



Part I

Best Practices:

Recruiting and Hiring Faculty for Mission

Prepared by

Abbie Robinson-Armstrong, Ph.D.
Vice President for Intercultural Affairs
One LMU Drive, Suite 4820
Los Angeles, CA 90045
310.338.7598
arobinso@lmu.edu

Robert Caro, S.J.
Vice President for Mission and Ministry
One LMU Drive, Suite 4844
Los Angeles, CA 90045
310.338.2987
rcaro@lmu.edu

September 2009

Table of Contents

Section I.

- Loyola Marymount University’s Catholic and Jesuit/Marymount Identity 1
- LMU History..... 2

Section II.

- LMU’s Mission and Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount Identity 4

Section III.

- The Catholic Intellectual Tradition 6
- Catholic Identity: Emerging Consensus 15

Section IV.

- Ethnic Diversity and Religious Identity in U. S. Catholic Higher Education..... 26
- Benefits of a Diverse Faculty..... 46
- Hiring for Mission: An Inclusive Term..... 60

Section V.

- Improving Faculty Selection: The Critical Indices Approach..... 62
- Questions to Ask and Not to Ask68
- Principles of Good Practice for Department Chairs, and Search Committees74

Section VI.

- References.....79



jesuit and marymount catholic identity

Loyola Marymount University shares in a rich intellectual heritage dating from the earliest centuries of Christianity. This Catholic intellectual tradition sees a mutually fertile relationship between faith and reason and thus seeks to promote dialogue between culture and religion. Governed by an independent Board of Trustees, LMU cherishes its Catholic identity while at the same time welcoming people from diverse backgrounds and promoting ecumenical and inter-religious understanding.

The distinctive character of Loyola Marymount is enhanced by the educational heritage of its founding and sponsoring religious orders—the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary (Marymount Sisters), the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange—and many dedicated lay men and women. The members of the religious orders, together with their faculty, staff, and administrative colleagues, share a common dedication to academic excellence, spiritual growth, and social justice as hallmarks of a contemporary Catholic university.

Religious Communities at LMU

[Society of Jesus: Jesuit Community](#)

[Marymount Sisters: RSHM Community](#)

[Sisters of St. Joseph: CSJ Community](#)

Offices and Institutes

[Campus Ministry](#)

[Center for Ignatian Spirituality](#)

[Center for Religion and Spirituality](#)

[Center for Service and Action](#)

[PLACE Corps](#)



The Highland Park bungalows where it all began.

LMU history

The names “Loyola” and “Marymount” have long been associated with Catholic higher education in countries around the globe. Saint Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus, sanctioned the foundation of his order’s first school in 1548. The Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary have conducted educational institutions since their establishment in France in 1849 by Father Jean Gailhac. These two traditions of education have come together in Los Angeles as Loyola Marymount University.

The present University is the successor to the pioneer Catholic college and first institution of higher learning in Southern California. In 1865, the Vincentian Fathers inaugurated St. Vincent’s College for boys in Los Angeles. When this school closed in 1911, members of the Society of Jesus opened the high school division of their newly founded Los Angeles College.

The collegiate division opened a few years later. Rapid growth prompted the Jesuits to seek a new campus in 1917 and incorporated as Loyola College of Los Angeles in 1918. Relocating to the present Westchester campus in 1929, the school achieved university status one year later. Graduate instruction began in 1920 with the foundation of a separate law school. The formation of a distinct graduate division occurred in June 1950.

In separate, though parallel developments, the religious of Sacred Heart of Mary began teaching local young women in 1923. In 1933 they opened Marymount Junior College in Westwood, which by 1948 had grown to a four-year college granting the baccalaureate degree. The school later transferred classes to a new campus on the Palos Verdes Peninsula in 1960.

Eight years later, Marymount College moved again, this time to the Westchester campus of Loyola University as an autonomous institution. At this juncture, the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Orange joined the Marymount Sisters as partners.

After five years of sharing faculties and facilities, Loyola University and Marymount College merged and formed Loyola Marymount University in 1973.

During the intervening decades, and under successive administrations, the University has grown in size and stature. Conscious of its history and heritage, LMU looks to its future as one of the nation's distinguished Catholic universities.



In 1968, Rev. Charles Casassa, SJ, and Sr. Raymunde McKay, RSHM, jointly announced the affiliation between Loyola University and Marymount College, bringing women and men students together on the Westchester campus for the first time.

LMU's Mission and Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount Identity

Founded in 1911 and located in Los Angeles, Loyola Marymount is the only Jesuit/Marymount university in the southwestern United States. It is institutionally committed to Roman Catholicism and takes its fundamental inspiration from the traditions of its sponsoring religious orders. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, Loyola Marymount has always been, above all, a student-centered university. It understands and declares its purpose to be:

- **The encouragement of learning**
- **The education of the whole person**
- **The service of faith and promotion of justice**

Each of these phrases takes on special significance when considered in light of the university's Catholic and Jesuit/Marymount identity.

The Encouragement of Learning

At LMU *the encouragement of learning* occurs in the context of an intellectual and cultural tradition that is marked by characteristics such as these:

- It views the world as sacramental and seeks to find God in all things.
- It esteems both imagination and intellect.
- It takes philosophical and theological thinking seriously.
- It engages in ethical discourse and pursues the common good.
- It shuns the supposition that there can be value-free facts.
- It seeks an integration of knowledge in which "faith and reason bear witness to the unity of all truth" (*Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, 1990, par. 17)

As foundational for inquiry and learning, and consistent with Catholic emphases since the landmark Vatican Council II (1962-64), Loyola Marymount intentionally strives to build an intercultural community, actively recruiting students, faculty, and staff from ethnically diverse backgrounds. In a similar way, the university places a premium on ecumenical interfaith dialogue. All religions are taken seriously, and a genuine welcome is extended to faculty, staff, and students from diverse faith traditions. This means that at LMU *the encouragement of learning* is a radical commitment to free and honest inquiry in teaching, research, and creative projects—but always with reverence before the mystery of the universe and openness to the Transcendent.

The Education of the Whole Person

With roots in the spiritual humanism of the renaissance, the university's Jesuit and Marymount traditions have as one of their chief characteristics an abiding concern for *the education of the whole person*. Growth in knowledge and mastery of a discipline are only part of the total educational experience. As one alumnus has remarked, "I consider my time at LMU a rite of passage to adulthood when I grew intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually." This kind of integrated personal growth reflects what is traditionally understood by *the education of the*

whole person. It takes place not only in the classrooms, laboratories, and library, but also in the chapels, residence halls, and recreation centers, on the athletic fields, in off-campus service projects, in campus-ministry retreats, and, indeed, wherever students gather. Faculty and staff all contribute to it when they establish a personal relationship with students, listen to them, respect their individuality, and help them to develop their unique talents for lives of freedom and responsibility, leadership and service.

At its best, *the education of the whole person* comes to fruition not simply in personal integration but in a transformational sense of one's place in the global village and a concern for those living on the margins of society. From LMU's perspective, today's whole persons are men and women with and for others—visionary men and women able to see beyond the bounds of culture and class and eager to work for the common good wherever it is thwarted by economic, political, or social injustice.

The Service of Faith and Promotion of Justice

In linking active concern for the disadvantaged to the service of faith, Loyola Marymount follows the lead of its sponsoring religious communities and the post-Vatican II Church in acknowledging that work for social justice is a requirement—not simply an option—of biblical faith. Even while making common cause with men and women whose work for social justice is motivated by noble secular values, LMU finds its deepest inspiration for the promotion of justice in the concern of the Hebrew scriptures for "the widow, the orphan, and the stranger in the land" and the preference of the Gospels for the "least" of Jesus' brothers and sisters.

There are many opportunities for members of our community to reach out to those in need, but doing good for the poor without a change of heart falls short of the university's faith-and-justice mission. The student who returned from a spring-break immersion to report that "I went there thinking I would serve the people of Appalachia but had no idea how they would change my perception of materialism" speaks to this distinction -- and verifies an important pedagogical insight: "When the heart is touched by experience, the mind may be challenged to change." As a pillar of our mission, *the service of faith and promotion of justice* thus looks toward attitudinal change as a prompt for students—and all associated with LMU—to understand the causes of injustice and to work for humanizing changes in society.

THE CATHODC INTELLECTUAL TRADITION

Transcript of address by
Margaret O'Brien Steinfels

In 1988, I gave a talk in this very city to this very organization, or at least a subgroup, the presidents of Catholic colleges and universities, not on this very topic but closely related: "The Church and American Culture: The Challenge to the Catholic Intellectual Community." Seven years have passed. Most of you are too young to have been in the audience, and most of you don't look like presidents—yet. The temptation to repeat myself has been strong.

I dug out that seven-year-old talk. It looked to be one of my very first encounters with a computer. From my errors, I infer that Larousse instead of the American Heritage Dictionary was on my spell-check. My talk was very long, as only computer-generated talks get to be, which probably explains why I have been given a strict time limit this evening.

I went over the usual suspects: John Tracy Ellis and Thomas O'Dea and a few unusual ones, Richard Hofstadter and the Vatican. That talk had the usual rhetorical strategies: a golden age of Catholic education (including a glowing account of my education at Loyola University) and a leaden age dulled by the difficulties faced in 1988. In concluding I offered the usual solutions and some unusual advice: Catholic colleges and universities should take *Commonweal* as a model of critical engagement with Catholic intellectual life, and for only \$39 a year.

As I reread that talk I said: This is good! Then came a voice from heaven: But is it true?

My analysis in 1988 rested on two controversies whose trajectories were then unclear. Since then, each has taken a decisive direction.

The first controversy: Was the Catholic identity of Catholic colleges and universities a question that would be or could be taken seriously? Many people wanted to address the issue, but concern for academic freedom along with a certain defensiveness led them to suppose that an effort to study Catholic identity would be defined primarily by episcopal control, theological narrowness, and moral overreaching. The Curran case was still being adjudicated in 1988, and The Catholic University was a living example of the tensions and dilemmas. It is not surprising if some people

Margaret O'Brien Steinfels is editor of *Commonweal*

NOVEMBER 1995 • ACCU

felt that addressing the Catholic identity of their institution would be like embracing a porcupine or maybe a skunk.

This anxiety distracted attention from other pressing issues: The erosion of Catholic identity because academic disciplines and accrediting agencies were shaping faculty and curriculum; because faculty and students were becoming more religiously and diverse; because of the decline in the numbers of religious and priests who expressed that identity; and because there was competition for students. (In defining its market niche, a Catholic school did not usually emphasize its Catholicity, but rather advertised a tradition of service and learning in the spirit of its founding religious community. Thus we have schools in the Jesuit, Benedictine, Mercy, Ursuline, Vincentian, Dominican, Holy Cross traditions, all managing to sound both more benign and more universal than the Catholic tradition.)

Seven years and many discussions later, it has become clear that, despite those anxieties, the Catholic identity question is being taken seriously. Whatever uncertainty lingers around *Ex corde Ecclesiae* and its ordinances, groups and individuals have pressed ahead to look at how colleges and universities see themselves as Catholic. Inevitably some find that they are Catholic in name only, while others are striving to sustain or reappropriate their Catholic identity. Your presence at this meeting and your numbers certainly suggest a willingness to talk about this neuralgic subject.

There was a second unresolved controversy in 1988: How should Catholics understand this identity issue in the context of American intellectual life generally: Were we now mainstream? Or irretrievably subcultural despite the efforts to pursue excellence as defined by the nation's premiere schools? How would loss of Catholic identity affect the church and ordinary Catholics, especially those who attended Catholic colleges and universities?

We have an object lesson in the secularization of the nation's once Protestant universities, traced in such powerful detail by George Marsden in *The Soul of the University*. I do not think that Professor Marsden makes any explicit link between the current perilous condition of mainline Protestantism and the readiness of denominational bodies over the last century to give up their colleges and universities because they felt so congruent with the culture. But it is hard to imagine that the connection is not there.

On the other hand, another Protestant historian, Mark Noll in *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, sees one symptom of evangelical Protestantism's debilitating anti-intellectualism in its inability to sponsor a single genuine university rather than strictly confessional colleges. Are Catholic institutions ambling along the same garden path to secularization or in a few cases, along the alternative path to sectarianism, with the same deleterious consequences, in either case, on the church's life and mission?

Today, how we fit in is no longer quite the right question. It has become clear or clearer, I think, that American intellectual life, depending on your perspective, has broken open or broken down. Conservative ideas and intellectual forces that once seemed marginal even to conservative politics have achieved an influence and coherence that many liberals envy. This influence brings with it a resurgence of talk about traditional values, attacks on the Enlightenment project and a spirit of anti-modernity. Conservatives in the academy, in think tanks and at journals of opinion work diligently to fill the vacuum created by the fragmentation of the political consensus, largely liberal, that has governed America since the New Deal and our intellectual life since the progressive era.

This fragmentation opens American intellectual life to new questions, new cultural and political configurations, an altered mainstream, if you will. All of us, including Catholic colleges and universities, are in a new ball game, though with the ascendancy of conservative ideas perhaps we face some of the same old "Catholic" temptations.

So seven years later I think there is something new to say (Surprise!), and it is this: Among many; though not all, American Catholic institutions there is now a readiness to take the issue of Catholic identity seriously. And about time! Or perhaps better to say, good thing, because the time frame in which this can be done becomes increasingly narrow.

Most dramatically, religious and clergy are fast disappearing from both classrooms and administrative offices. Who will be invested with the mission of fostering a school's Catholic identity and its connections to the Catholic community? Then there is the generational shift from pre- to post-Vatican II educated Catholics who are moving into those teaching and administrative posts. Without prejudging the outcome, we all know, whatever our age—from our peers, our siblings, our children, our grandchildren, our friends—that this represents a dramatic shift in attitudes wider church, and basic understanding of "the Catholic thing."

I believe we have a decade—ten years—in which this question of identity must be honestly addressed and definitively taken on as a commitment and core project of institutions that hope to remain Catholic.

And let me be clear about that: Such a project cannot simply be the work of a few individuals, of small groups, or of special institutes. The whole institution must make a substantial commitment to fostering a Catholic tradition of intellectual life.

Coming at this question as I do from the editorial trenches, I see this project as both exciting and perilous, and I will focus most of my remarks on Catholic intellectual life in general, leaving to Peter the simple task of talking about the specifics of higher education.

Catholic intellectual life is central to Catholic identity. It is fundamental to the life of the church, big C and little c, cathedral and congregation—to its continued vitality and to the church's mission in this culture. This is not a narrow ecclesiastical tradition, but a broad and infinitely useful one. *Commonweal* has fostered and questioned that tradition. Our writers and readers reflect that affection and that criticism. They are university people and journalists, book editors, lawyers, physicians, scientists, politicians; they are bishops, clergy and ordinary Catholics, who in their daily lives practice and depend upon the kind of thinking, reasoning, reflection that make up the Catholic intellectual tradition. Furthermore, this tradition also is explored and appreciated by writers and readers who are Methodists, Episcopalians, Orthodox as well as Catholics, and not only by Christians—Jews, secular humanists, and those lapsed from every religion known to humankind.

This tradition is carried on, pursued, criticized, developed, wrestled with by people from many different backgrounds. The way they think and write, read and reflect very frequently rests on their education in American Catholic colleges and universities. So along with the preservation of knowledge, the scholarly work of retrieval, the building up of bodies of knowledge and the education of the young, your schools are central to the practice of the Catholic intellectual life. Colleges and universities cannot claim to be Catholic if this tradition is not part of their core understanding; this tradition cannot survive if Catholic colleges and universities do not renew it, maintain it, nourish it, support it, and pass it on.

In the past several decades, Catholicism in the United States has become more charismatic, more Pentecostal, more experiential, open to

intellectual life both old and new currents of spirituality and meditation; it absorbs individualistic and congregational attitudes from American religion generally. But Catholicism is also and always has been a church with a brain, with a mind. So as important as these new manifestations may be, it is essential to the church, to its mission in the world, to the lives of ordinary people that there be a vigorous and Catholic intellectual life. And *Commonweal* can't do everything!

Of course, the Catholic identity of Catholic colleges and universities can have many expressions: honoring the founding mothers and fathers; worship and prayer; service projects; works of social justice like basketball and football; campus ministry; statues, medallions and endowed lectureships; the work of notable alum and prestigious faculty. But all of this would be a thin facade if it did not include at its core a living experience among students and faculty of Catholic intellectual life.

Yes, carrying on this tradition is an enormous challenge. You have to overcome bigotry and bias, including especially the prejudices Catholics themselves have against their own tradition. A Catholic intellectual is not an oxymoron. You do not have to be a Jesuit to be a Catholic intellectual. Yes, Catholicism and Catholic ideas have a checkered history. What institution, tradition, idea does not? From Plato to Foucault, from nominalism to deconstructionism; if human ideas have consequences, we can be sure some of them are bad. We have our fair share.

