Justice in Jesuit Higher Education
National Conference
2000
At Santa Clara University

Framing the Questions for Discussion

A Directory

The Commitment to Justice in Jesuit Higher Education

The Conference Process:

The conference is built around three keynote addresses and three forms of interactive small group sessions. The interactive sessions will consist of: **Topic Sessions** which will have a 10 - 15 minute presentation followed by facilitated discussion; **Interest Groups** where peers can gather to exchange ideas; and, **Model Programs** where conference participants can learn about specific justice programs that are working well in other universities. **Open Space** opportunities will be facilitated to allow interested groups to convene their own discussion sessions.

About This Framing the Questions Booklet:

The **Topic Sessions** and the **Model Programs-Group Presentations** have been designed in such a way as to maximize creative interaction and dialog among conference participants. Each of these two types of sessions will have a presenter and a facilitator. The presenters' task is to "frame the question" for discussion. In preparation, each presenter was asked to develop a two page "framing the question" document**. This booklet contains a compilation of those documents.**

For the Topic Sessions on Friday one presenter was assigned to each time slot, one each at 10:15 AM, 1:00 PM and 3:15 PM, so that, in most cases there are three different presenters. In some cases, presenters collaborated on their "framing the question" document; most prepared them separately. Conference participants will want to read, at a minimum, the documents in this booklet related to each of the sessions they plan to attend.

For the Model Programs - Group Presentations on Saturday there are various numbers of presenters for this 3:15 PM section of the conference.

The facilitators' task is to guide the session by convening it, keeping time, facilitating the discussion and seeing that notes are taken on focus questions and handed in at the end of the session. Conference participants should be prepared to talk about their experiences, if any, at their own college or university in these sessions.

Primary Outcome:

The primary outcome of this conference is expected to be a joint statement of principles and an action agenda for each university in promoting justice in Jesuit higher education into the next millennium. It is expected that conference participants will hear the keynote addresses, and participate in the interactive sessions. Information gathered in these sessions will be taken to Sunday morning meetings where university delegations will list strategies and next steps for what to do when they return home.

FACILITATORS' AND PRESENTERS' GUIDE

Topic Sessions: 10:15 a.m., 1:00 p.m. and 3:15 p.m.
Friday, October 6, 2000

Presenters: Presenters have prepared ahead of time a "framing the question" document for these sessions. Separate presenters are assigned to each time slot for each topic session. You are expected to take about 15 minutes at the start of the session to make an oral presentation that will elaborate on your written "framing the question." If your presentation and/or written document do not already contain possible focus questions, then you will want to prepare some. Plan to collaborate with the facilitator in this task.

Facilitators: Each session will have one assigned facilitator. It is their job to get the session started and ended on time, time the presenter, collaborate with the presenter in keeping the discussion going with focus questions, if needed. Facilitators are responsible to see that all participants get a chance to speak, if they wish, and to see that no one dominates the discussion. The facilitator shall assign a note taker for their session. The note taker has one job: to record near the end of the session the answer to the following question – What three things (at least three) can be done at our universities/colleges to improve the "commitment to Justice" in the area of this topic. The facilitator is responsible to see that this question is answered and that these written notes are delivered to the conference information desk in Mayer Theatre before the evening Keynote Address.

Mixed University Groups – 10:30 a.m.
Saturday, October 7, 2000

Each conference participant has been assigned to one of 20 small groups for this session. This assignment was done randomly with the exception that no university/college has more that one delegate in each group. You will have roughly 60 minutes for this session. You will need to move the groups briskly.

Facilitators: The role of the facilitator is to start and end the session on time, assign a note taker, move the discussion along with the following focus questions, see that all participants get a chance to speak, if they wish, and that no one dominates the discussion. Finally, the facilitator shall see that the notes from the session are delivered to the conference information desk in Mayer Theater before Saturday's liturgy at 5:30 p.m.

Suggested Focus Questions:

1) List one or two significant ideas you picked up yesterday in the topic sessions. Include especially, implications of justice to university life and justice taught in courses.
2) Focusing on these ideas, list the specific questions that you think this group needs to address.
3) Discuss these questions in order of priority.

Model Programs Presentations
Saturday, October 7 – 3:15 – 4:30 p.m.

This Model Programs session presents programs or projects at Jesuit Universities/Colleges that promote social justice. These programs were selected from among the "Model Programs" reports submitted by each university/college following the 1999 Regional justice conferences.

There are three presentation formats:

- In **"Featured Programs"** an individual program director will explain programs at a specific school, followed by facilitated discussion. There were no "framing the question" documents prepared in advance for these presentations.

Facilitators: Start and end the session on time. Time the presentation so that is does not exceed 45 minutes. Facilitate discussion insuring that anyone who wants to speak gets a chance and that no one dominates the discussion. Collaborate with the presenters in asking focus questions, if needed. Assign a note taker. The note taker has one job: to record near the end of the session the answer to the following question – What three things (at least three) can be done at our universities/colleges to improve the "commitment to Justice" in the area of this topic. The facilitator is responsible to see that this question is answered and that these written notes are delivered to the conference information desk in Mayer Theatre before the evening Liturgy.

- In **"Group Presentations"** we have clustered two or three similar university programs that will be explained by their directors in a joint presentation followed by facilitated discussion. Presenters in these sessions have prepared in advance a "framing the question" document which is copied in this booklet.

Facilitators: Start and end the session on time. Time the presentation so that is does not exceed 45 minutes. Facilitate discussion insuring that anyone who wants to speaks gets a chance and that no one dominates the discussion. Collaborate with the presenters in asking focus questions, if needed. Assign a note taker. The note taker has one job: to record near the end of the session the answer to the following question – What three things (at least three) can be done at our universities/colleges to improve the "commitment to Justice" in the area of this topic. The facilitator is responsible to see that this question is answered and that these written notes are delivered to the conference information desk in Mayer Theatre before the evening Liturgy

- **Gallery Presentations** are being organized for clusters of similar justice related programs listed in the "Model Programs" reports received from universities/colleges. Individual schools have volunteered to display informational materials on tables at the conference. At this time there are only five programs that have asked to display materials. While the Saturday 3:15 - 4:30 p.m. time slot was originally allocated for these displays, at this time, since there are only five displays, it makes sense to allow the option for them to remain on display for longer periods of time. This would be an option offered to those who wish to

display materials at the conference. No facilitators will be required for these Gallery Presentations and no “frame the question” documents were prepared in advance.

TOPIC SESSIONS

TOPIC SESSION 1-
Justice Education and the Core Curriculum
-Framing the Question-

By: John F. Kane
Regis University

As I see it, we are faced with three basic and interrelated questions or challenges as we seek to make concern for justice a core element of Jesuit liberal arts education. The first concerns how to develop and shape core curricula (requirements, courses...) so that knowledge of and concern for justice is one of the fundamental themes providing focus and integration throughout the core. The second concerns how to come to a sufficiently shared and non-ideological understanding of justice which will enable discourse about justice issues to be real and challenging, yet also open and inclusive. The third concerns the faculty development required to meet the first two challenges.

First: how make concern for justice a central and integrating theme of the core curriculum? Our schools have different kinds of core requirements which in various ways attempt both 1) to provide a "distributive" exposure to major disciplines of knowledge and 2) to provide some forms of "integrative" learning (perhaps by building around "core" themes or by hoping that disciplines such as history or philosophy or theology will provide integrating content). My guess is that justice topics and educational experiences which develop concern for justice happen in various and at times significant ways in both these dimensions of core studies. Another guess, however, is that such topics and experiences are not as explicit, as focused, and as central to core studies as our rhetoric suggests they should be. Some disciplines and faculty see questions of justice outside their proper scope. Other disciplines and some integrative (or interdisciplinary) courses which are expected to deal with justice topics may still find such topics only one, and perhaps not the most important, of many topic areas about which they must be concerned. Thus (again, this is my guess) while justice education happens in our cores, at times in significant ways, it is nonetheless at present a fairly haphazard thing -- dependent on the particular interests of certain professors, the cycling of certain courses, and other such variables. Thus the question: how might we better shape and develop our core curricula so that students will not only be regularly challenged to think about justice and to develop personal involvement with justice issues, but so that such concern will "spill over" into and inform their major fields of study and their career preparation? What can we learn from the experience of our different schools about such core development?

Efforts to respond to the challenge of the first question will depend to a significant degree upon response to the second question. Can we find significant, but non-ideological ways to understand and talk about justice so that we are challenging ourselves to face specific and often very hard realities, yet also allowing real debate among a diversity of perspectives and voices. Given the generally privitized state of moral discourse in our country, and the often contemptuously divisive character of much public discourse about justice, this is no easy task. By way of shorthand, let me

suggest two extremes we need to avoid. On the one hand, we must avoid merely rhetorical appeal to vague and general pieties which effectively insulate us from the real issues and challenges of justice in our world. On the other hand, we have to avoid so over-identifying concern for justice with any one analysis (whether left or right or...) that we in effect equate concern for justice with a particular social or political agenda -- with one "party" of faculty and/or students, so to speak -- thereby excluding other voices or, what is perhaps a more likely result, allowing those who do not share the "party line" to feel justified in opting out of the task of justice education. Let me suggest, as a point for discussion, that the tradition of Catholic Social Teaching is one resource we could turn to for developing a framework for discourse about justice that is both broad in scope and rooted in fundamental principles, yet capable of concrete and particular focus.

Finally, let me turn to the faculty. We will achieve no real response to these two basic challenges without the active support and participation of a significant part of the faculty. This will obviously require serious administrative leadership and support -- in faculty development, in hiring, in the structure of incentives and honors. The development of a faculty which is engaged with justice education must become a budgetary priority for our schools. But it will also require significant change in the way many faculty understand themselves and their work. Perhaps it is not even inappropriate to speak of the need for personal and professional "conversion." For a serious and sustained commitment to justice education not only runs counter to the way many (most?) disciplines and professions understand their proper work and their paths of career advancement; it also runs up against powerful social and cultural forces which affect all of us -- faculty, administrators, students, families -- forces working to maintain power and privilege and to resist change. Thus, for instance, it is easy enough for me to assert that every area of knowledge and professional competence is already implicated in the major issues of justice confronting our world and that every discipline and profession needs to become more consciously and explicitly aware of that involvement in its teaching and research. It is much harder, given prevailing academic and social patterns, for individual faculty, much less whole departments and programs, to come to that consciousness. And harder still to develop courses and curricula which effectively embody such awareness. Hopefully I'm overstating the challenge here. Hopefully we have many colleagues with the wit and skill and willingness we all will

By: Frank Morris
St. Joseph's University

In exploring ways in which justice issues are made present in the core curricula at Jesuit undergraduate schools, the following points might profitably be kept in mind. They arise from more than twenty years of experience as a faculty member at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, and from reflection on discussions and reports originating at the Eastern regional conference at Boston College in March of 1999.

1) Efforts to emphasize justice issues are not new, and we are not working with a tabula rasa here. There is general agreement that these issues need to be and are present in the core

curricula of Jesuit schools. (Sixty five percent of the deans and chairs at Boston College affirmed this point in a recent survey; but, interestingly, a large percentage of these respondents also noted that least influential or not at all important in bringing about this state of affairs are Jesuit documents, including Decree 4, and other documents of the Catholic church.)

2) In attempting to raise the collective conscienceness of an institution regarding justice issues, the curriculum design ñ however imaginative, theoretically integrated, or worthy ñ is likely to be ineffective unless it is executed by at least a critical mass of engaged, motivated, and informed faculty who cannot succeed without the ongoing and more than rhetorical support of an administration that has demonstrated its commitment to the task.
3) In attempting to enlarge or intensify the role of justice in the core, each school needs to pay particular and close attention to the historical and cultural contexts of the question as they exist at that institution. Questions that might be asked: what have we done in the past twenty-five years to promote justice in the core? What has been successful and why? What has not been successful, and why has it failed? What can we and should we be doing now?
4) A college or university might very well attempt to arrive at some degree of concreteness and specific understanding of the type of justice being promoted in its core program as Canisius has done in choosing a rather strictly defined form of social justice as its target.
5) But purely theoretical discussions-innocent of any connection to context- that adopt a Platonic approach to discovering at the perfect University the perfect balance in the core between justice orientation and disciplinary integrity should be avoided as occasions of sin.
6) Some kind of balance does needs to be sought between core curricula efforts aimed at what might be called disciplinary inculturation of justice issues and the direct promotion of social justice initiatives within core courses.
7) The following specific strategies ought to be considered in developing justice issues in core curricula:
   - Creating a diversity requirement
   - Creating a service-learning requirement
   - Increasing student awareness of the positive as well as the negative impact of globalization
   - Generating a vigorous program of development and orientation for new and not-so-new faculty
   - Connecting justice issues to a greater awareness of the disciplinary and academic backgrounds to which they are properly linked
   - Cultivating justice awareness in all the core disciplines- i.e. not assuming some disciplines don't need such cultivation while for others its is impossible.
8) The Saint Joseph's experience: the current effort to connect justice issues in the core- and throughout the University- to the Mission of the University; to the sense of Ignation identity professed by the Jesuit community at Saint Joseph's; to the University's strategic planning; and to the regular professional academic activities of the faculty and the administration.

By: Paul J. Bagley
Loyola College in Maryland

The focus of our consideration in this session is the role of the core curriculum in the commitment to justice in Jesuit higher education. To begin to "frame the discussion" of that relation, it perhaps is helpful to enunciate and acknowledge a few premises that should be operative in our discussion. First, as stated in the brochure for this conference, "the core curriculum is the primary vehicle for educating undergraduates in the skills and values of the Jesuit liberal arts tradition. " Second, from Chapter 12 of the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* it is expressly affirmed that the "branches to be taught in the universities of the Society" include theology0, comprising scholastic doctrine, Sacred Scripture, and positive theology, the knowledge of humane letters and of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, as well as the Chaldaic, Arabic, and Indian ones. Moreover, under the heading of humane letters was included grammar and "what pertains to rhetoric, poetry, and history." Study of the arts and natural sciences were also endorsed insofar as they "dispose the intellectual powers for theology and are useful for the perfect understanding and use of it. "Completing the list of requisite "branches" to be taught were the disciplines examined under the auspices of philosophy: logic; physics; metaphysics; moral philosophy; and "mathematics in the measure appropriate to secure the end being sought. " Third, the purpose of undertaking such studies, both by the members of the Society, as well as the extern students, was so that "the recipients may be able to teach with authority what they have learned well in these universities of the Society for the glory of God our Lord. " The stipulated aim of education in Jesuit schools of higher learning was succinctly stated: "the end of the Society and of its studies is to aid our fellowman to the knowledge and love of God and to the salvation of their souls." In addition to the three premises recalled here, one may authoritatively join the dictates of Third Decree of the *Documents of the 34th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus.* In that decree it is affirmed that the Society of Jesus "on a journey of faith [has] committed [itself] to the promotion of justice as an integral part of [its] mission. " Among the many ways enumerated by the Society of promoting justice, one finds a cause most pertinent to our work, namely, "educating men and women for others."

In the requirements of the core curriculum of the various Jesuits colleges and universities in the United States today, we continue to see the vestiges of the organizational framework for an university designed by St. Ignatius Loyola in 1556. Today we retain and honor the premium he placed upon a knowledge of the humanities, languages, mathematics and the natural and social sciences, even philosophy and theology, as critical components to achieving a sound liberal arts education. Furthermore, in compliance with Ignatius' exhortation that the schools give attention to "diversities of place and reasons which may move us to teach" other disciplines, Jesuit colleges and universities have increasingly gained in reputation for their schools of business and management. Often our undergraduate students elect studies in those areas to complement their education and prepare them for the work place. From the standpoint of Ignatius, all studies were directed to one end: the knowledge and the love of God for the sake of the salvation of the souls of those who undertook such studies. According to Ignatius' educational vision, "the Society of Jesus hopes by means of its educational work to send capable and zealous leaders into the social order, in numbers large enough to effect it for the good. " In his letter to Antonio de Araoz of 1551, Ignatius avers that the specific benefit of his educational program for "extern students" is that "they draw much greater fruit and direction from their studies, since they learn from the beginning to make a practice of directing all their studies to the service of God." Whatever differences obtained among the various disciplines, whatever

hierarchy was observed in their relations of study, all, learning was integrated and unified by a common purpose. Everything was pursued, expressed, attained so that it might serve "the greater glory of God."

It is not at all clear that such an end is the conspicuous and determined purpose of Jesuit education today. One would be hard pressed to conclude in the present circumstances that the core curriculum, as "the primary vehicle for educating students in the skills and values of the Jesuit liberal arts tradition" is evidently dedicated to the "service of God. " On the contrary, but for the unexamined habit of commitment to "liberal education" at Jesuit colleges and universities, it might be difficult to make the case that our educational programs are in any way integrated, unified, or teleologically designed. Academically and professionally, faculty operate in a culture that esteems ever increasing specialization in terms of research, publication, and teaching. The very suggestion of a kind of learning that might involve the intersection of disciplines or the integrations of kinds of knowledge is precluded a limine by the modern preoccupation with methods and methodologies which prevent discourse across disciplinary fields and which compel us to a situation where scholarship entails knowing more and more about less and less. Where the "branches," as Ignatius called the academic disciplines, are dissected from one another, no enduring fruit can properly grow. Instead, the branches assume an independence and autonomy of their own which can subvert the very integrity and unity of the purpose for learning for which they were intended.

In "framing the discussion" about the core curriculum and the commitment to justice in Jesuit higher education, it is necessary to be mindful that all our intentions, designs, programs, and aims must be determined and arranged in accordance with one end. According to the Third Decree of the 34th General Congregation, "the vision of justice which guides us is intimately linked with our faith. It is deeply rooted in the Scriptures, Church tradition, and our Ignatian heritage. It transcends notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements, which can never be an adequate expression of the justice of the Kingdom for which we are called to struggle at the side of our Companion and King. " If the core curriculum, our principal vehicle for communicating the Jesuit educational heritage, is to serve the greater glory of God and promote justice, then the disciplines of the core must acknowledge the faith in which the Ignation vision and the teaching of justice inherent in it are rooted. As scholars in Jesuit higher education, we have access to that heritage through a serious and lively intellectual tradition. Where Jesuit education promotes service *"ad majorum Dei gloriam"* and acknowledges dimensions of justice to that cause in the work for peace, equity, life, human rights, a healthy environment, global economies, technology, communications, and business, then no one of the branches of Jesuit education, and especially not those of the core curriculum, can be exempted from the call to justice.

Topic Session 2 - Courses and Programs on Justice
-Framing the Question-

By: Sandra Gooding
Loyola in Maryland

In a May 2000 article in America entitled "Educating for Justice", James E. Hug, S.J., president of the Center of Concern in Washington, D.C. makes the following observation about his topic: "The very orientation and cumulative impact of the curriculum itself must be reassessed. Does it prepare graduates to participate and to compete successfully in the processes feeding these contemporary negative trends [e.g. greater inequality, social unrest, and ecological degradation]? Or will it prepare competent and committed graduates to work for their transformation, for a world with basic justice for all its inhabitants and harmonious patterns of living within the ecological webs that constitute the universe as we know it?" The following discussion represents thoughts regarding curriculum revisions focused on course and programs on justice. These thoughts are drawn from my experiences as Director of Service-learning at Loyola College in Maryland, as well as with the Notre Dame "Teaching Catholic Social Teachings" project funded by the Wabash Center for Religious Studies.

How might units and questions addressing justice issues be incorporated into a variety of existing courses among the regular offerings at our colleges and universities?

The ideas I will share with you regarding this particular question focus on two pedagogical initiatives: service-learning and curriculum infusion efforts. Service-learning is receiving special attention at this conference via its own topic session. This experiential-based pedagogy, which combines academic and community service course components to maximize learning of course content, holds tremendous potential for raising questions regarding social justice issues in the classroom. While it represents a potential tool for introducing these important discussions, often times this potential is not capitalized upon. Too often, it seems that student activities in the community are not integrated into class discussions, but rather take place in isolation from the remainder of the course components. A final paper, many times a personal reflection piece not requiring critical analysis and integration of academic content, may be the only link between the course for which the service experience has been accomplished and the experience itself. In order to achieve its full potential as a teaching tool, I have been encouraging fellow faculty to more fully integrate service experiences into the classroom as an ongoing part of discussion throughout the semester, as well as to maximize the potential for truly transformative service-learning experiences through discussions focused on critically thinking about the linkages with specific course content. In addition, I think that the opportunities for broadening these discussions to include consideration of justice can be expanded considerably beyond what is actually taking place in most service-learning classrooms today, even at Jesuit institutions of higher education.

This expansion of service-learning discussions beyond specific course content to broader issues related to social justice may be accomplished, it seems to me, by the intentional inclusion of such questions in the preparation and reflection phases of service-learning pedagogy. As an example, in a Fundamentals of Marketing classroom, the preparation for the service-learning component of the course normally includes discussion of the service sites with whom the students will be working, as well as consideration of some of the marketing concepts which will be reinforced via the service experience. Justice-related issues are not a natural part of this mode of preparation. By supplementing the standard preparation material, however, with an auxiliary set of questions drawn from broader set of issues, students may be encouraged to approach the service experience in a very different and more expansive way. I would suggest that, while one does not want to supplant students' own interrogative processes, presenting them with basic philosophical, theological, historical, and economic questions relevant to the service site and experience may encourage them to view these experiences in a much broader context than that framed by the traditional preparation activities. By reminding students of important concepts from their core courses, these expanded preparation questions may also facilitate students' appreciation for the value of core course content as applied to situations in which they find themselves beyond the final exams of these courses. Such questions also provide a forum for introducing in an intentional way the discussion of justice issues which may not appear to spring naturally from, for example, a discussion of marketing fundamentals as applied in the service activity. In addition, effective reflection activities throughout the semester, and at the end of the course, are imperative if the potential for deepened discussions about all of these important questions is to be realized, especially for our purposes those relevant to social justice issues.

A second means by which justice issues may be incorporated throughout the curriculum is via a curriculum infusion program. Loyola College in Maryland, in conjunction with Notre Dame's "Teaching Catholic Social Teachings'" project, is currently exploring this means of incorporating discussions of these issues into a variety of existing courses. We are following the model set by a successful curriculum infusion program focused on diversity at Loyola. By inviting faculty from disciplines across campus to a series of workshops and guest lectures, we hope to encourage our colleagues to consider weaving in Catholic social teaching documents into their courses where possible, even if only in a very small number of class sessions. Justice issues are certainly at the heart of these teachings and should receive more attention in a wide variety of regular courses as a result of an on-going infusion program.

