in developing a Collaboration component for the CAP project that could be reliably assessed.

**Conclusion**

Since the close of the data collection portion of this study (June of 2012), the U.S. Government teachers at Monticello High School have continued to refine and improve the CAP assignment. They have developed and applied three new rubrics for student work as part of CAP: Proof of Debate, the CAP Final Group Presentation, and a formal individual Personal Citizenship Statement. (see Appendix B) The three rubrics all at least require on paper a higher level of student work for these key
components of the project work. Additionally, they have also created several documented instruction sheets for use by students during key parts of the CAP project process. These include forms explaining how to formulate a quality research question, how to define the problem once the research question is formed, the research process and how to establish evidence of debate around the policy issue in question, and interview guidelines accompanied by an interview self-evaluation rubric for students to use as a reflection and self-assessment tool after conducting an interview. (see also Appendix C) Ongoing refinement and documentation of the CAP process demonstrate an impressive commitment on the part of these teachers to "get it right" and bode well for the CAP program's continued success and improvement.

In terms of future CAP-specific research, a determination of the efficacy of CAP would benefit from a similar or more robust analysis of current student work using these new assessment tools and process guidelines. Such a study would help point to additional needed refinements to the project. In terms of citizenship education projects and curricula more generally, a comparative study examining the work of students under another such program would yield useful comparative data for analyzing CAP's effectiveness. Finally, and more difficult to construct, but vital in assessing the ultimate efficacy of CAP and other such programs, would be a longitudinal comparative study tracking
active citizen behaviors of CAP students and a non-CAP control
group of similar students beyond high school graduation. Such a
study could determine at least a correlation between
participation in the CAP project and a student’s likelihood to
participate in robust citizenship activities beyond the life of
the project.

Two other significant developments in the realm of United
States education since the close of this study also bear
mentioning. First, the relative ascendancy of Project or Problem
Based Learning (PBL) is significant. In a certain real sense, the
Citizen Action Project anticipated the PBL movement and is wholly
consonant with the goals and principles of PBL. Fundamentally,
PBL’s focus is to give students more agency over their learning,
with teachers designing the structure for meaningful and rigorous
project work in which students have a substantial role in
choosing project outcomes and the path to getting there,
presenting their work to “authentic audiences,” while
demonstrating to their teachers a certain mastery of specified
skills. Significantly, the Buck Institute for Education has been
at the forefront of this movement, working to design rigorous and
reliable rubrics to help give the impetus for such work in
schools more credibility. The fact that a growing number of
teachers and administrators are becoming conversant in the
language and practice of PBL bodes well for the expansion of
experiential citizen education projects like CAP.
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Second, in December 2015, the long-overdue reauthorization of ESEA/NCLB was finally accomplished by the 114th Congress with the support of President Obama and outgoing Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. Now called the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), many of the most stringent federal requirements of states and schools, such as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) have been turned over to states to set and then assess. States are still required to test students in reading and math in grades three through eight and once in high school, but the states now have wide discretion in determining what those benchmarks for performance must be. The full effects of ESSA, of course, will be years in the making, but for the purposes of this study, ESSA would seem to give more hope to the development and implementation of citizenship education programs.

Whether employing their own new rubrics or others, such as the BIE rubrics, in evaluating student work, such assessment tools will undoubtedly provide additional improvements to CAP’s rigor and effectiveness. As catalogued above, the quality of student work produced for the CAP project in 2012 and the focus of this study — formal writing, formal oral presentation, formal research and critical analysis of source material, formal collaboration, and formal creative or effective problem solving — was all sub-standard or, in the case of collaboration, non-existent. Still, the 2012 version of Monticello High School’s Citizen Action Project was a success according to both its own
terms, as well as to the terms of this study. To state again, students did demonstrate a more robust action-oriented understanding of the concept of citizenship. Students did take real actions on behalf of a policy issue and, as a result, participated in real politics. Their participation in turn gave them an enduring understanding of general political processes and how they (the students) can be an effective part of these processes; in this, the CAP project would seem to provide a structure tailor made for the development of phronesis in its students and access to an array of fora in which to engage in the critical praxis of democratic citizens. They emerged from the CAP experience knowing what to do and how to do it. Finally, CAP’s existence within the required senior-level U.S. Government course means that its use is imminently generalizable for two vital reasons: first, every state requires its students to take a U.S. Government or civics course; and second, since the nature of CAP privileges local political issues, CAP would be relevant in every locale and without any necessary association with either of the major political parties. Meeting these critical scalability requirements not only makes CAP a citizen education model worth replicating, but also gives the program true national promise.
APPENDIX A:

BUCK INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION RUBRICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking Opportunity at Phases of a Project</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Approaching Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launching the Project: Analyze Driving Question and Begin Inquiry</td>
<td>- sees only superficial aspects of, or one point of view on, the Driving Question</td>
<td>- identifies some central aspects of the Driving Question, but may not see complexities or consider various points of view</td>
<td>- shows understanding of central aspects of the Driving Question by identifying in detail what needs to be known to answer it and considering various possible points of view on it</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Knowledge, Understanding, and Skills: Gather and Evaluate Information</td>
<td>- is unable to integrate information to address the Driving Question; gathers too little, too much, or irrelevant information, or from too few sources</td>
<td>- attempts to integrate information to address the Driving Question, but it may be too little, too much, or gathered from too few sources; some of it may not be relevant</td>
<td>- integrates relevant and sufficient information to address the Driving Question, gathered from multiple and varied sources (CC 6.11-12.R.1.7)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and Revising Ideas and Products: Use Evidence and Criteria</td>
<td>- accepts arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question without questioning whether reasoning is valid</td>
<td>- recognizes the need for valid reasoning and strong evidence, but does not evaluate it carefully when developing answers to the Driving Question</td>
<td>- evaluates arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question by assessing whether reasoning is valid and evidence is relevant and sufficient (CC 6-12.SL.3, RI.8)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses evidence without considering how strong it is</td>
<td>- relies on &quot;gut feeling&quot; to evaluate and revise ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions (does not use criteria)</td>
<td>- evaluates and revises ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions based on incomplete or invalid criteria</td>
<td>- justifies choice of criteria used to evaluate ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- revises inadequate drafts, designs or solutions and explains why they will better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting Products and Answers to Driving Question: Justify Choices, Consider Alternatives &amp; Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td>meet evaluation criteria (CC 6-12.W.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• chooses one presentation medium without considering advantages and disadvantages of using other mediums to present a particular topic or idea</td>
<td>• considers the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea, but not thoroughly</td>
<td>• evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea (CC 8.RL.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cannot give valid reasons or supporting evidence to defend choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products</td>
<td>• explains choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, but some reasons are not valid or lack supporting evidence</td>
<td>• justifies choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, by giving valid reasons with supporting evidence (CC 6-12.SL.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not consider alternative answers to the Driving Question, designs for products, or points of view</td>
<td>• understands that there may be alternative answers to the Driving Question or designs for products, but does not consider them carefully</td>
<td>• recognizes the limitations of an answer to the Driving Question or a product design (how it might not be complete, certain, or perfect) and considers alternative perspectives (CC 11-12.SL.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is not able to explain important new understanding gained in the project</td>
<td>• can explain some things learned in the project, but is not entirely clear about new understanding</td>
<td>• can clearly explain new understanding gained in the project and how it might transfer to other situations or contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participation in Team Presentations | • Not all team members participate; only one or two speak | • All team members participate, but not equally | • All team members participate for about the same length of time
• All team members are able to answer questions about the topic as a whole, not just their part of it |