Many people, perhaps some of you, consider that the Catholic intellectual tradition is singular in its intellectual repression and oppression, its narrowness and dogmatism. Well, I say go read a history book! Some of you may be skeptical that the adjective *Catholic* adds anything to an institution or discipline except the judicial authority of ecclesiastical officials. I disagree. For 2,000 years, Christians have struggled in multifarious ways with everything from body and soul to kingship and regicide, from usury to voluntary poverty, and today still struggle with everything from medical decision-making to political theory, from child care to spiritual counsel, from race to gender. It is this tradition that pressed through the centuries—and reminds us in the Gulf War, in Bosnia—the idea of civilian immunity. The distinction between ordinary and extraordinary care of the sick and the dying remains a viable one because this tradition teaches it.

It is a deep and rich tradition; it is a tradition worthy of our attention and study. If this tradition does not have a place in Catholic colleges and universities, what is it that you are doing? What tradition has a better claim?

All thinkers and thinking are based in some tradition. A tradition is not a browned and dried-up certificate of deposit in the bank of knowledge, but a locus for questioning, a framework for ordering inquiry, a standard for preferring some sets of ideas over others. Tradition is the record of a community's conversation over time about its meaning and direction. A living tradition is a tradition that can raise questions about itself.

What am I talking about? Let me at least sketch what I think the Catholic intellectual tradition looks like.

"The joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the women and men of our time, especially those who are poor or afflicted in any way, are the joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well. Nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts.... Christians cherish a feeling of deep solidarity with the human race and its history."

That opening paragraph from *Gaudium et Spes* speaks of our Responsibility for all that is genuinely human, for what draws the minds and hearts of women and men. The Catholic intellectual tradition is universal in its breadth and its interests; that is a notion set forth, defended, repeated, and encouraged throughout the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

I quote the quote because there is an odd nostalgia for something like neoscholasticism, if not neoscholasticism itself—a nostalgia for a framework that provided the high level of integration said to have been the guiding light of preconciliar Catholicism. From my post at *Commonweal*, I am inclined to think that we are a long way from holding or even recovering, at least with any integrity, that kind of framework. In a post-positivist, post-Enlightenment world, no body of human knowledge enjoys that degree of authority.

But if we do not have such an integrated system, we do have ideas, habits of mind and heart. We have preferences and predilections, intuitions and practices. We have a history. As *Gaudium et Spes* says, our tradition is not set against the world. But neither is it naively accepting of every current of opinion that washes up on the shores of a pluralistic culture. It helps us to maintain a robust and refreshing level of skepticism. What do I find of value? A tradition where reason and discourse based on reason are honored and practiced.

Let me describe just a few of its characteristics.

First, reason and faith are not antagonistic or unconnected. In the Catholic tradition we do not accept what we believe blindly or slavishly, we are urged to think about and to understand what we believe. This is in some contrast to the society in which we live. American culture, with its Protestant history, tends to see religion as an expression of the individual, the subjective, the emotional, the immediate. In public life, religion and religious belief are confined to the realm of the private and personal, sometimes in an absolutist reading of the First Amendment, sometimes with the prejudice that religious thought has nothing to contribute. For the revivalist, faith is a personal and private encounter. For many in the cultural elite, as Stephen Carter argued in *The Culture of Disbelief*, faith is understood as a curious avocation, a personal hobby.

It is a loss to the whole society when any religious group accepts that role. In contrast, Catholics—the bishops, but many Catholic politicians and citizens as well—have often brought a philosophical and linguistic sophistication to public policy issues. If, for example, laws that would permit euthanasia and assisted suicide are kept at bay in the United States, it will be because the bishops, Catholic institutions, nurses, doctors, lawyers, ordinary citizens have been willing to express their deeply held beliefs, religious and philosophical, in a reasoned discourse that can build consensus across the whole society.

A second and closely related characteristic: Catholics have a tradition that takes philosophy and philosophical thinking seriously. This meant that from the beginning Christianity had to adapt systems of thought that were alien and even contrary to its religious beliefs and yet were crucial to its mission: that is, rendering its knowledge of God's presence and action in the world in a way that would make sense to others.

We don't usually think of Paul of Tarsus as a philosopher, but there he was in the agora debating Epicureans and Stoics, and in front of the Areopagus explaining the heretofore unknown God. Nor did it stop there. Eusebius, Bede, Augustine, Ambrose, Anselm, Thomas, Catherine, Teresa, etc., right down to our own time: American Catholic colleges and universities in the years after World War II were often the home to diverse philosophical schools—phenomenology, existentialism, Hegelianism, liberalism, pragmatism and Thomism—at a time when secular schools prided themselves on a univocal voice in their philosophy departments. The sometimes imperfect hospitality in our tradition expresses the conviction that a disciplined mind and systematic thought can help discern important things about what is real.

A third characteristic: Our tradition challenges the belief that facts come in pristine form—no baggage, no assumptions, no preconditions, no ends, no language that fills it with meaning. Our culture likes to treat facts as a given, as autonomous, unadorned objective realities; but a fact is an abstraction from something thicker and deeper containing implicit ends, whether or not the researcher, commentator, or scholar acknowledges them. There are virtually no value-free facts, from the construction of public opinion polls to descriptions of brain synapses or histories of the decision to drop the bomb on Hiroshima. The Catholic tradition reminds us that the fact/value distinction is practically a nil one, although our tradition is tempted sometimes to think there can be fact-free values.

Nonetheless, in our tradition epistemology and ethics are always inter-related. So, for example, the notion that education can be a value-neutral process in which teachers simply convey facts and the students simply receive them, in which behavior is neither right nor wrong but a matter of personal choice, in which judgments are neither better nor worse but simply someone's opinion, is nonsense, as the condition of so many schools grimly illustrates. This same analysis could be applied to psychotherapy, opinion polling, political analyses, medical decision-making, etc.

This brings me to a fourth and last point: It is a characteristic of our tradition, at its best, to resist reductionism; it does not collapse categories. Faith and reason are compatible but not equivalent. Our tradition rejects fundamentalistic readings of Scripture; the human person is neither radically individualistic nor socially determined. Empirical findings are not solely determinative of who we are and what we do. Yes, absolutely: Findings in psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, neurobiology enrich our understanding of the human person and the human project, but they do not exhaust that meaning or determine that trajectory. We are neurons and neuroses, but not only neurons and neuroses; neither DNA or TGF fully determined who we are or what we will do this weekend. There is space for grace and free will, thought, conscience, choice.

Time flies, and the list goes on: Symbolism is taken seriously, so is Analogical reasoning; images provide us with alternative ways of knowing. All of these are implanted in minds and hearts by our sacramental and liturgical practices. Our tradition takes mysticism seriously, so we know that ordinary everyday consciousness is not the last word about reality. The practice of caring for the poor and thinking about caring for them shapes political philosophy and social theory. The struggle everywhere to link faith and culture blesses us with an abundance of fictional worlds from Shusaku Endo's *Deep River* to Isabel Allende's *Eva Luna*.

To sum up: Yes, these characteristics can be found in other traditions. Yes, the Catholic tradition has been untrue to them at times or embraced them only kicking and screaming; but finally they have been embraced because our tradition becomes part of the cultures in which it finds itself—it must become part of the culture intellectually as in all other ways. Why? Because of its mission to transform the world, as we read in *Gaudium et Spes* (No. 40): The church, a visible organization and a spiritual community, "travels the same journey as all humankind and shares the same earthly lot with the world; it is to be a leaven and, as it were, the soul of human society in its renewal by Christ and transformation into the family of God."

Today in our culture, where the commodification of human life, human relationships, and body parts goes on everywhere, that engagement, that mission, means keeping the human person at the center of our inquiry. The human person must be seen in his or her social context, where an implicit and shared understanding of the good can be found and expressed.

All of this is deeply congruent with a religious tradition that is incarnational and sacramental, that keeps before us the idea of a God who acts in history on our behalf, a God who sent Jesus, who lived among us, who taught, who died for us, who rose from the dead and is present in the Eucharist. We are to love the Lord and love one another as he has loved us.

And there's the rub and that's the challenge. Catholic higher education, Catholic identity, Catholic intellectual life, the Catholic Church and its work in the world must finally be the work of a community of believers. In our culture that is a suspect category, nowhere more so than in the university.

CATHOLIC IDENTITY: EMERGING CONSENSUS

Transcript of address by
Peter Steinfels

Reprinted from Association of Catholic Colleges and
Universities, *Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher
Education* 1.1 (November 1995): 11-19. Also in
Origins 25.11 (August 24, 1995): 174-78.

Twenty-eight years and two weeks ago, about two dozen distinguished Catholic educators, bishops, and religious leaders gathered at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, and issued a statement declaring that "the Catholic university today must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence."

The Catholic university, the statement continued, "must have a true autonomy and academic freedom," but it must also be an institution where "Catholicism is perceptibly present and effectively operative."

No book on Catholic higher education, indeed no history of American Catholicism, is complete without reference to this Magna Carta for modern Catholic higher education. It is there in the record books, so to speak, like the Third Council of Baltimore with its decree on parochial schooling or the founding of The Catholic University of America in 1887.

My thesis today is a simple one: You are attending a gathering that is potentially as important as Land O'Lakes--a gathering that, if you so choose, has every likelihood of entering the history books as signaling a new moment in Catholic higher education, in American Catholicism and, just maybe, in our society's effort to achieve an authentic pluralism.

If this meeting is to be historic, it will not be due to anything that we can cram into the next 67 hours. It will be a landmark because more than 450 educators, many of you presidents—key people in a web of over 200 schools across the United States and by that very fact key people in a church of 56 million members--because you leave here not with a statement, not with all the answers, but with a collective will to focus on a common set of questions.

Land O'Lakes, we should remember, did not just happen at a four-day meeting. It was the crystallization of a process long under way. We can trace it in the title of Philip Gleason's forthcoming history of Catholic

Peter Steinfels is senior religion correspondent for *The New York Times*.

NOVEMBER 1995 • ACCU

higher education in the 20th century, "Contending With Modernity," and we can trace it in the subheadings of his closing chapters: "Self-Criticism and the Search for Excellence," "The Splintering of the Scholastic Synthesis," "The Contagion of Liberty," and "The Acceptance of Modernity."

Every step in that process was subject to misrepresentations and exaggerations. Every step elicited fears and accusations. Not all those fears were baseless. No great change comes about without introducing or skirting serious problems, problems that the beneficiaries of that change will eventually have to address.

Nor was that earlier process ever unanimous. It was carried forward by a core of farseeing, risk-taking educators and church leaders. There were only 26 signatories of the Land O'Lakes statement, all male and representing only nine universities.

I believe that a similar process is now taking place. Well over five years ago, I began an investigation that, after many months of interruptions, became a front-page story in *The New York Times*. I began with the intention of reporting on the challenges faced by all sorts of colleges and universities in maintaining a religious identity: Southern Baptist, Baylor and Southern Methodist; Mormon, Brigham Young; and Jewish, Yeshiva; no less than Catholic, Fordham, DePaul or Santa Clara. In the end we limited the story to Catholic schools. That was where the action was, where a whole family of schools seemed to be tottering on the edge of fateful change.

Frankly, what I discovered as I spoke with deans and presidents and faculty members left me stunned.

At the higher levels, there were repeated assurances that the commitment to Catholic identity had in no way weakened, although there was widespread admission that it might be more difficult to implement under current circumstances.

At the faculty level, in some quarters I found frustration and anger at the perceived loss of Catholic identity. Among other faculty members, I found resentment at the very idea that the Catholic identity of their institution meant anything beyond what they considered one or two vestigial theology courses and certain ceremonial flourishes—in other words, meant anything that might actually bear on their own teaching and research.

I found a non-Catholic political scientist wondering why, in view of the richness of Catholic thought and experience in relating God and Caesar, the government department at his Catholic university should be interchangeable with that of any first-rank secular school.

I found faculty members who said that job candidates with Catholic backgrounds or known interests in relating their research to religious or ethical questions would actually be at a disadvantage, because the philosophy department did not want to look too Catholic or the biology department did not want to give the impression of letting religious considerations intrude into strictly scientific decisions.

Above all, I found confusion and euphemism and evasion and a tremendous sense that the subject could not be discussed openly and candidly.

So it came as no surprise to me when I later read a speech in which Father Malloy of Notre Dame warned there was "no guarantee at all" that within the next 50 years most Catholic institutions of higher education would not "shuck off their religious identity as they become more academically sophisticated."

"If it happens," he added, "it will not be by way of a vote, but simply by default."

My 1991 article reported the agitation and debate over this issue already under way, but I may have underestimated what is today obvious. Slowly, steadily, a consensus about this new set of challenges for Catholic higher education has been emerging—by no means among everyone but, as at Land O'Lakes, among a core of thoughtful leaders.

It is noteworthy how many different ways the issue is described: People speak of the Catholic identity or mission or character. They speak of many Catholic institutions being at risk, or threatened, or uncertain, or problematic, or in need of clarification or reassertion, or in danger of becoming purely formal or ritualistic, and so on.

Those variations reflect, first of all, the wide variety of Catholic Institutions and the corresponding differences in which their concern about Catholic identity is manifest.

A campus like Notre Dame, a kind of island unto itself with an overwhelmingly Catholic student body, differs even from a Georgetown, immersed in the life of the nation's capital and with a much smaller proportion

of Catholic students. And both differ radically from a school like New Rochelle with its multiple campuses and its mix of a traditional college-age, liberal-arts student body with a far greater number of adult degree-seekers, many of them part-time, from minority groups and not Catholic.

Large universities with national aspirations, with extensive graduate programs or with prominent professional schools, confront a very different dynamic than small liberal-arts colleges.

The multiple ways of stating this concern also reflect the sensitivity surrounding it. What are the right words to indicate urgency but not alarmism or panic? To many educators, suggestions that their traditional religious mission was in any way at risk seem to disparage all that they have devoted their lives to and to ignore the very real accomplishments of recent years. Indeed concerns about Catholic identity have not infrequently been advanced with an accusatory edge--as though, who is to blame were a more important question than what can we do--and with a dubious nostalgia for a lost golden age.

No wonder savvy and sensitive educators have groped for tentative language, shied from sweeping and dramatic claims, even at the risk of underplaying the urgency of the problem.

But the new consensus goes beyond this core concern. Let me suggest eight more components of it:

1. You can't go home again. A return to the past is neither desirable nor possible, not in terms of the long-lost homogeneity of students' religious knowledge and background nor in terms of the embarrassing conformity once enforced by fiat.
2. The intellectual and academic environment has changed. Peggy has described some of those changes. They include what has been described as the shift from epistemology to community as foundational for inquiry. In "Exiles From Eden," Mark R. Schwehn, professor of humanities and dean at Valparaiso University, writes: "The answers to basic human questions such as what we know, or how should we live, or in what or whom shall we place our hope have come to depend, for a large number of intellectuals, upon the answer to a prior question, who are we?"

This is another form of the realization, as Alasdair MacIntyre has argued and Peggy mentioned, that all thinking is tradition-based, all inquiry tradition-directed. This in turn has led to the recognition that there is no college or university pure and simple. There are different

kinds of colleges and universities, "beholden to diverse educational traditions," according to David Burrell. The Catholic university and the Enlightenment university may not be exactly the same creature, although a crucial test for either, as Burrell also points out, is the extent to which its tradition is open to free inquiry and does not rule some queries out antecedently.

Last year, Rebecca Blank, a distinguished MIT-trained neoclassical economist from Northwestern, gave several lectures at Notre Dame, mostly dealing with poverty. But the subject of one lecture was how her religious convictions--she is an active member of the United Church of Christ-- affected her work as an economist. Professor Blank began by saying how glad she was to be able to give a lecture at Notre Dame that she couldn't give at Northwestern. Why not? First, she said, because probably no one would come. Second, she said, because if some people did come, they wouldn't know what she was talking about. And third, she said, because her dean would probably drop by to remind her that Northwestern (which, of course, was founded by Methodists) was a secular institution.

3. Catholic identity in institutions of higher education must be manifest in their intellectual life as well as in their liturgical celebration and pastoral services. All Catholic colleges and universities strove to make sure that their academic offerings were comparable to those of secular schools, and as confidence collapsed in the so-called neoscholastic synthesis of the 1940s and '50s, Catholic identity was increasingly associated with campus worship, campus ministry, community service, and the tone and regulation of student life.

In many cases, those responsible for such activities rose to the challenge even as they often had to struggle for respect and resources. But part of today's consensus, I believe, is that this is not enough. As Peggy emphasized, Catholic Christianity is a tradition of the mind as well as the heart and will.

Today's consensus has gone beyond polemical questions like: Is there a Catholic mathematics, a Catholic chemistry, a Catholic accounting, or a Catholic business administration? It recognizes that the rich Catholic intellectual heritage which should be communicated, explored, questioned, revised, and renewed does not pertain in precisely the same way and to the same extent to every field and discipline. But while that heritage could be less obviously relevant to chemistry and accounting than to political theory or literature, even chemistry and mathematics departments,

let alone business administration, might be hospitable to certain philosophical, ethical or cross-disciplinary reflections and conversation that are unlikely to occur elsewhere.