What new courses ought to be developed to inform and challenge our students to think critically about the most pressing justice issues?

Courses which are developed as part of "model programs" being discussed at this conference are examples of courses which may be developed. Boston College's PULSE Program and Loyola College's Service Leadership Program are two examples of programs which include special courses designed to discuss justice issues. In the capstone course of the latter program, for instance, social justice is one of the core issues to be discussed in the course. In addition to those courses designed specifically for students opting to immerse themselves in specialized programs, courses which pursue a cross-disciplinary perspective on justice issues will facilitate student formation of connections between knowledge relevant to their professional

studies and justice issues. For example, I will be working with a theology faculty member at Loyola College to develop a Marketing and Catholic Social Thought course to be offered out of the theology and marketing departments. Such a course will naturally focus on justice issues, not in the abstract, but specifically as they pertain to marketing activities.

What role do immersion experiences play in this process?

Immersion experiences play a very important role in this process, though a limited number of students will afford themselves of the opportunity to engage in this type of learning. Having accompanied a group of 25 Loyola College students to Tijuana, Mexico for Project Mexico in January of 1999, I can assure you that such immersion experiences are truly transformative for everyone involved, including faculty. This transformative process gleans its power largely from the opportunities for those engaged in the service activities to interact with those suffering because of injustices about which they have little direct experience. Immersion experiences, like service-learning experiences, provide opportunities to humanize justice issues, to put a face to the millions of people suffering from social injustices.

What sorts of programs need to be developed to provide sustained growth and development in our students thought and commitment to the faith that does justice?

I have provided suggestions regarding programs which could contribute to this goal. I believe very strongly that, while dedicated programs like the Service Leadership Program and immersion programs are very important to support, those programs which focus on faculty development appear to me to be the most critical to attend to at this important juncture. Until there is a critical mass of faculty across the disciplines who are interested in justice issues themselves and in putting forth the effort required to incorporated discussions of these issues into their courses and research, programs targeting students will be unsuccessful. Faculty who can serve as role models and mentors for students, who truly live a faith that does justice, are essential to any attempt to bring alive social justice initiatives on our campuses.

By: Patricia N. Chrosniak, Ph.D., Canisius College

One of the questions for this topic session is, *How might units and questions addressing justice issues be incorporated into a variety of existing courses among the regular offerings at our colleges and universities?* Rather than starting with the course and the addition of content, I propose that we define the justice issues that are important for consideration and then ask what should be salvaged in existing courses and what should be renovated. I have chosen the two verbs, *salvage* and *renovate* purposely. Sometimes I find that I am really satisfied with a course that I have designed and taught for several years, and, even though I enjoy integrating new research and ideas, and incorporating my own research, I might be too attached to certain aspects that require serious reconsideration, and I might not be observant to watch how my course

connects to any other concerns in my program. I have discovered in the past year that it sometimes takes one distinct purpose to nudge one into change; here it is consideration of justice.

Students are often heard to say, "*I took a course in that once*." Graduate student show their advisors a list of courses from the many in a catalog so that they can complete the 30 credit hours they need for their degrees. In both cases there appears to be a perception that courses stand alone and that expertise is additive. For example, what does a course in epistemology have to do with a course in educational psychology? I propose that it might be good for us to look at our ourselves as a community of learners and see if there are courses within a discipline or across disciplines that might have points of connection to make specific messages of justice more meaningful, and if so, what within individual courses can be adjusted to help bridge the message from one to the other (i.e., a kind of *constructivist* modeling)? Rochelle and Pea (*Educational Researcher*, 1999), in a discussion of educational infrastructures and the world wide web state:

…the tools for learning communities must move beyond forums for exchanging tidbits and opinions, to structures which rapidly capture knowledge-value and foster rapid accumulation and growth of a community's capabilities. Ideally the infrastructure for a learning community spawns far greater value than the contribution itself costs to produce. (EDR, June-July, 1999, p.24)

Scholars within our Jesuit College Communities who are involved in the study of those professions that are typically classified under the social sciences are in a special position for addressing issues of justice. One of the most involved of these fields is teacher education. Today teacher educators in all colleges and universities are experiencing more and more pressure to insure that their preservice teachers are able to fulfill all the demands of local, state, and federal education mandates while maintaining their integrity and commitment to the persons they teach. For Jesuit institutions the demands are no less serious as our task is to prepare teachers of faith and justice to serve children, youth and adults who live in situations as diverse as the American landscape.

The preparation of teachers goes beyond mere "readin', writin', and 'rithmatic." Not only are teachers required to study the theories that define their pedagogy, but they also must realize that all their internal resources will be utilized at one time or another to guide and nurture developing human beings. A professional commitment to teaching cannot be considered total without the teacher striving to understand the life contexts of the persons who are to be taught. It is the teacher who remembers her continuing role as a learner herself who stands the greatest chance of effecting justice in her classroom. If this is true for the teacher, it is also true for the teacher educator, the professor of education in our Jesuit colleges.

To get back to the original question for this session, I will now explain one attempt to look at one regional justice issue and modify a course for its inclusion. The issue concerns the instruction of youth who come form a wide range of diverse backgrounds.

In 1999 at Canisius College I had an opportunity to develop the first graduate course taught by broadband interactive video distance learning. I had recognized that the students in our graduate deaf education program needed a means to make connections among their courses that involved 42 credit hours of study. I also had offered myself as an adjunct to Fredonia College where I had previously professed, helping them to revive their masters in reading program. Therefore, I decided to develop my Psychology of Reading course (that I would teach for Fredonia) to address the question, *If audition is necessary to learn to read, then how can deaf persons learn*? This "new" course for Canisius and Fredonia became one in which I used a language processing approach while also helping the students to understand the children that they were teaching, i.e., connecting a typically theoretical course to others that had more to do with identifying the characteristics of learners and methods for teaching reading.

In this year prior to the US Census, I discovered that educational agencies and organizations were unable to characterize the families and children that area teachers were serving. I could get no firm numbers or accurate information about these people. Students at Fredonia were all teachers who served the rural populations, Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans. My students at Canisius College, located in the City of Buffalo, were preparing to teach a wide variety of deaf children with a growing population of minorities that are quickly catching up to the Caucasian group and will probably surpass it in this century. So, the issues of justice that I incorporated in this psychology course involved the practical problem of identifying and characterizing the children that the students were teaching. A study of the demographics of our area revealed many critical needs and the discussions between the teachers in Fredonia and my students were inspirational as well as informative. I tried to incorporate all the information into assignments and lectures on the psychological aspects of learning to read.

The "tool" for course dissemination included state-of-the-art distance learning equipment at three sites. Most sessions originated at Canisius College with the Fredonia students at two sites over 45 miles away. All students were able to see each other and their instructor on one of four monitors. There were very few technical glitches during the course and the sound and visuals were in perfect timing. Students were involved with whole group lectures, small group work, and individual research beyond the classroom. At the end of the course the evaluations were very positive and I developed a survey to probe student satisfaction and perceptions of learning. It was heartening for me to see that students at every site indicated new awareness about the children they served and that they commented about connections they were making between and among other courses they were taking in their programs.

Where is the justice? I see that crossing boundaries and collaborating with students form different disciplines has appeared to have had an effect upon many of the participants. In Rochelle & Pea's words, "…each contribution to the community spawn[ed] far greater value than the contribution itself cost to produce."

By: Suzanne MacAvoy,
School of Nursing,
Fairfield University

My comments will focus primarily on new course development and the role of immersion experiences in addressing justice issues. I will be discussing two courses that I've developed (or co-developed), both of which include an immersion component. One course is through the School of Nursing and the other is in the Peace and Justice minor in the College of Arts and Sciences. I am also working with an interdisciplinary group of faculty colleagues to develop a third course entitled Justice in the Developing World, which is an outgrowth of a trip we took to Nicaragua last semester. This new course will be offered in the upcoming spring semester.

The Nursing course is a 3-credit seminar entitled Health in Rural Appalachia and the immersion component is a one week, one credit clinical course in rural eastern Kentucky. The Peace and Justice course is Homelessness: Causes and Consequences, also a 3-credit seminar with a weekly immersion component in a variety of homeless shelters and soup kitchens in Bridgeport and the surrounding community.

Both of these courses were developed out of a conviction that students needed to learn about social justice issues through their course work and from the commitment to be a part of that process. We wanted to do this in a way that would be more than an academic exercise, which the students may or may not really come to understand and internalize. Consequently the immersion experiences, and assignments and approaches used to foster reflection, are critical. We wanted to increase our students' awareness and understanding of the realities of the social, political and economic structures of our culture. We wanted them to come to understand that they each have a role in correcting social injustice. We also wanted to begin to help them see themselves as advocates and role models through the choices they make and the way they choose to live their lives.

In nursing courses, students frequently touch upon topics which are related to social justice but the emphasis of courses in the major is one of helping student learn and apply nursing knowledge, critical thinking and refining clinical judgements. Having seen how the Homelessness course changed students' values and behaviors, I wanted to be able to provide a similar opportunity specifically for nursing majors, so I developed the Rural Health course. The students enjoy both of these courses, and consistently cite the immersion experiences as the highlight. They welcome the opportunity to discuss justice issues, and their site experiences in class. Nursing faculty have told me that the students who have taken the Rural Health course have a greater understanding of social justice issues and their implications for health and health care than do other students in the same course. They have also shared that these students' insights and questions are stimulating to both them and the other students in their courses. Immersion is key to this transformation.

Important in the immersion courses I teach is that the students learn the population characteristics. This helps to dispel myths and helps inform their perspective. In addition, students need to reflect on what they are learning, seeing, doing and feeling; and they need opportunities to discuss their experiences and responses with their peers and faculty, which gives them support and validation. A seminar format with an egalitarian approach and personal sharing by faculty are all important in fostering the openness needed to maximize this kind of personal growth. It is important in the courses to help students see the relationship between

social structures/constructions and the consequences/impact of those on the population. What is obvious to us is not so to young people at this stage of their development.

Students need to be able to see the theory they are learning, in their field placement. Interaction with the population while at the site is critical. The abstract becomes concrete, tangible, real. They see the effects of policies on lives/health. It informs their perspective and they become one with "the other". The action – reflection – action afforded by the combination of seminar and immersion is essential for formation of empathetic imagination. Reinforcement and role modeling of social justice behaviors by faculty serves to strengthen students' commitment to these sometimes counter-cultural values and behaviors.

Some additional questions that warrant discussion are: How can we influence our colleagues to see that justice education is as important as discipline specific education? How can we support our students' development as they encounter social justice issues on campus, at home, in their communities and in our society? What strategies can we use to increase students awareness through the courses we are already teaching?, and, What challenges have we encountered in our efforts to introduce new courses, programs and/or immersion experiences into the curriculum?

Topic Session 3 - Research on Issues of Justice
-Framing the Question-

By: Dennis Moberg and Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.,
Santa Clara University

The topic at hand is academic research on issues of justice. I will speak a bit about Santa Clara University then open the discussion up for you to contribute experiences and questions as they have arisen in the context of your own institutions.

Paul Locatelli, S.J., the President of SCU, has stressed that one of the distinctive roles of a Jesuit university is to raise critical questions and bring rigorous thinking and analytical approaches to justice-related issues, but this does not mean that the university as a whole is to communicate a particular ideology, a single tradition or school of thought to the exclusion of others. Naturally, one would expect to find justice-themed research in the work of the teaching scholars in the departments of Philosophy, Religious Studies, Economics, Sociology and Political Science, certainly in the Law School, and also in the work of professors who teach core ethics courses for both the undergraduates and the graduate professional schools and divisions. But what about engineering? What about accounting. Is justice a permissible rubric in research within these disciplines?

Before we turn to these and related questions, I would like to explore for a moment the conditions for the possibility of an affirmative answer. At SCU, we found that folks across disciplines, before and after tenure, and with pretty good gender balance (women faculty had a slight edge) are committed to research and education for justice. The reasons for this are complex, and perhaps can best be limned by considering the culture of a university. Probably, the president, the provost and the upper tiers of administrators talk about justice at most universities - valuing the human person, contributing to the common good, promoting the general welfare, etc. but is that enough to spur faculty to conduct justice-themed research? SCU attracts a high percentage of students who are interested in justice-related questions. The school has a reputation, and this in turn attracts a clientele. I think that justice-minded students provoke a fair amount of faculty interest in justice related concerns, and this contributes to the formation of their research questions.

Because of faculty and administrative interest, there is a great deal of institutional support of justice-themed research at SCU. Three examples: **The Bannan Institute for Jesuit Education and Christian Values,** supports of justice-related research through direct research grants, sponsors visiting scholars and conferences, and through dialogue and design grants, which bring diverse groups of faculty together for sustained conversations; the fruits of these conversations is regularly published in **explore** magazine. **The Markkula Center for Applied Ethics** supports innovative research in applied ethics and uses the perspectives of different

disciplines to help decision-makers devise practical strategies for resolving the ethical, value and justice questions confronting them. **The Center for Science, Technology, and Society** sponsors applied research on challenging questions regarding the impact of science and technology on the economy, work and the nature of organizations, education and learning, ecological systems, communities, families and the individual, questions that often demand a consideration of justice.

Thirdly, I would say that peer pressure, or its friendlier cousin, peer support, helps to foster a culture of justice-themed research at SCU. It is a place where professors are encouraged to profess their beliefs, where academic freedom is coupled with academic opportunity to explore intuitions, beliefs, values and passions, wherever these lead. In fact, they very often lead to research projects which 'contribute to the shared body of human knowledge about justice issues', as our first question asks.

Some SCU scholars are engaged in a theoretical and descriptive analysis of justice in their respective academic domains, others examine topically related justice issues, and still others are artists and performers who explore justice through experiential or artistic expression.

Permit me to give you a few examples of each. Under the heading of 'theoretical and descriptive analyses of justice':

Sara Garcia (Counseling, Psychology and Education), works with Mexican Corridos and cultural knowledge. She analyses ballads produced by the Mexican community in the United States. "The themes I treat in my intertextual analysis include social justice as well as cultural interpretations of agency."

Paul Soukup, SJ (Communication) researches ethical perspectives on new technologies. E.g., "Ethics @ e-mail: Do new media require new morality?", "The Real of Virtual: Communication Technology in Fostering Community".

William Sundstrom (Economics) researches and writes about a variety of economic topics with essential justice themes: "The Emergence, Persistence, and Recent Widening of the Racial Unemployment Gap" (with Robert W. Fairlie); "The Racial Unemployment Gap in Long-Run Perspective" (also with Robert W. Fairlie).

Under the heading of 'topically related justice issues':

Ruth Davis (Computer Engineering) considers that 'justice' includes equal access to technology for those typically under represented; she is engaged in a National Science Foundation supported project to investigate ways to improve and assess the effectiveness of programs to encourage high school girls to consider careers in Engineering, Science, and Mathematics.

Jacques Delacroix (Management) argues in a paper that the high levels of compensation granted American CEOs (specifically) cannot be accounted for by market processes nor even by lottery-like processes and that they, therefore, are not rooted in any known philosophical system of equity. "This is an original piece because it provides grounding for reform from the conservative end of the political spectrum."

Finally, some examples of ‘artistic and experiential treatments of justice-related themes’:

Aldo Billingslea (Theater and Dance): Under the direction of SCU’s Barbara Means Fraser, he performed the one man show ‘Paul Robeson’ in Santa Clara and in Dallas, Texas at Plano Repertory Theater. The play deals with Robeson's struggles for justice in the face of discrimination against African Americans and peoples of color, workers, and presumed members of the Communist Party.

Francisco Jimenez (Modern Languages), has recently published two books, The Circuit: Stories from the Life of a Migrant Child, (Cajas de Carton, in the Spanish version) and La Mariposa in which he describes the experiences of Mexican migrant farm workers.

Research on justice-related themes expands human knowledge; the expansion of human knowledge is in and of itself a social good. Justice research is a social good.

So, to our four questions:

1. In what ways can the scholarly and scientific research and publication skills of faculty members contribute to the shared body of human knowledge about justice issues?

Broadly conceived, justice is concerned with:
who/what is included/ excluded in distributions of benefits and burdens
whether alternative schemes distribute benefits and burdens satisfactorily
procedural norms for assuring satisfactory outcomes

What are the poignant research questions that emerge from such a broadly conceived notion of justice:
from the arts?
from the physical and biological sciences?
from the social sciences?
from the professional disciplines?

2. How do existing data and theories need to be improved?

Are there voices/ images/ representations in the arts that are wrongly excluded?
Would more disciplinary interconnectedness in the physical and biological sciences serve the cause of justice?
Are the justice issues in contemporary social science research too beholden to the existing
socio-political milieu?
Is justice served by research questions in the professional disciplines that focus on ‘how’ instead of ‘why’?

3. What special areas most need to be addressed?

Picture for a moment a scene of grave injustice. Imagine the pain, the suffering of human persons caught up in unfair and avoidable circumstances. Does your academic discipline offer tools for the exploration of the experience? For the elucidation of the social, political, economic

issues at stake? For the development and the production of the material, mechanical or informational structures for the repair of this and the avoidance of similar circumstances?

4. How can research be conducted so as to promote justice and yet respect the norms, methods, objectivity and integrity of disciplines?

What are the obstacles you have met or sensed that have hindered you from expressing your own appropriation of the virtue of justice as a researcher? What can Jesuit colleges and universities do to help you and your peers overcome these obstacles?

By: Joy Gordon
Philosophy Department
Fairfield University

My academic training is in the disciplines of philosophy and law. I do research in the areas of political philosophy, human rights, and ethical issues in international relations. These are models of two ways that I've tried to integrate my research with my commitment to justice.

Project #1: **Ethical problems of economic sanctions**. Economic sanctions consistently cause hardship that burdens the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of a society, not the political or military leaders responsible for a country's military aggression or human rights violations. In the post Cold War era, sanctions have become a very popular device of international governance, in some cases (particularly Iraq) with devastating consequences for the population as a whole. How is it that such policies can be legally and ethically legitimate as international governance, while the same acts done in the context of warfare would constitute war crimes (in that they systematically inflict harm on innocent populations as a means to influence political and military leaders)?

Question: What can I do to bring these issues into broad academic and public discussion? What can I do, for example, to see that the humanitarian issues become as central as the foreign policy issues? How can I use my writing to inform and influence policymakers?

Venues:
Academic publication. My goal here is to be as broad-based as possible, so I published one article on Just War aspects in a religious studies journal, and another article applying ethical theories to economic sanctions in a journal on ethics and international affairs. Because the claims I am making are quite controversial, I think it is also important to publish in venues with as much credibility as possible; so the book version of my discussion of economic sanctions is under contract with Harvard University Press.

Web sites. The internet (and electronic data bases) at this point have a tremendous influence on both academic research and public discourse, so when my published articles (or conference

papers) are placed on the web, I try to notify activist groups to build links into their web sites. The activists, in turn, can use the information and the arguments in lobbying.

Non-academic publications: While I'm doing research for a law review article or an ethics article, I also write up a version suitable for a magazine that circulates well outside academic circles. EG: a technical article I wrote last year on how the Security Council implements the sanctions regime on Iraq was published in The Nation, and that article was later inserted in its entirety in the Congressional Record.

Lobbying and activism: I also speak to local churches and community groups, and work with local activist groups, including students on our campus, to provide them with information and arguments that are being published in the field, or that I've come across in the course of my research. When activists in my community meet with a congressperson to lobby him or her on the issue, I offer to accompany them, or to provide them with materials to use in their presentation.

Project #2: US-Cuban Relations

The Cuban revolution brought about extraordinary accomplishments in health care, education, land reform, and in many regards, human rights. It has also been routinely characterized in the US press, and by the US government, as a totalitarian regime, where human rights violations are rampant. In fact, the situation is much more complex, with policies and a political culture that in many ways are both principled and humane.

In the course of researching my dissertation, which in substantial part concerned Latin American leftist thought, I lived and worked in Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Cuba, and established extensive contacts in those countries.

Question: What can I do to provide access to a perspective that is rarely given voice in the US press? What can I do to provide American audiences with the opportunity to understand the political culture of Cuba—both its accomplishments and its failings—outside of the context of "demonization"?

Venues: Publications, and facilitating academic exchanges and academic research

Publications: Academic articles in areas such as liberation theology, and legal issues of the economic embargo on Cuba; as well as publications with a broader audience (eg, an article on the Cuban economy in the Atlantic Monthly)

Conferences: Conferences are one of the few ways that American audiences can hear, and question, scholars and writers from countries where travel and communication are highly restricted by US regulations. Example: I organized a conference at Yale on human rights in Cuba and US-Cuban relations, sponsored by university officials as well as nearly a dozen academic departments. The conference was centered on the presentations of four Cuban intellectuals: a political scientist, a theologian, a diplomat, and a philosopher. After speaking at Yale, the Cuban intellectuals then spoke at similar events at Cornell, Brown, and Fairfield University.

Travel: Although travel to Cuba is highly restricted, exceptions are made for journalists and for "professional research." On this basis, I brought several groups of American academics and

journalists to Cuba, enabling them to see the country for themselves, and to talk to Cubans both within the university and in neighborhoods. Upon their return, they then wrote and taught about their experiences.

Topic Session 4 - Service Learning and Justice Education -Framing the Question-

By: Kathleen Orange
Spring Hill College

At the outset we need to ask: in what ways can service affect our students so as to help them to become more committed to the creation of a just society and more effective in creating it? We are aware of the class background of our students, and that they are likely to define success in life as replicating or improving their situation. A commitment to justice, on the other hand, begins in solidarity with the poor and marginalized, the very condition of life our students hope to avoid. Regular service which brings students into personal, sustained relation with inner city children, nursing home residents, the homeless, has the effect of breaking down the distance separating our students and their life world from that of the poor. One of the mindsets that most disables our students is the belief that the lives of the poor are without significance for the happiness of the "better off." Yet students find the affection and respect of Alzheimer's patients, disgruntled middle schoolers and immigrants struggling to learn English to be of immense value to them. Our students find self-validation in the eyes of people our society usually finds to be of little account. The circle of their deep affection has expanded according to the logic of real life. Most of them also spontaneously say that they realize they themselves have been "lucky" to have had a good start in life. And they seem to find irrelevant the question as to whether the kids they tutor in some way "deserve" their single parent homes, dangerous neighborhoods, and disintegrating public schools.