Presentation Rubric / Grades 9-12 / Page 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Approaching Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of Ideas &amp; Information</strong></td>
<td>presents information, findings, arguments and supporting evidence in a way that is not always clear, concise, and logical; line of reasoning is sometimes hard to follow</td>
<td>presents information, findings, arguments and supporting evidence clearly, concisely, and logically; audience can easily follow the line of reasoning (CC 9-12.SL.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not present information, arguments, ideas, or findings clearly, concisely, and logically; argument lacks supporting evidence; audience cannot follow the line of reasoning</td>
<td>• attempts to select information, develop ideas and use a style appropriate to the purpose, task, and audience but does not fully succeed</td>
<td>• selects information, develops ideas and uses a style inappropriate to the purpose, task, and audience (CC 9-12.SL.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• selects information, develops ideas and uses a style inappropriate to the purpose, task, and audience (may be too much or too little information, or the wrong approach)</td>
<td>• attempts to address alternative or opposing perspectives, but not clearly or completely</td>
<td>• clearly and completely addresses alternative or opposing perspectives (CC 11-12.SL.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not address alternative or opposing perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>meets most requirements for what should be included in the presentation</td>
<td>meets all requirements for what should be included in the presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not meet requirements for what should be included in the presentation</td>
<td>• has an introduction and conclusion, but they are not clear or interesting</td>
<td>• has a clear and interesting introduction and conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not have an introduction and/or conclusion</td>
<td>• generally times presentation well, but may spend too much or too little time on a topic, a/v aid, or idea</td>
<td>• organizes time well; no part of the presentation is too short or too long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• uses time poorly; the whole presentation, or a part of it, is too short or too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
<td>Approaching Standard</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice</strong></td>
<td>• mumbles or speaks too quickly or slowly&lt;br&gt;• speaks too softly to be understood&lt;br&gt;• frequently uses “filler” words (&quot;uh, um, so, and, like, etc.&quot;)&lt;br&gt;• does not adapt speech for the context and task</td>
<td>• speaks clearly most of the time&lt;br&gt;• speaks loudly enough for the audience to hear most of the time, but may speak in a monotone&lt;br&gt;• occasionally uses filler words&lt;br&gt;• attempts to adapt speech for the context and task but is unsuccessful or inconsistent</td>
<td>• speaks clearly; not too quickly or slowly&lt;br&gt;• speaks loudly enough for everyone to hear; changes tone and pace to maintain interest&lt;br&gt;• rarely uses filler words&lt;br&gt;• adapts speech for the context and task, demonstrating command of formal English when appropriate (CC 9-12.SL.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation Aids</strong></td>
<td>• does not use audio/visual aids or media&lt;br&gt;• attempts to use one or a few audio/visual aids or media, but they do not add to or may distract from the presentation</td>
<td>• uses audio/visual aids or media, but they may sometimes distract from or not add to the presentation&lt;br&gt;• sometimes has trouble bringing audio/visual aids or media smoothly into the presentation</td>
<td>• uses well-produced audio/visual aids or media to enhance understanding of findings, reasoning, and evidence, and to add interest (CC 9-12.SL.5)&lt;br&gt;• smoothly brings audio/visual aids or media into the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Audience Questions</strong></td>
<td>• does not address audience questions (goes off topic or misunderstands without seeking clarification)</td>
<td>• answers audience questions, but not always clearly or completely</td>
<td>• answers audience questions clearly and completely&lt;br&gt;• seeks clarification, admits &quot;I don't know&quot; or explains how the answer might be found when unable to answer a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes &amp; Body</td>
<td>makes infrequent eye contact; reads notes or slides most of the time; uses natural gestures and movements; looks poised and confident; wears clothing appropriate for the occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keeps eye contact with audience most of the time; only glances at notes or slides; uses a few gestures or movements but they do not look natural; shows some poise and confidence, (only a little fidgeting or nervous movement); makes some attempt to wear clothing appropriate for the occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not look at audience; reads notes or slides; does not use gestures or movements; lacks poise and confidence (fidgets, slouches, appears nervous); wears clothing inappropriate for the occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity &amp; Innovation Opportunity at Phases of a Project</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
<td>Approaching Standard</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Launching the Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Define the Creative Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Knowledge, Understanding, and Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify Sources of Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Below Standard**
  - may just “follow directions” without understanding the purpose for innovation or considering the needs and interests of the target audience

- **Approaching Standard**
  - understands the basic purpose for innovation but does not thoroughly consider the needs and interests of the target audience

- **At Standard**
  - understands the purpose driving the process of innovation (Who needs this? Why?)
  - develops insight about the particular needs and interests of the target audience

- **In addition to typical sources, finds unusual ways or places to get information**
  - adult expert, community member, business or organization, literature