4. Catholic identity must be something that pervades the work and life of a college or university and is not limited to the theology department. It is a tragedy that efforts to implement *Ex corde Ecclesiae* have so misdirected energy and attention to the certification and standing of theology professors. With most Catholic schools requiring no more than two semesters of theology, those courses could meet the severest standards of orthodoxy without guaranteeing any significant grappling with the Catholic heritage if it is not present elsewhere in the curriculum.

5. The future of Catholic identity will ultimately rest in the hands of the laity and in the hands of the faculty. By the year 2001, it is estimated that there will be an average of 14 Jesuits working on each of that order's campuses. Sponsoring religious orders, especially when enlivened by a vision, can yet wield a tremendous influence, but unless a campus exhibits a willingness rare in late 20th-century academia to submit to an authoritarian style, no vision can be implemented and perpetuated without the assent and support of a majority of faculty members. "The Catholicity of our institutions," Father Malloy has said, "will in the end be determined by the faculty."

6. The question of Catholic identity is therefore inescapably linked to hiring policies. This is a point of enormous delicacy but also of enormous importance.

George Marsden, whose history of the secularization of the nation's Protestant colleges and universities is required reading for anyone seriously interested in this question, has put the matter unflinchingly:

"Once a church-related institution adopts the policy that it will hire simply 'the best qualified candidates,' it is simply a matter of time until its faculty will have an ideological profile essentially like that of the faculty at every other mainstream university. The first loyalties of faculty members will be to the national cultures of their professions rather than to any local or ecclesiastical traditions. Faculty members become essentially interchangeable parts in a standardized national system.

"At first," Marsden continues, schools "can count on some continuity with their traditions based on informal ties and self-selection of those congenial to their heritage. Within a generation, however, there is bound to be a shift, and since departmental faculties typically have virtual autonomy

in hiring, it becomes impossible to reverse the trend and the church tradition becomes vestigial."

For a long time I thought that what Marsden so bluntly points out was the great unmentionable. Nothing else was as likely to provoke heated charges of discrimination or of violations of religious or academic freedom as the suggestion that the religious factor, whether in terms of personal commitment or in terms of scholarly interests in research and teaching, should play some part in hiring decisions.

Are you going to check baptismal certificates, monitor Mass attendance, banish wavering or lapsed Catholics, exclude non-Catholics or make them second-class campus citizens? Are not religious convictions, outside of theology, extraneous to responsible scholarship? Are not schools in danger of violating equal opportunity statutes, losing federal funds, or being subject to civil suits for discrimination?

I do not take those concerns and protests lightly, even if they can often be, as I found, reflexive rather than reflective, and sometimes showing unseemly haste to acquiesce in questionable interpretations of the law. And let me be clear: So far there is no consensus about how to respond to these concerns. Where there is consensus is that the hiring question, no matter how explosive, must be faced.

There is also consensus that this is not an either / or situation, that a wide range of choices regarding "religious heritage as a factor in hiring" exists between the total banishment of religious considerations or the diplomatic, "Here's our mission statement. Are you comfortable with it?" to the confessional-oath policies of some evangelical schools.

"The puzzle," writes Marsden, "is how to hold the middle ground. How is it possible, short of reverting to repressive strictures of earlier days, to maintain a vital religious presence, including an intellectual presence, in a modern university? Is there any way to retain the balance of being a university that is both Catholic and open to many other points of view?"

Having recognized the problem, the next most important step in this whole process toward a new era may be for a group like ACCU to organize a systematic and authoritative review of the options, one conducted, say, by a blue-ribbon committee whose members' scholarly credentials and parallel commitments to both Catholic identity and the academic are impeccable.

But those observations already indicate a seventh point of the consensus.

7. Catholic identity must embrace scholars of other faiths and of no faith not simply as admissible presences in Catholic higher education but as essential to its purposes. It is clear that in many cases Protestants, Jews, adherents of other religions, and agnostics and atheists may bring critical scholarly insight and good will to the Catholic campus mission for beyond what many Catholics offer.

8. The whole process of clarifying and strengthening Catholic identity can be easily undermined by the intervention of nonacademic ecclesiastical authorities. Catholic identity simply cannot be imposed or assured by fiat. It must be implanted by persuasion and sustained, ultimately, by love. If that cause is associated with nonacademic control over academic matters, the effort is half-lost before it has begun.

Let me summarize what I believe constitutes today's consensus. At its core is the realization that sustaining and revivifying Catholic identity is chief among Catholic higher education's challenges for the near future and has already inspired an outpouring of positive initiatives, from campus-based and national discussions to the establishment of a host of new institutes and programs.

Around this core, eight points:

First, there is no return to an imagined golden age.

Second, a changed intellectual context, with a growing appreciation of community, tradition, diversity and multiculturalism, offers opportunities to explain the intellectual and educational integrity of Catholic higher education to the academic world.

Third, the issue is one of intellectual life, of focus in research and teaching as well of student affairs, campus worship and ministry, and community service.

Fourth, the issue is far broader than the place and character of theology in the school.

Fifth, the issue ultimately will be decided by the attitudes of lay people and of faculty.

Sixth, the place in hiring of religious commitment and religious interests and competencies—in research and teaching must be confronted, and clear, meaningful policies developed.

Seventh, such policies must include, not exclude, non-Catholic scholars.

And eighth, infringements of academic autonomy by church authorities will be counterproductive.

At this point I hear someone asking: If we're agreed on so much, what's the big problem? In fact, I see not one big problem but four middle-sized obstacles. Some already have been suggested in my remarks.

The first, for example, is the defensiveness, the suspicion, the leaping to conclusions, the feeling of being under attack that can be stirred by these discussions or by even the most tentative proposal to make an institution's Catholic mission a significant factor in the hiring or tenure process. Fortunately, an increasing number of you are showing that a calm, open, participatory approach, untainted by the threat of premature or imposed solutions and more concerned about creating the future than defending the past, can create the atmosphere essential to a viable discussion.

The second obstacle is something that journalistic noses become quick to detect. Being a proper Boy Scout, I will simply describe it as the SD factor, for self-deception. Other, more rowdy types might want to initial it differently.

I sensed SD factor when I found in conversations about hiring that the impressive official version differed radically from what actually happened in the trenches. What but SD explained the official devotion to Catholic identity that was accompanied by promotional brochures and catalogs, by ads in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, by fund-raising campaigns in which all reference to *Catholic* had been either entirely eliminated, reduced to the minimum or duly obscured behind a word like *Jesuit*. Sometimes I was reminded of men who slip off their wedding rings when they go on business trips.

Less difficult to discuss but harder to confront are the entrenched power and national cultures of the academic disciplines and professions to which George Marsden referred. You know better than I the extent to which the disciplines, not the particular schools, define what is to be considered excellence, organize the subcategories of fields, and control the real loyalties, aspirations and career paths of faculty.

It is not only the problem of the job candidate in economics who is deterred by her discipline from developing a subspecialty in economics and theology or even cultivating an interest in interdisciplinary conversation of that sort. It is also the problem of the economics department members who feel that their own reputations vis-a-vis their discipline's standards (and therefore their marketability) might be tainted by actively recruiting someone with a theological interest. There is a conflict here that must be acknowledged and confronted head-on.

Finally, there also is a similar conflict with secular academia over academic freedom. I am in firm agreement with the Land O'Lakes statement's affirmation of excellence, autonomy, and academic freedom, as well as an effectively operative Catholic presence.

Unfortunately, there are notions of academic freedom widespread in the United States that, practically speaking, hold these defining aims to be incompatible. Historians have not missed the anti-religious--and I might add, anti-Catholic--strain that has run through both the academy's formal and informal understandings of academic freedom. George Bernard Shaw quipped that a Catholic university was a contradiction in terms, while John Henry Newman argued at length why a secular university was a contradiction in terms because it excluded from its scope a central set of questions and area of knowledge. We know which view is more popular, the sound bite or the argument.

I am not suggesting that Catholic educators work themselves into a lather of victimization over this fact. They simply need to recognize that in their world serious misunderstanding and, yes, even bigotry still sometimes operate--and to be prepared to name and challenge it when necessary.

Different images come to my mind when I try to sum up this gathering. A launching pad. A frontier. A mountain valley. They all suggest a point reached with difficulty but now the staging area for a departure into new, uncharted territory.

You need to overcome the doubts, anxieties, nagging uncertainties that beset anyone daring to attempt something new. There is, after all, a world out there of people, many of whom we respect, absolutely convinced that there are no other alternatives in higher education except narrow

institutions of indoctrination and the religious featurelessness of most college and university life. To defy that conventional wisdom, to explore the unexplored, you need to know the direction you want to travel, but you also must be willing to move forward without a fully filled-in map, without all the answers, without, in your case, a new synthesis, a grand educational theory or a guaranteed route through all the tangles of academic freedom, faculty fears, and a church struggling with pluralism.

You need to go forward together. Over 200 schools have a much better chance of accomplishing collectively what would be a very risky expedition for one or two or a dozen isolated institutions.

American Catholicism's array of colleges and universities, absolutely unparalleled in the world, was not created without risk taking and readiness to venture something new. Make this gathering worthy of that history. Make it the moment where it becomes obvious that, through your creativity, enlivened by God's spirit, there can be something new under the sun in higher education.

Ethnic Diversity and Religious Identity in U.S. Catholic Higher Education

Robert V. Caro, S.J.

A 2006 *New York Times* report highlights the "murky" and "contentious" environment that has followed in the wake of two affirmative action decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in 2003. Both decisions involve the University of Michigan. In one case, the court upheld the use of race in law-school admission decisions, finding that a "highly individualized holistic review of each applicant's file" justified consideration of an applicant's race. In the other case, involving undergraduate admissions, the court struck down the practice of awarding points based on race.¹

One might say the court took away with one hand what it gave with the other. Opponents of affirmative action seized on the uncertain state of the law as well as the changing composition of the court to raise legal challenges that call into question "hundreds of thousands of dollars in fellowships, scholarships, and other programs previously created for minority students."² Many universities, facing threats of litigation and other pressures, are opening funds to white students that they had previously dedicated to ethnic minorities.

According to the newspaper report, "Officials at conservative groups that are pushing for changes see the shift as a sign of success in eliminating race as a factor in decision making in higher education."³ Roger Clegg, president and general counsel for the conservative Center for Equal Opportunity is quoted as saying, "Our concern is that the law be

Robert V. Caro, S.J., is the Vice President for Mission & Ministry, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA.

¹Jonathan D. Glater, "Colleges Open Minority Aid to All Comers," *New York Times*, March 14, 2006, A1, A22.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

followed and that nobody be denied participation in a program on account of skin color or what country their ancestors came from.”⁴

This view, which fails to recognize the significance of historical differences in educational opportunity for privileged white students on the one hand and minority students on the other, is countered by Theodore M. Shaw, president of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.: "How is it that they [Clegg and others] conclude the great evil in this country is discrimination against white people? Can I put that question any more pointedly? I struggle to find the words to do so because it's so stunning.”⁵

Anyone who believes in the benefits of a diverse college campus will be troubled by the liberal-conservative polarity reflected in this news account. Besides calling into question whether and to what extent proactive programs for minorities are consistent with legal principles, the split serves as a chilling reminder that the underlying goals of educational equity for traditionally under-represented groups are still subject to the shifting winds of politics. The point is underscored by declining minority enrollments for fall 2006 at UCLA and several other University of California campuses, where Proposition 209, a 1996 voter-approved initiative, banned consideration in public institutions of race and gender in admissions and hiring.⁶

Whatever the outcome of current legal challenges in the wake of the Michigan case or of efforts in California's public universities to work around the restrictions of Proposition 209, I believe that for United States Catholic universities, numerous passages of the decrees of the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) and other ecclesial documents of recent decades provide a much broader context in which to situate a firm commitment to ethnic diversity. This context encompasses, but goes beyond, American racial/ethnic politics and makes clear that for Catholic universities a commitment to ethnic diversity is not an option but needs to be a key feature of their identity. These universities should be inclusive not because of legal or political exigency but precisely because they are Catholic and therefore see every human being as a child of God, embrace a commitment to the common good, and share the

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Rebecca Trounson, "A Startling Statistic at UCLA," *Los Angeles Times*, June 3, 2006, A1, A10

church's post-Vatican II concern for the cultural progress of all people, especially the poor and afflicted.

After reviewing conciliar and other church documents in the first part of this paper, I will suggest, in the second part, that a university whose commitment to ethnic diversity is grounded in Catholic identity will not be satisfied with mere tolerance of minority members. Rather, it will urge everyone to make educational capital of the opportunity to engage the other in genuine dialogue, with social and intellectual solidarity the desired result.

Finally, having made the case that a commitment to ethnic diversity is central to contemporary Catholic identity, I will go on to caution that the two are not coextensive. Catholic identity is a broader complex of cultural and religious values and provides the unifying structure that supports a commitment to diversity. I will conclude by suggesting that the particularity of Catholic identity and the inclusivity a university espouses through its commitment to ethnic diversity need to be held in creative tension.

Conciliar and Other Ecclesial Documents

Any overview of the documents of the Second Vatican Council needs to begin with *Lumen Gentium*, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. This first and foundational decree of the council, approved November 21, 1964, is less concerned with the institutional organization of the church than with the basic reality of the church's relationship with Christ. The document moves toward a view of the church as the primary sacrament of encounter with Christ and as the instrument for achieving, in Christ, the unity of the human race. This understanding corresponds with the image of the church as community, or people of God, and gives rise to the idea that the mission of the church encompasses not only the ministries of word and sacrament but also the pursuit of justice and concern for the transformation of the world. "The church is called to not only preach the word and celebrate the sacraments," said Ann Ida Gannon, B.V.M., in a reflection on *Lumen Gentium*, "but also to serve human needs in society and culture; social, political, economic, [and] scientific areas are also proper areas for her influence."⁷

⁷Ann Ida Gannon, B.V.M., "Some Aspects of Catholic Higher Education since Vatican II," *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education* 8.1 (Summer 1987): 12.

If *Lumen Gentium* is the foundational document of Vatican II, subsequent documents spell out its implications for a church that no longer sees itself in a defensive posture toward the world but rather in dialogue with it, e.g., *Unitatis Redintegratio* (Decree on Ecumenism), *Dignitatis Humanae* (Declaration on Religious Liberty), and *Nostra Aetate* (Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions). Most especially, however, *Gaudium et Spes*, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, is recognized as the lens through which we should read *Lumen Gentium*. If *Lumen Gentium*, as a *dogmatic* constitution, speaks at times in language that appeals mainly to believers, *Gaudium et Spes*, as a *pastoral* constitution, addresses all of humanity:

Now that the Second Vatican Council has studied the mystery of the church more deeply [in *Lumen Gentium*], it addresses not only the daughters and sons of the church and all who call upon the name of Christ, but the whole of humanity as well, and it wishes to set down how it understands the presence and function of the church in the world today.⁸

Situating itself in solidarity with the entire human race, *Gaudium et Spes* embraces the church's mission of service and expresses its desire to shed the light of scripture on "the joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the people of our time, especially those who are poor or afflicted."⁹ In other passages it will be clear that the outreach is not one way; rather, the council wishes a genuine dialogue in which the church not only shares the wisdom of Christian faith but also learns from the world.¹⁰

Undergirding the document's concern for "the people of our time" is its strong emphasis on the humanity of Jesus and its corresponding emphasis on the dignity of every human being as reflected in the reality of the incarnation: Jesus became who we are. This theological anthropology is apparent in the following passage:

Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed in [Christ], has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare. *Foy*, by his incarnation, he, the

⁸ Flannery, Austin, O.P., ed. "Gaudium et Spes", *Vatican II Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations: A Completely Revised Translation in Inclusive Language*. Northport, NY: Costello, 1996, 2.

⁹ "Gaudium et Spes," 1.

¹⁰ "Gaudium et Spes," 33: "The church is guardian of the deposit of God's word and draws religious and moral principles from it, but it does not always have a ready answer to every question. Still, it is eager to associate the light of revelation with the experience of humanity in trying to clarify the course upon which it has recently entered." See also *Gaudium et Spes* sections: 40, 44, 92.

Son of God, has in a certain way united himself with each individual. He worked with human hands, he thought with a human mind. He acted with a human will, and with a human heart he loved.... Conformed to the image of the Son who is the firstborn of many brothers and sisters, Christians receive the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom 8:23) by which they are able to fulfill the new law of love.... All this holds true not only for Christians but also for all people of good will in whose hearts grace is active invisibly. For since Christ died for everyone, ... we must hold that the Holy Spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partners, in a way known to God, in the paschal mystery.¹¹

By emphasizing the humanity of Jesus, *Gaudium et Spes* helps us to appreciate a telling parallel between the concern of Jesus for the people of his time and the council's concern for "the people of our time"—not just the Christian faithful, but all people. Not only are the preaching and parables of Jesus "placed in the context of the social, political, and economic realities of the period in which [the gospels] were written,"¹² but also, within that context, they frequently show us Jesus reaching out to strangers (non-Jews), to women, and to all kinds of marginalized people—tax collectors, public sinners, lepers, etc. The ministry of Jesus was truly inclusive. It is exemplary in its openness to the other.