When a service experience in which students are already learning so much is combined with course content it is likely to reshape the academic outcomes and perhaps the academic objectives themselves. Janet Eyler and Dwight Giles in their work *Where Is the Learning in Service Learning?* point out that there is a gap between the concepts texts use to explain the world and the world as it really is. Service experiences help students challenge the incompleteness of their texts, take responsibility for their own learning and their own knowing, and give them authority to reconstruct the world. (In order that professors can guide this process with an awareness of the relation between service and concepts, they need to take an active role in selecting the service site and stay in contact with it. Service learning as a field recommends that courses identify a project students engage for the course rather than having them placed at different sites, precisely to allow the instructor to make critical connections between the 'received knowing' of the textbook and the students'experience.) Service learning has the potential to challenge the knowledge structure that leaves intact the system of poverty and marginalization. More important it changes students from receptacles of knowledge, responsible to give it back on a test so as to be certified for the next level, to makers of their own knowing about the world who hold the received knowledge up and challenge its adequacy. Just as they recognize the marginalized as subjects who regard them, they take on their own subjectivity and its responsibility for action.

It is the engagement of our students' affections and of their active knowing that is essential to nurture and develop their capacity for justice. This entire enterprise is rooted in the Gospel, and in the prophets. The articulation of this relationship is a responsibility not only of our universities but also of church leaders, like Cardinal Mahony, who is leading the fight for a new amnesty for immigrants. *Encuentro 2000*, held in Los Angeles in July was the church in action, committing itself to inclusion, and to working against the injustice in which it has too often participated. When the church commits itself to the inclusion of the marginal and to working for justice with them as one body of Christ, it is not difficult to see that our work in the universities with our students to understand and actively critique structures of injustice *is* a work of faith. When we call our students to challenge the structures of society on behalf of the friends they have made among the poor, we ask them to hope in things unseen. This is a challenge to us as well.

The question I see is how do we understand this rich process and how do we develop a responsible guidance of it?

By: James F. Gilsinan, Dean
College of Public Service
Saint Louis University

In the history of higher education, the term "service learning" is an oxymoron. We have continually attempted to differentiate between learning and service. The former was the "real" work of the academy and took place in the classroom and the laboratory. The latter was seen as being too vocational. It took place away from the university. That is why until recently internships and practica were barely tolerated and their administration assigned to either new faculty or non-faculty supervisors.

Our culture reinforces this degradation of the term "service." When the term is attached as a modifier to another term, the second term loses status, perhaps because the primary meaning of "service" has traditionally referenced the occupation or duties of a servant. Indeed, the Latin root of the term means slave. Thus, to claim we are moving to a service economy that relies on service jobs is to say something faintly damning. Similarly, when we attach service to learning we may be unintentionally assigning second-class status to this form of pedagogy.

Gender issues compound these organizational and cultural difficulties. While the emphasis on service may represent a change in the way males think about learning, the same may not be true among females. Education, social work, and nursing represent to some a kind of "pink collar" academic ghetto created by associating service with female proclivities. This is a stereotype that many female students want to escape. The emphasis on service, and therefore the highlighting of academic majors within these helping professions, runs counter to the significant increase of women students in business, law, medicine and the hard sciences.

There is no such thing as immaculate perception. The terms we use to describe things carry with them a set of pre-understandings, stereotypes, and organizational reinforcements that tacitly shape our view of the world and what constitutes appropriate action within it. Therefore, the first step toward an effective service learning program is surgery – cutting out the implied qualifier and focusing instead simply on how we can improve learning that contributes to social justice.

This rhetorical work leads in turn to three other crucial implementation steps. Cummings (1998), in a study of learning reforms at Michigan State University (MSU) and at the University of Buffalo (UB), provides an experiential template of what else is needed to establish and maintain such efforts. Learning reforms must be institutionalized within a recognizable academic structure. This means they should not be the project of a specialized office, but an integral part of an ongoing academic structure – e.g. a council of deans, an academic department that acts as a fulcrum for coordination and implementation among other departments, or as part of the mission of a college or school. Otherwise, as was the case at MSU, a change in top administrative positions will slow down the momentum for reform.

After the rhetorical and structural work is done, decisive action to reform promotion and tenure processes is necessary to insure that reward structures reinforce the new approach to learning. Saint Louis University created the College of Public Service in part to institutionalize a teaching, learning and research environment that integrates the resources of the community with those of the academy in ways that enhance both. This integrative learning requires that rank and tenure criteria recognize and reward interdisciplinary, applied scholarship. It also requires that we construct a definition of faculty work load that gets away from the artificial separation of teaching, research, and service and instead creates structures in which all three dimensions of scholarship are themselves integrated. Increasingly, for example, we have classes that are linked to projects – by signing up for a class a student also participates in the faculty grant activity. The class provides both an opportunity for systematic reflection on the topic and for the dissemination of findings in the form of papers, reports and other products.

Finally, if the community and university are to work together in partnership, attention must be paid to the form of the relationship. Many communities are suspicious of universities because of past experience. The university often focuses on the research needs of its faculty, with the community and its members simply becoming objects of study. Increasingly communities are demanding equality. How to achieve this equality while insuring that both partners maintain their integrity is a difficult challenge. We have instituted two reforms that try to take into account the needs of viable partnerships. Community members screen student workers – if a student is not acceptable to the community, he or she is withdrawn from the project. Such rejection provides a teachable moment wherein students can learn better ways to approach community members and their problems. We also encourage faculty to co-author with community project participants.

The four ingredients for successfully linking community and university resources in a context of social justice education involve rhetorical reform, structural change, rank and tenure renewal

with a review of how faculty work loads are determined, and equalizing community participation within a partnership.

Cummings, W.K. (1998) *The Service University Movement in the U.S. Searching for Momentum.* Higher Education 35: 69-90.

By: Mary Ellen Carroll
Regis University

Let's begin our discussion with an accepted definition of service learning and then move on to discuss the role and structure of service learning in the context of justice education.

Service Learning ...
$is a method by which students learn through active participation in thoughtfully organized service
$is conducted in, and meets the needs of, the community
$is integrated into and enhances academic curriculum; includes structured time for reflection
$helps foster civic responsibility
-from the National Community Service Trust Act of 1993, prepared by Dr. Rick Battistoni, Director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service

Why is service learning a component of Jesuit education?
Standing within the Catholic and Jesuit traditions, service learning at Jesuit Universities and Colleges takes on further specificity in terms of its intended outcomes and its principle focus. Through these traditions we are called to promote justice and to discern the influence of our actions from the perspective of the poor. In 1989, Superior General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J. stated, The Society of Jesus proclaims that their service of faith through the promotion of justice is the mission that must be integrated as a priority into each Jesuit work. Our purpose in education, then, is to form men and women for others." ... In short, we want our graduates to be leaders-in-service." [Callahan, 1997:21]

How can we educate leaders who will serve the faith that promotes justice?
In our quest to understand and discern what justice looks like, we must have the opportunity to hear the voices of those not often heard in our culture and in our educational system. Voices which provide a view of reality from the vantage point of the dispossessed. Through service we develop our capacity to listen and to learn from the people at the margins-we grow in solidarity with them and begin to see society as an integrated whole. As members and sustaining links of "this whole," we can no longer forget, dismiss, or distance ourselves from "the other." We glimpse the interdependent nature of justice. We are transformed and we must rise to the challenge of becoming positive change agents in society.

Our goal, therefore, is not simply to experience and gain a deeper understanding of the “voices” of the other, but rather, to learn about and gain the tools through which the inequitable systems and structures of society can be changed.
How do we individually and collectively strive to attain this goal? Let us consider the role and structure of service learning in the context of justice education through the following questions.

At each of our institutions, how have we defined the role of service learning?
$Is service learning integrated into the curriculum? (Across the curriculum, within introductory and advanced courses, is it required or optional)
$How is service learning linked to faith? (e.g. Catholic Social Teaching, Jesuit General Congregation documents, other faith traditions)
$Do “minimum requirements” exist in some way to standardize what constitutes a service learning course?
$What are the penalties or rewards for faculty or departments that do/do not integrate service learning into any of their course offerings?
$How do we evaluate the effect of service learning on our campus and in our communities?

How is service learning structured so that our institutions and our graduates are invested in bringing about a more just society?
$In what ways do we insure that students connect their service learning experiences to a larger context of social justice?
$Does service learning include multiple forms of service? (direct service opportunities, advocacy, research, consciousness raising, ...)
$How are we working in partnership with our communities? How do our partnerships build and empower communities? Do some of community relationships resemble unhealthy dependencies?
$How do our degree programs, career services, internships, capstone courses, thesis topics, etc. enhance and deepen students= service learning experiences?
$How do we educate and model that pursuing a more just society is a lifetime commitment?

Topic Session 5 - From Faith to Justice: Caveats and Celebration -Framing the Question-

by: Catharyn A. Baird, J.D.[1],
Regis University

As a Christian, not a Catholic,[2] who has taught at a Jesuit University for more than 15 years, I've always been thrilled with the emphasis on themes of justice which are part of the fabric of the Jesuit and Catholic Social Thought tradition. However, as the leadership in the Catholic church has become increasingly conservative and as subtle and not-so-subtle pressure is being put on the faculty to assure that we are orthodox in our teaching, I find myself increasingly disquieted and concerned about the tension between maintaining appropriate intellectual boundaries of an academic setting while assuring that the themes of justice are given appropriate emphasis in the curriculum. I find myself torn between encouraging diversity of opinion and exploring the relationship between faith and justice while cultivating the academic rigor and objectivity which are the hallmarks of our institutions and disciplines.

Thus, I would like to frame the conversation in terms of caveats and celebrations. As we seek to intentionally weave themes of justice into our classes, I believe we must be aware of the caveats which must precede taking any particular stance. However, I would not want the caveats to diminish either our commitment to or the celebration of forwarding the cause of justice.

Caveat 1: Know Thyself. I teach ethics in the business program at Regis as well as the School for Health Care Professions. When I tell the truth, I love the official Catholic position on economic justice and worker's rights but I'm just not quite so certain about the official position on health care. What I noticed is that in matters of economic justice I was not bringing the same level of critique to the classroom as I was when teaching about health care issues. Thus, as I acknowledge my own biases I can subject my own preferences to the same level of scrutiny as I do those assertions coming from either an official position (of whatever nature) or my students. I must remember that my role as a professor entitles me to an opinion, but my opinion should not be privileged over others.

Caveat 2: Respect the discipline. As I have exhorted my colleagues (both at Regis and other Jesuit universities) for many years to be sensitive to issues of justice, many have told me that the constraints of their discipline and requirements for publication thwart their efforts to explore

---

[1] Professor of Business, Regis University.

[2] I'm an Episcopalian who left the General Baptist Conference in the 70's after it became fundamentalist rather than evangelical.

themes of justice both in the classroom and in their writing. Those of us who come to the academic setting from a position of faith know that we must use the tools of good scholarship to advance our cause. Again, the Jesuit tradition stands us in good stead as we are encouraged to have a position of faith which inspires and nurtures us at the same time we use the tools of reason and research to forward the conversation. The trick is to balance between advancing a position which legitimizes and forwards a concern for themes of justice at the same time we respect but are not inappropriately constrained by the requirements of our discipline.

Caveat 3: Respect the Student. Our students come to us with their own sets of concerns and definitions of just action and just results. The role of the university, I believe, is to help our students more clearly articulate and critique their positions as well as broaden their base of resources which will enhance and nuance their commitments. Thus, we must respect the faith and justice commitments of our students and allow them to explore what those beliefs mean in their lives. From time to time we will find their actions embarrassing (especially if they choose to picket about some practice on our campus which they perceive as unjust) or we will believe them naive in their projects. However, as we nurture their sense of justice and with integrity allow ourselves to be shaped by them, we can embark on a journey together which will forward the cause of justice.

While the caveats are important, let us not forget the causes for celebration as we connect our lives of faith with a call to action.

Celebration 1: A commitment to the primacy of conscience. Whatever the failings of various faith traditions, the Catholic-Jesuit tradition holds a commitment to the primacy of conscience over the mandates of authority. Thus, while authority must be respected and understood, we are able to explore the various approaches to justice that different faith traditions have and develop the ability of each of our students to define for themselves the connection between their faith and their call to justice. We also are able to explore when one should move against the voice of authority, whether sacred or secular, and the options for action and responsibility that one has in making the decision to go against the *status quo.*

Celebration 2: Permission to explore the relationship between faith and justice. Proselytizing (as tempting as it is with causes I espouse) is inappropriate in a university setting. However, because our universities are grounded in the faith of the Ignatian tradition, we have permission (permission that many of our colleagues in other universities do not have)...if not a mandate...to assist our students in exploring and connecting their own faith to the actions they will take as citizens of the world. We can assist students in determining both the causes of justice to which they are called and the venues in which their action will take place. This mandate cannot be left to Campus Ministry, as vital as their role is. Rather, faculty have an invaluable opportunity to help students make the connections between faith and justice in each of our disciplines.

Celebration 3: God will continue doing God's work, with or without us. I love the admonition attributed to Ignatius: pray as if all depends on God; work as if all depends on you. In our work we must avoid both indifference (God will take care of it) and hubris (I'm solely responsible for achieving justice in this world). The strength of the Jesuit tradition is that the men called to the

Jesuit order see themselves and those of us who work with them as companions of Christ, people called to work together to advance the cause of God on this planet. Our challenge is to invite our students into that companionship to advocate for those who are less fortunate at the same time that we respect the faith tradition that nurtures our students and respect God's calling for each.

Our students tell us that our passion and love for our academic discipline is often what distinguishes a mediocre class from an excellent class. Our students hunger for signposts that we can give them on the road to melding their faith with their professional and personal life. They want to hear our stories of how we made sense of our faith traditions at the same time we wove the tapestries of our lives. However, they don't want preaching nor do they want us to dictate to them their answers to life's questions.

The question for us is how to bring our enthusiasm and experience to a classroom while giving our students room to find their own voices and make their own choices. How do we live with integrity our life stories and commitments while remembering that the life tasks and concerns for our students are very different? How do we remember the caveats surrounding advocacy while celebrating and advancing the cause of justice until all "hate evil, love good, and maintain justice" so that "justice rolls on like a river, and righteousness like a never-failing stream" (Amos 5:15 and 24)? That is our task: a task that is made easier with the conversation and companionship that comes when like minded people undertake a journey together.

By: John A. Coleman S.J.,
Loyola Marymount University

In this workshop-discussion, I want to raise questions, 'brainstorm' with others and probe experience at host universities about two areas of 'discourse' on justice in the Jesuit university setting:

(I) Competing and often Incompatible Rhetorics of Justice at Jesuit Universities

In my capacity as " assessor" (1999) at Loyola Marymount, concerning faculty and departments/schools' concern for and commitment to justice (including especially where it touches curriculum and faculty research), I discovered two disparate, sometimes over-lapping, sometimes conflictual , rhetorics about ' thinking and teaching' about justice in Jesuit universities:

(A) Secular Liberal Egalitarianism:

In oral and written responses from faculty, the implicit regnant discourse about justice was a secular, American liberal-egalitarian language. Its main categories are four:

(1) Equality: this is usually defined as equality of 'opportunity' or access; (2) Autonomy: under this rubric, justice is stipulated as mandating 'informed consent'; (3) Inclusion; (4) Diversity—as a value in itself and as an element of inclusion. Diversity was mainly a code word for a focus on including more women, Afro-Americans , Latinos and other ethnic minorities. Secular liberal-egalitarian schemes of justice include both some attention to distributive justice (usually focused on access) and commutative justice—i.e., keeping contracts.

(B) The Discourse of Catholic Social Thought on Justice

Other respondents (but a minority of respondents) evoked Catholic Social Teaching's rhetoric of justice. The Catholic rhetoric of justice overlaps, partially, with the secular liberal-egalitarian discourse.. Thus, equality, in Catholic justice discourse, includes a fundamental 'moral' equality—caught in the Catholic concept of 'human dignity'. But note: 'human dignity' is richer and quasi-ontological in Catholic discourse and includes more than mere equal opportunity and 'access'. It reaches to 'equal respect'. Catholic discourse on equality also insists on the protection of a minimal human equality for all based on human need. Liberal egalitarian schemes may or may not –more usually not—honor 'need' as a pressing moral claim.

Catholic Social Thought honors autonomy and 'informed consent' in its core concept of human freedom. Catholic approaches to diversity are usually rooted in arguments about the right to one's culture and language. Themes of inclusion and equal access are best caught in the net of the Catholic concept of " justice as participation". But note, again: 'justice as participation' is a more robust concept than mere equal access and inclusion since it demands inclusion with empowerment and active voice in ways the liberal-egalitarian schemes generally do not.

Yet Catholic Social Thought contains a surplus which, while it includes equality, autonomy, inclusion and diversity, goes beyond them. Four Catholic concepts related to justice , in particular, cut a wider swathe than what is caught by the liberal egalitarian lens of equality, autonomy, inclusion and diversity. Thus: (1) The rich Catholic concept of solidarity refers Catholics to solidarities which are larger than one's own congenial units (nation, university, city). It broadens distributive justice criteria to break out of one unit of analysis. Liberal egalitarians, however, usually restrict the application of justice just to one nation state unit. (2) The Catholic (indeed, scriptural) notion of ' a preferential option for the poor' points to something larger than equality or even inclusion. It usually justifies—on the surface level not perfectly 'egalitarian'—programs of 'affirmative action' or a preferential justice for those who have been marginalized. (3) The Catholic notion of ' social justice' presents a third category to distributive and commutative justice. Institutional arrangements or systemic organization may be unjustly arranged so as to preclude or skew 'the common good'. Having equal access or being included in an unjustly institutionalized system is not enough. We need some such third category to expand those caught by the notions of distributive and commutative justice. If the pie (or social system) is rotten, it is not enough to have equality of access to it and the keeping of contracts. (4) In his book, Dependent Rational Animals (Peru, Illinois: Carus Publishing, 1999), Catholic philosopher , Alasdair MacIntyre, draws upon Aquinas' (and the Catholic tradition's) notions of caritas and misericordia (love and mercy) to evoke what he calls a needed ' just

generosity' which goes beyond narrow justice to embrace a virtue characteristic of types of action that are, at once, just, generous, beneficent and done from pity. 'Just generosity' bids us to do more than justice requires and relies not just on 'reason' which governs justice but on our sympathies—aimed at those most in need (whether strict justice requires it or not). For MacIntyre, echoing here medieval debates about the relation of justice and mercy, only a compassionate justice or a just generosity ever delivers even strict justice.

Question:

Where in the curriculum or in the 'hidden curriculum' of the university debates, rituals, symbols and discussions do we find any way to get these two—partially, at least, incommensurate --'rhetorics of justice' in conversation with each other. Without this conversation the justice our universities espouse may be still fairly truncated and not really fully Catholic. These two competing (and partially incommensurate) rhetorics of justice lie latent and cross the divide within faculty, staff and administration-- whenever we talk together about justice. Can this division be raised up to an explicit consciousness at our Jesuit universities to further a vital conversation about justice at Jesuit Universities ?

II. Student Rhetorics and Movements for Justice

Mission statements about justice at the university often, implicitly, get stated as if students are mainly 'recipients' of a curriculum on values of justice or an ethos. They need to be 'educated in', 'won over to' etc. the school's Jesuit justice mission.

Yet, in fact, independently of our universities' mission statements and curriculum, there exists a burgeoning student-led justice movement in the U.S., found in such groups as The Student Alliance to Reform Corporations (STARC) and United Students Against Sweatshops(USAS) which have , each ,some 200 chapters-- on as many campuses in the U.S. and Canada and have, increasingly, in places such as The Universities of Pennsylvania and Michigan, engaged in teach-ins on the economic injustices accompanying globalization. The contemporary student-led justice movements seem to focus on three major issues:

(1) Injustices ingredient in economic globalization and the globalization of capital, such as sweatshop labor. Campaigns have been mounted , focusing on university book stores, against retailers who use / abuse overseas sweatshop labor in providing clothing items sold at university book stores. (2) A second set of issues focuses on student-led movements opposing the run-way cost-inflation in contemporary American universities which has led to large tuition hikes which far outpace inflation and rival the health care sector in its run-way growth in pricing. (3) A third set mounts campaigns geared to the justice of wages paid to workers (especially, the unskilled, such as janitors , food care workers etc.) who work at universities. At Johns Hopkins and the University of Southern California, successful campaigns have focused on health benefits and a living wage for workers on university campuses. An especial target in this third set has been the Sodexo-Marriott Corporation which runs food services at over 500 U.S. campuses. Sodexo-

Marriott is facing censure from the NLRB for unfair conditions for its workers and has been singled out by student groups because it is the largest single investor in the burgeoning U.S. privatized prison system. (cf. Liza Featherstone, " The New Student Movement, The Nation, May 15, 2000)

Question:

How do we find ways to 'interface' the kinds of issues raised by this new student movement for justice with discussions about justice at our Jesuit universities. These movements carry a powerful argument that universities have obligations to justice yet little of their impact has been felt on our Jesuit campuses. Are we missing an important 'teaching' and 'teachable' moment by neglecting the student-led justice issues in our discussions of justice at Jesuit universities?

By: Joseph Currie, S.J.
Fordham University

"Watching the Whole Process . . . "

From 1975 to the present, Jesuit leadership has consistently cited the skill of Ignatian discernment as a basic tool in the implementation of the commitment to a faith that does justice that is to characterize every Jesuit ministry, including that of higher education. Most recently, Father Kolvenbach has written: "It seems of vital importance to keep striving to translate our social awareness, identity, and image into effective, evangelically meaningful service to the poorest and most suffering of God "s people. It is a matter of continually re-discovering and re-discerning " in situ " the demands and challenges which the recent General Congregations pose to our social action in today "s societies, cultures, and religions

Not only does the practice of Ignatian discernment allow us to link more effectively "the service of the faith " with "the promotion of justice; " it also provides us with a useful way of assessing the fruits of this commitment over the years, while paying special attention to Jesuit higher education. Group discernment requires not only the effort of individual participants to be disposed in inner freedom to do God "s will, but also a common vision understood in the same way and shared by all, the focus which unites group members despite their "different gifts and works and ministries " (1 Cor. 12). Such a necessary orientation initiates the discernment process involving information gathering and sifting through various options. And once an option is chosen by the group, Ignatian discernment has us seek confirmation of the choice made. To guard against deception, Ignatius urges us to "watch the whole process " as the decision is implemented, to see if indeed the choice seems to be "of God " or not (SpEx, ##332-333).