- **Promotes divergent and creative perspectives during discussions**
  - CC 11-12.SL.1c
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generate and Select Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- stays within existing frameworks; does not use idea-generating techniques to develop new ideas for product(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- selects one idea without evaluating the quality of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- does not ask new questions or elaborate on the selected idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reproduces existing ideas; does not imagine new ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- does not consider or use feedback and critique to revise product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- develops some original ideas for product(s), but could develop more with better use of idea-generating techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- evaluates ideas, but not thoroughly before selecting one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- asks a few new questions but may make only minor changes to the selected idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- shows some imagination when shaping ideas into a product, but may stay within conventional boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- considers and may use some feedback and critique to revise a product, but does not seek it out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses idea-generating techniques to develop several original ideas for product(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- carefully evaluates the quality of ideas and selects the best one to shape into a product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- asks new questions, takes different perspectives to elaborate and improve on the selected idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses ingenuity and imagination, going outside conventional boundaries, when shaping ideas into a product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seeks out and uses feedback and critique to revise product to better meet the needs of the intended audience (CC 6-12.W.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Work to Users/Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- presents ideas and products in typical ways (text-heavy PowerPoint slides, recitation of notes, no interactive features)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adds some interesting touches to presentation media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- attempts to include elements in presentation that make it more lively and engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- creates visually exciting presentation media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- includes elements in presentation that are especially fun, lively, engaging, or powerful to the particular audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relies on existing models, ideas, or directions; it is not new or unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follows rules and conventions; uses materials and ideas in typical ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is not useful or valuable to the intended audience/user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not work in the real world; impractical or unfeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is safe, ordinary, made in a conventional style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has several elements that do not fit together; it is a mish-mash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The term “product” is used in this rubric as an umbrella term for the result of the process of innovation during a project. A product may be a constructed object, proposal, presentation, solution to a problem, service, system, work of art or piece of writing, an invention, event, an improvement to an existing product, etc.*
# Collaboration Rubric for PBL
(for grades 6-12; CCSS ELA aligned)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Performance</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Approaching Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Takes Responsibility for Oneself** | • is not prepared, informed, and ready to work with the team  
• does not use technology tools as agreed upon by the team to communicate and manage project tasks  
• does not do project tasks  
• does not complete tasks on time  
• does not use feedback from others to improve work | • is usually prepared, informed, and ready to work with the team  
• uses technology tools as agreed upon by the team to communicate and manage project tasks, but not consistently  
• does some project tasks, but needs to be reminded  
• completes most tasks on time  
• sometimes uses feedback from others to improve work | • is prepared and ready to work; is well informed on the project topic and cites evidence to probe and reflect on ideas with the team (CC 6-12.SL.1a)  
• consistently uses technology tools as agreed upon by the team to communicate and manage project tasks  
• does tasks without having to be reminded  
• completes tasks on time  
• uses feedback from others to improve work | ✓ |

| Helps the Team | • does not help the team solve problems; may cause problems  
• does not ask probing questions, express ideas, or elaborate in response to questions in discussions  
• does not give useful feedback to others  
• does not offer to help others if they need help | • cooperates with the team but may not actively help it solve problems  
• sometimes expresses ideas clearly, asks probing questions, and elaborates in response to questions in discussions  
• gives feedback to others, but it may not always be useful  
• sometimes offers to help others if they ask | • helps the team solve problems and manage conflicts  
• makes discussions effective by clearly expressing ideas, asking probing questions, making sure everyone is heard, responding thoughtfully to new information and perspectives (CC 6-12.SL.1c)  
• gives useful feedback (specific, | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respects Others</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Approaching Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• is impolite or unkind to teammates (may interrupt, ignore ideas, hurt feelings)</td>
<td>• is usually polite and kind to teammates</td>
<td>• makes detailed agreements about how the team will work together, including the use of technology tools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not acknowledge or respect other perspectives</td>
<td>• usually acknowledges and respects other perspectives and disagrees diplomatically</td>
<td>• follows rules for collegial discussions (CC 6-12.SL.1b), decision-making, and conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes and Follows Agreements</td>
<td>• does not discuss how the team will work together</td>
<td>• discusses how the team will work together, but not in detail; may just “go through the motions” when creating an agreement</td>
<td>• honestly and accurately discusses how well agreements are being followed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• does not follow rules for collegial discussions, decision-making and conflict resolution</td>
<td>• usually follows rules for collegial discussions, decision-making, and conflict resolution</td>
<td>• takes appropriate action when</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• does not discuss how well agreements are being followed</td>
<td>• discusses how well agreements are being followed, but not in depth; may ignore subtle issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allows breakdowns in team work to happen; needs teacher to intervene</td>
<td>• notices when norms are not being followed but asks the teacher for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizes Work</strong></td>
<td>help to resolve issues</td>
<td>norms are not being followed; attempts to resolve issues without asking the teacher for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does project work without creating a task list</td>
<td>• creates a task list that divides project work among the team, but it may not be in detail or followed closely</td>
<td>• creates a detailed task list that divides project work reasonably among the team (CC 6-12.SL.1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not set a schedule and track progress toward goals and deadlines</td>
<td>• sets a schedule for doing tasks but does not follow it closely</td>
<td>• sets a schedule and tracks progress toward goals and deadlines (CC 6-12.SL.1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does not assign roles or share leadership; one person may do too much, or all members may do random tasks</td>
<td>• assigns roles but does not follow them, or selects only one “leader” who makes most decisions</td>
<td>• assigns roles if and as needed, based on team members’ strengths (CC 6-12.SL.1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wastes time and does not run meetings well; materials, drafts, notes are not organized (may be misplaced or inaccessible)</td>
<td>• usually uses time and runs meetings well, but may occasionally waste time; keeps materials, drafts, notes, but not always organized</td>
<td>• uses time and runs meetings efficiently; keeps materials, drafts, notes organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Works as a Whole Team</strong></th>
<th>help to resolve issues</th>
<th>norms are not being followed; attempts to resolve issues without asking the teacher for help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• does not recognize or use special talents of team members</td>
<td>• makes some attempt to use special talents of team members</td>
<td>• recognizes and uses special talents of each team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does project tasks separately and does not put them together; it is a collection of individual work</td>
<td>• does most project tasks separately and puts them together at the end</td>
<td>• develops ideas and creates products with involvement of all team members; tasks done separately are brought to the team for critique and revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:
CAP RUBRICS AND GUIDES DEVELOPED SINCE 2012

Class Period:
Group Members:

### Grading Rubric: Group Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>POF resolution statement explicitly details umbrella topic and POF, “therefore” statement strongly stated, action plan detailed in a comprehensive, step by step manner, 4 or 5 valid artifacts present, project very clearly displays measurable civic participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>POF resolution statement clearly details umbrella topic and POF, “therefore” statement clearly stated, action plan detailed in an understandable, step by step manner, 3 valid artifacts present, project clearly displays measurable civic participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>POF resolution statement vaguely details umbrella topic and POF, “therefore” statement stated, action plan detailed in a step by step manner, 2 valid artifacts present, project displays measurable civic participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>POF resolution statement barely details umbrella topic and POF, “therefore” statement attempted, action plan detail attempted, with some “holes” in information present, 1 valid artifacts present, project partially displays measurable civic participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>POF resolution statement does not detail umbrella topic and POF, “therefore” statement not stated, action plan not detailed, no artifacts present, project does not display measurable civic participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grading Rubric: Personal Citizenship Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Statement very clearly links quote to CAP research and experiences, is at least 4 sentences long, and is prepared ahead of time either in the PowerPoint presentation or typed in a word document to turn in to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Statement clearly links quote to CAP research and experiences, is at least 3 sentences long, and is prepared ahead of time either in the PowerPoint presentation or typed in a word document to turn in to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Statement links quote to CAP research and experiences, is at least 2 sentences long, and is prepared ahead of time either in the PowerPoint presentation or typed in a word document to turn in to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Statement vaguely links quote to CAP research and experiences, is at least 1 sentence long, and is not prepared ahead of time or is handwritten to turn in to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Statement is not prepared ahead of time. No statement given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proof of Debate Presentation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FACTS</th>
<th>DYNAMICITY</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The presentation contains multiple sources that show evidence of a debate on both sides; The sources employed are credible and convincing.</td>
<td>Facts, not emotions, are presented and summarized; Facts clearly delineate an honest debate; two sides (at least) with equal station are presented.</td>
<td>Issue presented in a dynamic way; The facts used are compelling to the audience; The presentation strives to engage the audience in the reality of the debate.</td>
<td>All members of the group take ownership of the presentation; Information is shared verbally with visual accents; The presenters do not read to the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>One or two sources showing evidence of the debate on both sides</td>
<td>Facts presented, mostly not read from a visual. Some emotional arguments included</td>
<td>Issue presented in a somewhat dynamic way</td>
<td>Most of the members take ownership of the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Limited and/or unclear source showing evidence of debate on both sides</td>
<td>Facts mostly read from visual and/or mostly emotional arguments presented</td>
<td>An attempt at a dynamic component</td>
<td>Some members of the group take ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete/Must Represent</td>
<td>Slanted or one sided evidence presented</td>
<td>Facts unclear or entirely based on emotion</td>
<td>No attempt at creating a dynamic component</td>
<td>Few in the group present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proof of Debate Presentation Rubric

Decisions of the reviewers:

- Is this group ready to move on the developing an Action Plan? (YES or NO)
- Does this group need a follow-up visit? (YES or NO) If yes, WHEN?
- Do any individual members of this group need to demonstrate their contribution and knowledge further? (YES or NO) If yes, WHO?
- Does anyone need to be pulled out of this group to work individually? (YES or NO) If yes, WHO?
- Does this group need to be split? (YES or NO) If yes, do they need a new topic? (YES or NO)
Rubric for Social Research Interview

Your Name: ___________ Interviewee's Name: ___________ Interview Date: ___

Rubric for Self-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ask Yourself</th>
<th>4 Points (A)</th>
<th>3 Points (B)</th>
<th>No Points (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did I put my biases aside and listen sympathetically?</td>
<td>Yes, I was just focused on understanding the interviewee.</td>
<td>Mostly, but sometimes I was thinking about my opinions instead.</td>
<td>No, my mind was clouded with my opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I help create a relaxed and open atmosphere for the interview?</td>
<td>Yes, I was receptive to learn about the interviewee's views.</td>
<td>Mostly.</td>
<td>No, my body language, attitude and/or tone were un receptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I ask open-ended questions so the interviewee could fully explain his/her ideas?</td>
<td>Yes, my questions were designed to let him/her fully explain.</td>
<td>My questions were okay, but not great.</td>
<td>My questions didn’t really allow the interviewee to reveal his/her thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I allow enough space so that the interviewee did not feel rushed or cut-off?</td>
<td>Yes, I waited to make sure he/she was done.</td>
<td>Once or twice I started talking too soon.</td>
<td>No, I rushed through the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the interviewee did not fully explain something, did I follow-up with more questions?</td>
<td>Yes, I made sure I understood what he/she was saying by asking appropriate follow-up questions.</td>
<td>Mostly, I probably needed to follow-up once or twice but did not.</td>
<td>No, I didn’t want to seem stupid, so I just let it slide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes, I was aware of my main questions/what I thought he/she was saying</td>
<td>Mostly.</td>
<td>No, I lost track of where the interview was going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I silently ask myself during the interview, if my questions were getting answered?</td>
<td>Yes, I verbally summarized what I thought he/she was saying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I practice active listening?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I ask clarifying questions?</td>
<td>Yes, I asked if I understood correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I “shop” as unexpected information was revealed?</td>
<td>Yes, I followed up on unexpected information.</td>
<td>No or Not applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I redirect the line of questions as needed?</td>
<td>Yes, when he/she went off-track, I asked a question to help get back.</td>
<td>Sometimes.</td>
<td>The interview never really went off-track. Or, it went off track and I didn’t ask a question to help get back on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I overcome some social anxiety and worry in completing this assignment?</td>
<td>Yes, I did! These kinds of assignments had always been hard for me.</td>
<td>It was a little bit of a worry but no big deal.</td>
<td>Not applicable, this kind of a situation is easy for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I try to find out a lot about the interviewee prior to the interview?</td>
<td>Yes, I was quite familiar with his/her ideas prior to the interview.</td>
<td>I had a pretty good idea of what he/she thought.</td>
<td>No, I asked questions during the interview that I could have easily known beforehand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I prepare well for the interview?</td>
<td>Yes, I wrote questions over several days, and refined them. They were in-depth.</td>
<td>My questions were pretty good, but some were not well thought out, or I should have done more research beforehand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were my questions well thought out and written? Did I share and refine my questions over time?</td>
<td>No, I just played it by ear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I do any role-plays while preparing for the interview?</td>
<td>Yes, I practiced significantly.</td>
<td>I did a little practice.</td>
<td>No, and I should have prepared better, or I really didn't need to practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did I get permission to record and share the results of the interview for the purposes of our research?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conducting an Interview for Social Research

**Purpose:** As we attempt to decide the best course of action on important (and often complex) issues, we need to gather information. We can gather information from written and electronic sources, but oftentimes interviews can provide important insights. Some people are experts in a field, and therefore present an important opportunity to gain deep understanding of an issue. In a democracy, it is often important to understand what non-experts think and feel about an issue since they choose office holders, sometimes vote directly on issues, and express their opinions in various other ways.