As many commentators have pointed out, at Vatican II, the Roman Catholic Church began to emerge for the first time as a truly global church,¹³ not simply a Western church, and for that reason the other who makes a claim on us in the name of our common humanity is as likely to be found across the world as on the other side of town. Concern for the common good, which is axiomatic in Catholic social thought, may begin at home but is not, in the view of the council, limited by local or national borders:

Because of the increasingly close interdependence that is gradually extending to the entire world, we are today witnessing an extension of the role of the common good, which is the sum total of the social conditions that allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and easily. The resulting rights and obligations are consequently the concern of the entire human race. Every group must take into account the needs and legitimate aspirations of every other group, and even those of the human family as a whole.¹⁴

¹¹ "Gaudium et Spes" 22.

¹² Mark Bosco, S.J., *Graham Greene's Catholic Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), 85. Bosco offers illuminating comments on several council documents in his discussion of Graham Greene's post-Vatican II development as a Catholic novelist.

¹³ See, for example, John R. Crocker, S.J., (World Vision and Global Church/" *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education 2.2* (Winter 1982): 42-48.

¹⁴ "Gaudium et Spes," 26.

Whether at home, on our campuses, in local communities, or in the larger world, the social interdependence—the human solidarity—envisioned by *Gaudium et Spes* requires individuals to have a sense of personal responsibility for "their obligations in conscience toward themselves and various groups to which they belong."¹⁵ The document recognizes, moreover, that a developed sense of personal responsibility for the common good is scarcely possible without education. "Above all," it says, "we must undertake the training of youth *from all social backgrounds* if we are to produce the kind of men and women so urgently needed today, men and women who not only are highly cultured but are generous in spirit as well."¹⁶ In a similar vein, a subsequent passage of *Gaudium et Spes* speaks of a "duty" to "ensure the recognition and implementation everywhere of everyone's right to human and civil culture in harmony with personal dignity, *without distinction of race, sex, nation, religion, or social circumstances.*"¹⁷ In carrying out this duty,

Every effort should be made to provide for those who are capable of it the opportunity to pursue higher studies so that as far as possible they may engage in the functions and services, and play the role in society most in keeping with their talents and the skills they acquire. In this way all the individuals and social groups of a particular people will be able to attain a full development of their cultural life in harmony with their capabilities and traditions.¹⁸

Similarly, *Gravissimum Educationis*, the council's Declaration on Christian Education, underscores the idea that "all people of whatever race, condition, or age, in virtue of their dignity as human persons, have an inalienable right to education."¹⁹ Mindful of this right, the council asks universities to facilitate entrance "for students of great promise but of modest resources."²⁰

Taken together, all these passages make the conciliar case for a Catholic university's commitment to ethnic diversity. We can summarize them by saying that since the time of the council, the church no longer assumes a defensive posture but wants to be in dialogue with the world. The church's mission includes, in addition to the ministries of

¹⁵ "Gaudium et Spes/I 31.

¹⁶ "Gaudium et Spes/" 31 (Emphasis added).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 60 (Emphasis added).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Flannery, Austin, O.P., ed. "Gravissimum Educationis", *Vatican II Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations: A Completely Revised Translation in Inclusive Language*. Northport, NY: Oostello, 1996, 1.

²⁰ "Gravissimum Educationis," 10.

word and sacrament, a concern for justice and the development of people, especially those living on the margins of society. Every woman and man is a child of God and has been raised to a new dignity through the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Against this background, the council documents urge the importance of education for the local and global common good and point to the responsibility of educational institutions to promote social interdependence and welcome students "without distinction of race, sex, nation, religion or social circumstances."^{20b}

In the decades following Vatican II, key documents continued to echo the council's faith-inspired call for economic development, social justice, and human solidarity in promotion of the common good. Two of these documents are Pope Paul VI's 1967 encyclical, *Populorum Progressio*, and Pope John Paul II's 1987 encyclical, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*. Both documents descend directly from *Gaudium et Spes* and join a long tradition of social encyclicals going back to 1891. And both are referenced in John Paul's 1990 apostolic constitution on Catholic higher education, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, in the paragraph where the pope touches on a Catholic university's diversity commitment as part of its responsibility "to contribute concretely to the society within which it works."²¹ The entire paragraph is worth quoting as a reprise of the conciliar documents reviewed above:

The Christian spirit of service to others for the promotion of social justice is of particular importance for each Catholic university, to be shared by its teachers and developed in its students. The church is firmly committed to the integral growth of all men and women (cf. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* #27-34). The Gospel, interpreted in the social teachings of the church, is an urgent call to promote "the development of those people who are striving to escape from hunger, misery, endemic diseases and ignorance; of those who are looking for a wider share in the benefits of civilization, and a more active improvement of their human qualities; of those who are aiming purposefully at their complete fulfillment" (*Populorum Progressio* #1). Every Catholic university feels responsible to contribute concretely to the society within which it works: for example, [by making] university education accessible to all those who are able to benefit from it, especially the poor or members of minority groups who customarily have been deprived of it. A Catholic university also has the responsibility, to the degree that it is able, to help to promote the development of the emerging nations.²²

Like the documents of the council, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* sees a university's commitment to ethnic minorities, the poor, and other under-

^{20b} "Gaudium et Spes," 60.

²¹ Pope John Paul II. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii-apc_15081990_ex-cordeecclesiae_en.html>, 1990, 34.

²² *Ibid.*, 34 (Emphasis added).

represented groups as an act of social justice—as a necessary expression of the church's gospel-based concern for the common good and the development of peoples. Such a commitment is to be realized primarily in the context of the university's home country. Yet it is not surprising that the church's concern is global and that in the postcolonial era, Catholic universities are encouraged to cultivate in their faculty and students an awareness of the needs of emerging nations.

In their 1980 statement *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, the U.S. bishops offered universities similar encouragement for an international perspective, even while emphasizing a strong diversity commitment as required by the social reality of the United States.²³ For the bishops, such a commitment extends not only to student recruitment and financial aid but also to faculty hiring and the presence of minorities on boards of trustees. This is what the bishops wrote:

As new minority groups seek educational opportunities, Catholic institutions should strive to respond to their legitimate needs, providing student aid and an education that respects their culture while offering the benefits of the Christian heritage. We have in mind Blacks, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and other minorities, but, especially, Hispanic Americans, whose own Catholic culture is so rich and whose numbers are so great.... We ask that attention be given to the need for the presence of minority persons on boards of trustees and faculties of these institutions. [Moreover,] because the unity of all people under God is a fundamental principle of Catholic theology, an international point of view should be evident on the Catholic campus.²⁴

As is clear from the bishops' statement, from papal documents, and from key passages of Vatican II, contemporary Catholic universities have a responsibility to share in the church's postconciliar concern for the development of individuals and societies. It is ultimately a concern for—a belief in—human dignity, social justice, and the common good. It provides the broad context in which the documents we have reviewed situate a Catholic university's commitment to ethnic diversity and provide the motivation for it. I turn now to a consideration of how such a commitment can be furthered when diverse groups and individuals attend to the church's post Vatican II emphasis on dialogue.

Beyond Tolerance: Embracing Dialogue

At first glance it might appear that the success of a university's commitment to ethnic diversity could be measured in terms of minority

²³ United States Catholic Conference, *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, (Washington, DC: USCC, 1981).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

student enrollment, faculty ethnicity, retention rates, and so on. But are such indices enough? Or, to ask the question another way, does a commitment to diversity imply more than providing educational access to previously under-represented groups? For those whose epistemology valorizes the context in which learning takes place, the answer to this latter question is a resounding "yes." They see the embrace of diversity as offering positive educational benefits for the entire campus community. They see that for students, as well as faculty and staff, a diverse community promotes openness to intellectual, ethical, and spiritual dimensions of truth previously unseen. As a benefit specifically for students, this enhanced understanding is aptly described in the *amicus* brief filed by the University of Chicago and other institutions in the affirmative-action case brought against the University of Michigan:

Students are both recipients and providers of the learning that takes place at universities, and [universities] have a vital interest in what students bring to the task of educating each other.... Diversity helps students confront perspectives other than their own and thus to think more vigorously and imaginatively; it helps students learn to relate to persons from different backgrounds; it helps students become better citizens. The educational benefits of student diversity include the discovery that there is a broad range of viewpoints and experience within any given minority community—as well as learning that certain imagined differences at times turn out to be only skin deep.²⁵

Chicago's website goes on to point out that when meaningful diversity is absent, "homogeneity perpetuates unchallenged assumptions—the very antithesis of what a university stands for." On the other hand, when there is a critical mass of diverse faculty, staff, and students, as Fairfield University President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., has remarked, "interaction, understanding, enlightenment, and conversion" occur.²⁶ In formal and informal settings, dialogue happens, and diversity's value-added educational benefits click in.

So a full-fledged commitment to ethnic diversity means more than opening the doors to minority groups. It has implications as well for members of the majority community. It is not enough that they support an official policy of nondiscrimination, or remain free of bias or prejudice, or proclaim tolerance for ethnic groups other than their own. A

²⁵ University of Chicago, "Diversity Statement" Autumn 2004. <http://www.chicago.edu/docs/education/diversity-statement.html> (Accessed December 6, 2005).

²⁶ Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., Fairfield University, "Martin Luther King Day Remarks," January 2005. <http://www.fairfield.edu/x6337.xml> (Accessed October 4, 2005).

full-fledged commitment to diversity, teleologically grounded in Catholic beliefs in human dignity, social justice, and the common good, will mean more than tolerance. It will mean outreach to the other. And it will mean, on a Catholic campus, embracing the spirit of dialogue bequeathed to the church by Vatican II.

We have already noted the emphasis that *Gaudium et Spes* places on dialogue with the world. The actual word 'dialogue' (*dialogus*) appears four times in that document and even more often in the decree on ecumenism (five times) and the decree on the church's missionary activity (six times). It is also used in the decree on religious liberty; and throughout the documents the related word 'discussion' (*colloquium*) is used even more widely.²⁷ But the council did more than talk about discussion and dialogue. Vatican II also practiced what it preached, and, according to Joseph Komonchak, continues to serve as a model for dialogue. The council, he writes, "provided ample room for discussion [and] debate, for disagreement, and, as often as not, these were dealt with by conciliation and compromise for the sake of as broad a consensus as possible."²⁸

Dialogue—in the sense of a willingness to engage with others on sensitive topics like religion, politics, or culture—is rarely easy and not always successful. Yet, in the spirit of Vatican II, it belongs at the heart of a Catholic university's commitment to ethnic diversity. As Bradford Hintze suggests in the following description, taken from his study of practices of dialogue in the Catholic Church since Vatican II, dialogue does not guarantee moving beyond tolerance, yet it holds great promise for doing just that—for breaking down barriers and building community:

The distinctive, dynamic feature of dialogue ... is the back-and-forth movement in communication between individuals in which people are acting both as speakers and listeners and there is an exchange of messages that provide the condition for possible common understandings, judgments, decisions, and actions. Through this exchange people can gain insight into their personal and communal identity and into the world; horizons expand, minds and hearts change, conversions occur. Such a dynamic supplies the necessary ingredients in the formation of bonds of relationship, bonds that may withstand varieties of hostility, or elicit uneasy tolerance, but

²⁷ Bradford E. Hintze, *Practices of Dialogue in the Roman Catholic Church: Aims, Obstacles, Lessons and Laments*, (New York: Continuum, 2006) 308, note 28.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 126.

that also provide the condition for the possibility of the deepest forms of sociality, friendship, and love.²⁹

In an article addressing the mission of Catholic higher education in a divided world, David Hollenbach, S.J., is similarly optimistic about the possibilities of dialogue for breaking down barriers that have traditionally divided local and global communities. He is specifically concerned with a renewed dedication in Catholic universities to the common good, which of course includes harmonious relationships among ethnic groups. In developing his argument he makes a case for the importance of dialogue in casual social contacts as well as in more structured academic encounters.

Hollenbach believes that the common good, a central theme in Catholic tradition long before Vatican II (it has roots in Aristotle and was discussed by Aquinas) is in serious trouble today from both American and global pluralism. He points out that many thinkers (*e.g.*, John Rawls) claim that we cannot be expected to agree on the good we share in common. Without such agreement, groups that are fundamentally divergent in their culture, religious tradition, or way of life appear as threats to one another. "The most they can hope for is tolerance, and for many middle-class Americans, this is the highest good."³⁰ Hollenbach argues that Catholic universities are well situated to counter this predilection for individual goods over the common good. Catholic universities, he writes,

... have a particular capacity and special responsibility to bring reflection on the common good to bear on the [racial, ethnic, and class] divisions of our metropolitan areas and on the cultural and religious conflicts that divide our globalizing world.... The teaching and research of Catholic universities ought to be making notable contributions to understanding how metropolitan and global interdependence can embody commitment to the common good. This can be called the university's mission of solidarity.³¹

According to Hollenbach, this mission of solidarity in pursuit of the local and global common good can take two forms: social and intellectual solidarity. Both presuppose dialogue.

²⁹ Hintze > *Practices of Dialogue in the Roman Catholic Church: Aims, Obstacles, Lessons and Laments*, 8.

³⁰ David Hollenbach, S.J., "Strength in Mission through Solidarity: Catholic Higher Education in a Divided World," *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education* 23.2 (Summer 2003): 6.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

Social solidarity reflects the idea, prominent in Catholic social thought, that the dignity of human persons comes to fruition in community. Social solidarity therefore rejects all forms of personal interaction "that reinforce inequality and existing patterns of exclusion, whether these be economic, political, or cultural."³² It is equivalent to what Aristotle called "civic friendship" and is a prerequisite for justice. Indeed, the ultimate injustice—the negation of social solidarity—happens when "a person or group [is] treated actively or abandoned passively as if they were non-members of the human race."³³

Unjust exclusion can take many forms, whether on a college campus or in the wider community, and people who promote it—or simply tolerate it when they could do otherwise—fail in their responsibility to the common good. It is the duty of Catholic higher education to sensitize students to the responsibilities of social solidarity or civic friendship and help them envision ways to live it out, ways that involve talking and interacting—dialogue—with individuals from groups other than their own.

Intellectual solidarity, which implies a more structured academic context than social solidarity, calls for honest, respectful dialogue that is hopeful of convergence and open to the possibility of growth. According to Hollenbach, intellectual solidarity requires "more than a tolerance that simply leaves others who are different alone ... it requires both listening and speaking in a genuine conversation across the boundaries that have traditionally divided the world."³⁴ He adds this particularly apposite observation:

Overall the Catholic intellectual tradition [has] a conviction that cultures holding different visions of the good life can get somewhere if they are willing to risk serious engagement with one another. This conviction should above all shape the Catholic university today, marking [its members] with a readiness to listen to those with different views ... while being unafraid to speak [their own] convictions with true humility.³⁵

Like Hollenbach, William M. Shea finds a strong impetus within the Catholic intellectual tradition, spurred on by Vatican II, for active dialogue with—rather than passive tolerance of—those from other back-

³² Ibid., 8.

³³ Ibid., 8. (quoting Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality* [New York: Basic Books, 1983] 76).

³⁴ Ibid., 9.

³⁵ Ibid., 10.

grounds or traditions. In an article entitled "Beyond Tolerance: Pluralism and Catholic Higher Education," Shea focuses on religious pluralism, but his general analysis of tolerance and its shortcomings is equally relevant when applied to ethnic pluralism. He cites a dictionary definition of tolerance—"to suffer to be or to be done without prohibition, hindrance, or contradiction" — and notes (as did Hollenbach) that although tolerance in this sense is a useful political virtue, it is "essentially negative," namely, "the willingness and the ability to put up with something the elimination of which might be more difficult or dangerous."³⁶

Shea then differentiates three types of tolerance. He calls the first type the tolerance of the Enlightenment. It is characterized by a concealed classicism and "takes its own truth for granted, along with the falsity or inauthenticity of the tolerated." For Shea, this type of tolerance "leads nowhere," least of all to understanding. It can be the tolerance of a bigot.³⁷ Shea's second type—relativist tolerance—is characteristic of what he calls the "muddle headed liberal." Far from being a bigot, the liberal relativist may profess openness but "will not engage in serious critical conversation about beliefs and values because, in the final analysis, no belief or value is incorrect or wrong."³⁸ Shea's critique of these first two types of tolerance is devastating:

The tolerance of the Enlightenment and the tolerance of liberalism are no longer adequate for dealing with the realities of American political, academic, and ecclesial life. They either permit us to avoid and ignore the other or they permit us to talk with the other without taking the conversation seriously. They militate against the very task of education: they may allow the other, whether student or faculty member, to "construct their world of meaning" but they do not aid in it or lead to it. Neither of these versions of tolerance befits the teacher or the administrator who cares about the integrity of education ...³⁹

But there is a third type of tolerance, which Shea calls "active tolerance" and which closely resembles Hollenbach's social and intellectual solidarity. Neither arrogant (like the tolerance of the Enlightenment) nor condescending (like relativist tolerance), active tolerance "is based on humility and on respect for the minds and hearts and history of others.... When it is practiced with full heart, it is the sort of tolerance

³⁶ William M. Shea, "Beyond Tolerance: Pluralism and Catholic Higher Education," *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education* 8.2 (Winter 1988): 39.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 39.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 39.

that seeks the truth in the life and words of another and assumes that there is a truth there to be found.”⁴⁰ For Shea, this type of tolerance—he says perhaps it should be called by another name—is a “crucial” virtue in academic life.⁴¹ It is the tolerance of genuine dialogue—it requires careful listening as well as speaking—and happens only when participants from different racial, ethnic, or religious groups (or from both sides of a disputed question) take responsibility for their convictions and express what is most meaningful to them with clarity, courage and a willingness to grow in mutual understanding.