As we observe the whole course of events between 1975 and 2000, have Jesuits and their colleagues in ministry managed to evolve a clear understanding -- together -- of the faith/justice vision, so that all might be committed to its basic thrust " And does the same discerning group

experience over the years -- together -- the right "fit " between the option and its own felt orientation, or a "congruence of freedoms " that registers as ongoing peace-in-action, whatever the cost "

Two positions on the commitment to justice in Jesuit higher education that emerged during this quarter century seem at first to represent opposite ends of an ideological spectrum, apparently making it impossible to find a common ground or vision between the two. The first, capturing the attention of the world in the aftermath of events at the UCA in November 1989, is that of Ignacio Ellacuria, who taught and worked to make the Jesuit university in El Salvador "a university of a different kind, " with "its center outside of itself. " "If in its activity the university does not struggle against structural evil, " Ellacuria wrote, "it is not in tune with the Gospel. The university "s Christian character cannot be measured by professions of faith, adherence to hierarchy, or explicit teaching of religious topics, but by its concrete direction in history. The university is measured by which master it serves, fully aware that one cannot serve two masters, and that one of the masters one cannot serve is wealth, understood as a god opposed to the God revealed to us in Jesus Christ. " American Jesuit theology professor, Martin Tripole, offers an opposing view in two publications in the 1990s straddling the Jesuit 34th General Congregation in 1995. Tripole at first saw the traditional role of Jesuit higher education slighted by upstart social activists: "Some in the social ministry thought their apostolate would become the exclusive one, once the "new " Society of Jesus had taken hold. The Society was thought to have radically departed from its past. The old order of variegated apostolates in education, retreat work, and spiritual counseling had become irrelevant and outmoded; the new order of direct action in the world destroying unjust relationships, inhuman repression, and widespread material poverty had begun. And behold, all things would eventually be made "new ". "

Irish Jesuit Seamus Murphy, with a background both in activism and academics, tended to agree with Tripole that the original understanding of justice at the 32nd General Congregation (1974-75) seemed too narrowly focused. Just before the 34th General Congregation, he proposed a continuum of activities for the promotion of justice that would allow the overall goal of Christian justification and liberation to be both integral and constitutive of all Jesuit ministries. His continuum ranged through the following efforts: (1) social, structural justice for the poor and oppressed; (2) social, structural justice oriented to the non-poor minorities; (3) social, non-structural justice for any group or issue; (4) justice in behavior, such as commutative justice; and (5) justice in character, as in the formation of values, attitudes, and conscience. Whether or not Tripole and Murphy, published shortly before the 34th General Congregation, weighed in on its deliberations, Tripole at least expressed satisfaction with the outcome: "The 34th General Congregation has taken what the 32nd General Congregation initiated, but has re-fashioned it to produce something that is not only more theologically sound, but also more appropriate to the total mission of the Society of Jesus, and thereby more supportive of the Society "s apostolate of higher education. "

If the work of Tripole and Murphy has helped to clarify just what the Jesuits " corporate orientation should be in this regard, thereby providing a vision to which all could subscribe in their different ministries and capacities (i.e., arriving at a true and workable common vision) and, further, if the witness of Ellacuria and so many others in and out of Jesuit higher education has

only served to strengthen the corporate resolve (i.e., finding confirmation of a choice already made), then we might conclude that the original faith/justice commitment was and still is a sound one. The challenge to those of us engaged in Jesuit higher education is to maintain an openness to God “s will insofar as it can be discerned. This requires a disposition of “Together we seek the best way “ rather than “Our way is right and yours is wrong. “

In conclusion, an evangelical commitment to justice as its understanding has evolved over the past twenty-five years, seems confirmed for all ministries undertaken by Jesuits and their co-workers, not least within their traditional engagement in higher education. The faith/justice vision should therefore inform every aspect of Jesuit university life, from curricular studies to co-curricular activities, from university-wide policies to one-to-one relationships on campus, from research and publication to community service and cultural insertion programs. Forming “men and women for and with others “ must not remain just a catchy and attractive slogan, but a distinct reality and an ongoing and attainable goal for all of our Jesuit colleges and universities.

Some questions for discussion: (1) Would you agree that events of the past quarter century seem to confirm the faith/justice option taken by Jesuits at their 32nd General Congregation “ (2) Is corporate or group discernment a realistic goal today for a group as large and international as is that of Jesuits and their colleagues in ministry, individually and culturally diverse, whose members acquire specialized training, are encouraged to develop inquiring and critical minds, albeit with “discerning love, “ and are responsible for running increasingly complex and quasi-autonomous institutions “ (3) Do you view the expanded notion of justice espoused by Tripole, Murphy, and others as a necessary corrective, or does it in fact blunt or compromise the original intent and driving force of the 32nd General Congregation? (4) Should higher education mingle “praxis “ with theory? If so, to what extent: service learning? studies abroad? cultural insertion? social service? community development? public advocacy? community organization? (5) Are there limits to a Jesuit university “s ability to act as an effective change agent in society?

Topic Session 6 - Women and Jesuit Colleges/Universities: "OF" OR "AT" -Framing the Question-

By: Patricia E. Erickson, JD, Ph.D
Director, Criminal Justice Program
Canisius College

Justice can be conceptualized in both personal and institutional terms. In personal terms, justice is attributed to persons who are disposed to treat others fairly and act according to that disposition. In institutional terms, justice refers to social structures designed to promote and ensure that others are treated fairly. In American society, for example, programs such as Affirmative Action were developed as structural mechanisms to promote and ensure just treatment of women and minorities in the workplace. Structures such as Affirmative Action were needed because historically a significant percentage of persons in authority in the workplace refused to recognize the importance of treating women and minorities fairly in terms of hiring and promotion.

How should the personal and institutional forms of justice concerning women be translated into policy, practices and pedagogy in Jesuit colleges and universities? Although much change has occurred concerning both the personal and institutional dimensions within the past twenty years, what are the issues that remain to be addressed?
For example, are women routinely considered and selected for the highest levels of administrative positions or is a "glass ceiling" still at working that implicitly reserves those positions for men? Have issues of gender inequity in salary and promotion been adequately addressed? What structural mechanisms exist to deal with perceived grievances that are gender based? Does the social structure at Jesuit colleges and universities hinder or facilitate the retention of women faculty and administrators?

The personal and institutional issues of justice also concern not only faculty and administrators who work at Jesuit colleges and universities but also those who are employed in clerical and in maintenance positions. In our day-to-day interactions, do we treat these women fairly? Do we treat them with respect and dignity? Do we compensate them in accordance with Jesuit principles of distributive justice?

Finally, issues of justice also concern those women who participate in Jesuit colleges and universities as students. The percentage of women students attending Jesuit colleges and universities has increased dramatically over the past twenty years. Curriculum changes such as Women Studies Programs have been implemented to acknowledge the importance of women's perspectives and intellectual contributions. What issues remain to be addressed? For example, do we ask our women graduates about their academic experiences so as to examine what else we might do address their issues of concern?

The 34th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus promised to "listen carefully and courageously to the experience of women and align ourselves in solidarity with women." In order to do so, our institutional structures as well as our personal intentions must reflect the promise of "solidarity with women." What have been our successes and failures in this regard? What work still needs to be done?

By:
Dr. Nancy E. Snow, PhD
Professor of Philosophy
&
Daniel C. McDonald, S.J.
Associate Dir. of University Mission and Identity
Marquette University

Creating a Gender Inclusive Environment: Toward an Anatomy of Change

Gender equity is the equal treatment of women and men in the workplace. It includes a consideration of whether cultural mores embedded within the economic, social, political, religious, and even linguistic structures of our society operate in such a fashion that they offend the equal dignity of women created with men in the image of God. (Working definition of the Marquette University Gender Equity Task Force adapted from U.S. Federal Law for non-discrimination and *Decree 14* of the **Documents of General Congregation 34** of the Society of Jesus)

The Background

In *Decree Fourteen* of the Documents of **General Congregation Thirty-Four** of the Society of Jesus, the injustices toward women in the Church and Civil Society are outlined. In addressing the previous **General Congregation Thirty-three** the document opens:

> *General Congregation 33 made a brief mention of the Aunjust treatment and exploitation of women.@ It was part of a list of injustices in a context of new needs and situations which Jesuits were called to address in the implementation of our mission. We wish to consider this question more specifically and substantially on this occasion. This is principally because, assisted by the general rise in consciousness concerning this issue, we are more aware than previously that it is indeed a central concern of any contemporary mission which seeks to integrate faith and justice. . . . It is of personal concern to those who work with us in our mission, especially lay and religious women.* (**GC34**, p. 171)

The document continues and outlines the Jesuit Congregation=s analysis of the situation of women, the roles and responsibilities of Jesuits in addressing these issues through a reflective process of personal conversion, and the charge to find innovative ways to move toward full and equal gender justice. This requires a critical, unbiased examination of the attitudes and activities

that currently prevail in various aspects of university life, since that is the context in which we live and in which gender justice succeeds or fails.

Recognizing the need for an examination of gender justice issues at Marquette University, Father Robert A. Wild, S.J., the President of Marquette University formed a Gender Equity Task Force. In a letter dated July 23, 1999, Father Wild, charged the Task Force on Gender Equity:

1. To determine if there are areas of perceived gender inequity among the faculty, both full and part-time, with an awareness that gender may intersect with other issues such as age, race and ethnicity;
2. To examine data in multiple areas of university activity such as recruitment, hiring, and appointment of faculty, workload distribution, allocation of leadership responsibilities, compensation, and promotions to assure that faculty are treated equitably and are not disadvantaged because of their gender; and
3. To prepare a report on the findings and conclusions of the task force that will include a plan, with recommendations, to address any inappropriate gender differences.

Framing the Question

How does one approach a complex educational institution for an analysis which elicits a diagnosis of possible injustice and a prescription for change? The Gender Equity Task Force at Marquette University decided upon a combination of tests of and by faculty and administrators to reveal the living situation: a hard data survey, a climate survey, a survey of department chairs, interviews with deans, and summary reports of anecdotal evidence from women and men teaching at Marquette University.

Together these sources of information reveal an anatomy of both positive and problematic gender justice concerns in an institution that desires to struggle positively with this issue. Two main categories emerged: procedures and attitudes. In both categories, there is evidence that healthy and positive initiatives improve the climate for women. By contrast, unhealthy procedures and attitudes mask the contributions of women; create a chilly climate for them; and disempower all participants, both women and men.

Taking a cradle to grave approach to academic life revealed the absence of crucial procedures in a number of areas. Further, surveys from faculty and Chairs indicated problematic attitudes. While attitudes cannot be legislated, it is none-the-less true that institutions, especially those committed to education, should be able to positively influence attitudes through education.

Presentation

Our presentation will selectively call attention to the ways and forms of gender inequity; the invisibility of women and chilly climates for all; and, the prescriptions for healing and diagnostic solutions discovered in these studies. Finally, we will discuss the implications of our

study for justice in other areas of university life such as diversity and women and men occupying staff and administrative positions.

By: Stephanie Mitchem
University of Detroit Mercy

At all colleges and universities:

45% of non-tenured professors are women
26% of tenured professors are women
39% of all faculty positions are held by women
13.5% of all faculty positions are held by persons of color

At surveyed Catholic colleges and universities:

58% of surveyed institutions do not have a women's studies office
34% of respondents did not experience gender discrimination; the rest did, at different levels of intensity
Only 15.8% of respondents believe that their institution takes gender discrimination seriously
All women's studies directors/coordinators and faculty report a neutral to negative climate for women's studies
Only 7.1% report that their administration is interested in women's studies.

From "The Status and Climate of Women's Studies at Catholic Institutions of Higher Education: a Qualitative and Quantitative Exploratory Study," National Association of Women in Catholic Higher Education (NAWCHE), presented June 30, 2000, Boston College. [1]

I know a woman I sometimes call "friend," who is disabled. She is only *sometimes* a friend because she can be so very embarrassing. As an activist for disabled rights, she lives with a "take-no-prisoners" attitude. She's a member of an activist group, "Not Dead Yet." I've been out with her when she runs her wheelchair over a person too slow in getting out of her way. My relationship with her is like imagining the prophet Ezekiel as friend: would he show up at the restaurant with clothes on, or half his hair shaved off? Yes, there are clearly reasons for prophetic action for justice. The rest of us stand uncomfortably by, frustrated by our own clumsiness.

I've also been on the other side of the fence, as an African American. I recently confronted someone, whom I've known for years, about an action that I perceived as racist. Her anger and her response were immediate: "You know I didn't mean that. I've had years of racial sensitivity training." She is right; I know that she would not have intended insult. However, we are both people who work with the public. What if she had acted in the same way around someone who did not know her personal intentions? I responded, "If you run over me with a car, I am sure you would not mean it, but I would still be hurt."

Both these anecdotes are instructive for a discussion of women working in Jesuit universities. They both indicate the annoyance and discomfort of working for justice for women. The realities of our lives sometimes conflict with our beliefs.

A recent study by NAWCHE on women faculty at Catholic institutions is partially cited above. The study indicates we still have far to go to achieve justice for women. Our good intentions have taken us to the point where we might have conversations. And therein lie the difficulties for the next phase.

Personal truths can cause pain and damage relationships. This is certainly the part none of us like for we would prefer to have pain-free solutions to injustices. We seem either to stand by when people run their wheelchairs over others, or **we** have to choose to point out how we have been hurt. In this process, we must face realities, not abstractions. This is our pastoral need: we are challenged to minister to each other, with justice as practice not theory.

There is always the temptation to turn realities back into abstractions; so much more comfortable to speak of justice instead of doing it. When this occurs, who holds responsibility for not letting the issue slide down some slippery slope into a meaningless impersonal void?

My focus in this reflection so far has been internal to our Jesuit schools. Jesuits have been tremendous advocates for women's justice, in a less-committed church climate. I write here as a person who attended diocesan seminaries and spent a number of years in diocesan barracks. The Jesuits have taken public stands for women through the commitments of their congregations as well as school by school, such as the continued support of NAWCHE by Boston College.

But there are other tensions with which we live. We are in a time when conservative forces, not committed to justice, are attempting to set a national agenda. This can be a difficult time for presidents of Jesuit schools, who must deal with the folk who want to complain about those "wild women" who are destroying the fabric of society. This can be a difficult time for the clergy and theologians who are challenged to toe some imaginary company line. This can be a painful time for faculty who may become targets of right-wingers in twenty-first century lynching campaigns; anything dealing with sexuality/gender clearly, some state, has no place in a Catholic school.

In this climate, in the midst of our stumblings and discomforts, should we hope?

Stephanie Y. Mitchem
University of Detroit Mercy

[1] Used with permission of the National Association of Women in Catholic Higher Education. For further information, contact the NAWCHE office, Boston College, Women's Studies Program, Dept. of Sociology, McGuinn Hall 519A, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167, or by phone, (617) 552-4198.

Topic Session 7 - People of Color in Jesuit Universities -Framing the Question-

By: Herbert A. Medina , Associate Professor of Mathematics & Elizabeth A. Stoddard, Dean of Student Services Loyola Marymount University

Topic for Discussion

In the sixteenth century, above the door of the Collegio Romano in Rome, one of the first Jesuit educational institutions, hung the famous inscription "School of Grammar, Humanities, and Christian Doctrine, Free." While the economic realities of our time make it nearly impossible to conceive a university that did not charge tuition, it seems clear that it is necessary for Jesuit institutions to lower tuition if they truly are not going to "perpetuate the present division between the privileged and the excluded."[3] This issue is specially important to people of color as African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans are disproportionately poor.

To make the statements above more concrete, let us look at the numbers at Loyola Marymount University. The tuition and fees for an undergraduate entering Loyola Marymount University in the fall semester of 2000 are $19,100; and the budget for that student if s/he is to live on campus is more than $25,800. For 1998, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services defines that a family of four is "living in poverty" if their yearly household income is below $16,450.[4] Thus, even if 100% of the income of a family of four living in poverty were to be used for tuition and fees, that family could not afford to send a child to Loyola Marymount University.[5] The cost for one student to live on campus is almost 160% of the household income for a family of four living in poverty. Perhaps this would not be such a huge concern if the number of Americans living in poverty were insignificant. Unfortunately, this is not the case. For example, during 1997 the percentage of Latinos and African Americans living in poverty were 27.1% and 26.5% respectively.[6] This means that for over one fourth of the Latino and African American families in this country, not even 100% of their household income could pay for tuition and fees at Loyola Marymount University. The U.S. Census Bureau also reports that in 1997, 19.9% of all children in the country were living in poverty [op. cit.]; this figure certainly implies that in the near future, a college education at Loyola Marymount University is not a realistic option for about one-fifth of all people in this country.

In fact, for people of color, an education at Loyola Marymount University is beyond the economic means of not just those living in poverty. For example, the median household incomes in 1997 for African Americans and Latinos were $25,050 and $26,628 respectively [op. cit.].

---

[3] Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., "The Jesuit University Today," Address to the Directors or Presidents of Jesuit Institutions, Rome, November 5, 1985.
[4] *Federal Register,* February 24, 1998, Volume 63, Number 36.
[5] In this discussion, we will not take into account financial aid that is often provided to students.
[6] U.S. Census Bureau, *Report CB-175,* Washington D.C., September 24, 1998.

That is, 100% of a the household income for an “average” African American or Latino household would not cover the budget for one student to attend Loyola Marymount University.

Current trends in tuition costs suggest that Jesuit universities are not at all interested in becoming more affordable. What can they do to situate themselves within the economic means of people of color?

Topic for Discussion

Most colleges and universities in the United States have made efforts to increase the number of students, faculty and staff of color on their campuses. This is especially true on Jesuit campuses, where the issue of diversity on campus is easily framed as an issue of justice. As the complexion of the campuses changes, how do we move from being multicultural institutions (institutions that are racially diverse) to intercultural institutions (institutions where there is exchange across and between races cultures)? The movement from multicultural to intercultural does not happen easily or spontaneously.

As Jesuit colleges and universities become more diverse issues of race and culture emerge. It is not easy to talk about race and culture. Race and culture are the proverbial elephants in the classroom that no one talks about. Not talking about issues of race and culture does not make the issues cease to exist; in fact it exacerbates them. For any genuine discussion to take place, we must beyond intellectual discussions to discussions of the heart.

How do we initiate and maintain on-going conversations about race and culture at our institutions? How do we assure that everyone on campus is heard? How do we acknowledge that the experience of people of color on our campuses is most likely not the same as the experience of their white counterparts? How do we affect change on the campuses as an outcome of the conversations?

Topic for Discussion

Making students of color feel welcome on college and university campuses with a dominant white male Roman Catholic culture is a task that requires constant attention and even vigilance. Many universities feel they are not making inroads unless students are not associating with others who look like them. Faculty and administrators are distressed when they walk into a dining hall or campus quad and see groups of African American students, fraternity and sorority members and Filipino students in different areas, not interacting.

Why is it important that students have diverse groups of friends? Why is it not appropriate for students to associate with people with whom they are comfortable? Is it that we want our students of color to assimilate into the dominant culture, or do we want all students to widen their comfort zones? If we do want students to widen their comfort zones, how do we provide deliberate opportunities for students to interact?

By: Karla D. Scott

Director of African American Studies & Associate Professor of Communication Saint Louis University

A few years ago, a graduate of our Masters in Communication program was accepted into law school at a private university in a mid-size northwestern community. [7]Renee's plan to attend law school predated her Master's degree and she never wavered from that goal, submitting applications for almost two years before finding a program that could meet her needs. She finally received word of admission to this particular school in the form of a personal telephone call which proved to be the start of an aggressive recruiting period. She later learned that in addition to financial aid she was also eligible for campus housing—an extremely attractive perk for the single mother. After time talking with family and friends, Renee accepted the offer, and relocated— with her teenage daughter—only to find within three months, profound isolation.

What I recall most about Renee's tearful telephone call to me was her description of driving from store to store one evening trying to find hair care products for herself and daughter. In the end she drove for an hour to a neighboring community and reluctantly bought products that "came close enough to working." She later phoned relatives and friends back home in St. Louis to send other crucial hair and skin care products. In addition to the grooming crisis, her daughter was one of two African Americans in the high school, had virtually no social life, and was doing as well as she could in school. Renee's joy at being in law school quickly faded as she found herself—an older, African American single mother—ignored and isolated by other law students and faculty. There was no Black law student organization and the two other Black law students felt just as isolated as Renee who was also trying to respond to her daughters needs at a difficult time. Renee left after that first year and moved to a nearby state in pursuit of a second Masters degree at a university with a more ethnically diverse population. Three years later, Renee's daughter recently graduated from high school with several college scholarship offers and Renee, having abandoned the law school goal, is now teaching in an adjunct capacity.

This example of good intentions gone bad should motivate us to think more carefully about the consequences of recruiting faculty and students of color in the name of "becoming more diverse." The question to ask is not should we, obviously that has been a commitment for many of our institutions. ***The questions however, should include attention to what happens once we have recruited and the student or faculty member has arrived—is that where our responsibility ends? And if we decide it is not the end, how do we further efforts at not just retention but in helping to make the experience a positive one for however long the stay?*** At this point it may be easy to say, "Well no one goes out of the way to make White students feel welcome for their four years" or "White faculty don't feel a need to have special groups for professional support" In response to that it should be noted that any discussion regarding the underrepresentation of people of color should have as a reference point the various reasons for that underrepresentation.

Historically, people of color have been excluded from participating in areas of life taken for granted by other individuals—a memory with aftereffects that are still difficult to overcome even

[7] I will use to name Renee to protect the identity and privacy of this student.

after four decades of mandated integration. And despite efforts at assimilation, the experiences of most people of color still include being devalued as inferior and present only by law or default—not the first choice or "the real thing."

Acknowledging this reality is paramount for addressing the underrepresentation of people of color for it is key to understanding the perceptions individuals may have of institutions—including Jesuit institutions of higher learning— and the role that perception may play in decisions to become a part of that institution or not. If this history is more fully understood, then efforts to recruit and retain can more adequately address lingering questions many people of color have such as how much abuse will I have to take in the name of attaining this goal? Or how much of me, myself, my world as I know it, will I have to give up in order to make this work?

