

Archived Information

CIVIC EDUCATION

Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth National Goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1985	\$0	2000	\$10
	1990	\$0	2001	\$12
Legislation: Part F, of Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8141). The statute authorizes a noncompetitive grant to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California.	1995	\$4	2002 (Requested)	\$0

Program Description

The purpose of this program is to support instruction on the history and principles of democracy in the United States, with a particular focus on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The program provides teacher training and curriculum materials for upper elementary, middle, and high school students. The curriculum, titled *We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution*, seeks to promote civic competence and responsibility among students, including support for the constitutional rights and civil liberties of dissenting individuals and groups. For upper elementary and secondary students, the program also provides simulated congressional hearings that give the students the opportunity to show their understanding of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For secondary students, these hearings culminate in a national competition and celebration in Washington, D.C., where the winning class from each state and their teachers participate and visit members of Congress.

Project Citizen, a program for middle grade students, focuses on the role of state and local governments in the American Federal system. *Project Citizen* requires classes to choose a social problem, evaluate alternative policies to address the problem, and then develop an action plan to encourage implementation of their policy. As a culminating activity, students create a portfolio and binder displaying their work, which they present to school and community leaders in a simulated legislative hearing. An intensive weeklong institute is provided for the teachers.

For more information, please visit the program Web site at: <http://www.civiced.org/>

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY CIVIC EDUCATION CURRICULA TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH THE “WE THE PEOPLE: THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION” PROGRAM.

Indicator 1.1 Student participation in the “We the People...” Program: The total number of adoptions of “We the People...” curriculum will increase annually.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The total number of adoptions by states and large school districts of the “We the People...” curriculum has reached 20 as of the end of summer 2000.</i>		Status: Target met.	Source: Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, June 2000. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> May 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> August 2001.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: The “We the People...” Program’s staff members continue to spend time assisting states and school districts in the formal curriculum adoption process. Validation Procedure: Actual count of adoptions. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.
1998:	9		
1999:	19	No target set	
2000:	20	20	
2001:		21	
2002:			
Indicator 1.2 Teacher institutes: The number of teachers who attend the summer “We the People...” professional development institutes will increase annually.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of teachers participating in professional development institutes in the summer of 2000 was 354.</i>		Status: Target exceeded.	Source: Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, June 2000. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> Summer 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> September 2001.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: The “We the People...” Program staff members were able to conduct institutes in each of five regions of the United States. Validation Procedure: Actual count of teacher participants. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.
1998:	183		
1999:	317	200	
2000:	354	318	
2001:		320	
2002:			

OBJECTIVE 2: FOSTER STUDENTS' INTEREST AND ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE COMPETENTLY AND RESPONSIBLY IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS.

Indicator 2.1 Simulated congressional hearings: At least 80 percent of students participating in the "We the People..." national finals competition will outperform nonparticipating students on national assessments of their knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1999:	89%	80%	<p>Status: Target exceeded.</p> <p>Explanation: Survey items were taken from three sources: the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress Civics assessment, the 1997 University of Michigan's "Monitoring the Future" survey, and the 1998 UCLA American freshman survey. An item-by-item comparison was conducted, and at least 82 percent of the participants in the "We the People..." finals outperformed the average of nonparticipating students in knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes by statistically significant margins on every item of a survey instrument, based on previous nationally administered surveys.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: The National Assessment of Educational Progress, University of Michigan, and UCLA survey results have been validated by National Center for Education Statistics and other nationally recognized research institutions. The Center for Civic Education conducts a survey of the participants in the national finals and in analyzing the results.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are self-reported. The Center for Civic Education would like to utilize an external data collection agency to conduct its surveys and prepare independent reports, but additional funding would be required to support external evaluation.</p>
2000:	82%	80%	
2001:		80%	
2002:			