Shea makes a convincing case that the first two types of tolerance are not up to the task of fruitful academic discourse, leaving us free to conclude that something more is required if faculty, staff, and students are going to embrace (rather than give hesitating or indifferent approval to) a commitment to ethnic diversity. That “something more” is the kind of dialogue that, as Shea acknowledges, moves beyond tolerance to a genuine willingness to engage the other.

As we saw in the first part of this paper, a basic commitment to ethnic diversity on the part of a Catholic university is not simply a political statement but is also, and more fundamentally, an expression of religious identity. Similarly, the embrace of diversity as offering positive educational benefits to an entire campus community takes on added urgency at Catholic universities because it is an opportunity to put into practice the spirit of dialogue bequeathed to the church by Vatican II. In their overlapping emphases on dialogue and social/intellectual solidarity, Shea and Hollenbach take us beyond tolerance and help us to see that a Catholic university's commitment to ethnic diversity cannot be simply a matter of nondiscrimination in providing access for historically under-represented minority groups. It is indeed that, but it is also an opportunity for majority as well as minority members of a university community to engage one another in their pursuit of knowledge and, in that enterprise, to open themselves to new possibilities of friendship and love. “To risk serious engagement,” in Hollenbach's phrase, is to embrace the kind of dialogue that moves away from a person's comfort zone and ordinary frames of reference (thus it is a risk) in order to

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Loyola, Ignatius. *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius*. Trans. George E. Ganss, S.J., St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992. Cf. Ignatian Presupposition: “Every good Christian ought to be more ready to give a favorable interpretation to another's perhaps obscure statement or position than to condemn it” (St. Ignatius Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises* #22).

create an epistemological world where new knowledge can be born and where human dignity will be respected, social justice promoted, and the common good advanced. In a university setting there are many occasions, both formal and informal, intellectual and social, for such dialogue.⁴² In a Catholic university, embracing them is an opportunity—and also a responsibility—to break down barriers of fear, to expand horizons, and to grow in human solidarity.

Particularity and Inclusivity: A Creative Tension

As crucial as ethnic diversity may be for the identity of today's Catholic university, it is nonetheless only a part of that identity. We saw above that the documents of Vatican II (especially *Gaudium et Spes*), as well as subsequent ecclesial statements, help us situate a Catholic commitment to ethnic diversity in the church's concern for human dignity, social justice, and the common good. Yet in developing such themes and in its desire to honor diversity-catholicity with a small "c"—the council "drew upon the wider intellectual heritage of Catholicism, the broader theological framework within which the social fits."⁴³ This "wider intellectual heritage"—which in fact is not exclusively theological, which includes an imaginative as well as an intellectual dimension, and which is perhaps more aptly called the "Catholic cultural tradition"⁴⁴—is the birthright and defining characteristic of Catholic universities. It differentiates them from their secular counterparts and, in some respects,

⁴² Loyola Marymount University Brochure. *Interculturalism: Definition, Vision, and Goals*. October 2005. The kinds of dialogue I have been emphasizing as incumbent upon a Catholic university in the spirit of Vatican II overlap with the pro-active approach to ethnic diversity known as interculturalism. At Loyola Marymount University, for example, Interculturalism is defined as "sharing and learning across cultures with the aim of promoting understanding, equity, harmony, and justice in a diverse society." The interculturalism vision statement elaborates: "Grounded in the Catholic intellectual tradition, Loyola Marymount University affirms human dignity and promotes justice. Different cultures are unique expressions of these common aspirations. All cultures can contribute to the search for knowledge and the building of communities based on the common humanity of all people. At LMU interculturalism is an essential source of academic excellence and a defining characteristic of our campus community. We draw upon interculturalism to create a university of excellence, to serve as a model Catholic institution, and to be a catalyst for the creation of a more just society built 'on respect and a sense of shared destiny."

⁴³ Bryan J. Hehir, Remarks Delivered at August 3-6, 1995, Conference at University of St. Thomas. In *Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education* 1.1 (November 1995): 37.

⁴⁴ Robert N. Bellah, "Religion and the Shape of National Culture" *America* 181.3 (July 31-August 7, 1999): 11-14. Robert N. Bellah writes of "a Catholic cultural tradition in America that has never been completely Protestantized." (13).

from other church-related colleges and universities. To the extent that it is alive and well, it keeps these universities—at the heart of their academic life as well as in their institutional ethos—a—true to their identity and ensures that they remain not only inclusive but also Catholic in a particular sense, Catholic with a large "C." Such universities, even as they grow in academic distinction, aspire to be recognized as centers of Catholic life and culture; indeed, as places where the church does its thinking.

An increasing volume of literature has appeared in recent years on the Catholic cultural/intellectual tradition and on the nature of Catholic higher education, much of it motivated by a concern that Catholic universities not go the way of many originally Protestant institutions that threw off their religious identity during the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth.⁴⁵ It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a comprehensive overview of this literature, so let it suffice for present purposes to note that the cultural/intellectual tradition that belongs at the heart of a Catholic university includes characteristics such as these.⁴⁶

1. **It views the world as sacramental and seeks to find God in all things.** Whereas classic Protestantism stresses the otherness of God, Catholicism, with its strong focus on the incarnation, refuses to lose sight of the immanence of God. In the words of Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins, "The world is charged with the grandeur of God."^{46b} On this view, the world is filled with signs that speak

⁴⁵ Associated Press, "(Church Ties Loosened by Many Universities," *Los Angeles Times*, August 22, 1992, B4-B5. An iconic example was the dramatic decision of Presbyterian-founded Occidental College in Los Angeles to remove the cross from its campus chapel as the college strove to project a pluralistic image. According to President John Slaughter, "Part of the problem here was that the college was perceived to be continuing to behave as though it were a Christian college. This created some difficulties with students and faculty members." (B5).

⁴⁶ The following list makes no pretension to completeness. It draws heavily on explanations and examples of the Catholic intellectual/cultural tradition developed more fully by, among others, Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, "The Catholic Intellectual Tradition," address given during August 3-6, 1995, conference at University of St. Thomas and published in *Origins* 25.11 (August 24, 1995): 169, 170-73 (also in Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, *Occasional Papers On Catholic Higher Education* 1.1 [November 1995]: 3-10); and by Mark W. Roche, *The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), 2003. Both Steinfels and Roche reflect themes from John Paul II's *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*.

^{46b} "(God's Grandeur/" *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, 4th ed. (London: Oxford UP, 1967), 66.

to us of hidden realities, as do the church's seven sacraments—outward signs of graced experience. Especially in the Eucharist, believers encounter Christ and, in communion with him, grow in community with one another.

2. It takes philosophical and theological thinking seriously.

Catholics are not fundamentalists nor do they hold to the principle of *sola scriptura*. They view theology as faith seeking understanding, and from the beginning they have sought to give an accounting of what they believe. Early on they began to see their faith through the lens of Greek thought and thus brought into the church a tradition of philosophical reflection. It flourished in the first universities, founded by the church in the middle ages, and continues to the present day. In contrast to the dominant secular view, Catholic tradition stresses the ability of the human mind to arrive at reasonably argued conclusions and, ultimately, to know objective truth.⁴⁷

3. It esteems both intellect and imagination. In Catholic tradition, the speculative mind of Thomas Aquinas is no less esteemed than the poetic imagination of Dante Alighieri. While extremists among the Reformers were smashing statues and destroying stained glass in their zeal to purify religion, Catholic devotion was fostering the use of imagination in prayer and promoting a baroque sensual exuberance in art and architecture. Although not without its own strain of Puritanism, Catholic tradition, in esteeming works of imagination as well as intellect, honors both sides of the flesh-spirit duality. Given the tradition's emphasis on incarnation, it could do no less.

4. It eschews the supposition that there can be value-free

facts. Was the dropping of an atomic bomb on Hiroshima merely a fact or also a moral evil? For Catholic thinkers, it was, of course, both. In Catholic tradition facts are rarely simple, autonomous realities but have implicit teleologies and value implications. As Margaret

⁴⁷For a position quite at odds with the Catholic intellectual tradition, of media commentator Tim Rutten's description and criticism of "a strong new current in American life—the culture of assertion, which increasingly pushes logical argument out of our public conversation. According to this schema, things are true because I believe they are true and you *have* to respect that, because it's what I believe/" Rutten adds that the culture of assertion "makes things like creationism an issue in our schools and the demands of biblical literalism a force in our politics." (*Los Angeles Times* [May 20, 2006j, E13). Tim Rutten. "Concoct a Word War? It Won't Crack This Code," *Los Angeles Times*, May 20, 2006, E1, E13.

O'Brien Steinfels has observed, "The notion that education can be a value-neutral process in which teachers simply convey facts and students simply receive them, in which behavior is neither right nor wrong but a matter of personal choice, in which judgments are neither better or worse, but simply someone's opinion, is nonsense."⁴⁸

5. It respects the integrity of the individual but also pursues the common good. The American ethos, as influenced by classic Protestantism, exalts the autonomy of the individual and is thus not entirely comfortable with the idea of the common good. Catholicism, on the other hand, takes seriously the demands of biblical justice and social solidarity. Even while it has learned from Protestantism a deepened respect for individual integrity, it "elevates to an unusual degree the embeddedness of the individual within a collective identity."⁴⁹ As we have already seen, this concern for the common good is reflected in the documents of Vatican II and other ecclesial writings. In a specifically American context, Robert Bellah views Catholics as having a special responsibility to promote the common good as a counter-balance to the dominant individualism of our culture.⁵⁰

6. It seeks an integration of knowledge in which "faith and reason bear harmonious witness to the unity of all truth."⁵¹ All learning, all intellectual disciplines shed light on the created world and point beyond to the Source of truth. In Catholic tradition, this is why faith and reason are not antagonistic or ultimately contradictory and why there is optimism about the ability of the mind to know objective truth. It is also why contemporary Catholicism encourages dialogue with culture and other faith traditions; why it looks, as toward a horizon never quite attained, for the integration

⁴⁸Steinfels, "The Catholic Intellectual Tradition," 9.

⁴⁹Roche, *The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University*, 11.

⁵⁰This is the theme of Bellah's article cited above. Interestingly, he remarks, page 13, a strong correlation between the common good and the Catholic emphasis on the sacraments, especially the Eucharist: "The sacraments pull us into an embodied world of relationships and connections ... rather than a world in which individuals attempt to escape from society" The tension between individuals and society is already implicit in an earlier work, Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1985). Robert Putnam's evocatively titled *Bowling Alone* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) also addresses this tension.

⁵¹*Ex Carde Ecclesiae*, 17.

of knowledge, not its compartmentalization.⁵² The search for the unity of truth and integration of knowledge is reflected in the propensity of Catholic universities to raise ethical/moral questions across the disciplines, to place equal emphasis on teaching and research, and to link the liberal arts with professional training.

In its emphasis on ethical values and dialogue and in its concern for social justice, solidarity, and the common good, this list of characteristics reinforces the grounding for a Catholic university's commitment to ethnic diversity that we reviewed more extensively in earlier sections of this paper. At the same time, even this brief glimpse at the Catholic intellectual/cultural tradition suggests that a university claiming Catholic identity will need to live out this claim in ways that can leave no doubt as to its distinctive and unifying religious ethos. It will indeed welcome to the campus community and actively engage non-Catholics, ethnic minorities, and members of other previously under-represented groups. More fundamentally, however, it will ensure that it nurtures and makes available to successive generations of students the full riches of the Catholic intellectual tradition. It will therefore promote, in the words of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, "a continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute by its own research,"⁵³—research that "necessarily includes (a) the search for an integration of knowledge, (b) a dialogue between faith and reason, (c) an ethical concern, and (d) a theological perspective."⁵⁴

In sum, a truly Catholic university will be known for its inclusivity but even more for its dedication to the intellectual/cultural tradition that is its birthright—and that undergirds its commitment to diversity more profoundly than any consideration of legal or political exigency might do.

No one claims it is easy to achieve the dual goals of particularity and inclusivity—of a strong Catholic identity and simultaneous commitment to ethnic diversity. As noted above, engagement across cultural

⁵²Roche, *The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University*, 29-30, finds a grounding for academic freedom in the Catholic approach to discovering truth: "The defense of academic freedom need not arise only from the Protestant elevation of the autonomy of the individual; it can equally derive from the Catholic elevation of truth as that which is best discovered by our having listened carefully to all possible positions."

⁵³*Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, #13.

⁵⁴*Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, #15.

divides can be a risky business. And, to cite an example from the volatile realm of faculty hiring, Thomas Monahan, Dean of Commerce and Finance at Villanova University, believes that "the goal of diversity implies a potential conflict with the goals of preserving our Augustinian Catholic identity."⁵⁵ Other potential conflicts or turf battles—in student recruitment, core curriculum emphases, allocation of resources, etc.—are not hard to imagine. Yet such conflicts need not be either/or situations. Catholicism is no stranger to the reconciling of tensions. As the church's intellectual-cultural tradition suggests, a whole range of polarities is endemic to Catholic life. We have already noted those between transcendence and immanence, faith and reason, grace and nature, fact and value, individual and community; and still others could be added, for example, between obedience and freedom, or between prayer and work.⁵⁶ In each of these polarities, as long as both sides remain in creative tension, with neither side trumping the other, balance is achieved and the vibrancy of the tradition is assured.

This paradigm can be a reassuring source of hope for United States Catholic universities as they seek to balance their faith-inspired commitment to ethnic diversity and educational equity for traditionally under-represented groups with fidelity to the unifying religious heritage that supports and enriches that commitment.

⁵⁵ Thomas Monahan, Villanova University, "Mission-Centered Faculty Hiring: Some Difficult Choices," April 4, 2002, <http://www.villanova.edu/jaaup/archive/hiring.htm> (Accessed November 29, 2005).

⁵⁶ William A. Barry, S.J., and Robert G. Doherty, S.J., have explored the tensions characteristic of Jesuit spirituality in a small book entitled *Contemplatives in Action: The Jesuit Way* (New York: Paulist Press, 2002). *Mutatis mutandis*, what they say of balancing the tensions in Jesuit spirituality speaks as well to the range of polarities inherent in Catholic life. They write that "Jesuit spirituality functions best when [the] tensions are alive and clearly felt, that is, when Jesuits experience within themselves the pulls of both sides of each polarity" (5).

Benefits of a Diverse Faculty: A Review of the Literature

Abbie Robinson-Armstrong, Ph.D.
Loyola Marymount University

Derenda King, Ed.D.
Loyola Marymount University

David Killoran, Ph.D.
Loyola Marymount University

Colleges and universities with a predominantly white faculty drastically limit the institution's ability to provide educational experiences that produce "an empowered, informed, and responsible student capable of negotiating the inevitable differences in a diverse society" (University of Arizona, 2006, p. 1). Conversely, an institution with a diverse faculty provides significant benefits for everyone in the campus community. In this paper, we define a diverse faculty as one that is characterized by a "diversity of experience, age, physical ability, religion, ethnicity, gender, and other human attributes" (WISELI, 2004, p. 2).

According to the American Psychological Association, many institutions strive to create a diverse faculty to ensure a broad representation of viewpoints, paradigms, and content expertise (American Psychological Association (APA), 1994). Not only can a diverse faculty prepare students to live and work in an increasingly complex global society, a professorate marked by diversity 1) "promotes cognitive, social and emotional growth and development in students, 2) increase and raise the level of intellectual discussion within the faculty, and 3) adds multiple perspectives, theories and approaches to scholarship and the curriculum that students consume" (Milem & Hakuta, 2000, p. 39).

While colleges and universities have experienced steady growth in the ethnic and gender diversity of student populations, they have not experienced similar growth in the faculty (Turner, 2002). According to Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, and Richards (2004), many campuses engage in efforts to diversify the faculty—usually fueled by arguments related to the increasingly diverse student population and the need to prepare all students for a diverse society—but the reality is that the least successful of diversity initiatives is in the area of faculty diversity.