Is it fair to recruit students of color when upon arrival they find few others who look like them, talk like them, shop like them or even party like them? Is it fair to expect them to abandon their cultural traditions and preferences in order to fit into the larger student body? How fair is it to ask students to ignore the need to interact with others who understand the world the way they do? Even more critical for faculty, take the above questions and note that we must also ask how such a move would impact the life of the faculty member *and other family members?*

How do we at Jesuit Universities make faculty, staff and students feel more welcome when they enter the gates, doors or cross thresholds—not just for a day or during welcome week, but for the duration of the stay— however long? Do we have organizations that offer a feeling of connection, understanding, solidarity? Such groups should not be viewed as separatist or segregation but a normal need to be around others who may understand and experience the world the way you do. For example, "The Black House" on campus or the "The Black Table" in the cafeteria often are terms used to describe locations for African Americans to gather for shared cultural and social experiences. Unfortunately, such locations are often frowned upon as if their presence signals a failed attempt at assimilation. Nothing is further from the truth. *The fact that students and/or faculty of color are at the institution in the first place is assimilat*ion—*being there means one has accepted minority status in pursuit of an important goal*. All that is asked upon arrival is some understanding of cultural, racial even ethnic differences as perfectly normal and natural. Support in the form of protected time and space to share with like others; a sense of community where one is not subject to stereotypes and suspicion; and acceptance for being the way you are without the need to defend, explain or justify. Can we provide such an atmosphere? And if so, how is it done?

Topic Session 8 - Economic Barriers to Jesuit Higher Education
-Framing the Question-

By: Charles L. Currie, S.J., Executive Director
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

Introduction: Jesuits have always sought to make education affordable to their students, with a special sensitivity to lower income students. Today that goal is especially difficult to achieve in the United States. With increasing concern by parents, students, the general public, and even Congress about the cost of a college education, it is important to sift through the complex reality of the situation and to know what is being done about it.

Some Basic Facts:

For the 1999-00 academic year, the average private college or university tuition was $15,380. For Jesuit schools, only 15 exceeded that average; three exceeded $20,000.

In the 1970s, a serious belt-tightening period, there was little if any real growth in college tuition. In the 80s and early 90s, college tuition often rose higher than the Consumer Price Index as colleges sought to make up for the salary stagnation, deal with deferred maintenance, and meet the challenges of educational and informational technology. More recently, annual increases have normally been kept at less than 5% at private (and Jesuit) schools.

At private colleges, 70% of students receive aid, with the average amount being almost $9,000. For Jesuit Schools, typically 80%-plus receive aid. With various kinds of "tuition discounting, relatively few students pay the "sticker price."

At private institutions, families with an adjusted gross income of $70,000 or more paid an average of $10,428 in tuition, less grants, in 1995-96, and those with an adjusted gross income of under $15,000 paid $4,004.

Financial aid comes in many forms: grants, work-study and loans, and from many sources: federal, state and institutional. Some $64 billion in financial aid was provided to students in 1998-99. In Jesuit schools, the financial aid profile includes; federal funds of $749 billion (55%); state funds of $72 million (5%); and institutional funds of $538 million ((39%). That means that 13% of the institutional budget goes to financial aid.

About half of graduates graduate with student loan debt, which amounts to an average of $14,300 for graduates of private schools. The average monthly payment to pay off this amount is $175.

Students form different ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds enroll in college at significantly different rates. Sixty-five percent of student 18-24 from families with incomes greater than $75,000 enroll in college. Only 26% of students in same age group from families with income less than $25,000 attend college. Black and Hispanic students enroll at rates substantially less than white students.

Some Myths:

Only rich students can go to elitist, private (e.g., Jesuit) schools.

Reality: On average, families of undergraduates attending "flagship" state universities have higher family incomes than their counterparts at private colleges, and private colleges, compared with public universities, offer more need-based financial aid, making these schools as accessible as public schools.

Colleges charge whatever they want; they have a monopoly.

Reality: Private colleges set their own tuition, but they operate in a very competitive environment. They have to develop tuition and aid policies that allow them to maintain enrollment and offer the programs and facilities that will keep them competitive. In the past 15 years, private colleges have had to triple student aid expenditures from their own resources to make up for cuts in federal and state funding.

There is no basis for the soaring increases in college prices.

Reality: First, the facts: four-year private college tuition rose by 43% over the past ten years. Many factors influence college cost increases: technology and facility costs, faculty salaries, student aid expenses, and cuts in public appropriations. After a period of substantial increases in the 80s and early 90s, when colleges were trying to make up for cuts made in the 70s, annual price increases have stabilized at 5 per cent. Colleges are trying to do even better, searching for new and innovative ways to cut costs and minimize tuition increases.

Some Discussion Points

What Jesuit schools are doing to make their schools accessible to all students:

- substantial increase in institutional funds for financial aid, with targeted fundraising for the same
- increased efforts to increase minority enrollment
- lobbying for more public (federal and state) funding

Some of the major reasons for increased tuition:

- a university, especially one in the Jesuit tradition, is a labor-intensive activity
- high cost of items in "educational" bread basket, as compared with "normal" breadbasket (EPI vs. CPI)
- demand for costly services and facilities by parents and students
- cost of reporting to public agencies

- the high price of a “total-care institution”

What are Jesuit schools doing to hold down costs:

- innovative procedures
- collaborative and cooperative efforts
- ongoing search for waste

Topic Session 9 - Globalization and Justice Education
-Framing the Question-

By: Winston Tellis,
Fairfield University

Maximize profits:

Progression…
Reduce costs
Offshore production
Shareholders gain
The offshore workers?

What standards should be used to evaluate offshore production?

If Disney's subcontractors pay 30 cents/hour in Haiti, should we object?
If so, why? If not why not?
What working conditions should we consider minimally acceptable?
How should we react to child labor? What if it is legal in Pakistan?

What about the relationship between development, environment, and health?

Are these mutually antagonistic?
Will profits always decline if a business must protect the environment?
Is it cheaper to pollute abroad than to be protective of the environment?
Is it conscionable to knowingly harm the health of offshore workers because they need the job and will not object top hazardous work?

Should our students start thinking about international standards for outsourcing?

Would the UN be a place to develop such standards?
Would that create an "underground" system?
When a country has 60 – 80% unemployment, will they abide by standards?
Would they accept hazardous industries unacceptable in US and Europe?
Should schools of business lead the way?

What should our students know about the international debt crisis?

Have the World Bank and IMF have instituted policies that affect developing countries?
What is the effect of the indebtedness in those countries?
What policy should we present as an acceptable alternative?

Should technology be introduced in developing countries?

Is efficiency always in the interest of the host country?
Is the technology consistent with the culture of the host country?
What if the cost of production **must** be kept low through technology, or the

contract will move to another country?

What type of crops should be grown abroad?

Cotton replaced the local crops in Nicaragua to satisfy US demand. Problem?
Should local produce first feed domestic need?
What of the money export brings?
Should the workers be protected from harmful chemicals?
Who should pay for those protections?

By: Barron Boyd,
LeMoyne College

What is globalization?
Globalization as centralization + globalization as diffusion

What are the elements of the phenomenon?

Markets
Media
Communications
Multinational corporations
Global social movements
Global norms "regimes"
Transnational organizations

Is it a "new" phenomenon?

Why do some say that globalization threatens standards of global justice?
Are there any particular areas where this threat is likely to be felt? E.g. labor standards, human rights, the environment, democratic practices?

Is globalization always a threat, or can it provide positive areas for the development of global justice?
--Globalization from Above (WTO, profit based, elite driven, core states)
--Globalization from Below[*] (populist, empowering, norm-based, INGOs)

Given the complexity and power of globalization….

Do we at Jesuit institutions have any particular obligations to address globalization issues? Do they bring any particular strengths/weakness to this task?

Do we have any particular obligations to ***teach*** about the impact of globalization? If so, what should that pedagogy look like?

Do we have any particular obligations to ***act*** on globalization issues? If so, what should those actions look like?

What should we do to provide students, faculty, and administrators with the tools to understand and make ethical/just decisions in this globalized world? (Some suggestions drawn from the real experience at Le Moyne College and wishful thinking)

- Faculty Development
  - Support for course development with global twist
  - Support for global-oriented research projects
  - Support for faculty (re)education projects
    - (Values program Summer Institutes which stress global dimensions to topics)

Programs

  - Speakers
  - Movies-film festivals
  - Campus Minstery activities stressing global connections
    - (educate on the anti-sweat shop movement, anti- School of the Americas activity, alternative breaks to Mexico and [perhaps] South Africa to do global service)

- Curriculum
  - New Courses in global issues/ethics/perspectives
    - (International Human Rights course that uses South Africa and global Women's Movement as cases for analysis)
  - New Global-oriented Majors
    - (a major in Global Business which would provide students with the tools to function in the modern global marketplace, but which would also provide the philosophical/ political/ ethical analytic skills to spot justice issues and to help "subvert" the system---but don't tell anybody, please)
- Co-curricular activities
  - Support Campus clubs that support diversity and global issues
    - (International Students Association, Ethnic Organizations-El Progresso, Asian Persuasian, etc.)
  - Support Clubs that give students global "experience"
    - (Model United Nations groups)
  - Foster residential situations which give primacy of global justice concerns (International House)

By: Madeline Wake, PhD, RN
Marquette University

Globalization presents many challenges for the academy as we prepare professionals to lead beyond national boundaries. There are challenges in separating cultural biases and familiar standards from fundamental human rights considerations. A mark of Jesuit education should be preparation to create ethics-based models of working in a world community. However, to me, the ultimate question about globalization and justice extends beyond the domain of world markets. The question is: *How do Jesuit Universities promote equitable distribution of higher education and its products-graduates, innovations and new knowledge?*

In Fall 1998, UNESCO convened the first World Conference on Higher Education. The conference issued the World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action. According to the Preamble of the Declaration:

> "The second half of this century will go down in the history of higher education as the period of its most spectacular expansion: an over sixfold increase in student enrollments worldwide, from 13 million in 1960 to 82 million in 1995. But it is also the period which has seen the gap between industrially developed, the developing countries and in particular the least developed countries with regard to access and resources for higher learning and research, already enormous, becoming even wider. It has also been a period of increased socio-economic stratification and greater difference in educational opportunity within countries, including in some of the most developed and wealthiest nations. Without adequate higher education and research institutions providing a critical mass of skilled and educated people, no country can ensure genuine endogenous and sustainable development and, in particular, developing countries and the least developed countries cannot reduce the gap separating them from the industrially developed ones. Sharing knowledge, international cooperation and new technologies can offer new opportunities to reduce this gap.

Partnerships between developed and developing countries can distribute the benefits of higher education for social-cultural and economic development. Marquette University College of Nursing is involved in two such partnerships at present in East Africa and in Georgia.

The HIV-AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa is a crisis which calls for extraordinary action. Nurses are the front-line health professionals in AIDS care. A Marquette nurse practitioner faculty member is setting up a program to address related needs. A nurse-midwife from Kenya completed a one year certificate program in AIDS Care and Counseling at Marquette and returned to Mombasa to open a clinic. Now Marquette Nursing is partnering with her and the East African Jesuit Province to expand a program on advanced nursing for AIDS care.

Marquette Nursing is also working with nurses and physicians in the country of Georgia to improve health care delivery and health status in that country. Over a three year period, the partners are identifying the most significant health problems and developing community-based interventions.

What are other Jesuit institutions doing about globalization and justice education?

Some issues of global social justice and higher education are:

X How do we prepare all of ours students for global awareness and readiness for emerging justice questions?

X How do we promote “brain gain” and prevent “brain drain” when educating students from developing countries?

X How do we incorporate fundamental human rights considerations in the pedagogical and business decisions of international education?

X How can we build partnerships within the global system of Jesuit Universities to more equitably distribute higher education?

Topic Session 10 - Poverty and Justice Education
-Framing the Question-

By: Gerald L. Miller, Ph.D.
Rockhurst University

As Jesus hears the cries of the poor, so must Jesuit institutions.

I. FRAME THE QUESTION

How can Jesuit educators really get an honest understanding of poverty and social justice across to our students and academic institutions today?

Students, even those educated in Jesuit high schools, often take the position that they themselves have not directly caused poverty and it is, therefore, not their problem to solve. Reflecting the larger Church itself, Jesuits themselves and Jesuit institutions acknowledge poverty as an important justice issue, but often struggle with realistic remedies. "The Catholic Church's attitude toward money and property accumulation ha[s] never been settled; its responses range from vows of perpetual poverty to soaring cathedral spires" [*The Memory Palace of Matteo Ricci*, 166].

Moreover, how can Jesuit institutions deal with the pedagogical issues that surround poverty and justice education? How can the ideal of "men and women for others" really be inculcated in our students and actually thrive in our academic institutions?

Clearly, answers to these questions are complex and difficult. At times dealing with these issues seems so overwhelming that even the most dedicated academic proponents of Catholic social teaching and social justice pin their hopes on what Jesuit colleges and universities already do well – information dissemination and service projects. Please do not misunderstand, information and service are extremely valuable to educating men and women for others. The point is not to denigrate the crucial importance of what is being done; it must be kept. The point is to question: is this enough?

II. POVERTY

If we continue to think of poverty as basically a lack of money, then, paradoxically, the problem seems both relatively simple and yet impossible to solve. If poverty is simply a lack of money, then solve the problem by getting more money to the poor. This solution, however, is probably the most-resisted approach that can be offered. If we persist in conceiving of poverty as a lack of money, then given the real world that we actually live in, what Jesus noted will indeed be always be true: "the poor you will always have with you …" [Mt 26:11].

At Jesuit institutions we must instill in our students that poverty is a lifestyle many are forced – by circumstances of their birth [including race and geography], their education, their health, their age, their mental or physical disabilities, and more – to live, a lifestyle that daily grinds them into desperation and away from the hopes that God has for their lives.

Dorothy Day wrote of how she was trying to absorb this into her life in moving from a ***spirit*** of poverty to really knowing the ***precarity*** of poverty. This precarity – the constant realization by the poor that even the so-called life they have teeters precariously and, ***at any time***, could fall apart into disaster – was communicated to her by a priest: "nowadays religious communities are good, I am sure, but they are mistaken about poverty. They accept, admit, poverty on principle, but everything must be good and strong, buildings must be fireproof. Precarity is everywhere rejected, and precarity is an essential element of poverty" [*Poverty and Precarity*, May 1952].

Understanding poverty is to not only identify with a lifestyle of privation and distress, it is also to internalize what the poor always know – they could be homeless and hungry within a day or two, that even the little shabby life they have put together could all fall apart in no time at all – the precarity of poverty.

III. JUSTICE EDUCATION

Justice is multidimensional, with legal, social, economic and moral aspects. Justice is local and global. Justice is micro and macro. To instruct regarding justice, Jesuit educators must see the big picture and still be able to concentrate with fairness on individuals. We cannot hide behind what is merely legal. We cannot absolve ourselves through what are acceptable societal mores. We cannot shelter our students and institutions from a global awareness of injustice even though it seems beyond any human solution.

So what are we Jesuit educators to do to educate for justice? In concert with information and service, we must devise ways to help our students and institutions develop a genuine appreciation and acceptance of a spiritual theme we don't hear much about these days – the Mystical Body of Christ. ***We must move our students to embrace the belief that we are all, each and every one of us, parts of this larger whole***. And, as with our own bodies, when one part suffers, the whole body suffers.

Furthermore, to remedy this suffering is not charity, but justice. To hold to the belief that we are all created by God and by virtue of this creation are members of the Mystical Body of Christ, with the right to live with human dignity, is the root to eliminating poverty. And to afford this life with human dignity to each other is simple justice. ***Our students will help us find the ways to truly be men and women for others if only we help provide the proper formation***. And it looks like a job for all of us, not just the Jesuits, not just theologians and philosophers, but all Jesuit educators and academic institutions.

By: Marilyn Fernandez
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Anthropology and Sociology
Santa Clara University

Global and domestic poverty, even in the midst of unprecedented economic abundance and technological advances, constitutes one of today's most persistent ethical and spiritual challenges to ourselves and to Jesuit institutions. In many countries, particularly in the United States, living standards have improved dramatically over the last 25 years. Yet, in developing countries which have a population of more than five billion, 1.2 billion live on less than $1 a day. Two billion live on less than $2 a day. In the U.S., about 34.5 million or 12.7% of the population lives below the poverty line (calculated in 1998 at $8,316 for an individual and $16,660 for a family of four). American children are twice as likely as adults to be poor. This is just the face of economic poverty. Poverty is more than a lack of income. It also includes the real-life social manifestations of poverty: difficulty accessing jobs because of low skill levels and social and geographic isolation, limited access to education, poor health care, living in marginal conditions with no resources to fall back on, lack of affordable child care and after-school programs for children, unsafe living environments, and the inability to participate in the life of a community. Socially constructed differences in race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, and nationality impose additional costs on the poor, just as they benefit others.

This discussion assumes that the choices and opportunities necessary for human development – adequate standard of living, including food, housing, education, health, work, and social security – are basic human rights. And in so far as growing numbers of families and children in our societies do not have a decent standard of living and the opportunities essential to human development, particularly in the midst of plenty, we have an unjust society. Let us also assume that the commitment to justice is a valued part of Jesuit higher education. We are then faced with three sets of questions, at the minimum, about how we understand poverty and how it relates to our institutions. One, do we limit ourselves primarily to a theoretical study of poverty and/or do we take a more applied approach? Second, if we agree that the role of a university is to mainly advance our understanding of poverty, do we focus on individual/family responsibility for poverty and/or do we focus on systemic forces that limit access to the resources needed for a decent life? Third, if, on the other hand, we agree that the mission of Jesuit Higher Education goes beyond just understanding poverty but preparing youth to do justice work, then do we educate students to be activists directly involved in correcting the injustice of poverty or to be skilled poverty analysts who make recommendations for change?

Theoretical versus Applied Focus on poverty and justice

The argument can be made that Jesuit institutions of higher education are first and foremost educational institutions whose primary, if not sole responsibility, is to educate students about poverty and to leave the choice of whether and how to make a difference up to the student. For those who agree with this view, poverty and justice work will remain at the purely

theoretical level: understanding the causes of poverty, the persistent inequalities, and identifying the consequences of poverty, with the practical implications left to the practitioners. On the other hand, there are many who strongly feel that Jesuit institutions have a mission beyond just understanding poverty but doing something about poverty as well. Service-learning programs, immersion experiences, and other programs that expose students to poverty through learning outside of the classroom become an integral part of an applied perspective. Which of these two, the theoretical or applied should be a Jesuit institution's primary focus? Or in the interest of academic freedom and integrity, is it imperative to cultivate a university environment that is open to focusing on either theory or application, provided that both perspectives are valued and engage each other?

Theoretical Analyses: Individual vs. Systemic Focus

Explanations of poverty range from a focus on individual responsibility for the state of the poor to structural forces that create and perpetuate poverty, to those who examine the interplay between the systemic constraints and individual responsibility. Culture of poverty, cultural deprivation, cycle of poverty theories propose that it is a lack of work ethic, inability to defer gratification, or lack of information that lead individuals to cause, even if unwittingly, their own troubles. In this perspective, the source of and remedy for poverty is located within the poor. If society does get involved, the action is designed to change individuals and to get them out of poverty. In contrast, the systemic analysis leads one to focus on changing the societal constraints – lack of jobs with good wages and benefits, discriminatory practices in education, hiring, health care, housing – that limit access to opportunities to break the cycle of poverty. In general, the desire to help a person is more immediately gratifying than is systemic change work. But, rather than limiting ourselves to one or the other of these ways of understanding poverty, do we cultivate in our students and in ourselves a multi-causal perspective that allows the evidence surrounding the specific poverty-related issues to be the primary factor that guides our analyses?

Analyses vs. Activism

The third set of options, that between analyses and activism, assumes that as institutions we are committed to justice and poverty work. We can either choose to focus on learning how to make policy recommendations (drawn from our multi-causal understanding of poverty) that others can act on or we can ourselves become change agents. The latter will require exposing ourselves to more than direct service experience, which if left unguided, runs the danger of reinforcing pre-conceived notions of poverty. We will have to be involved in change organizations, such as environmental programs and other grass-roots initiatives, whose primary objective is to change the way society functions. Perhaps, an incremental introduction to both types of applied work will have the best outcomes in helping students understand both the causes and consequences of poverty. We might also ask whether it is enough only for students to be exposed to justice work. Should Jesuit universities take a stand in the larger community on poverty and justice issues?

Ultimately, our choices from among these alternatives have to be made in the context of

our mission as an institution of higher education where poverty and justice are central thematic foci. The specifics of how poverty and justice issues are articulated and implemented are perhaps best left to individual faculty, programs, and universities, provided they are consistently and systemically addressed.

This conclusion, however, leads to two further considerations. In examining each of the above questions, how would we know if we and our institutions are taking seriously either or both of the dual approaches, e.g., educating for activism and educating for analyses? And, if we agree that our universities have an obligation to pursue and to balance the dual approaches to each of the three questions, what general criteria would we use to articulate and to assess this complementarity?

In short, I believe that in embracing either of the dual educational approaches to the exclusion of the other in any of the above three questions shortchanges our students and us. The real challenge is to take poverty and justice seriously and to find ways to integrate and strengthen both approaches to all three questions. What do you think?

Topic Session 11 - Campus Reward Systems -Framing the Question-

By: Hersh Shefrin,
Santa Clara University

Universities are societal institutions, not closed systems. Therefore, we need to think about reward systems in relation to social context. In particular, universities compete with each other in economic markets. They compete in their efforts to attract students, and they compete for the resources they need to carry out their educational missions. This means that rewards relate to both inputs and outputs. A well-designed university reward system will be tied to the university's mission. And well-designed reward system will serve to guide faculty and staff to fulfill that mission.

University mission must also be determined as part of an open system, not a closed system. Like faculty and staff, students (along with their parents) also make choices about which university to attend. That choice primarily reflects how well they perceive that a university will prepare students for future careers, and how well it will prepare them for how to live. There are many dimensions associated with the way a university is perceived, relative to these criteria. These dimensions include the quality of the intellectual environment, the social nature of the college experience, the caliber of campus amenities, and the strength of the campus culture. Faith and justice are important parts of campus culture.

Faculty and staff rewards come in many forms. Some are pecuniary such as base salary, benefits, grants, and summer stipends. Other rewards are nonpecuniary. Examples are awards that recognize achievement, the regard of one's colleagues, tenure, promotion, responsibility, office amenities, and for faculty teaching load, teaching schedule, physical resources, and travel budgets.

What are the factors that determine how faculty and staff are rewarded? Some are external. Faculty and staff have outside alternatives. Rewards must be sufficiently attractive to induce them to join an institution rather than go elsewhere. Others are internal and relate to performance, which leads to the issue of how performance is measured.