Through this assessment, we want you to develop skill at conducting an interview for social research. Once developed, you can use this skill throughout your life in many contexts. You might use it professionally in careers such as health care, journalism and education. You can even use it in various technical careers. What good is great knowledge of computer programming, for example, if you fail to first have a thorough knowledge of what your client wants the computer program to do? Medical professionals need to know how to elicit information from their patients, lawyers from their clients, and even auto technicians from car owners. How many family crises would be lessened or even avoided, if we learned to listen sympathetically and simply understand another person’s point-of-view? How often do we jump to false conclusions, or decide to get into an argument based on our own pre-conceived notions before we bothered to get all the facts? In order to become adept at interviewing, we must first put our biases on hold and simply try to understand what the person is saying, and how he/she arrived at his/her current opinion.

**Skills Needed in Order to Conduct Successful Interviews**

**Interviewing – A Skill Set.** Good interviewing is not simply one skill, but a skill set. In other words, good interviewers must be competent at several skills. So what are the skills that good interviews must master? What do expert interviewers do? Listen and/or watch expert interviewers, such as, Terry Gross or Larry King. Analyze what worked and what did not. Noticing their skills will be a step toward developing your own.

**What does good social research interviewing look like?**

Listen sympathetically. Some interviews may be confrontational, such as, when a lawyer cross-exams an unfriendly witness in court. Sometimes journalists or members of Congress aggressively confront interviewees. For social research, however, good interviewing is not aggressive. We listen sympathetically. We want interviewees to be comfortable and share their stories, opinions and perspectives. We are not there to argue or to judge, but to understand. Of course, you are entitled
to your own opinions, but during the interview put these aside and simply try to understand. What does this person think? How did he/she arrive at this understanding? What facts, logic and beliefs influenced this person?

*Ask open-ended questions.* You may probe in a social research interview without being aggressive. How do you do this? First, ask open-ended questions. These are questions that cannot be answered with a simple "yes" or "no." Open-ended questions allow the interviewee to explain. This provides the interviewer with a window into the interviewee’s thought process.

*Allow space.* Second, don’t be too quick with your questions. Allow space. Let the interviewee expand. Often you will get helpful information that you had not anticipated.

*Ask the interviewee to expand/explain.* If the interviewee does not naturally expand and explain, you might simply ask him/her to do so.

*Ask yourself, “Are my questions getting answered”?* Of course, just as some people may be reluctant to provide thorough explanations, others may offer lots of information. Listen carefully. Are you getting the information you need?

*Practice active listening and ask clarifying questions.* In other words, try to summarize what the interviewee just told you, and ask, “Did I understand that correctly?” Is the speaker straying from your questions? If so, gently bring him/her back to your essential questions. Politely persist in trying to get your questions answered. Remember you are not cross-examining a witness -- so be respectful as you persist.

*Learn to shop.* (No, sorry, we are not going to the mall.) In this context, “shopping” means to follow-up on unexpected responses that might apply to your questions. Listen carefully. If you’re not sure what the interviewee is saying, ask more questions and listen carefully.

*Redirect the line of questions as needed.* If the interviewee is providing the information you need, keep following-up. If not, redirect. In other words, go back to your essential unanswered (or partially answered) questions, and try to get those answered. For example, “So, you were saying ... would you tell me ...?” Or, “Something that I really want to know is ...”

*Identify Potential Interviewees.* Who might be a good source for the research you are doing? Do you know about any experts in the area? What local interest groups or other organizations may have knowledgeable sources? Does your teacher have any suggestions regarding potential interviewees?

*Invite a Speaker to Class.* With the prior permission of your teacher, perhaps you class can invite a speaker(s) to visit and present. If so, prepare some questions. Be
ready to ask. Pay attention so that you do not ask something that has already been covered, but be ready to follow-up on items that may be unclear. Take notes during the presentation and discussion.

**Overcome fear.** Many people are shy. Practically everybody is uncomfortable some of the time. For example, you may be comfortable face-to-face, but nervous on the phone, or vice versa. Or you may be comfortable talking with peers, but nervous with adults. Anyhow, it is important to recognize if you are uncomfortable, and to develop ways to manage your emotions so that you can have a successful interview. The first step is recognizing the situations in which you are uncomfortable. Everybody has felt uncomfortable many times in life. So it is totally natural to experience shyness, nervousness and anxiety. However, you can learn ways to deal with these emotions. There are many resources – written materials, youtube videos and other people who can help you develop methods for dealing with this common issue. If you have suffered from this kind of anxiety, this assignment may become a great gift to you. It will give you an opportunity to overcome fear. For example, many people who once suffered from fear of public speaking now truly enjoy it. Think of how relieved and happy you will feel when you have overcome your anxiety.

**Help the interviewee feel comfortable.** Have you ever listened to an outstanding interviewer and noticed how he/she helped the interviewee feel comfortable? People share more when they feel comfortable. When you focus on the other person and listen with sympathy, you will forget your own anxiety.

**Schedule an interview by making a phone call.** In order to get an interview, you must first schedule one. You might need to call someone on the phone and ask for an interview. It is important to know what you are going to say beforehand. Many people write out a script and practice saying it until it no longer sounds scripted. You may practice role-plays with a friend or classmate until you feel well prepared for the phone call. If you still feel nervous about the phone call, do some “low-outcome” calls. For example, call some stores and ask them what hours they are open. Like all skills, the more you do it, the more natural it becomes.

**Prepare for the interview.** How do you best prepare for the interview? First, find out as much as you can about the person’s life and ideas before you meet. As you research, write questions that you think he/she will be able to answer. Write questions that pertain to your research. Write questions about anything that does not make sense to you. Develop questions to yield depth of information. For example, “Can you explain the factors that influenced your thinking?” Or, “What events/research/etc. do you find most convincing?” “What factors specifically led to your conclusion?” Ask friends and teachers to review your questions. Are your questions clear to them? Do you need to revise them? Are there some good questions that you may have forgotten to ask? Start developing your questions
early in the preparation process. You subconscious will be working on this over the
days and weeks prior to the interview. Suddenly, new questions will pop into mind.
Record them. Continue to record and refine your questions. Be sure that you bring
your prepared questions to the interview. Also, be ready to record the interview in
writing and with a recording devise.