Methodology

The primary goal of our research was to conduct an integrative review. According to Jackson (1980), an integrative review infers "generalizations about substantive issues from a set of studies directly bearing on those issues" (p. 438). Our intent was to summarize accumulated knowledge and highlight important issues concerning the benefits of faculty diversity (Cooper, 1982). In 2006, we began our search for scholarly literature on the benefits of a diverse faculty by

reviewing research that spanned a ten-year period, 1998-2008. The resources collected included journal articles, book chapters, books, and reports.

We utilized several academic search engines to locate and retrieve scholarly material, such as Google Scholar, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Journal Storage (JS), the Wilson Index, Project Muse, PsycINFO, and Wiley Interscience. Additional article sources were identified through Academe, Journal of College Student Development, Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, Journal of Higher Education, the Review of Higher Education Journal, Research in Higher Education Journal, and the Review of Educational Research Journal.

Key word searches consisted of the following terms: benefits of faculty diversity, diversifying the faculty, educational benefits of diversity, valuing diversity in faculty, educational value of diversity, and the importance of faculty diversity. What follows is a summary of the literature on the benefits of a diverse faculty. Specifically, we describe the ways in which a diverse faculty impacts colleges and universities, student learning and citizenship outcomes, student retention and persistence, faculty, the curriculum, and campus climate.

Impact of a Diverse Faculty on Colleges and Universities

A. Helps Institutions Fulfill the Mission of Higher Education

Gurin (2001) states that the overarching mission of higher education is “to prepare young people for active participation in our democratic society, which is an increasingly diverse society” (p. 1). The researcher further noted the following:

institutions of higher education have an obligation, first and foremost, to create the best possible educational environment for the young adults whose lives are likely to be significantly changed during their years on campus. Specific objectives may vary from one institution to another, but all efforts must be directed to ensuring an optimal educational environment for these young people who are at a critical stage of development that will complete the foundation for how they will conduct their lives. (p. 1)

An analysis of the mission statements of the top twenty-eight liberal arts colleges in the United States, as ranked by U. S. News and World Report, supported Gurin’s philosophical stance on the mission and purpose of American higher education. The mission statements contained a range of essential aspirations that surpassed intellectual mastery as a goal (Anonymous, 2000). More than half of the institutions included the following values in their mission statements: “1) developing self knowledge and growing personally, 2) learning perspectives from diversity, 3) developing and nurturing a liberated, creative mind, and 4) gaining an increased capacity for tolerance, respect, and concern for others” (p. 2). The value of learning from diversity was recognized by more than 60% of these colleges. Tolerance and respect for others was an essential element in 57% of their mission statements.

B. Enhances an Institution’s Academic Reputation

The presence of faculty from diverse backgrounds enhances an institution’s academic reputation among its key constituents, including students, parents, funding agencies, and American

corporations. Today's sophisticated students and their parents understand the value of emersion in a diverse college environment. Parents tend to encourage their children to select institutions that can provide opportunities for them to interact with students and faculty who are different from themselves. Funding agencies and foundations, such as the Kellogg Foundation and the Ford Foundation, place a high emphasis on diversity within the institutions they choose to fund. American corporations increasingly demand that institutions of higher education produce graduates "who have studied, confronted, and appreciated diverse points of view" (Maher, 2002, p. 1). To meet the demands of these important constituencies, institutions must aggressively recruit and retain a diverse faculty (American Psychological Association (APA), 1994; Humphreys, 1995; Maher, 2002; Maimon & Garcia, 1997; Milem, 2003; Tatum, 2003).

C. Helps an Institution Achieve its Mission of Excellence in Research and Teaching

In order to prepare students for the new global reality, institutions must fully engage their communities of scholars in cutting edge research that incorporates multiple views, theories and approaches (Maher, 2002). "By nurturing a diverse group of scholars, [a] university can participate fully in current scholarly discussions and activities [that sustain and improve] the academic reputation" (p. 1). According to Smith and Moses (2004), a diverse university speaks to the core of the vitality and viability of an institution. Only through a diverse faculty can all of those concerned, as well as society as a whole, "draw from a full range of perspectives that both challenge and inform knowledge production and dissemination" (p. 1).

D. Helps an Institution Prepare Students for a New Global Reality

A diverse faculty plays a major role in preparing students for a workforce that is undergoing rapid and unexpected changes. A diverse workforce, from the perspective of the business community, will lead to a successful enterprise. A diverse faculty draws on the strengths of a variety of sources and enables differing viewpoints to enter into the dialogue to resolve problems. Maimon and Garcia (1997) said "in order to prepare all students for a new global reality, our universities must provide an environment that values the differences that make every individual unique and inspires all students and faculty to reach their full potential" (p. 4). Turner (2000) sums it up nicely:

Major companies seem to be discovering that diversity is vital to their success. If higher education intends to continue to educate students for the world of work, it must also embrace the contributions different perspectives can bring. In other words, institutions need to provide arenas in which students can interact and exchange ideas with professors from diverse backgrounds. As the populations of minority groups continue to grow in this country, the viability of U. S. higher education may depend on the ability of colleges and universities to meet this goal. (p. 1)

E. Helps an Institution Demonstrate Support for Fairness and Justice

According to Tatum (2003), diversity is not simply a good idea. It provides evidence that colleges and universities are fair in their thinking and just in their practices. "Twenty years ago, a lack of diversity within a university faculty was a consequence of unequal opportunity in American

society. Today, a lack of diversity within a university faculty suggests unequal opportunity in that university” (p. 2).

Impact of a Diverse Faculty on Student Learning and Citizenship Outcomes

A. Increases Student Learning and Citizenship Outcomes

A diverse faculty impacts student learning and citizenship outcomes in a number of ways (Wilds, 1999). According to Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Smith (2003), learning outcomes are impacted by a distinctive use of pedagogical techniques, the introduction of diversity in the curriculum, and experiential opportunities that allow students to utilize in real life the concepts they have learned in the classroom. Moreover, learning outcomes associated with diversity and inclusion impact students’ academic growth, cognitive development, complex thinking skills, intellectual self-confidence, motivation, and institutional satisfaction and involvement (University of Arizona, 2006). For example, Wilds (2000) cited a study by Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996) that found that students who engage in activities that provide opportunities to formulate positive relationships with other students and faculty from backgrounds different from their own showed measurable gains in their critical thinking skills, reported greater openness to diversity and challenge, [and] exhibited reduced levels of ethnocentrism.

B. Increases Benefits for European American Students

Research has also shown that a diverse faculty provides more benefits for European American students than for students of color, particularly those coming from homogenous backgrounds who have had little if any previous contact with minorities, and whose interpretations of minorities are primarily influenced by negative media images (Alger, 1997). The existence of minorities in faculty positions provides students with diverse role models and increases the likelihood for students to interact with them and develop more effective mentoring relationships (Turner, 2002). Furthermore, according to Chang (2007) and Austin (1993) (as cited in Diversity Digest, 1997), “the more diverse the faculty and student body, the greater the likelihood that the [European American] student will socialize with someone of a different [ethnic] group or discuss [cultural] issues” (p. 3). Cross cultural interaction has been shown to contribute to the students’ “academic development, college GPA, satisfaction with college, level of cultural awareness...commitment to multiculturalism and diversity, intellectual self-confidence, and social self-confidence” (p. 3). Findings from another study further underscore the long-term educational benefits of cross-cultural interaction for [European American] students. Using post-college graduation survey data, the study found that “interacting with [people] of color during and after college has a positive effect on [European American] males’ post-college sense of social responsibility and participation in community service activities” (Villapando, 1996, as cited in Diversity Digest, 1997, pp. 3 – 4).

C. Increases Student Retention and Persistence

Interaction with a diverse faculty also plays a critical role in student retention and persistence (Alger, 1999; Antonio, 2003; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 2003; WASC, 2001). Research has shown that the single leading predictor of college attrition is insufficient interaction with other

members in a college community (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1997, as cited in Nagda, Gregerman, Jonides, von Hippel & Lerner, 1998). Sufficient interaction involves sustained, informal contact—students interacting with other students and faculty—and it must occur early in a student’s career in college, a time when they have a greater likelihood of departing (Levin & Levin, 1991, as cited in Nagda et. al., 1998). Noel and Smith (1996) found that European American, African American and Mexican American students prefer to disclose information to faculty members of their own cultural background. African American and Mexican American students, however, have a stronger preference, especially concerning topics of a cultural, academic or sensitive nature, which further strengthens the case for faculty diversity.

Additionally, minority students comment that the presence of a diverse faculty provides a welcoming atmosphere which increases the likelihood that they will connect with role models who share their same experience and beliefs. Daryl Smith (1989), in her book *The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy?* described the benefits of faculty diversity in higher education, particularly for students of color: faculty diversity 1) provides support for students from diverse backgrounds, 2) serves as a symbol of the institutions’ commitment to people of color, 3) creates a more comfortable environment for students as well as for faculty and staff of color, 4) broadens the range of what is taught and how it is taught, and 5) creates opportunities for collaboration to occur among minority and majority faculty. Thus, for students of color, “the absence of faculty and staff of color signals that it may be difficult to get the support and mentoring that they need to achieve academic success” (Feagin, 2002, p. 26). Students need to feel that it is possible to achieve the objectives they have for themselves and that there are people who are willing to assist them by serving as advisors and sources of inspiration.

Impact of a Diverse Faculty on the Curriculum

A. Adds Multiple Perspectives, Theories and Approaches to Scholarship

Diversity in the faculty has increased the production of new knowledge about socio-cultural differences. Women and faculty of color employ a wider range of pedagogical techniques. They are more likely to introduce readings and research that address the contributions of women and minorities in their courses (Milem, 2003). Gurin (2001) found that after four years of college, students who were exposed to diversity in the curriculum demonstrated higher intellectual and civic engagement than students who had little to no exposure to diversity in the classroom. Thus, the presence of a diverse faculty not only improves intellectual engagement and academic motivation, but it diversifies the course offerings, texts, and classroom examples, which improves communication, understanding, and interaction among individuals of diverse backgrounds (Alger, 1997; Wild, 2000).

Paul Penfield (1993), a professor of electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), wrote:

Women and minority faculty bring to the department a different perspective on engineering. Whether because of biology or culture, women usually tend to have somewhat different beliefs about what is important, about appropriate uses of technology, and about how human occupations, including engineering, are or should be carried on. These different attitudes and

styles should be represented in our teaching and research program. Our students' education is incomplete without them. (p. 3)

Contributions from faculty of varied diverse backgrounds incorporate multiple scholarly perspectives, theories and approaches. They also help faculty learn how to effectively teach in a diverse classroom. John Brooks Slaughter (2000), the President Emeritus at Occidental College and the former Director of the National Science Foundation stated that "through the use of team teaching and interdisciplinary approaches to education as well as syllabi rich with contributions from a multiplicity of sources, the strengths of a diverse faculty can be exercised in a highly effective manner" (p. 25).

Antonio (2002) found several trends on the impact of faculty diversification on scholarship:

- Although European American faculty produced more research as measured by traditional means, faculty from diverse backgrounds "were more likely to place a high degree of personal importance on engaging in research activities, to spend more time per week engaged in research and writing, and to feel that the opportunity to pursue research was a very important consideration in choosing a career in academe" (p. 591).
- While most if not all faculty believe that colleges should be involved in solving problems and influencing change in society, diverse faculty were more likely to take personal responsibility for participation in social change and more likely to advise students involved in community service.

The findings suggest that these are deep and compelling reasons to renew with vigor efforts to diversify the faculty. "Faculty of color bring to the academy a unique combination of values and philosophies from which higher education can benefit" (Antonio, 2002, p. 598).

Impact of a Diverse Faculty on Campus Climate

A diverse faculty also impacts the campus climate. The presence of underrepresented faculty helps attract and retain new underrepresented faculty. This process provides increased opportunities for intergroup interaction, which, in turn contributes to creating a healthy climate. “A diverse campus with a healthy climate will both promote and reflect the inclusion of all cultures and perspectives in the research, curriculum and pedagogy across all disciplines” (UC Campus Climate Work Team Report, 2007, p. 3). As a result, the university’s commitment to diversity is reinforced.

A. Reduces Isolation

A diverse faculty may also reduce the isolation experienced by women and people of color, which may lead to increased productivity and a greater likelihood of promotion (Lamont, Kalev, Bowden, & Fosse, 2004). According to Antonio (2003), “resistance to diversity in less diverse environments contributes to an inhospitable climate for faculty from diverse backgrounds” (p. 3). Diversity among the faculty and the student body as well forces institutions to improve their climates for diversity, creates a sense of community, and provides opportunities for role modeling and mentorship.

B. Alleviates Negative Stereotypes

The benefits of faculty diversity may be even more valuable for faculty than students, especially as it serves to break down negative stereotypes about the intellectual authority and expertise of women and faculty of color. According to Alger (1999), European American faculty may have the most to gain from interaction with diverse faculty, “because as members of [the] majority [group], they have lived in a culture where most people in positions of authority are also [European American]” (p. 5). Face-to-face interaction is a critical component of the learning process and if properly channeled, it can enrich the educational experience for everyone on campus.

Discussion

The values in the mission statements of the top 28 liberal arts colleges in the nation indicate that some of our most prestigious institutions understand the value of a diverse academy. They also indicate that, in many instances, faculty and administrators now understand the overarching mission of American higher education—to promote critical reflection and to stimulate cognitive, social and emotional growth, and development that prepares students to live in a diverse society. Colleges and universities cannot realize this mission without recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty (Meacham & Barrett, 2003; Smith & Moses, 2004). Fifty years of empirical evidence leads researchers to conclude that “a diverse faculty provides substantial benefits [and] thus is essential to [a] university’s well-being and advancement” (Maher, 2002, p. 1). In addition, “a diverse faculty represents a broad range of viewpoints, paradigms, and content expertise” (APA, 1994, p. 8) and therefore “helps all students achieve the essential goals of a college education” (Anonymous, 2000, p. 2). Research has also shown that “positive benefits accrue from diversity in the classroom and... [European American] students experience no adverse effects from classroom diversity” (Anonymous, 2000, p. 2).

Given that American colleges and universities share an essential mission to provide a comprehensive educational experience that prepares students to live and work effectively in an ever-changing global society, it is imperative that they produce graduates “[from diverse backgrounds] who can be agents of change, who can help to identify and reduce social inequality,” and value differences as positive keys to the academic, social, political, and economic stability of this country (Hurtado, 2005, p. 7).

Given this, colleges and universities cannot continue to rely solely on the knowledge, practices, and experiences of the current majority members if they expect to produce college graduates who are adequately prepared for the challenges and expectations of an evolving global society. Instead, higher education institutions must begin to emphasize the necessity of exposing students to diversity, particularly in the faculty. A diverse faculty enhances student learning and citizenship, contributes a variety of experiences, perspectives, and ideas to the curriculum, decreases attrition rates among students, particularly underrepresented students, and provides significant benefits for European American students. In fact, the learning and citizenship outcomes of both minority and European American students alike benefit from exposure to a diverse educational environment (Alger, 1999). European American students in particular “receive benefits ranging from enhanced intellectual and social self-confidence to growth in academic skills to increased civic engagement” (Antonio & Hakuta, 2003, p. 2).

A diverse faculty also teaches all students that women and people of color can succeed in academic environments. “Students think of faculty as successful professionals. Therefore, it is important that our faculty include women and people from minority groups to provide role models or ‘existence proofs’” (Penfield, 1993, p. 3).

In addition, a diverse faculty helps students learn how to evaluate differing points of view and understand human differences, as it exposes them to multiple scholarly perspectives and inclusive pedagogies, and enhances their learning outcomes, retention and academic success (Hurtado, 2001; Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Smith, 2003; WASC, 2001).

There is a growing body of empirical evidence that offers compelling arguments about the benefits that a diverse faculty provides to the faculty in general (Milem, 2003). A diverse faculty brings new kinds of scholarship, reduces isolation experienced by women and faculty of color, breaks down stereotypes, and improves the campus climate (Antonio, 2002; Milem, 2003; Smith 1989). Thus, when colleges and universities continue to seek and value a diverse faculty, the entire academic community benefits.

Conclusion

Colleges and universities benefit from recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty in many ways. The presence of a diverse faculty enhances an institution’s academic reputation, and provides opportunities for a college or university to achieve its central mission of excellence in teaching and research. American corporations challenged institutions of higher education to graduate students who are prepared to succeed in today’s diverse work environments. A diverse faculty not only helps colleges and universities achieve this goal, it is also a crucial factor in achieving the overarching mission of higher education: student growth and development as scholars and citizens.