A university that has well articulated goals, and has developed clear indicators to measure progress in reaching those goals, will be in a position to craft an effective reward system. Because students have a primary need to be prepared for future careers, rewards should be tied to how well faculty and staff meet that primary need. There are a variety of inputs that can be used in this connection: teaching evaluations, quality of instructional materials, curriculum innovations, etc. Similarly, faculty have a responsibility to be active scholars as well as teachers, and can be rewarded based on the quantity and quality of their scholarship. Rewards will also reflect contributions to service.

Justice related issues cut across the three main dimensions along which performance is evaluated. Universities for whom justice is a core value will seek ways to integrate justice related issues into the fabric of the university. There will be some courses and programs dedicated primarily to justice related issues. There will be courses and programs whose primary focus are not justice-related issues, per se, but have components that relate to justice. Similar comments apply to scholarship, and to service.

Because universities serve multiple constituencies, and offer a range of services, reward systems need to be carefully balanced. Rewards for justice related activities might need to be balanced against other traditional educational activities. There are some disciplines where justice related issues play a prominent role in established scholarship, but other disciplines where this is not the case. Such differences may lead to different balance points, in respect to rewards.

Discussion Questions:

Faculty and staff may differ in respect to their views about what the concept of justice means? How should this be reflected in the reward system?

> **Faculty and staff may differ in the importance they attach to justice, both within schools and across schools. How should a university deal with such differences when it comes to rewards?**
>
> **How should a university assess the impact of justice related activities on students?**

On what basis should faculty and staff be rewarded for undertaking justice-related activities? On effort, quantifiable results, anecdotal evidence or some combination? And if a combination, how are the relative weights to be determined?

To what extent do rewards encourage or discourage the promotion of justice in assisting students' personal formations, in classroom instruction, in the development of courses or programs, in choice of research projects, in efforts to develop university/community relations?

To what extent are rewards and recruitment related?

Do reward systems and faculty and staff development systems need to be designed in tandem?

When a university's mission is to help shape students views about how to live, as well as what career to select, should the activities of alumni play any part in campus rewards?

By: Tom Plante,
Santa Clara University

"What are the rewards (and sanctions) that motivate allocation of faculty and staff time? To what extent do these rewards encourage or discourage the promotion of justice in assisting students' personal formations, in classroom instruction, in the development of courses or programs, in choice of research projects, in efforts to develop university/community relations? How do thee systems of rewards and sanctions need to be altered?" - National Justice Conference Brochure

Any student who has completed a course in general psychology knows that if you want to increase a particular target behavior you generally must provide reinforcements to encourage the behavior. These reinforcements might be internal or external but they must exist. If you want to stop a particular target behavior then you generally must either not provide reinforcement or you provide a punishment when it occurs.

If Jesuits colleges and universities would like to encourage both faculty and staff to be sensitive to justice issues and engage in justice based teaching, research, and service, they must consider how these activities might be supported, nurtured, funded, and rewarded. They must go well beyond providing lip service to these issues. For example, fundamental changes in the way rank and tenure, evaluation, and faculty/staff search committees consider candidates must take place to truly enhance justice issues a Jesuit colleges and universities.

Can Jesuit educational institutions alter their reward systems to provide reinforcement for justice related teaching, research, and service? Can a culture be developed from the President's Office and Board of Trustees down through the Provost, Dean, and Department levels that nurture and reinforce justice related issues and projects?

Specific questions for reflection and discussion follow:

1. Should rank and tenure committees be instructed to review quality justice related research, teaching, and service in a more favorable manner consistent with the university mission?

2. Should job applicants for both faculty and staff positions be interviewed regarding justice related issues and interests?

3. Should faculty and staff evaluations and merit pay be tied to justice related work?

4. Should the Sponsored Projects office assist faculty and staff with securing justice related internal and external grants?

5. Should Jesuit institutions put aside monies specifically designed for justice related research, teaching, and service?

6. Should faculty be encouraged and rewarded for integrating justice related issues and topics into their curriculum?

7. Should Jesuit institutions develop teaching, research, and service awards to recognize and highlight justice related work?

8. Should Jesuit institutions provide justice related workshops to encourage research, teaching, and service in justice issues?

If some or all of the questions above were answered with a "yes," then how can these proposals and changes be instituted in Jesuit institutions? Are model programs available at this time that could be shared with others? How might the highest levels of university administration begin this process? Where will the money and resources come from? Will there be backlash from faculty and staff?

Prepared by Thomas Plante, Santa Clara University (tplante@scu.edu)

Topic Session 12 - Spirituality for Justice
-Framing the Question-

By: Mark Ravizza, S.J.,
Santa Clara University

Some Challenges and Issues

This Topic Session explores the question, "How do we help faculty, staff, and students develop a strong spirituality that supports justice, whatever their religious background?" Such a broad question invites a range of responses. Rather than focusing on one particular response to the exclusion of others, in these remarks I want simply to stimulate our discussion by framing some issues that are emblematic of the challenges that *any* adequate response must consider. Obviously such a list is not exhaustive, but my hope is that it will serve to suggest the complexity of the question at hand.

The Privatization of Spirituality and a Turn to the Beyond

The thought that spirituality ought to lead to just action is hardly a new idea. "Already some eight hundred years before Christ, virtually all the Jewish prophets began to affirm, over and over again, one singular truth . . . the quality of our faith depends upon the character of justice in the land and the character of justice is to be measured by how we treat three groups—widows, orphans, and foreigners (those with the least status in society)."[8] This same sensibility continues to be defended by contemporary authors; for example, Jon Sobrino writes: "spirituality as kinship with God means imitating in history the holiness of God as God has been revealed in self-revelation—not as distant from the secular and profane world, but as absolute salvific nearness. . . This is the prime element of affinity with God as proposed to us in scripture: to know God is to practice right and justice toward the poor and helpless."[9] Given this long history of associating spirituality and justice, the question of our Topic Session might itself seem puzzling. Why do *we* feel the need to ask how spirituality can support justice, when this connection already is so clearly emphasized in the traditions of every major religion?

Part of an answer to this question might be found in the modern tendency to privatize our religious lives, to move away from institutional religions, and to see spirituality primarily in terms of inner experiences with an otherworldly focus. As one popular "spiritual" author explains, "most of what is written these days suggests that spiritual practice is a matter of cultivating a private garden of inner experiences—mystical experiences, out-of-body experiences, near death experiences, peak experiences, former lifetime experiences, enlightenment experiences, prosperity, self-esteem, ego-strength—or of improving our relationships with our intimates. Most psychotherapists and self-proclaimed spiritual gurus

[8] Ronald Rolheiser, *The Holy Longing: The Search for a Christian Spirituality* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), p. 175.
[9] Jon Sobrino, *Spirituality of Liberation* (New York: Orbis, 1985), p. 40.

advocate a retreat into privatism to cultivate our own garden."[10] A similar tendency is found among our students. Speaking of his peer group, one member of Generation X writes, "One of the most common spiritual questions I have heard from Xers is 'where and how can I get away and not see anyone?'"[11]

This understanding of spirituality as a movement inward and away raises an obvious challenge. How can we at once respect this desire for solitude and inner transcendence, and yet still encourage people to appreciate the connection between spiritual practices and ethical action? How do we respond to the hunger people have for "spiritual experiences" like retreats and good liturgy, while at the same time leading them to find God in the struggle for justice? Are there ways in which existing retreat programs, liturgy planning committees, prayer groups, etc. could be expanded to bring in such concerns with justice? Or is it better to seek to incorporate more explicit opportunities for prayer and spiritual reflection into service programs, immersion experiences, and community-based learning opportunities? The Ignatian tradition with its emphasis on "contemplation in action" and "finding God in all things" offers one type of engaged spirituality that could be useful here. But how do we share this spirituality in contexts where members of the university either lack a common faith or see their faith as a purely private affair? Moreover, how do we reach out to people of all religious backgrounds and build a community that welcomes the riches of all spiritual traditions?

Whose Justice? Which Spirituality?

These last questions raise the challenging issue of how to foster a spirit-filled community amid the increasing diversity found at Jesuit colleges and universities. Many faculty, staff, and students might not be opposed to the general idea of developing a spirituality that supports justice. But which spiritual practices should be followed? And how should justice be promoted? How can we at once preserve the tradition of Ignatian spirituality on which Jesuit universities were founded, and at the same time create an atmosphere in which people of all faiths can find a home? What concrete ways can we find to bring together people with diverse spiritualities who are perhaps working for justice in dramatically different settings? One model might be to gather such people in reflection groups in order to share not only their practical experiences, but also how their work for justice nourishes and is nourished by their own spiritual practices. What else could be done?

A related issue concerns who should take the lead in developing such programs. Does the responsibility for fostering a spirituality for justice fall to Campus Ministry? Service Learning Programs? Centers that promote Jesuit education? Human Resources? The Jesuit Community? Student Affairs and Residence Life? How might these different organizations collaborate to provide the university with more integrated opportunities to develop an engaged, justice-oriented spirituality?

Clarifying the Connection

---

[10] Sam Keen, *Hymns to an Unknown God: Awakening to the Spirit in Everyday Life* (New York: Bantam, 1994), p. 222.

[11] Tom Beaudoin, *Virtual Faith* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), p. 165.

A final issue asks about the relationship between spirituality and justice. In the broadest sense, spirituality is concerned with how one relates to the sacred. For Christians this involves orienting one's life to a God who loves us first and calls us to respond to this gift by loving God and our neighbor in return. On this view spirituality is not restricted to devotional pieties and practices that are explicitly directed toward God. Rather it encompasses a whole way of life in community, for an incarnational spirituality is predicated upon the notion of "finding God in all things." Such an approach has the virtue of making it clear from the outset that spirituality and the struggle for justice flow from a common font. But given this understanding how, if at all, can we distinguish these two? Should we collapse this distinction, and see our work for justice as itself a spiritual practice? Or should these two be seen as "partners" each of which deals with a distinct part of life? For example, one might say spirituality centers on a foundational relation with God, and our work for justice constitutes a response to this relation through outward action in the world? How might these different understandings affect our own experience of working for justice? How might they influence the type of balance we seek between traditional spiritual practices (such as prayer and meditating on scripture) and our efforts to promote justice?

Prepared by Mark Ravizza, S.J., Santa Clara University (mravizza@scu.edu)

By: Margaret R. Pfeil,
St. Joseph's University

The description of this session in our conference materials already suggests a direction we may fruitfully pursue in considering the shape of spirituality for justice. How do we help faculty, staff, and students develop a strong spirituality that supports justice, whatever their religious background? Implied here is the existence of a variety of approaches to questions of spirituality in relation to issues of justice. How might Jesuit institutions of higher education, while firmly rooted in Ignatian spirituality, encourage spiritual growth that honors and nurtures this plurality? We may describe spirituality broadly as a set of practices by which a person seeks to respond to and fully engage his or her experience of God. Taken together, these practices constitute a spiritual discipline. What sorts of experiences and practices do our faculty, staff, and students bring to the table as we consider the way in which spirituality might ground our work for justice?

Mystagogical Reflection Groups

In answering this question, a mystagogical approach might be in order. In the early church, mystagogy served as a way for those recently initiated into the Christian community to explore the meaning of the sacramental rituals in which they had just participated. While this practice subsequently fell into disuse, the current RCIA process has retrieved mystagogy as a method of catechesis. Neophytes are invited to reflect upon their initiation experience and share it with other members of the ecclesial community.

As Kathleen Hughes has suggested, mystagogical method offers several advantages: It is experiential, dialogical, communal, and ongoing.[12] While she has applied mystagogy to the sacramental life of the Catholic Church, it is possible to adapt this method to the task of fostering a pluralistic climate of spirituality for justice.

One model might entail forming small groups among faculty, staff, and students who express interest in cultivating a spirituality for justice. Some ongoing involvement in social service and/or social action would be a prerequisite to participation in such a group.

Members would be invited first to articulate their own approach to spirituality and to relate this to issues of justice that they encounter. How does one's own spirituality inform the way in which he or she perceives a particular issue of justice? What spiritual practices nourish the person's ongoing commitment to justice in this case? What challenges, questions, insights, and fruits of prayer have surfaced? How would the person describe his or her experience of God's presence in this process? These are just a few of the lines along which the discussion might proceed. Ideally, group members would take turns facilitating, and they would be able to shape the conversation toward the needs and interests of the members.

Dialogical and Communal

This approach would nicely complement Ignatian spiritual practices, especially the process of individual discernment. In addition, though, it would open the way for practitioners of other spiritual traditions to share their wisdom. In the course of their conversations, participants would be able to offer one another companionship and solidarity on the journey and to learn from one another about a variety of spiritual practices that can nurture a commitment to justice.

Experiential and Ongoing

The group's discussions would flow from and return to nourish the spiritual practices of each member in his or her work for justice. Applied in this way, the mystagogical method is radically experiential ñ it is both rooted in and directed toward the spiritual journey of each person.

In this sense, the process also reflects the inherently experiential nature of spiritual practices. They can inform, inspire, and ground one's commitment to justice; in turn, actions on behalf of justice attentively pursued may serve to deepen one's spiritual life, propelling the person farther along the path, deeper into love of God and neighbor.

Ultimately, a spirituality for justice will enliven this ongoing process of personal and social transformation. Mystagogical reflection groups, while not requiring an ongoing commitment of the same magnitude (i.e., lifelong), would at least provide a stable source of spiritual companionship and growth over the course of one or more academic years.

---

[12] See Kathleen Hughes, RSCJ, *Saying Amen. A Mystagogy of Sacrament* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1999), 13-16.

Topic Session 13 - Institutional Issues: Internal
-Framing the Question-

By: Timothy R. Austin
Loyola University Chicago

1. Experience suggests that an institution's programs, policies, and procedures establish the public's perception of its commitment to social justice far more vividly than any platitudinous generalizations in its mission statement. Let me give a couple of examples.

Last year, Northwestern University journalism professor David Protess received credit (together with his students) for bringing about the moratorium on executions in Illinois that became, for a while, a focal point in the presidential campaign.

My wife, a special education teacher, tells me that the University of Wisconsin/Whitewater has a high reputation among her professional colleagues for going beyond the letter of the Americans with Disabilities Act and providing a wide range of creative and nuanced services to the differently abled students she teaches.

According to its Web page, Hampshire College in Massachusetts designates up to twenty scholarships every year for international students—scholarships that may cover as much as full tuition (over $25,000 in 1999/2000).

Such programs catch our attention. When I hear about them, I find myself asking "Why isn't a Jesuit school leading the way in that area? How come it's left to a Big Ten school, a regional land-grant campus, or a somewhat radical liberal-arts school to make the headlines here?" Even as I ask myself this, of course, I recognize that there are probably a dozen equally laudable schemes underway on AJCU campuses that I happen not to have heard about. But my point is that a theoretical commitment to social justice means little if it is not embedded and embodied in the programs, policies and procedures that affect the everyday lives of the faculty, students and staff at a college or university.

2. Yet it is precisely when we try to implement changes in this spirit that we encounter resistance at our institutions. I am sure that each of the programs that I described above was greeted with initial skepticism (or worse) when it first saw the light of day:

"If our professors and our students adopt high-profile positions on a controversial issue like capital punishment, we may lose the political backing of Senator Rightwing. We don't want parents thinking that our institution is going to turn their sons and daughters into radical activists. And, oh yes!—you can kiss that $1m pledge from Mrs. Tuffbody goodbye."

"Providing all these accommodations for students with learning disabilities as well as those with physical handicaps will take a huge amount of money and effort. And how can we alter the

course ground rules for a student who requests an 'accommodation'? If I allow one member of my class extra time for a test, aren't I being unfair to all the others? I could be sued!"

"Generous scholarships to international students are all very well, but they represent nothing but net losses to our bottom line—and this at a time when we are in a losing the battle to keep higher education (especially an education at this college) affordable."

3. We are dealing here, in short, with two stubborn facts about the world as we know it. On the one hand, universities and colleges are corporate entities. In constant high-stakes competition with other institutions for students, faculty, gifts, grants, and kudos, they must respond adroitly to subtle and often swift changes in the field of higher education. Demographic, cultural, and technological developments all exert significant stresses. On the other hand, all colleges and universities also carry large payrolls; offer services to the public in return for money (much of which is provided in one way or another by state or federal government); and sponsor research that may involve human subjects, hazardous materials, or animals. Each of these activities quite appropriately entails substantial government regulation. And both the urge to act aggressively as a corporate entity in the "business" of higher education and the need to comply with policies and procedures prescribed by government agencies affect Jesuit colleges and universities every bit as much as they do any other institution.

4. But should not Jesuit faculties and administrations respond to such pressures in ways that differ qualitatively from the responses typical at other universities and colleges? More specifically, should not Jesuit institutions sometimes find themselves acting in the interests of interpersonal and social justice rather than in reaction to corporate or legislative forces—even if at considerable apparent "cost"? Such a proposition may sound radical, but I believe that those who work in Jesuit colleges and universities face such choices more frequently than we typically acknowledge. I hope that, when such occasions arise, we are at least open to adopting "the road less traveled," though I suspect that in many cases we too quickly fall back on more socially conventional values. At the very least, therefore, we should be constantly reviewing the principles that are at stake in this confrontation with an eye to potential future applications to our own situations.

5. When politicians weaken in the face of a difficult situation in which it seems easier not to act than it is to act, we chastise them for displaying a "a lamentable lack of political will." I suggest that there are many routine circumstances in academic life where it is easy to marshal excellent arguments for not taking a course consonant with the Jesuit commitment to justice. Not that we don't look around for a way to have our cake and eat it too, of course. If we could only find some government grant to fund those expanded services to students with disabilities for us, we'd be delighted to put them in place. But the issue is really what we do when circumstances do not offer such a convenient escape. To put it bluntly: if considerations of social justice suggest a course of action that, in any other institution of higher education would be judged foolish or even irresponsible, are we willing to take that road regardless? It is, I believe, a matter of collective will as well as one of faith—and a very tough call.

At the conference in October, I will offer a few fictional, but I think credible, "case studies" in which a Jesuit university or college might need to decide whether or not openly to embrace justice as a principle capable of overriding either competitive self-interest or unreflective complicity with government policies. These case studies focus more narrowly on questions of institutions' self-governance ("internal" questions) than do the examples I used at the beginning of this brief introduction. But the principles involved will be similar. I look forward to our discussion, and would welcome additional suggestions of "case study" situations that we might use to explore our topic.

By:

Howard E. Eisenberg
Dean and Professor of Law
Marquette University

Ronald L. Danielson
Associate Professor of Computer Engineering
and
Chief Information Officer
Santa Clara University

Justice is a fundamental theme in Jesuit Higher Education. The model programs described at this conference show that much of the resources and energy of Jesuit colleges and universities is focused on developing organizations that will promote the ideals of social justice. Individual faculty, from a broad spectrum of disciplines, share this concern and weave justice issues and experience with the disadvantaged into their classes. Our institutions speak proudly of graduates with a concern for the marginalized in society and an inclination to act to address issues of justice.

However, this strong message to the external community is muted if there are areas of injustice within our institutions. Do we find it easier to clearly identify unjust actions through the polarizing filter of distance, whether to another continent or to the barrio across town? Do the rush of day-to-day activities, awareness of the nuances of a particular situation, and financial expediency cloud our view of unjust situations on our campuses?

We are charged today with identifying areas within our institutions where inequities may be hidden, to begin resolving issues of unjust treatment to or among members of our community. The areas below identify a few points to begin that discussion.

Commitment to Paying a Living and Fair Wage

Our communities function best when all members feel valued and have the opportunity to succeed through their own efforts. Each of our institutions must pay a living wage not merely a minimum wage to all of our employees. University compensation should include a range of

benefits, including health insurance and retirement funds. No full time employee of a Jesuit college or university should be required to live in near poverty or at a mere subsistence level. Each institution must periodically review its salary schedule to assure itself that the lowest paid employees of the institution are paid sufficiently to meet reasonable living expenses. We must be particularly mindful that often the lowest paid institution employees are women and members of minority groups who have been historically been undervalued and marginalized in the society as a whole.

We must also take steps to assure that part-time faculty are being fairly paid and not exploited. The use of part time faculty should be monitored at a college and university level to assure that such faculty are not being used merely to save money and that the use of such faculty is consistent with the missions of our institutions and our commitment to justice.

Open Our Community Commitment to Diversity

Our Community Commitment to Diversity

The best way to begin to overcome injustice is to know members of all areas of society as human beings. Many Jesuit colleges and universities were established to provide educational opportunities to immigrants and the children of immigrants who were denied admission to existing institutions. While Jesuit institutions of higher learning were primarily intended to serve ethnic Catholic minorities, Jesuit colleges and institutions also freely admitted Persons of Color, Jewish students, and other non-Catholic minorities long before such policies were considered politically fashionable or mandated by statute. Today we must strongly reiterate our commitment to diversity as part of our mission and commitment to justice. Our campuses must reflect the ethic and racial diversity of the Catholic Church, the communities we serve, and the communities in which we are located. This includes both our student body, our faculty, university administrators, and staff. We must assure that women are hired and promoted to positions of responsibility both within and outside the faculty. We must recognize that a commitment to diversity is part of our Mission and part of our commitment to justice. We must be prepared to articulate this aspect of our mission and defend and explain our policies to our stakeholders, members of the public, and members of accrediting groups.

Transparent Decision Making

The decision making processes within our institutions should be made clear to our stakeholders, including our alumni, students, faculty, and staff members. All stakeholders should have the opportunity for meaningful input before decisions of broad impact are made or before decisions are made that impact one unit or segment of the university community. In appropriate circumstances, input should be sought from people outside the university communities, including people in the community who live near an institution and elected and appointed public officials. The ultimate actual decision maker should be clearly identified, and decisions on key matters of university policy should be articulated, clearly explained, and disseminated. Once made, policy decisions made by our institutions should be respected, but responsible dissent from those decisions should also be respected and not the basis for reprisals.

Information Sharing

Awareness of the state of the institution and of plans for change empowers all members of the community to make decisions about their own welfare. The opportunity to voice opinions about plans, policies, and institutional directions gives people a sense of participation in decisions and increased feelings of self-worth. Our institutions should share with its stakeholders and the public important information regarding university policy and planning, including comprehensive information about the finances of our institutions. Each institution must develop practical ways for all members of the community to have their voices heard in debating issues on campus, and to participate in campus governance, without fear of reprisal. While the institution must assure that personal information about individual employees remains confidential, the policy of confidentiality should not be overly broad so that members of the university community do not know of key facts influencing the operation of the institution.