**Develop your interviewing skill through role-plays.** Interview friends and
teachers. Interviewing, like writing or playing a sport, is a skill that you can
continuously develop. Good practice helps to yield good results. Interview others.
You can interview your friends and they won’t even know it! They might just think
you are curious.

**Get Permission to Share Information from the Interview.** Take notes and/or
record the interview. Ask for permission to record. Ask and get permission to use
interview information for your purpose. Written permission is best. Permission
forms need to clearly state how the information will be used.
Evidence of Debate

Purpose. When studying controversial issues, it is an essential skill to be intimately familiar with all sides of the debate. Students must deeply understand the arguments on all sides of a question. Arguments are not merely opinions or assertions. Rather they contain the facts, logic and documentation to support those opinions (assertions). Put simply, students must demonstrate their deep comprehension of the various positions and of the supporting evidence.

Procedures. What must students do in order to demonstrate evidence of debate?

1. Students must demonstrate their knowledge of the various opinions about the particular controversial issue. First identify the groups and/or individuals engaged in the debate. What are their various positions? What are they for or against? What are the various “shades of grey” expressed by various parties who are engaged in the debate? Indentify, all the positions – not just the most extreme, but moderate positions as well.
   a. For example, some people want to greatly expand nuclear power, others want to totally eliminate it, and still others want to have it as one of our energy sources, but are concerned about various safety and waste issues.

2. Cite your sources.

3. Collecting the facts and logic for every position analyzed. In order to do this aspect of the assignment well, you must put all of your prejudices and pre-conceived notions aside. First and foremost, simply try to understand how a person/group came to their opinion. Listen (or read) with an open mind. Record all the facts, studies or other evidence that each party provides in support of its position. What logic does this person or group use to connect the facts to the conclusion? In this phase of the research, you are simply collecting the information. Do not get overly critical here. Simply record the positions and their complete arguments.

4. Vetting the Sources. Deeply analyze all the sources. Is the source reliable? Once you have comprehended the basic argument, you may need to closely read (listen) to the supporting evidence. Is this evidence reliable? How do you know? Can you find other evidence supporting or refuting it? How reliable are these other sources?
Correlation to Standards:

Lifelong-Learner Standards

1. Plan and conduct research.
2. Gather, organize, and analyze data, evaluate processes and products; and draw conclusions.
3. Think analytically, critically, and creatively to pursue new ideas, acquire new knowledge, and make decisions.
4. Understand and apply principles of logic and reasoning; develop, evaluate, and defend arguments.
5. Seek, recognize and understand systems, patterns, themes, and interactions.
6. Apply and adapt a variety of appropriate strategies to solve new and increasingly complex problems.
7. Acquire and use precise language to clearly communicate ideas, knowledge, and processes.
10. Participate fully in civic life, and act on democratic ideals within the context of community and global interdependence.
12. Apply habits of mind and meta-cognitive strategies to plan, monitor, and evaluate one’s own work.

Social Studies Essential Standards

1. Patterns of change and continuity are complex and shape the growth and development of societies.
2. Civilizations are Systems defined and shaped by numerous complex and interdependent systems.
3. Understandings of human experience and the past are developed through a careful synthesis of multiple perspectives through primary and secondary sources.
4. The development and communication of a position is the result of analyzing several resources and using them to clearly convey one’s argument.
APPENDIX C:

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DOCUMENTATION
SURVEY


PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Martin Ferrell

TELEPHONE: 703-999-3707

ADVISOR: Professor Frank Ambrosio

SPONSOR: N/A

INTRODUCTION
You are invited to consider participating in this research study. Please take as much time as you need to make your decision. Feel free to discuss your decision with whomever you want, but remember that the decision to participate, or not to participate, is yours. If you decide that you want to participate, please sign and date where indicated at the end of this form.

If you have any questions, you should ask the researcher who explains this study to you.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) version of accountability in education, whether intentional or not, has led to the narrowing of the public school curriculum to tested subjects in certain grades. Recent budgetary constraints have simply served to accelerate this process. At the same time, policy debates on every issue in American politics have grown increasingly adversarial and polarized. Given this current educational and political context in the United States, the need for quality citizenship education programs is great, even as the challenges facing the implementation of such a program grow ever more daunting.

This study is being done in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the Citizen Action Project (CAP) at equipping high school students with the skills of citizenship.

Your participation in the surveys will help determine to what extent, if any, the CAP program is useful for equipping high school students with knowledge and skills associated with effective citizenship.
Title: Educating Ethical Citizens: Aristotle, Dewey, and Gadamer: A corrective for No Child Left Behind
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STUDY PLAN
You are being asked to take part in this study because you are currently enrolled in US Government at Monticello High School. About 150 subjects will take part in this study at Monticello.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to fill out 2 identical surveys – 1 at the beginning of your participation in the CAP project and 1 at the end of the project. This survey should take around 10 minutes to complete. You will be asked to fill out the survey during your US Government class. In this survey, you will be asked questions about the meaning of the term "citizenship" and roles and duties that a citizen has in our society.

You can stop participation at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the researcher first.

You can stop participating at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the researcher first.

RISKS
There are NO anticipated risks associated with participating in this study.

BENEFITS
If you agree to take part in this study, there will be no direct benefit to you. However, information gathered in this study may help to refine the CAP project in ways that will benefit future students.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to keep any information collected about you confidential. However, it is impossible to guarantee absolute confidentiality.

In order to keep information about you safe, steps will be taken to protect the data collected. Study data will be kept in a password-protected file on the researcher's personal computer which only the researcher can access, and paper copies of your surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the researcher's office.

Once the pre- and post- survey results are compared, survey data will be entered anonymously into an Excel spreadsheet, and all identifiers of you will be destroyed by shredding the original paper surveys.
Title: Educating Ethical Citizens: Aristotle, Dewey, and Gadamer. A corrective for No Child Left Behind

Please note that, even if your name is not used in publication, the researcher may still be able to connect you to the information gathered about you in this study.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary at all times. You can choose not to participate at all or to leave the study at any point. If you decide not to participate or to leave the study, there will be no effect on your relationship with the researcher or your teacher or any other negative consequences.