References

- Alger, J. R. (1997). The educational value of diversity. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from http://www.diversityweb.org/research_and_trends/political_legal_issues/affirmative_action_policies/educational_value.cfm
- Alger, J. (1999). When color-blind is color-bland: Ensuring faculty diversity in higher education. *Stanford Law and Policy Review*, 10 (2), 1-15.
- American Psychological Association (APA) Public Interest Directorate. (1994). Valuing diversity in faculty: A guide. Washington, D. C: American Psychological Association. Retrieved March 15, 2006, from <http://apa.org/pi/oema/diversity/book1/homepage.html>
- Anonymous. (2000, Sep/Oct). Does diversity make a difference? A research report. *Academe* (86) 5.
- Antonio, A. L. (Sept/Oct 2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (5), 582-602.
- Antonio, A. L. (2003, Nov/Dec). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe*. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2003/03nd/03neanto.htm>
- Antonio, A. L. & Hakuta, K. (2003). The effects of racial diversity on cognitive complexity in college students: A true classical experiment. *The Racial Diversity Experiment*. Retrieved February 7, 2006, from <http://www.stanford.edu/group/diversity/>
- Austin, A. E. (1994). Understanding and assessing faculty cultures and climates. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 84, 47-63.
- Cooper, H. M. (1982). Scientific guidelines for conducting integrative research reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(2), 291-302.

Diversity Digest. (1997). Who benefits from racial diversity in higher education?

Retrieved February 9, 2006, from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W97/research.html>

Feagin, J. (2002). *Continuing significance of racism: The U. S. colleges and universities.*

Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gurin, P. (2001, Jan). Opinions to be expressed: The mission of higher education.

Expert report of Patricia Gurin, Gratz, et al. v. Bollinger et al., Grutter, et al. v. Bollinger, et al. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from

<http://www.vpcomm.umich.edu/admissions/legal/expert/opinion.html>

Humphreys, D. (1995). Faculty recruitment in higher education: Research findings on

diversity and affirmative action. *Diversity Web*. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from

http://www.diversityweb.org/diversity_innovations/faculty_staff_development/rec

Hurtado. S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects

the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield, *Diversity*

challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action (pp. 187 – 203). Cambridge,

MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Hurtado, S. 2005). Research shows benefits of linking diversity and civic goals.

Diversity Digest, 9(1), 6-7. Retrieved August 21, 2008, from

<http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/vol9no1/hurtado.cfm>

Hurtado, S., Engberg, M., & Ponjuan, L. (2003). The impact of the college experience

on students' learning for a diverse democracy. Paper presented at the Annual

Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Portland, OR,

November 12-15, 2003.

- Hurtado, S., Ponjuan, L., & Smith, G. (2003). Women and faculty of color on campus: Campus diversity and civic engagement initiatives. Retrieved October 15, 2005, from University of Michigan, Diverse Democracy Project web site:
<http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/>
- Jackson, G. B. (1980). Methods for integrative reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(3), 438-460.
- Lamont, M., Kalev, A., Bowden, S., & Fossee, E. (2004). Recruiting, promoting, and retaining women academics: Lessons from the literature. May 8, 2006, from <http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~mlamont/lessons.pdf>
- Maher, J. V. (2002). University of Pittsburgh: Memorandum. Retrieved February 9, 2002, from <http://www.pitt.edu/~provost/diversity.html>
- Maimon, E. P. & Garcia, M. (1997). Transforming institutions: The importance of faculty diversity. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/F97/transforming.html>
- Meacham, J. & Barrett, C. (2003, July). Commitment to diversity in institutional mission statements. *Diversity Web*, 7(1-2), 1-6. May 8, 2006, from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/vol7no1-2/meacham-barrett.cfm>
- Milem, J.F. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education (pp. 126-169). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Milem, J. F. & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. J. Wilds (Ed.), Minorities in higher education, 1999-2000 (pp. 39-64). Seventeenth Annual Status Report. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Nagda, B. A., Gregerman, S. R., Jonides, J., von Hippel, W., & Lerner, J. S. (1998). Undergraduate student-faculty research partnerships affect student retention. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22 (1), 55-72.
- Noel, R. C., & Smith, S. S. (1996). Self-disclosure of college students to faculty: The influence of ethnicity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 88-94.
- Penfield, P., Jr. (1994, Jan/Feb). Faculty diversity. *The MIT Faculty Newsletter*. Retrieved February 7, 2006, from <http://www-mtl.mit.edu/~penfield/pubs/diversity.html>
- Slaughter, J. B. (2000, November). *Creating the inclusive campus: The essential role of faculty diversity*. Presented at the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering (NACME), Inc., Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- Smith, D. (1989). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?* Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314987)
- Smith, D. & Moses, Y. (2004). *Hiring and retaining a diverse faculty*. Presented at the University of Washington Senior Administrators Workshop, Seattle, WA.
- Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 133-160.

- Tatum, C. (2003). The recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty: A proposal by the dean's diversity subcommittee. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from <http://coh.arizona.edu/COH/facinfo/diversity/diversity.htm>
- Turner, C. S. V. (2000, Sep/Oct). New faces, new knowledge. *Academe*. Retrieved November 7, 2005, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3860/is_200009/ai_n8927830
- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees. Retrieved August 21, 2008, from <http://www.aacu.org/publications/divfacintro.cfm>
- UC Campus Climate Work Team Report. (2007). *Study group on university diversity campus climate report*. Retrieved September 20, 2007, from http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/07-campus_report.pdf
- University of Arizona. (2006). *UA discusses... Creating inclusive learning environments: The educational benefits of inclusion*. A Project of the Diversity Resource Office and the Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Office. Retrieved November 20, 2007, from <http://diversity.arizona.edu/Documents/Educational%20Benefits%20of%20Inclusion.pdf>
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). (2001). Handbook of Accreditation. Alameda, CA: Publisher.
- Wilds, D. (2000). *Minorities in higher education research, 1999 – 2000*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED457768)

Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI): University of
Wisconsin- Madison. (2004). Benefits and challenges of diversity.

Retrieved July 2, 2008, from

http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/initiatives/climate/Benefits_Challenges.pdf

Hiring for Mission: Definitions

'Hiring for Mission': An Inclusive Term

Presumably all of our efforts to hire not only a competent but a distinguished faculty are mission-driven, motivated by our primary commitment to the encouragement of learning and our corresponding goals of promoting academic excellence in a student-centered university. Yet in a growing body of literature* 'hiring for mission' has taken on the specialized meaning of hiring to enhance the religious identity of a church-related college or university.

This is the way the phrase is used in the 1999 discussion document from the trustees entitled "How Is Loyola Marymount University a Catholic University?" So when we speak of 'hiring for mission' in this specialized sense, we mean hiring with a view to enhancing our way of being a Catholic university in the spirit of LMU's Jesuit and Marymount founders.

Note that this does not mean hiring only Catholics. A genuine spirit of ecumenical and inter-religious openness (and of openness to non-believers) is an important part of LMU's Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount identity. On the other hand, the University is not indifferent to the particularities of its religious heritage, both as a lived faith and an intellectual tradition. As we face a time of unprecedented growth, it is important to attract to the faculty significant numbers of men and women who understand and respect the intellectual tradition and religious inspiration that distinguish Loyola Marymount University from its secular counterparts.

* See, e.g., J.A. Appleyard, S.J., and Howard Gray, S.J., "Tracking the Mission and Identity Question: Three decades of Inquiry and Three Models of Interpretation," *Conversations* (Fall 2000, pp.A-15); Robert Bernie, *Quality with Soul: How Six Premier Colleges and Universities Keep Faith with Their Religious Traditions* (Eerdmans, 2001); James L. Heft, S.M., Ronald M. Katsuyama, Ph.D., and Fred P. Pestello, Ph.D., "Faculty Attitudes and Hiring Practices at Selected Catholic Colleges and Universities," *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, 21:2 (Spring 2001), pp. 43-60; Peter Hans-Kolvenbach, S.J., "The Service of Faith and Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education," Keynote at Santa Clara Justice Conference (October 6, 2000); Wilson Miscamble, C.S.C., "Meeting the Challenge and Fulfilling the Promise: Mission and Method in Constructing a Great Catholic University" in *The Challenge and Promise of a Catholic University*, ed. Theodore M. Hesburg, C.S.C. (University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), pp. 209-23.

LMU's contemporary way of being a Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount university includes a strong commitment to an ethnically diverse faculty (cf. 2001 Strategic Plan and 2005 statement, Interculturalism: Definition, Vision, and Goals) as well as to achieving gender balance. Diversity initiatives and efforts to improve the balance of women and men on the faculty are not only socially just but also pedagogically justified, based as they are on the realization that inquiry and learning are enhanced when a variety of voices is heard.

Hiring for mission at LMU is thus a seamless process, impelling us to be attentive on many fronts. Without in any way gainsaying the need to find and hire academically distinguished faculty, we need to seek out candidates who will contribute to our religious mission, who will enhance our ethnic diversity, and who will improve our gender balance.

IMPROVING FACULTY SELECTION: THE CRITICAL INDICES APPROACH

Published--The Department Chair, 6, Summer, 1995

(Anker Publishing, Bolton, MA)

Hiring a new faculty member may be among the most important decisions a department ever makes. The new hire represents the department's future and along with other new hires will help shape image, culture, and students for years to come. The hiring decision is also an expensive one, possibly accounting for around a million dollars or more of the university's money over the course of a career. Even more will be spent if poor choices are made and new searches are required. In such cases, the department chair is at least somewhat accountable if for no other reason than at most colleges and universities, it is the department chair who is primarily responsible for creating and overseeing the selection process.

That responsibility begins with effective selection of both a search committee chair and committee membership (e.g., Ilkka, 1995). It continues with the department chair facilitating the committee's efforts in any number of unobtrusive ways ranging from making sure permission to hire has been accomplished to providing secretarial and budget support. But perhaps the most important facilitation may involve helping the search committee develop and ask job-relevant questions as well as engage in meaningful answer assessment. Encouraging the search committee to attend to effective question development is crucial for a couple of reasons. First of all, the low validity and reliability of the employment interview as an assessment measure across various professions is fairly well established in the interviewing literature (e.g., Dipboye, 1992). The reasons for such problems of validity and reliability are related to such concerns as lack of position clarity, problems with interview structure, and of particular interest here, skill in developing and asking position relevant questions. Secondly, university faculty search committees are generally not composed of individuals with extensive prior training in personnel assessment and thus, they are neither any more or less skilled as employment interviewers than those who conduct interviews in other professions. In turn, while it may be presumed that faculty avoid judgments based on race, sex, age, disabilities, or attractiveness, it is not unreasonable to assume that some future faculty search committees at otherwise fine institutions will still (1) ask far too many job irrelevant questions (versus job relevant ones); (2) not ask these questions in a consistent manner, e.g., different questions and different sequencing of questions; and (3) not meaningfully compare candidate answers against previously established and agreed upon benchmark responses. Given these assertions, the remainder of this article offers an approach to question development, which is easily implemented, and decidedly more job relevant.

Question Development

Critical Indices questions are questions which emerge from a thorough job analysis and which focus upon specific knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) the candidate may need to exhibit in order to meet certain job tasks. While the committee may develop a large number of useful questions, the department chair should encourage the committee to develop at least five or six Critical Indices questions which speak to the KSAs needed to accomplish various job requirements. The committee might actually wish to develop two sets of such questions, one set for a screening interview (e.g., teleconference) which focuses upon establishing comparative professional quality, and another set for the on-site interview which further examines professional quality but also addresses personal fit.

As developed here, the Critical Indices approach draws from and combines ideas developed by Feild and Gatewood (1989), Janz (1989), and Janz, Hellervik, and Gilmore (1986). While others (e.g., Coady, 1990; Watts, 1993) have emphasized the value of descriptive interviewing, this approach incorporates both descriptive and situational interviewing, agreeing that one of the best indicators of future behavior is past behavior (descriptive focus--"what did you do when..."), but unwilling to discard the value of well developed, hypothetically construed contexts (situational focus--"what would you do if...") for assessing some aspects of a candidate's potential (Janz, 1989). The Critical Indices approach also recognizes the value of what is termed interrogative questions, follow up questions for both descriptive and situationally based interview questions. Below, each of the three question types is further discussed and illustrated.

Descriptive Behavior Questions—Janz (1989) notes that there are four types of interview information: credentials, experience descriptions (e.g., surface discussion on duties, responsibilities), opinions (includes self perceptions and commentary on other contexts, plans, goals, etc.), and behavior description (detailed accounts of actual events from the applicant's work and life situations). Janz believes the latter category is most useful in that it reveals specific choices made as well as indications of the circumstances encompassing such choices. Descriptive behavioral patterned interviewing involves questions which seek to contextualize and specify the more general and often philosophical questions asked in interviews. Instead of a question which asks, "what kind of relationship between teacher and student best fosters learning?" the descriptive approach asks, "tell me about a teaching situation from your past which best illustrates the kind of relationship that should exist between teachers and students?" In any event, the descriptive question forces the candidate away from abstract and perhaps even "canned" answers to instances which reveal choices made and values actualized. In a sense, the shift is simply from conjecture to specific instance, but in another and more important sense, it is a shift from detached reflection to more personal revelation (see Appendix A).

Situational Questions—To ask candidates to answer all questions based on specific, past experiences could easily become counter-productive if for no other reason than candidates may not have the requisite experience from which to draw. Thus, the use of hypothetically construed or situational questions are appropriate, especially for candidates with limited job experience. For example, suppose the job analysis underscored the importance of development and delivery on an effective introductory course in the discipline. The experienced teacher might simply be

Situational Questions (Continued)

asked to discuss her most recent rendition of the introductory course. The novice, however, might be asked to construct a hypothetical course syllabus with such attendant questions as, how would you structure the course? Explain what materials you would select and within that corpus, what might you emphasize? What key readings? Assignment? Evaluation system? --and of course, the lingering "why" is also available. Admittedly, the hypothetical situation reduces expectations for a richer, more personal and contextualized answer, however it may still provide committee members with the opportunity to assess the candidate's ability along a variety of relevant dimensions, for example, problem solving, organizational skills, subject matter competency, and resource awareness (see Appendix A).

Interrogative Questions—These are the "why" and "how come" probes of the candidate's initial answers, and can serve one or more functions, (a) promoting understanding, (b) providing modest confrontation in order to test commitment to views, (c) illustrating the candidate's ability to re-examine a response based upon new information and/or perspective offered by a committee member. Moreover, such answers might provide some initial guidance for the kind and amount of mentoring likely to be needed should the candidate subsequently be selected.

While Critical Indices questions may constitute only a small portion of the total questions asked by a committee, it is important that all the Critical Indices questions asked of one candidate be asked of all candidates, and to the extent possible in the same order and with the same amount of time available for an answer. Without scripting the interview too tightly, the selection committee chair might actually organize and in order, cue members assigned to ask predetermined, critical incident questions. While it is impossible to control every intervening variable in every interview, it is important to provide each candidate with as even an opportunity to respond to Critical Indices questions as is possible. And, while other information and answers to non-Critical Indices questions may significantly impact on candidate assessment, evaluation of candidate answers will be significantly enhanced if at least some answers to identical questions can be meaningfully compared across all candidates.

Benchmarking

Once the primary candidates have been screened and after the top few have made an on-site visit and been interviewed by the search committee, it is imperative for both legal and ethical concerns that the decision to offer the position to a given candidate be based upon objective, interview-based information. For example, while decisions based on age or sex are illegal, the search committee could also not invite and then later reject a candidate based on a "disqualifier" previously evident in the written materials (e.g., lack of a terminal degree). Instead, it is to everyone's advantage to be able to make a clear and thorough comparison of each candidate based upon answers given to undeniably job relevant questions which were asked of every candidate in approximately the same way and sequence. And, while such answers as noted on paper (or with permission, as recorded on tape), might be compared among candidates, the committee should also have developed its versions of high quality answers, acceptable answers, and unacceptable answers for each Critical Indices question. Following each interview,

Benchmarking (Continued)

individual members would evaluate answers to each of the Critical Indices questions. Such evaluations could then be collated and discussed with reference to the committee-developed benchmarks. Obviously, unanticipated and yet excellent variations on the benchmark answers might emerge, and as a consequence, the committee may have to re-consider its benchmark and/or reconsider the viability of the question itself.

Conclusion

While there are many ways in which the department chair can facilitate a more effective search process, the chair should make every effort to assure that the search committee will ask questions which allow for a useful, comparative assessment of the candidates who have made it to the short list. Questions which address specific behaviors, which are asked in the same way and the same sequence for every candidate, and which are evaluated against established benchmarks, should improve the value of the screening and selection interviews in particular as well as the overall search process. To the extent that the department chair is able to foster the use of a question development approach as outlined above, the interests of the department, the institution, the students, and the eventual hire, are more likely to be served.