Ensure respect for all persons as human beings

On any university campus educational, economic, and occupational differences stratify the community. In an institution of higher learning there is the particular problem of stratification between tenure track faculty and everyone else. This is reflected in levels of compensation, hours of work, and conditions of employment. Often administrators and faculty do a poor job of explaining why such difference exist, and faculty members are insensitive to the legitimate concerns of non-faculty employees. This can sometimes be reflected in arrogant and disrespectful behavior by faculty which undermines the basic Mission of the institution. Justice requires that interactions between members of these strata be conducted with respect for one another.

Topic Session 14 - Institutional Issues: External -Framing the Question-

By: Larry A. Braskamp,
Universities and Responsive and Responsible Organizations
Loyola University Chicago

By purpose, function, and design, universities are both responsible and responsive. The genesis of my thinking about these two terms is from the 1940 statement of the AAUP. The AAUP statement begins with these words: Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest either of the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. (AAUP, 1995, p.3). Being responsive means acknowledging the needs and priorities of the greater society. However, in being responsible in its service to society, higher education must adhere to its calling--the free search for truth and its free exposition (AAUP, 1995, p.3). That is, we must be responsible as an academic institution in our greater society. In meeting the goals of the common good, higher education must be a critic of society which society will not always like or appreciate. My central theme is that universities need to be both responsive and responsible, and the achievement of meeting these dual and sometimes conflicting goals is the core of our challenge. As we become more active partners in the greater society, we will need to change how we fulfill our core purposes, standards and be true to our values.

Thus a tension will and should exist. Harland Bloland, a professor of higher education, provides this insight into this dilemma--too much responsiveness may be irresponsible. He offers this paraphrase of the sociologist, Everett Hughes, about the accountability of medical doctors, “A doctor who is too responsive to his patients is called a quack”. At a minimum, higher education can only hold such a status and honor by those being served if the academy acts responsibly. But it must always be willing to negotiate its power and role in society. Ironically, its impact and influence are most evident when it touches society, i.e.; it is relevant to the larger community it serves. As we recommit the university to the public good, we need to “recognize this paradox: the more relevant to the public good faculty work becomes, the more important academic freedom becomes." (Braskamp and Wergin, 1998, p. 86).

Being responsive and responsible means that we accept the apparent incompatibility between scholarship and social relevance, independence from and collaboration with the greater community, a critic of but also an accountable ally of society to help solve its ills, and the dual goals of private gain of the academy and service to a larger community. The solution is not to eliminate this tension, but to build on the creative and energizing tension between responsibility and responsiveness. The academic community thus should make this tension more salient through dialogue, debate, negotiation, and communication among the relevant communities of interest. It must diligently engage the faculty themselves in the debate and share with the other publics its values and the bases of its priorities. The academy can not expect to have the support of the greater community if it does not share its values and the results of its deliberations. Practically, higher education must adhere to the principle that it is first and foremost an

educational institution. It sponsors learning communities and teaching centers. It is thus not a social service agency, a social activist organization, a community health center, nor an arm of the government.   It needs to be a meeting place for all people to make their positions known and a voice of reason and reflection. Its engagement in the larger society is to be a leveraged one for the greater good of our society.

The public expects both public and private universities to be engaged. The land grant universities have been the leaders partly in their role to advance the economic well being of our country. The engagement of Jesuit universities in society is different; it is based on a foundation that is ethical and faith-based and on our collective belief about our purpose in life. Our engagement reflects our beliefs about who we are as humans in this world, our understanding of the truth, and our calling to serve others.

We need to become more actively engaged in helping society define the "common good". As an academic institution, we can be one voice among many in debating and deciding what is a just and caring society. This is an especially challenging endeavor, because the "common good" is no longer easy to define given the diversity of our society. (Conversations, David Hollenback S.J., author of "Is Tolerance Enough? The Catholic University and the Common Good", 1998). Roberto Goizueta, argues that only when the marginalized actively and fully participate in the community, will we have a "pluralistic community that reflects the *common good* " (p. 23). Who should thus be responsible for the dialogue and whose views count?

Faculty are expected to work differently to meet the expectations of the general public. Faculty who become engaged in partnerships with the extended community do face new challenges. Often they find this type of work difficult and uncomfortable. From my experience, I have concluded that faculty often lack experiential knowledge of the issues being addressed. For example, faculty have not had the type of experiences that many of the partners had had or have to face on a daily basis, such as poor living and working conditions, discrimination, and living according to different cultural values. Moreover faculty are not accustomed to the messiness of direct engagement in societal problems. Partnerships are not as easily controlled and controllable as the traditional research and instructional settings that many faculty have been accustomed to. In our language, this type of work is called "Low church" in contrast to "High Church" work.

Other issues emerge. What is the proper balance between the role of faculty as scholars and as advocates? With a responsive university perspective, connections among the disciplines and fields of study also are necessary. Societal problems and solutions do not fit into the traditional disciplinary mode. Scholarship also is just not only discovery of new knowledge, but also integration, engagement in the greater society, and teaching (Boyer, 1991). In doing so, we have the opportunity to embrace multiple forms of scholarly inquiry and creativity, and various modes of communication. A different posture on developing the research agenda of the faculty is also required (Braskamp and Wergin, 1997). Universities must look outward as well as inward for their research agenda. Faculty will advance the fulfillment of the social contract with society if they are more willing to publicly negotiate with external stakeholders what problems are worth

studying. At a minimum, they need to become involved in the communities enough to understand the perspective and cultural backgrounds of those they wish to help. Thus expectations, financial support, rewards, and self-identity individually and collectively of the faculty become even more challenging and critical.

By: Dan Hartnett, S.J.
Loyola University Chicago

Over the course of time, justice has been variously defined either in accordance with merit, on the basis of urgent need, or on the grounds of fundamental equality. But whatever definition is employed, justice involves fidelity to the claims of our relationships. The challenge of justice is always to determine exactly what are the most binding relationships in our personal and institutional lives and then to discern the requirements of each.

As a university community, our primary relationships take place “on campus”: in the classrooms, libraries, residence halls and offices of our universities. Not surprisingly, it is in these places and spaces where the requirements of justice are initially met: in our day-to-day dealings with faculty, students, administrators and staff. Justice should inform the way we treat each other, the way we make decisions or reconcile differences. Justice ought to be the internal culture at each university.

At the same time, no college or university exists as an island, but rather is involved in an extensive network of relationships with extramural institutions, public and private agencies, as well as neighborhood organizations. We have been asked to consider the kinds of claims that these external relationships place upon our institutions and about how we might embrace these responsibilities more creatively.

A recent issue of Conversations (Number 17, 2000) suggests a convenient focus for our exploration; it speaks of the university as citizen. The argument is not that the university should abandon its traditional mission of teaching, research and service in order to become a social service agency. The point, rather, is that the university rediscover and redefine its true mission of scholarship by taking “institutional citizenship” more seriously. The engaged citizen-campus is one that not only fosters just relationships within its walls but beyond them as well – in the city. We might brainstorm ways in which the university can regularly exercise this corporate citizenship. Here are some examples:

The university can act as “convener” for the larger community, creating opportunities (forums, lectures, seminars, workshops, town-hall meetings, etc.) where people can come together to deliberate over social matters of vital interest, thus, contributing to the broadening of the public square.

The university can lend its “professional expertise” to local organizations in the elaboration and implementation of special projects that aim to make the city a better place for all, especially for those groups in need or at risk.

The university can develop different kinds of “service-learning” programs that enable students and alumni to “plug into” critical areas of the city in such a way as to make possible efficacious service as well as personal transformation.

The university can reach out to the political leaders of the city in such a way as to foster a “sustained focus on the common good”. In this sense, the university can function as an institutional reminder to the political community of the need “to widen the circle” and practice responsible stewardship.

These are only meant to be examples; certainly many more can be found. The list of possible actions is virtually limitless and it will clearly vary from place to place. But we need to keep in mind that, at each institution, internal mechanisms need to be created that will contribute to and guarantee the outreach mission of the university. These mechanism will need to be visible, flexible and savvy.

Dan Hartnett, S.J.

Topic Session 15 - The Consistent Ethic of Life
-Framing the Question-

By: James R. Kelly,
Fordham University

I offer pedagogical reflections on the consistent ethic, which can be expanded or abbreviated, for our different class settings, ranging from a peace and justice seminar to an English literature class. My four main sections are: (A) Personal pedagogical assumptions; (B) Scholarly matters of abortion history; (C) *The consistent ethic of life*: Origins, Content, Context, Controversies; (D) Its present impact and dialogical future.

(A) **I assume** (1) that many or most students expect that there is nothing new to hear or fresh to say about abortion. That the debate is endless and stale and unpromising and that, finally, one decides about it in the privacy of her/his conscience. (2) That the fact that I (you) am (in my case, white, male, middle-aged, Roman Catholic) means I will say predictable things, such as "just say no". (3) That because some and maybe many "still feel that fetuses fare better in official Church teaching and practice, than women" (McCormick, 1988: 105) I explicitly adopt as a central lens a pregnant woman who does not want to be and who is full of fear and ambiguity. (4) That the point of a class room is neither indoctrination nor tolerance but scholarship, truth, and dialogue, thus making it clear that the instructor too must keep learning.

(B) As **matters of scholarly fact** (1) contrast the Christian vision of the neonate with the pagan view (citing P. Brown, *The Body and Society*, 1988:28; 438-9). "The mere fact of physical birth did not make a Roman child a person. Its father must lift it from the floor". "By the sixth century, the ancient right of the Roman fathers to decide whether or not he would accept a newborn child was spoken of as a custom that belonged to a distant, pagan age … Emphasis (is) on the role of God in forming the child from its first moment in the womb". (ii) Succinctly summarize *Roe v. Wade* and connect to the prized modern values such as women's equality, autonomy, self-actualization, and fairness (iii) explain why even supporters of legal abortion fault *Roe*, (iv) why unlike Western Europe, abortion has become a polarizing and stalemating dimension of American politics (Mary Ann Glendon, *Divorce and Abortion in Western Law*, 1988) as *Roe's* kind of agnostic, relativistic account of human life, and its diffuse definition of health, more radically breaks with the tradition's sense of life's sacredness at every stage. Explain how *Roe* subverts human solidarity.

(C) Succinctly explain in the context of *The Challenge of Peace* Bernardin's thesis in his December, 1983 Fordham address *A CONSISTENT ETHIC OF LIFE: AN AMERICAN-CATHOLIC DIALOGUE* that the Bishops' opposition to nuclear war and to abortion rest on the same principle and that Catholicism has increasingly moved to making stronger the presumption against taking human life and making the exceptions more restrictive. This is described as seeking "common ground" between just war theory and pacifism. Illustrate how

the "systematic, comprehensive, and analogical" formulation of the *consistent ethic* and its linking of "right to life" and "quality of life" issues offers a critical lens on not only single issue right to life and pro-choice movements but on American politics more generally. Show how the "dialogue" dimension of consistency offers a self-critical stance into Catholic teaching itself. The consistent ethic needs constant revision as it challenges the Church to better grasp its post-Vatican 11 insights as it challenges society.

(D). In a "good news/ bad news" analysis of its present impact discuss why the *consistent ethic of life* makes such little impact on the politics of abortion and show where it has found institutionalization in the *Seamless Garment Network* (Harmony, June 1998), *Feminists for Life*, and authoritative Church documents, including *The Gospel of Life* (1995). (ii) To show likely future of the *consistent ethic* in what I take to be the definitive 1992 Supreme Court decision *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania vs. Casey* and the need for *common ground* use the example of current discussion about the death penalty and American Catholic attitudes (James R. Kelly and Christopher Kudlac, "Pro-Life, Anti-Death Penalty?", *America*, April 1, 00: 6-8). Return to my key pedagogical assumption by concluding with *Feminists for Life's* theme of "You have Choices" and their challenge for universities and colleges to develop "College Outreach Programs".

By: Stephen Zunes
University of San Francisco

One perspective that keeps Catholic/Jesuit concepts of justice distinct from most secular and many religious movements is our belief in a consistent pro-life ethic, which underscores our commitment to the protection of life, which is threatened in today's world by war, abortion, poverty, racism, the arms race, the death penalty and euthanasia, and the recognition that these issues are linked under a consistent ethic of life.

Yet, it is a topic about which many Catholics are uncomfortable addressing, in part because of ideological divisions within the Church and the polarization on such issues in the political arena, where most politicians support church policies on some of these pro-life issues while opposing them in others.

Why do something that will just get everyone mad at you? There will be attacks from the right for addressing the death penalty, racism, militarism and economic injustice. There will be attacks from the left regarding the church's opposition to abortion and euthanasia. Is one simply asking for trouble for taking a position which does not fit neatly into the ideological spectrum, or does Jesuit education assume that God created a complex world where important issues need to be addressed based on ethical principles regardless of where they might fit into a given society's political alignments?

How does the violence of abortion, euthanasia, war, capital punishment, racism and economic inequality relate to the liberal individualistic ethos prevalent in American society? of spiritual poverty? of an economic system based on material gain, profit and consumerism? Does challenging such violence require simply legislative solutions or might there need to be a more radical transformation of society in order to more broadly establish a consistent pro-life ethic?

How might legitimate concerns regarding national security, women's rights, easing the suffering of the dying, and protection from violent crime be addressed in ways which lessen the appeal of violent responses?

The late Joseph Cardinal Bernardin referred to such a consistent pro-life ethic as the "seamless garment," emphasizing that such an ethic is rooted in the teachings of Christ and in church doctrine. How might concerns raised as part of a consistent ethic also be addressed to non-Catholic, non-Christian and non-religious segments of our institutions?

How might we, for example, bring together anti-abortion and anti-death penalty activists within our colleges and university for dialogue? How might we assist them in appreciating the common underlying ethical issues of their issues? How might we build a common ground that would challenge traditional ideological strictures which keep differing segments of the pro-life movement apart from each other? How might we make a consistent pro-life ethic more visible and more legitimate?

Stephen Zunes
Department of Politics
University of San Francisco

By: John J. O=Callaghan, S.J.
Loyola Stritch School of Medicine
Chicago, Illinois

Introduction. Joseph Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago is the person credited with having given high profile to the concept of a “Consistent Ethic of Life” (CEL). His introduction of the concept and its further expansion in subsequent presentations can form the basis for exploring the idea.

1. Dec. 6, 1983 (Fordham University). Bernardin began with the Bishop’s pastoral letter “The Challenge of Peace.” He wanted to argue the case made[13] there for linking questions of abortion and nuclear war.

[13]He admitted that the case was really not *argued* in the letter, or at least that the letter failed to provide “a fully articulated framework” for the linkage.

B He is convinced that "the pro-life position of the Church must be developed in terms of a comprehensive and consistent ethic of life." The central idea of the letter is "the sacredness of human life and the responsibility we have, personally and socially, to protect and preserve sanctity of life."

B There is a *presumption against* taking human life, but with *exceptions.* But many go further, not denying the right of the state to this, but challenging its *exercise* in the light of available more humane ways of defending society.

B Our cultural context shapes the content of our ethic of life. *Technology* induces a sharper awareness of the *fragility* of human life. "We *can* B but *should* we?"

B The spectrum of life cuts across issues of: genetics, abortion, capital punishment, modern warfare and the care of the terminally ill. Distinct problems, enormously complicated, deserving individual treatment B but "this combination of challenges is what cries out for a consistent ethic of life."

B The principle against the direct taking of innocent human life is pertinent to Catholic teaching on war and on abortion. The Catholic position on abortion "demands of us and of society that we seek to influence an heroic social ethic."

> *"Those who defend the right to life of the weakest among us must be equally visible in support of the quality of life of the powerless among us: the old and the young, the hungry and the homeless, the undocumented immigrant and the unemployed worker. . . . Consistency means we cannot have it both ways."*

2. March 11, 1984 (Saint Louis University). Bernardin wanted to "continue the dialogue" occasioned by his initial talk, speaking to *why* a CEL is needed and *what* is actually being advocated.

B We need to espouse a CEL because of *the dimension of the threats to life today*: nuclear war, abortion, executions, euthanasia, and *the value of our moral vision*: it has the scope, strength and subtlety to address a wide range of issues in an effective fashion.[14]

B The *systemic* vision of Catholic ethics should be the background for the *specific* positions we take on a range of issues. Not everyone in the Church must do all things, but *"the way* we oppose one threat should be related to support for a systemic vision of *life."*

The Cardinal also spoke of four different dimensions of CEL:

---

[14]AThe Catholic Moral Vision in the United States" (Georgetown University, Sept. 9, 1996) expanded on this.

B It is possible to identify one general moral principle with diverse applications;
B We need to apply different moral principles to different cases;
B How do we relate a commitment to principles to our public witness of life?
B What is the relationship between moral principles and concrete political choices?[15]

3. For the next decade and more, Bernardin continued to develop his CEL and make its application the subject of many talks and articles. It also was the object of analysis and criticism, within and beyond the Catholic community. Because it is in the application that the concept proves helpful or not, discussion might best center around those particular applications participants pick out as interesting. Three books which are ready sources of both Bernadin's texts and commentaries on them are:

Consistent Ethic of Life, ed. Thomas G. Fuechtmann (Kansas City, Sheed and Ward, 1988); *A Moral Vision for America,* ed. John P. Langan, S.J. (Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 1998);
Celebrating the Ministry of Healing (Catholic Health Association of the United States, St. Louis MO and Washington DC, 1999).

John J. O=Callaghan, S.J.
Loyola Stritch School of Medicine
Chicago, Illinois

[15]Bernardin developed this theme at length in an address "The Consistent Ethic of Life and Public Policy" in Washington, D.C. Feb. 10, 1988.

MODEL PROGRAMS:
Group Presentations

MP 10 - Group Presentation-Medical Outreach Programs -Framing the Question-

By: Beth Furlong
Creighton University

This Discussion Session will be an opportunity for individuals to share and learn about colleagues' involvement in a variety of medical and health outreach programs. Faculty from several schools will discuss the types of practice and research endeavors they are involved in relative to justice and medical outreach programs.

Jane Peterson, RN, Ph.D., Community Health Nursing faculty at Seattle University will describe the undergraduate and graduate programs they have to facilitate students' learning in these areas. For example, she will share their outreach programs with families living in low-income housing units, an increasing focus on new immigrants, and their newly launched Spring quarter course in Belize.

Judith Mouch, RN, Ph.D., faculty at University of Detroit Mercy, teaches in the School of Nursing - both in Community Health Nursing and Parish Nursing. She will report on their curriculum change which has moved the entire nursing curriculum into the community and how this relates to justice and medical outreach programs. In addition, at this University, she will describe their University Health Education Center which includes students from all the helping profession disciplines. They work together on projects in the community.

Tim Casey, senior Dental student at Creighton University and Jos Welie, NMedS, JD, Ph.D., Ethics faculty at the Center for Health Policy and Ethics at Creighton University, will report on research they are conducting. Their survey research of four generations of dental alumni from Creighton University will determine 1) the extent to which alumni consider dentists, and particularly Creighton graduates, morally obligated to foster the provision of basic dental care to vulnerably and marginalized patient populations, 2) the knowledge base of Creighton dental graduates regarding justice concerns, and 3) whether Creighton graduates personally strive to increase the provision of care through clinical, political or other means. They will present the preliminary results of their research.

Beth Furlong, RN, Ph.D., JD, faculty in the School of Nursing at Creighton University will discuss the kinds of community outreach programs students are implementing in the new Care Management Curriculum in the School of Nursing. In addition, she will discuss justice experiences of nursing students, other health science students, students from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business, faculty and staff who have participated in Creighton's health outreach program in the Dominican Republic for the past two decades.

Following these presentations, individuals participating in this session will discuss these questions-

1) How do we best teach students to appreciate the strengths and the cultures of others?
2) What do students learn when they are immersed in a culture unfamiliar to them?
3) How do we get students to appreciate how each of us may contribute to the injustices of the world?
4) How do we call students forth "to do justice" in other ways than direct health care to patients?

MP 11 - Faculty Development Programs
-Framing the Question-

By: Peter Facione,
Santa Clara University

The concept of faculty development, while appearing to be one of those simple and straightforward ideas that everyone would support, turns out to be more complex and more controversial than might be expected. Given that institutional resources are limited and that the interests of different individuals and different agencies diverge, any institution can quickly find itself immersed in surprising difficulties when deciding how best to approach faculty development.

These difficulties are often even more challenging for Jesuit, Catholic universities. The planners of this Justice Conference initially described our conversation about faculty development as being about how Jesuit universities are using immersion programs, curricular grants, and endowed professorships to foster the Jesuit character of their institutions. Faculty development, for purposes of this conference was interpreted as being a process aimed at promoting faculty interest in and faculty research on issues of justice.

Five problems for our discussion unfold themselves from this beginning.

(A) What is the main mission of a Jesuit, Catholic university and how does the work of individuals, of schools, and of departments fit into that? To what extent should the resources of the institution be directed, under whatever rubric including faculty development, toward the fulfillment of that main mission? Should any resources not be devoted to that main mission?

(B) Should faculty development be extended beyond the region where the professional interests of individuals overlap with the goals of their departments, programs, and institutions? Specifically, to what extent should faculty development funding be used as a means to shape and nurture stronger connections to institutional goals and objectives, in the ways that private foundations and government agencies use grant programs to respond to their goals and objectives?

(C) Given that faculty come from doctoral programs that strongly orient them toward definitions of quality and success that are shaped by their professional associations, and given that campus reward structures tend to give de facto priority to achievements related to scholarship as defined by the standards of one's professional discipline, should universities establish alternative faculty development programs to provide incentives and rewards to individuals and departments that respond more directly to campus strategic goals and to the Jesuit and Catholic character of the institution?

(D) If so, what might be some examples of viable faculty development strategies and departmental incentives that would support those strategic goals and the specific Catholic and Jesuit institutional identity? Would curriculum development money, endowed professorships, travel and equipment support, staff support, and the like be sufficient, or should the support be more directly connected to faculty evaluation and promotion decisions as well?

(E) Fundamentally, the question is how to do faculty development in support of the Jesuit and Catholic character of the institution, particularly its justice commitment, without arousing fears (legitimate or not) of proselytizing, indoctrination, or political correctness. In other words, how can we make social justice a "problematique" rather than a "prescription"?