If you decide that you no longer want to take part in the study, you are encouraged to inform the researcher of your decision. Together, you and the researcher will decide on a case-by-case basis whether or not the information already obtained through your participation will be included in the final report.

QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?
If you have questions about the study, you may contact Martin Ferrell at 703-999-3707.

Please call the Georgetown University IRB Office at 202-687-6553 (8:30am to 5:00pm, Monday to Friday) if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.
STATEMENT OF PERSON OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT
I have fully explained this study to the participant. I have discussed the study's purpose and procedures, the possible risks and benefits, and that participation is completely voluntary. I have invited the participant to ask questions and I have given complete answers to all of the participant's questions.

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent  Date

CONSENT OF PARTICIPANT
I understand all of the information in this Informed Consent Form.
I have gotten complete answers for all of my questions.
I freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Please indicate whether you agree to be videotaped as a part of this study.
☐ YES  (If you change your mind about this at any point, please let the researcher know)
☐ NO

Signature of Subject  Date

Printed Name of Participant

Once you sign this form, you will receive a copy of it to keep, and the researcher will keep another copy in your research record.
Georgetown University Social & Behavioral IRB  
IRB Number: ______

Georgetown University Institutional Review Board
Application (Protocol) for Committee C
Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB Review (C-1)

Section One: Application Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator:</th>
<th>Martin Ferrell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>School of Continuing Education – Doctor of Liberal Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Pager:</td>
<td>703-999-3707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wmartinferrell@gmail.com">wmartinferrell@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>8328 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA 22102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-Investigator:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Pager:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Participant (member of faculty or official or administrative unit):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Phone/Pager:</th>
<th>E-mail address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is this research for your thesis/dissertation?  

| X Yes | No |

Title of Project:  

Purpose of Project (one or two sentences):  

Form C-1 (revised 2011/11/9)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Georgetown University Social &amp; Behavioral IRB</strong></th>
<th><strong>IRB Number:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Educating Ethical Citizens: Aristotle, Dewey, and Gadamer. A corrective for No Child Left Behind.</em></td>
<td>This study evaluates the effectiveness of the Citizen Action Project (CAP) at equipping high school students with the requisite skills of citizenship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional Co-Investigators/Consultants, if any</strong></th>
<th><strong>Department or Institution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgetown University Social &amp; Behavioral IRB</strong></td>
<td><strong>IRB Number:</strong> ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated duration of total project</strong></td>
<td>5 months study of the project and its students; 4 months writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated total number of subjects</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including control subjects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age range of subjects</strong></td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of subjects</strong></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where will study be conducted?</strong></td>
<td>Monticello High School, Charlottesville, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of subjects</strong></td>
<td>12th grade US Government students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience of Principal Investigator:</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Ferrell is a high school history teacher of sixteen years and currently enrolled in the Georgetown DLS Program. (See attached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief summary (also attach a CV or biosketch,)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source of Funding/Grant Support for Project (if any)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commercial Support for Project (if any)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Background. Provide a brief historical background of the project with reference to
the investigator’s personal experience and to pertinent scientific literature. Use
additional sheets as needed.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) version of accountability in education, whether
intentional or not, has led to the narrowing of the public school curriculum to tested
subjects in certain grades. Recent budgetary constraints have simply served to
accelerate this process. At the same time, policy debates on every issue in American
politics have grown increasingly adversarial and polarized. Given this current
educational and political context in the United States, the need for quality citizenship
education programs is acute, even as the challenges facing the implementation of such
a program grow ever more daunting. Is it possible to deliver a citizenship education
program that is necessarily experiential, but one that can also be brought to scale –
both in terms of the number of students taught, as well as in the mechanisms of
assessment that are both efficient and reliable? The project’s goal is two-fold: 1) to
develop a metric by which to measure the efficacy of citizenship education programs
generally; and 2) using the metric, to evaluate an existing citizenship education
program, the Citizenship Education Program (CAP), whose stated purpose is to
deliver these skills to all 12th grade US Government students at Monticello High
School in Charlottesville, Virginia.

I have chosen Monticello High School’s CAP Project because I was familiar with the
school and its faculty, having taught there from 1998 to 2001, and I know of the CAP
Project from these former colleagues who have shared stories of its implementation
with me since its inception in 2005 as part of the Annenberg Foundation’s national
Civic Education Project. Through their reports and my own preliminary research (I
have visited the school and observed classes on two separate occasions this fall) I
know that CAP both has as its explicit goal the teaching of citizenship skills, and that
these teachers have effectively brought this program to scale. Every high school senior
participates in this program as part of her required U.S. Government class. For these
reasons, CAP is an ideal program for the focus of my study.
2.2 The plan of study. State the hypothesis or research question you intend to answer. Describe the research design, methods, interventions, and procedures (including standard or commonly used interventions or procedures) to be used in the research. Specifically, identify any interventions, procedures, or equipment that are innovative, unusual, or experimental. Where appropriate, provide statistical justification or power analysis for the number of subjects to be studied. *Use additional sheets as needed.*

In the era of NCLB-accountability in education and shrinking budgets for public education, is it possible to deliver a citizenship education program that is necessarily experiential, but one that can also be brought to scale – both in terms of the number of students taught, as well as in the mechanisms of assessment that are both efficient and reliable? This project will examine a program (CAP) that claims to do both.

Having designed the citizenship metric, taking as its foundation the work of three philosophers (Aristotle, Dewey, Gadamer), by which to measure citizenship education programs, I will then apply this metric to the CAP program. In addition to studying the program, through the process of applying the metric, I hope to refine the measurements for future more effective use.
The research strategy relies on several measures by which I will obtain data for analysis in applying the metric: a written pre- and post-program survey of all students (150) in the program; observation and video-recording of the focus group (2 groups, 10 students total) presentations; collection and assessment of written work posted by students to their Google Sites; observation and video-recording of the graded culminating seminar.

The metric will then be applied to the collected data in order to evaluate the relative success of CAP at equipping students with the specified skills.

2.3 Risks. Indicate what you consider to be the risks to subjects and indicate the precautions to be taken to minimize or eliminate these risks. If any data monitoring procedures are needed to ensure the safety of subjects, describe them. Use additional sheets as needed.