References

- Coady, S. (1990). "Hiring faculty: A system for making good decisions." *CUPA Journal*, 41, 5-8.
- Dipboye, R.L. (1992). *Selection interviews: Process perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Feild, H.S., & Gatewood, R.D. (1989). "Development of a selection interview: A job content strategy." Eds. R.W. Eder & G.R. Ferris, *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ilkka, R.J. (1995). "Selecting Members of The Faculty Search Committee." *The Department Chair*, 5, 11-13.
- Janz, J.T. (1989). "The patterned behavior description interview: The best prophet of the future is the past." Eds. R.W. Eder & G.R. Ferris, *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Janz, J.T., Hellervik, L., & Gilmore, D.C. (1986). *Behavior description interviewing: New, accurate, cost effective*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Watts, G.E. (1993). "How to hire good faculty." *AACC Journal*, Jun/Jul, 29-33.
- Critical Indices Approach -- Selection Interviewing (R.J. Ilkka, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point)

TRADITIONAL QUESTIONS

1. How do you define good teaching?
2. How have the works of leading scholars in our field influenced you?
3. How would you describe your classroom relationship with students?
4. What are your greatest strengths & weaknesses as a teacher (scholar)?
5. What is your philosophy regarding the evaluation of students?
6. In terms of your professional goals, where would you like to be in the next five years?

BEHAVIORAL QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about a time where you excelled as a teacher?
2. Given who you consider to be among the most influential scholars in our field, how have they impacted on your teaching (or your scholarship)?
3. If a student challenged your views in class in a fairly convincing manner, how would you respond to the student and class?
4. What would you say were the strongest and weakest aspects of your teaching the last time you taught the introductory course? (or in the last article you published?)
5. What evaluation system did you use in the last graduate seminar you taught?
6. What two or three accomplishments from the past five years might best indicate where your professional career will take you in the next five years?

Questions to Ask and Not to Ask Legal Questions

The legal questions listed below should be asked only when relevant to a particular job.

TOPIC	LEGAL QUESTIONS	DISCRIMINATORY QUESTIONS
Family Status	Do you have any responsibilities that conflict with the job attendance or travel requirements? Cannot be asked unless all applicants are asked the same question and their answer evaluated in the same manner.	Are you married? What is your spouse's name? What is your maiden name? Do you have any children? Are you pregnant? What are your childcare arrangements?
Race	None.	What is your race?
Residence	What is your address?	Do you own or rent your home? Who resides with you?
Sex	None.	Are you male or female?
Sexual Orientation	None.	Are you homo/heterosexual?
Weight & Height	Job-related questions.	How much do you weigh? How tall are you?
Age	If hired, can you offer proof that you are at least 18 years of age?	How old are you? What is your birth date?
Arrests or Conviction of a Crime	Have you ever been convicted of a crime? You must state that a conviction will only be considered as it relates to fitness to perform the job being sought.	Have you ever been arrested?
Citizenship or Nationality	Can you show proof of your eligibility to work in the U.S.? Are you fluent in any languages other than English? You may ask the second question only as it relates to the job being sought.	Are you a citizen of the U.S.? Where were you born?

Disability	Are you able to perform the essential functions of the job with or without reasonable accommodation? Show the applicant the Position Announcement so the answer is an informed one.	Are you disabled? What is the nature or severity of your disability?
Relatives	Name(s) of relative(s) already employed by LMU. Name and addresses of emergency contacts.	Name and address of any relative of applicant.
Military	Military experience in U.S. Armed Forces.	Applicant's military experience in other than U.S. Armed Forces, National Guard or Reserve Units. Applicant's whereabouts in 1914-1918, 1941-1945, 1950-1953, 1964-1975.
Organizations	Applicant's membership in any professional or trade organization.	All clubs, social lodges, fraternities, societies or organizations to which the applicant belongs, other than professional trade or service organizations.
References	Names of persons willing to give professional and/or character references.	The name of the applicant's pastor or religious leader.
Photographs	None.	Photographs with application or after interview but before hire.

Legal and Effective Interviewing, Costal Training Technologies Corp., Virginia Beach, VA.

(1) Sample Questions About Mission and Identity

1. How do you see the difference between Loyola Marymount University as a Catholic university and secular institutions you are familiar with?
2. How do you see yourself contributing to LMU's Jesuit and Marymount heritage, e.g. to the dialogue between faith and culture, to our commitments to the education of the whole person and the service of faith and promotion of justice?
3. At Loyola Marymount we are concerned about hiring people who will be a good fit for the University. On the other hand, why do you think LMU might be a good fit for you?

As a religiously-affiliated university, LMU is not prohibited from discriminating on the basis of religion and it is expected that certain positions, e.g., President, Director of Campus Ministry, will be filled by a Roman Catholic. In faculty hiring, however, it is not the practice to inquire about a person's religion (although candidates sometimes volunteer that information). Hiring for Mission does not mean hiring only Catholics but hiring faculty who appreciate the religious identity of the university and will contribute to its mission. Of course it is all to the good, when opportunity presents itself, to hire faculty whose scholarship/creative work is informed by living experience of the Catholic intellectual/artistic tradition.

(2) Sample Responses to Questions About Mission and Identity

The following are some responses regarding LMU's Catholic/Jesuit identity from candidates interviewed at New Orleans MLA Convention (December 27-28, 2001) for an assistant professor position in the English Department. The question posed to the candidates asked them to say what they thought would be different about LMU as Catholic/Jesuit, compared with secular universities. In some instances the candidates also indicated what they might personally hope to contribute to LMU's Catholic/Jesuit identity.

1. A tradition of Jesuit intellectual rigor is part of the environment at LMU. It helps to keep in perspective things like athletics or Greek life, which are more dominant on some other campuses.
2. Social justice involvements are a prominent aspect of a Jesuit campus. N.B.- In his dissertation candidate brings a theological perspective (among others) to bear on Don LeLillo; looks for hints of hope, belief, salvation.
3. On a Jesuit campus there is a concern for faith and justice. Among Catholic educators, Jesuits are noted for openness rather than providing pat answers. They welcome ecumenical and inter-religious dialogue. N.B.- In his own approach to literature candidate wants to move beyond post-modern responses to raise questions of belief. Candidate "would like to participate in academic advising and social advocacy programs, helping students to develop into well informed, socially conscious, and principled adults while continuing my own growth as a Catholic scholar and educator."

4. LMU claims to be concerned with “the education of the whole person.” Do you take this part of your mission seriously? Are you concerned about students’ emotions as well as their reason, their heart as well as their head? Do you nurture love, trust, and honesty along with your commitment to justice?
5. A Catholic university is different from its secular counterparts in its openness to a spiritual dimension. It wants students to be reflective about their place in society. Jesuit education highlights social responsibility and outreach to the community. N.B.- Candidate thinks it would be interesting to research how Catholic motives for social responsibility might differ from Emerson’s Protestant motives (wrote his dissertation on Emerson and DuBois).
6. A university like LMU is open to questions about spirituality. Without imposing a spirituality, a teacher can raise questions, focus issues.
7. As experienced at Detroit Mercy, Jesuit education is concerned with service learning, outreach to the community.
8. LMU preserves the Jesuit respect for the humanities/liberal arts as over against the “corporatizing” of much of higher education.
9. Catholic education is open to the mystery of God lying behind everyday occurrences. “A rainbow is no less a miracle for the fact that science can explain it.”

(3) Sample Questions About Inclusive Teaching and Learning

1. What is your basic teaching philosophy?
2. What do you see as the basic function of undergraduate education?
3. What would you do to get to know your students -- the backgrounds and experiences they bring to class that influence how they learn from you?
4. Describe the repertoire of teaching methods you would use in order to help you work effectively with diverse groups of students?
5. What strategies for successful learning do you share with students?
6. Is the content of your course such that it acknowledges and incorporates diverse experiences and perspectives? Could it be?
7. How do you want to be perceived by your students?
8. What courses in graduate school did you enjoy most and find helpful in preparing to teach? Why?

9. What are your teaching strengths / weaknesses?
10. What does the term *Equitable Class Participation* mean to you?
11. How do you develop good student / professor relationships?
12. What courses could you teach from those listed in the Bulletin for our department?
13. What new courses could you introduce? What other ways do you see yourself contributing to our department?
14. How do you propose to balance teaching, research, and service in your career?

(4) Sample Questions on the Understanding of Gender Issues

1. Sometimes women students don't participate as much as men. What have you done to encourage women to participate in your classes? Has it worked?
2. Approximately how many men have you nominated for fellowships, awards, and prizes? How many women?
3. Have you had teaching or research assistants in the recent past? How many were women?
4. (For science faculty) Research shows that women in science often have lower aspirations than their male colleagues. Have you encountered this trend in your classes? What do you do about it?
5. (For science faculty) What differences have you perceived in men and women in the laboratory? Do you tend to have single-sex lab teams? Why?
6. How have you encouraged women students to enter traditionally male fields?
7. What has been your experience with faculty or student hostility to women and women's issues? What was your response?
8. Have any students ever complained to you about sexual harassment or discrimination in any work with professors or staff? If so, how did you respond?

(5) Sample Questions about Writing Across the Curriculum for Those Teaching Core Courses

1. Why do you use writing in your courses, and how do you think writing promotes learning in your discipline?
2. What issues do students seem to struggle within their writing for your courses?
3. What frustrates you about student writing?
4. How do you assess student writing? What are you looking for in student writing and how do you communicate this to students?

(6) Sample Questions About Research

1. Why did you decide to pursue a doctorate in your field?
2. How did you choose your dissertation topic?
3. Do you plan to revise your dissertation for publication?
4. Describe your research. Who are some of the leading scholars in your field? How would you situate your work in relation to theirs?
5. Where do you see your research going? What do you plan to look at next?
6. What types of equipment will you need to continue your research?
7. How can you involve undergraduates in your research? What types of research projects would you have them work on?

(7) Sample Questions About Extra Curricular Activities and University Service

1. At LMU, as at other institutions, there are opportunities for service at the department, colleges, and university levels. Have you thought about types of service you might eventually like to be involved in?
2. Studies show that retention rates improve when faculty interact with students outside the academic setting. Do you see a role for yourself in this student's extra-curricular activities?

Principles of Good Practice for Department Chairs, and Search Committees

Adapted from Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner and Samuel L. Myers, Jr. (2000)

Before the Search Begins

Good:

- Clearly articulate campus rationale in support of hiring for mission, i.e., to enhance religious identity, to promote ethnic diversity, and to move toward gender parity.
- Create a search committee that is enthusiastic and genuinely committed to faculty diversity, gender balance, and Catholic/Jesuit-Marymount identity.
- Incorporate the university's mission and commitment to diversity/ inclusiveness into campus and community addresses and publications.

Better:

In addition to the above,

- Create a diverse search committee-comprised of faculty from both minority and non-minority backgrounds that brings multiple perspectives and fresh ideas. Provide for student input. Be sure one person has special responsibility for diversity/gender concerns and another person for religious mission concerns.
- Make sure that the search process is also viewed as a critical retention tool.
- Require diversity training for all chairpersons and staff supervisors.
- Include and align commitment to mission/diversity efforts in the institutional and departmental strategic plans.
- Create open line of communication with potential faculty already in your department or school-adjunct or part-time professors, graduate students, and research associates.

Best:

In addition to all of the above,

- Secure all resources needed to conduct a comprehensive search.
- Make sure that your campus has developed and continually audits a comprehensive plan to address and show commitment to diversity in every area of campus life- faculty hiring, curricular reform, student enrollment, campus activities, and general campus climate.
- Establish and cultivate ongoing and routine relationships with local and national minority organizations and special interest groups as well as with students and faculty at colleges and universities that educate graduate students of color.
- Be aware of Lilly Network doctoral fellows and graduate-student alumni of the Collegium Colloquy on Faith and the Intellectual Life. These young scholars are interested in teaching at universities that promote dialogue between faith and contemporary culture.
- Incorporate new research findings and data about faculty of color into the everyday practices of an institution. For example, convene information forums, roundtables, and retreats, presenting emerging research and successful practices.

During the Search**Good:**

- Explain to the committee its charge from the outset – a commitment to the racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty as well as gender balance and Catholic identity must be clearly stated goals.
- Critically analyze the job description and advertisement, making sure they are geared toward inclusiveness.
- Mail position announcements to minority groups and organizations, university and local organizations, women's groups, and local minority churches and organizations.

- Cover the cost of the candidates expenses related to the interview – hotel, food, and travel.
- During the campus visit, make sure that all the interactions with the candidate are honest and genuine.
- Offer to arrange a meeting with groups such as Asian American Faculty Staff Association, Committee on the Status of Women, and the African American Faculty Staff Association or anyone else of similar background, interests, ethnicity, or gender to give their perspectives on the campus and local community climate.

Better:

In addition to the above,

- Write a position announcement that attracts a diverse group of applicants.
- Contact by letter and phone previous faculty of color, visiting scholars and/or individuals who have made diversity-related presentations on campus.
- Establish a vita bank.
- Use listservs, bulletin boards, and other forms of technology to announce positions and recruit potential candidates.
- Create an institution-wide funding pool to cover departmental expenses for costs associated with the on-campus interview of potential candidates, the cost of advertisements in minority publications, and travel costs for off-campus recruiting efforts.

Best:

In addition to all of the above,

- Educate the search committee, and provide opportunities for discussion on diversity and equity as well as mission and identity issues.

- Utilize personal and professional networks to seek leads to potential minority and women candidates and candidates acquainted with the Catholic intellectual tradition.
- Initiate recruitment trips to universities that prepare a significant number of minority and women Ph.D. graduates.
- Establish a pool of potential minority and women candidates through a Visiting Scholars, Faculty Fellows, and/or ABD Fellowship programs.
- Advise the candidate of any incentives that might be negotiable in the salary package (reduced work loads, grant funded opportunities, etc.).
- Cover the cost of an additional campus/area visit to explore housing.

After the search

Good:

- Honor all start-up conditions mentioned in the final letter of agreement.
- Do not overload the new hire with excessive service demands- committee memberships, advising, etc.

Better:

In addition to the above,

- Follow-up with the new hire regularly to help with transitions and to answer any concerns that might develop in the first few days/weeks/months.
- Provide mentoring and professional development opportunities.

Best:

In addition to the above,

- Continue efforts to diversify the faculty. Support other campus diversity initiatives as well as initiatives to promote heightened awareness of LMU's distinctive mission and identity.
- Provide the new hire with clearly stated standards and procedures regarding evaluation and performance.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the search process in order to avoid future missteps. Acknowledge the successes and failures and share that information with other search committees.
- Sponsor campus and community-wide gatherings to highlight the research, teaching, and service contributions of new faculty.

References

- Beach, D. (1997, March). *Affirmative action at Colgate University*. Retrieved June 4, 2002, from <http://offices.colgate.edu/aa/IIIB2.html>.
- Bureau of State Audits (May 2, 2001). *University of California Faculty Hiring Audit*
- California State Auditor/Bureau of State Audits (2001). *University of California: Some campuses and academic departments need to take additional steps to resolve gender disputes among professors*. (Summary of Reprot No. 2000-131-May 2001).
- Faculty diversity at MU: A task force report* (1999, November 9). Office of Minority Affairs and Faculty Development, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Faculty recruitment toolkit* (2001, Winter). Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- Gaff, J. G., Pruitt-Logan, A. S., Weibl, R. A., & Participants in the Preparing Future Faculty Program (2000). *Building the faculty we need: Colleges and universities working together*. Washinton, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Gainen, J. & Boice, R. (1993). *Building a diverse faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Guide for recruiting faculty* (n.d.) Unpublished manuscript from California State University, Northridge.
- Holliday, B. G. (n.d.). Increasing cultural diversity. Retrieved November 28, 2001 from <http://www.apa.org/pi/oema/diversity/book1/book1.html>.
- Johns Hopkins University (1997). *Recruitment, retention, and Professional Development of women faculty*. (Subcommittee report from Provost's Committee on the Status of Women.) Retrieved June 4, 2002 from www.jhu.edu/news_info/reports/womenfac/report.html.

- LaCross (2001). *Who is qualified?* Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin.
- Smith, D.G., Wolf, L.E., & Busenberg, B.E. (1996). *Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Recruitment process* (1998). Retrieved June 4, 2002 from <http://sci.sdsu/ode/recruitment/interviewtips.html>.
- Spangler, M. S. & Wixon, C. (2000, June). *Strategies to achieve a diverse faculty and staff*. AAHEBulletin.com. Retrieved June 30, 2003 from <http://aahebulletin.com/public/archive/june/asp?pf=1>.
- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- University Equity Office (n.d.) *Faculty recruitment*. Retrieved June 4, 2002 from <http://www.gmu.edu/equity/faculty-recruit.htm>.
- University of California (2001). *University of California: Affirmative action guidelines for recruitment and retention of faculty* [Brochure]. Office of Academic Development and Academic Personnel Office.
- Vukelich, C. (2001). *University council of teacher education: Faculty recruitment and retention plan*. Retrieved June 4, 2002 from http://www.udel.edu/ucte.docs/faculty_recruit.html.
- Wilson, R. (2002, July 12). *Stacking the deck for minority candidates?* [Electronic Version]. The Chronicle of Higher Education.