As we come to grips with these important, yet very complex and potentially worrisome questions, let us take note of some of the diverging imperatives, familiar to and felt by many of us, that every university experiences when attempting to outline for itself a comprehensive and effective institutional program of faculty development.

1. Continuing tenure track faculty vs. long and short term temporary faculty
    - E.g. Eligible for travel reimbursement, internal grants, teaching releases
    - E.g. The relationship of teaching duties with research interests
2. Programs to advance institutional identity and mission vs. programs aimed at advancing the self-identified professional goals of individuals within their academic disciplines.
    - E.g. Funding for social justice immersion programs vs. professional travel
    - E.g. Institutional priorities for staffing and program development funding
3. Junior level faculty for early career development vs. mid and senior level faculty for institutional strategic impact.
    - E.g. Eligibility for sabbaticals and other developmental leaves
    - E.g. Conditions placed on the kinds of projects eligible for internal funding
    - E.g. Support for journal editors and officers in professional societies
    - E.g. Nominations for mission-related programs such as international volunteers or social justice immersion grants.
4. Centralization vs. decentralization of development resources and their sanctioned uses.
    - E.g. Support for college or university teaching development center
    - E.g. Funding for technology to be used in teaching or scholarship
    - E.g. A campus or school level programmatic direction or center of excellence or and related funding for positions, curriculum development, travel, teaching releases, and the like.
5. Problems emerging when faculty development activities become the basis for faculty evaluation"?
    - E.g. Using in the tenure decision information about a candidate's teaching that one gained through classroom observations or other conversations related originally to the person's voluntary participation in faculty development programs.

E.g. When deciding about a possible appointment or assignment, using information or impressions about a person gained during participation in a social justice immersion, campus retreat, or Jesuit conversation activity.

It is a given that it is both wise and reasonable for institutions to place significant priority and to devote serious resources to faculty development. As we struggle to give practical significance to this academic platitude, let is keep in mind the questions and complexities raised above. If we are to be universities that are Catholic and Jesuit, how shall we understand and implement an effective and comprehensive program of faculty development?

Discussion paper prepared by
Peter A. Facione, Dean
Santa Clara University

MP 12 - University Multicultural Affairs Offices
-Framing the Question-

By: Marshall Sauceda, Assistant Dean
Student Development Services
Loyola Marymount University

During the last 30 years, many universities and colleges established offices to increase enrollment and retention for students of color (African American, American Indian, Asian Pacific American and Chicano Latino). Colleges recognized that in all aspects of higher education (students, administrators and faculty), these populations were seriously underrepresented.

In a desire to diversify campuses, colleges initiated new policies and financial aid packages that gradually increased the racial and ethnic composition of the student body. While each ethnic group experienced different levels of success, opportunities improved for everyone. For example, this year's annual report of the National Urban League stated that the number of blacks in college grew 43 percent since the 1970s. Among Asian Pacific Americans, current graduation rates often equal or exceed white students.

However, as enrollment increased and the political climate changed, these policies were challenged as "reverse discrimination" against non-minorities. One perspective held that these initiatives "favored" one group over another and were inherently unfair and divisive. In addition, the academic successes achieved by students of color were cited as indicators that these policies had accomplished their goals and were no longer needed. Over time, numerous lawsuits, legislation and judicial rulings limited and in some cases eliminated long standing affirmative action policies.

A contrasting viewpoint acknowledges that while advancements have occurred, there is still a critical need for policies and offices that help create access and equity for all students. This perspective cites college participation rates for students of color as frequently lower then for white students. In addition, overall retention and graduation rates for students of color also tend to be lower. Also, at many colleges, students of color routinely report racial incidences and do not feel welcomed on campus.

Given these extremely divergent perspectives, what role should Multicultural Affairs Offices serve on college campuses today, especially at Jesuit institutions? How do such offices and programs promote justice and Catholic social teaching?

At the core of this issue, are diversity programs beneficial or divisive for a campus community? Do they encourage students to remain separated? What relationship should Multicultural Offices have with white students? Can they support students of color without alienating other students? Are such offices still needed or are they outdated?

Organizationally, are Multicultural Affairs Offices equal members of their institutions? Do they garner the same level of support, resources and influence as their peers? Is the entire institution fully committed to improving its racial climate or is the Multicultural Office the catchall for these issues? How can Multicultural Affairs staff members be strong student advocates and good colleagues?

Finally, how can Multicultural Affairs Offices adapt to the growing complexity within communities of color and the ongoing changes in race relations? What are the new paradigms that will effectively carry these offices into the next century? How will multicultural initiatives at Jesuit institutions be unique from other colleges?

This session encourages open and honest dialogue on these difficult and challenging questions. It is an opportunity to share perspectives, ideas, constructive criticisms and practical strategies. The goal is to promote better understanding of Multicultural Affairs Offices and the roles they play in Jesuit higher education.

MP 13 - Professional Schools and Justice Programs
-Framing the Question-

By: Kristin Guest, Professor
Seattle University

There are, I believe, some unique challenges for professional schools in relation to justice programs. In this group presentation, I will share a bit of our experience in the School of Education at Seattle University as we began an exploration prompted by the invitation to all Jesuit universities to engage in the self study of the effect of the commitment to justice on academic and curricular aspects of institutional life. In doing so, I will offer some of the kinds of framing questions for discussion that emerged from our dialogue in the School of Education as well as from cross-program dialogues that have occurred on our campus. I offer these examples and these questions because they arise from the experience I know best. I hope, however, that they open dialogue that is much broader than what we are doing at Seattle University, and encourage fruitful sharing of the common issues that face us as faculty in professional schools at Jesuit universities.

Some of the questions that I suggest we might consider include the following, drawn from the self assessment process at Seattle University, from my thinking and the thinking in the School of Education and at all university discussions at Seattle University on justice issues, from the Santa Claire Regional Justice Conference in October of 1999, and from *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice: A Sourcebook* (edited by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, & Pat Griffin).

1. What programs, research efforts, community involvement projects do you consider to be models of education for justice in your professional school? What process(es) did you use to involve faculty/staff/students in the development of and support for the implementation of these model programs?

2. How does the Mission of your professional school reflect a commitment to justice education?

In our case, our faculty agreed that we needed to engage in dialogue about what we meant by justice education. Out of that process, and with the help of a half-day retreat at which our President and Associate Provost shared their thoughts on education for justice, we adopted a school position statement on Education for Justice that reads as follows:

> School of Education faculty share a commitment to education for justice. Consistent with our Jesuit tradition, this commitment reflects beliefs in the dignity of the human person and the rights in a just society of individuals to participate in socio-cultural, economic and political structures that affect them. We express these commitments by challenging ourselves and our students to wrestle both conceptually and experientially with issues of justice and the common good. This

> will be accomplished to the extent that we treat others with respect and dignity, share stories of our journeys toward justice, teach and model skills of genuine civil dialogue, and listen -- to each other, to our students, to those who have suffered injustices. We will be successful when our graduates use their knowledge in lives of service for the transformation of society.

It is our intention to include this in website literature about the School of Education, on prominent visual display in our building, and in program handbooks. While obviously it is not enough to formulate statements about justice education if those words remain only on paper, we agreed that there is some power in public pronouncements to ourselves and our students of our commitments.

3. Curriculum: How are faith and justice an integral part of the curriculum in your professional school?

4. Faculty: How are your faculty encouraged to incorporate justice issues in their teaching, research, and faculty development?

5. Community:

A. How do you model just communities in relationships with each other in your professional school?

B. How are your faculty, staff and students involved in addressing justice issues in the external communities (both professional communities, and the neighborhood and civic communities) of which you are a part?

6. How can (do) we provide opportunities for faculty, staff and students in our programs to share their own journeys to a commitment to justice? to explore stories of what grounds their justice commitment?

7. How can we best respond to some of the unique features of professional school students in relation to education for justice? E.g., most professional school students are in residence for less time than four-year undergraduates, so how can the Jesuit commitment to justice education impact these students? How can we most effectively capitalize in relation to justice education on the rich life experiences and developmental maturity levels that many (most) graduate students bring to their professional school education?

8. How can recruiting literature from professional schools best reflect the nature of Jesuit education and its core commitment to education for justice? Do brochures, catalogues, scholarships, admissions criteria at your professional school reflect the core Jesuit commitment to justice?

9. Is a commitment to education for justice best fostered in professional school through a required core course that deals with justice education, as content infused throughout the curriculum, or through some combination of the two?

10. As professionals, how do we respond to the (often unspoken) cultural assumptions, debates and competing discourses that swirl around us in our culture?

11. What factors do you see as facilitating education for justice in your professional school? Inhibiting efforts toward education for justice?

The time allotted obviously will not allow dialogue on all of these questions. Perhaps the group can identify some that will broaden and deepen our collective understanding of the central challenges facing professional schools in relation to justice programs, and help us shape continuing dialogues that will enable us to fulfill our Jesuit mission more effectively.

Kristin Guest, Professor,
School of Education
Seattle University

By: Sharon Homan, Ph.D., Professor of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Saint Louis University

Framing the Question: What are creative ways professional schools can develop a "commitment to justice" in the university?

Response at Saint Louis University: An interdisciplinary graduate course, *Social Responsibility and the Professional*

Background/Comments: The syllabus (below) provides background, rationale, and the course content.

PPS G-593-02, CMH C-542-02, SW S-795-01
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE PROFESSIONAL
Course Instructors

Sharon M. Homan, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Public Health
O'Donnell Hall
977-8103

Mary Domahidy, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Chair
Public Policy Studies
O'Donnell Hall
977-3934

Gary Behrman, LCSW, M. Div.
Director of Admissions
School of Social Service
Tegler Hall
977-2752

Faculty Participants

Charles Bouchard, O.P., S.T.D.
President
Aquinas Institute
O'Neil Hall 201
977-3886

Francis Cleary, S.J., S.T.D.
Associate Professor
Dept. of Theological Studies
Humanities 239
977-2868; clearyfx@slu.edu

Kenneth Homan, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Division of Philosophy and Theology
Quincy University
217-228-5497

John Kavanaugh, S.J., Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Philosophy
105 Humanities
977-3159

James Fisher, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Marketing
Davis-Shaughnessy Hall 460
977-3836

John Ammann, J.D.
Assistant Clinical Law Professor
Law School
Queen's Daughters Hall 317
977-2796

Course Description

The purpose of this course is to examine the practice of our professions in ethical context, and in particular, as vocations to love and justice. This requires a shift from thinking solely about *professional ethics* (legal ethics, medical ethics, and social work ethics) to thinking about the *ethics of a profession*. *Professional ethics* are largely determined by professionals in the form of codes of ethics. Yet, professionals and professional institutions (e.g., public health) serve more than the profession. They serve the common good. This requires that we also attend to our social responsibility to meet the demands of justice - individual justice, distributive justice, social justice, and global justice. The test of love and justice is how we care about the poor and those in the margins of society. This course engages graduate students, faculty, and community professionals in interdisciplinary study, critical reflection, and dialogue regarding social responsibility. Course participants will consider methods of critical thinking and ethical systems as they apply to their professional work and personal lives. Some of the questions to be considered are: How do we know what is morally good? How do we decide what to do as we are confronted with the social issues of today? What principles guide us in this ongoing discernment? How does faith inform, form and transform our thinking and actions? How do we see our professional work as socially transformative – globally, locally, and professionally? How can our different experiences and perspectives of community enhance our understanding of the problems of our communities? How might we collectively envision a renewal of public life and identify ways we can contribute to this renewal?

This semester, the theme of the course is engaging families and local communities in working together to strengthen families and neighborhoods, and improve the health of individuals and families. We will examine the structures (economic, social, political) that threaten human dignity and well being and identify means to transform them and be transformed ourselves. We will look at community life from both global and local perspectives, studying principles of community engagement and partnership, and in particular, neighborhood initiatives involving faith communities. We will study methods of ethical analysis and reflection that foster our personal development as reflective practitioners. We will examine the values that motivate and sustain community engagement and successful partnerships.

Rationale for Course

We are struck by the interest among members of our academic and practice communities to be morally engaged. However, we sometimes shy away from moral engagement because of disciplinary language barriers, or feeling constrained by political correctness, or simply not knowing how our beliefs enter in amidst the pluralism of values and cultures. Many of us find ourselves with state-of-the-art skills in our disciplines but limited in our education, language, and systems to engage in such reflection and enter into discourse. The course gives us the opportunity to learn from each other, to challenge and encourage one another. Together we can grow as a community that is spiritually disciplined, morally engaged, theological reflective, and collegially led.

Myron Bloy, one of the cofounders of the Association for Religion and Intellectual Life, states:

> ...when one does discover such communities of faith in the academic world, communities whose life is to rebuke the powers of chaos and a celebration of the power of God in that world, they seem to have four distinguishing marks. In the first place, they are spiritually disciplined...In the second place; such communities are morally engaged.... they will remain ever restless until all human beings share in the justice and mercy which brothers and sisters deserve.... Two other marks of the mature faith community, which seem especially crucial in the academic world, are that they are theologically reflective and collegially led. Because, contrary to Marx, ideas *do* have power, because academic institutions have become primary gestating places for the ideas that shape our common life, and determine our primary self-identity, and because in such institutions human beings in the most formative stages of their lives are grappling with those ideas mature faith communities will reflect on and engage those formative ideas out of their experience of their life with God....Such communities of Jews and Christians – living in all the dimensions of the communal existence God has called them to – spiritually disciplined, morally engaged, theologically reflective, and collegially led – do indeed exist to carry out significant ministries in the academic world. They do so, of course, only "more or less," for we all have a good deal of growing in grace to do in this world before we are finished. ("The Recovery of Spirit in Higher Education" in "Faith Communities in the Academic World," Cross Currents, Winter 93/94: The Once and Future University: 453-462).

Course Organization

The course is organized in such a way as to move through a hermeneutic (i.e., interpretive) circle, and ongoing movement of experience, theological reflection, and action. In particular, we will borrow from Robert McAfee Brown (Unexpected News: Reading the Bible with Third World Eyes, 1984) and Larry Rasmussen (God, Goods, and the Common Good, 1987). Brown, like the liberation theologian, Gustavo Guitierrez says, "Theology is always the second act," not the first. First, we begin with commitment to and involvement with the poor. Rasmussen and Brown contend that, in the midst of the struggle of the poor for justice, we begin theological reflection.

Borrowing form the insights of Rasmussen and Brown, we begin our course in the midst of the struggle of the poor for justice. We will look at the struggles, social problems, and concerns of our communities working with the poor.

We move from our experience to interpreting this experience and reflecting on our actions. This critical reflection involves three movements – 1) building a common theoretical discourse in morality, ethics and the use of Scripture in ethics; 2) developing a praxis method; and 3) applying this praxis method to examine the practical imperative that our professions are vocations to justice and love.

Conscience formations, deliberation of public issues, and critical reflection aren't ends in themselves. They lead us to actions as individuals, as professionals. We also share in a public vocation to be community of deliberation, a community for formation of conscience, and a community of moral action. This public vocation requires us to deal with the ambiguity of discourse, the pluralism of thought, the competing values and conceptions of public good. Can we collectively vision a renewal of public life and identify concrete actions?

By: John Kohls
School of Business Administration
Gonzaga University

One of the first questions to be addressed is **what are the goals of justice education in the professional school?** Are the goals the same as for university as a whole, or are there goals specific to the education of the professional school which need to be pursued? For example, we want to prepare student to be good citizens, aware of injustice where it exists, with compassion for those who are given fewer opportunities, or who suffer from discrimination or exploitation, a desire to work for social justice. But are there additional goals specific to the professional school? (A sampling of the issues that relate to Business education will be given later.)

A related question, is whether professional schools can rely on the curriculum in the liberal arts core to convey justice values to encourage student reflection on issues of social justice, or is there some special contribution to justice education that professional schools can and should make. Most instructors in the Business School for example believe that both in terms of subject matter and methodology, courses in philosophy, religious studies, literature, etc. are better positioned to
address justice concerns. On the other hand, there are justice issues specifically involving the world of business and its professions. The same is undoubtedly true of other professional schools like education or engineering. Educators in these professions are in a unique position to communicate specific professional obligations that instructors of general ethics, for example, cannot do. The easy answer is that both the core and the professional education should address

justice issues. The more difficult challenge is to **specify the role of the core curriculum and the role of the professional curriculum in accomplishing the goals of justice education.**

Once the role of the professional school in justice education is determined, faculty can begin to address some **questions of implementation.** Should there be a single required course to address justice issues in the profession or should it be integrated through various courses in the curriculum? Or both? Is one approach satisfactory for all students in the professional school, or are different approaches needed for different specialties? Is reading, lecture, discussion, writing and testing the best way to address justice issues, or is it important to include an experiential component like service learning? Should there be a number of opportunities for students to be exposed to justice issues, and then rely on advising and student interest and initiative to take advantage of those opportunities, or should they be part of a required curriculum? How might justice education goals be furthered by extracurricular student activities, particularly clubs, invited speakers, service opportunities and other activities?

Another general issue is that of **integrating the justice education** which occurs in different courses, both across courses within the professional school, and between the university core and the professional curriculum. One aspect of this is determining whether there should be specific topics addressed or experiences provided in the core, so that those teaching in the professional school can build on those experiences. One of the early hallmarks of Jesuit education was that it was systematic. Courses would build on each other, earlier courses providing preparation for later courses. In some areas of higher education we continue this practice, particularly in math and the sciences. We also try to provide a foundation in writing, speaking and critical thinking skills to be used throughout a student's education. As higher education has moved more to a cafeteria plan in the core requirements, this has been lost. I believe some Jesuit schools have preserved more of this approach of building on earlier foundations, in philosophy and religious studies requirements for example. But the question of an integrated education program may need to be addressed once again. In examining our students' education in the core, there is probably no consistency in exposure to justice issues. What students learn about justice in an Ethics course, for example, may be as varied as the instructors who teach the course. The advantage is that students may bring a variety of course and life experiences to the discussion of the requirements of justice. The disadvantage is that each teacher in each class must begin anew to provide principles and approaches within which to frame the discussion of the justice concerns raised in that class. One question is whether we can achieve justice education goals better with a systematic integrated and thus more uniform approach, or is it satisfactory to provide a number of opportunities for students, both in the curriculum and outside, and encourage students to do their own integration?

Each professional school will have numerous justice issues associated with that field. Some effort may be required **to determine whether some of these issues are critical** to address, and some are optional. As an example, the following are some of the issues which could (perhaps should) be addressed in the Business School curriculum.

What is the purpose of Business? The answer to this question has significant consequences for what justice toward different stakeholders would look like.

How is self interest and concern for the common good to be addressed in business management?

How does faith inform one's work life?

What does justice in the work place demand with regard to questions of compensation, working conditions, discrimination, diversity, and affirmative action, due process, whistleblowing, employee loyalty, profit sharing. Outside the workplace there are issues of fairness to consumers, appropriateness of advertising, use of political influence, impacts of mergers and acquisitions, obligations to stockholders and to communities.

The same issues apply to business in the international environment, but they are often more complex and stark, because of greater opportunities for influence of government, worker exploitation, and environmental degradation. There are problems with financial systems and trade patterns which seem to limit opportunities for development in many countries. There are issues related to the demands that can or should be made on business partners and suppliers, paying of taxes, transfer pricing, technology transfer, pricing, copyright and patent protection.

At both the national and international levels, there are issues related to fairness of public policies and institutions. These are constantly debated and many aspects of the university curriculum have
important insights to contribute; the Business School will also have important if not critical contributions to make.

MP 14 - Urban Studies and Research
-Framing the Question-

By: Phil Nyden
Prof. of Sociology & Director
Center for Urban Research and Learning
Loyola University Chicago

Recent interest among American higher education associations in creating "engaged universities" has stimulated considerable discussion around how universities can effectively connect their teaching and research activities to the needs of the broader community outside the university. There is a long history of university "urban centers" doing research *on* communities, producing research reports and policy recommendations, sometimes independent of community input. Within the academy the community is often seen as a "living laboratory" for students and faculty. These perspectives have produced both an intellectual and practical "them-and-us" orientation as the university looks beyond its walls.

Clearly there are multiple examples of positive, constructive community engagement among American universities that treat community as equal partners rather than as objects of study. In particular, Jesuit institutions have at their heart an ongoing commitment to bringing about social justice for those who have been denied economic, political, and social opportunities. A key question is how do we integrate our knowledge, experience, and capacity inside the university with the knowledge, experience, and capacity in community-based organizations, social service organizations, government, and health care providers, among others, in bringing about positive social change?

I would like to use the experience of two university:community collaborative research and action centers as part of the context for discussion. The Loyola University Chicago Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL) has functioned for five years to promote collaborative university:community research. The Policy Research Action Group (PRAG), a 12 year-old, Chicago-based consortium of four universities and over 20 community-based organizations has supported similar work. PRAG and CURL have supported more than 250 projects, many of which have had an impact on local, state, or national policy.

CURL's mission statement explains that

> The Center is grounded in a model of collaborative research and teaching in service to the community. This <u>*new model of teaching and learning*</u> stresses knowledge exchange between the university and community that builds capacity while drawing on the strengths of both the community and university. In working closely with communities outside the university, the Center recognizes the knowledge and experience of individuals and organizations in non-academic settings. Strong emphasis is placed on the equal

partnership between the university and community in the formation of research issues, development of methodologies, analysis of data, and writing of results. The research leads to action and policy change at the university, community, and government levels.

In the context of the theme of the Commitment to Justice Conference, this past work by community:university partnerships at our university and other universities does raise a variety of questions:

How do or should research issues get framed? Should they be framed by the community? by the university? together? If together, how is this done?

Do we need to redefine our understanding of research to include not only academically-driven inquiry, but other projects not always viewed as "research," e.g. documentation of successful innovative grassroots programs, participatory evaluation of ongoing community-based programs, or work on successful strategies to bring about social change?

What is or should be the connection between research/learning and advocacy?

Does involvement in activist or advocacy work diminish (or increase) the value of research?

Should more learning take place "outside the box," that is, outside the formal classroom and in the community where issues may be less predictable but more "real" than classroom exercises or discussion?

Since many community-defined research and educational needs do not fall within traditional academic disciplines, should our universities develop stronger internal interdisciplinary connections to better respond to community needs?

Since many communities are facing similar issues and coming up with innovative grassroots solutions, is there a role for Jesuit colleges and universities to facilitate communication among academic centers and between collaborative university:community partnerships in various cities?

There are other related questions that participants in the group discussion will undoubtedly raise. The questions above can provide a starting point for this discussion.