I do not anticipate any risks to the participants associated with the project. I will
use the standard IRB consent forms to obtain participants’ consent. For the participants who are still minors, I will also obtain parental consent for the minor’s participation in the study. Any reporting of participant-specific data in the thesis or oral defense will be anonymous.
3.1 Indicate whether this project involves any of the following subject populations?

X Children (Children are defined by local law as anyone under age 18.)

☐ Prisoners
☐ Pregnant women
☐ Cognitively impaired or mentally disabled subjects
☐ Economically or educationally disadvantaged subjects

If you indicated any of the above, in the space below please describe what additional safeguards will be in place to protect these populations from coercion or undue influence to participate. (Use additional sheets as needed.)

Use of parental consent form for participation.

3.2 Recruitment: Describe how subjects will be recruited and how informed consent will be sought from subjects or from the subjects’ legally authorized representative. If children are subjects, discuss whether their assent will be sought and how the permission of their parents will be obtained. Use additional sheets as needed.

Subjects will be recruited with the help of their classroom teachers. All students enrolled in Monticello’s spring semester US Government classes will be eligible and may participate. The teacher and I together will introduce the project to each class. During the introduction, we will distribute and explain in detail the consent forms and the process for data collection. Based on consent, the classroom teachers will then help in identifying students for the two focus groups.

All students will be asked to fill out the pre- and post-CAP survey. The classroom teachers have elected to incorporate the survey into the CAP program itself as a pre- and post-program assessment of student understanding of “citizenship” for their own data collection purposes. As part of the consent process, the classroom teacher and I will make clear the dual purpose of the survey. In other words, both the teacher and I...
will be using the data collected for our separate purposes.
3.3 Compensation: Will subjects receive any compensation for participation in cash or in kind?

☐ Yes  
X No

If subjects receive any compensation, please describe amount or kind of compensation in the space below.

3.4 Fees: Will any finder’s fees be paid to others?

☐ Yes If so, please describe the amount below.

X No
4.1 **Sensitive Information.** Will identifiable, private, or sensitive information be obtained about the subjects or other living individuals? Whether or not such information is obtained, describe the provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of data. Use additional sheets as needed.

No.

The data obtained from the student-participants are exclusively their work associated with the fulfillment of the requirements of the CAP program. The video footage will be kept as digital files on my password protected work computer to which only the Madeira School’s Technology Department and I have access. I will access all written work submitted by the focus groups on their Google Site. Any of this work, which I then copy or download will be stored in the same password protected account. The handwritten surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet to which I have the lone key. All reporting of data in the written thesis or in the oral defense will strictly protect the confidentiality of the participants – no names will be used in either discussion.

**Section Five: Conflict of Interest**

5.1 **Conflict of Interest:** Do any investigators or co-investigators have a conflict of interest as defined in the Georgetown University Faculty handbook? [http://www.georgetown.edu/facultysenate/handbook.html#financial](http://www.georgetown.edu/facultysenate/handbook.html#financial)

☐ Yes. If so, please explain below.

X No.

Note: A copy of each investigator’s and co-investigator’s current Georgetown University Financial Conflicts of Interest Disclosure Form must be attached to this application (original plus one copy)
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Each “investigator” must submit a Georgetown University Study Specific Disclosure Form as part of this protocol application. “Investigator” includes the principal investigator and any other person who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research.

The Georgetown University Study Specific Disclosure Form is available for downloading from the IRB website: http://ora.georgetown.edu/irb/irbDisclosure.htm

Questions about the Georgetown University Study Specific Disclosure Form can be directed to the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Conflicts Regulation Office at 202-784-5313 or conflictsregulation@georgetown.edu

 Guidance for Conflicts Disclosure in Publications and Presentations
Financial and/or Intellectual property interests (e.g. patents or patent applications) must also be disclosed in all related press releases, publications and presentations.
Georgetown University Social & Behavioral IRB

IRB Number:

X I certify that the information furnished concerning the procedures to be taken for the protection of human subjects is correct. I will seek and obtain prior approval for any modification in the protocol or informed consent document and will report promptly any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse effects encountered in the course of this study.

X I certify that all individuals named as consultants or co-investigators have agreed to participate in this study.

X I assure that the protected health information identified on the “Medical Records Release and General Authorization to Use and Disclose Health Information for Research” and the persons and entities that may use, give and receive protected health information is accurate and reflective of the known use and disclosure for this human clinical study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Martin Ferrell</th>
<th>703-999-3707</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed/Typed Name of Investigator</td>
<td>Telephone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 14, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank Ambrosio</th>
<th>Department Chair:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed/Typed Name</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If more than one department or administrative unit is participating in the research and/or if the facilities or support of another unit, e.g., nursing, pharmacy, or radiation therapy, are needed, then the chair or administrative official of each unit must also sign this application.

Authorized Signature

Date

Title and Department

Authorized Signature and Title

□ Approved
□ Disapproved

Form C-1 (revised 2011/11/9) 177
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Signature and Title</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Six: Attachments

Please attach the following items in order for the IRB-C to review your research:

*Note: provide the original plus 15 copies of all materials for FULL REVIEW (ONLY). Provide the original only (of all materials) for EXEMPT and EXPEDITED reviews.*

IRB-C Application forms (all forms are available on the IRB-C website at: http://ora.georgetown.edu/irb/irbC.htm

- X Form C-1 (always required)
- X Request for Expedited Review (Form C-3) and/or Request for Exemption (Form C-4)

Note:
- One or both, depending on nature of the research
- X Study Specific Disclosure Forms for all Investigators
- X Certificate of completion of education in the protection of human research subjects (required)
- X Informed consent document
- □ Any recruitment notices or advertisements
- X Any survey instruments, psychological tests (other than standard, commercially available instruments), interview forms, or scripts to be used in the research
- X Investigator’s qualifications (CV, biosketch, or Form 1572, if available)
- □ Formal research protocol, if available.
- □ Grant application, if applicable.

IRB-C forms may be mailed or delivered to the following address:

Social & Behavioral Sciences IRB-C  
Attention: David Blanco, Project Coordinator  
Georgetown University  
Med-Dent SW 104, 3900 Reservoir Road NW  
Washington, DC 20057-1005  
Fax: (202) 687-4847  
Email: cdb36@georgetown.edu

For questions, please call the IRB office at (202) 687-6553
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