

# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

---

JUNE 1946

---

PROCEEDINGS ANNUAL MEETING—1946

~

LAYMEN IN JESUIT SCHOOLS

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND JESUIT SCHOOLS

COOPERATION AMONG JESUIT SCHOOLS

FACULTY RETIREMENT PLANS IN  
JESUIT SCHOOLS

VETERANS IN JESUIT SCHOOLS

---

VOL. IX, No. 1

---

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)



# Contributors

The QUARTERLY is happy to print in this annual meeting number some of the papers presented at the Convention. Because of limitations of space, we are unable to print all the contributions in this issue. We can assure all participants in the program of the gratitude and appreciation of the Association for their generous services.

FATHER ALBERT H. POETKER, S.J., is well known to readers of the QUARTERLY. Father Poetker is former president of the University of Detroit and at present executive dean of the university.

MR. THOMAS J. ROSS is head of the firm of Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, public relations consultants to many corporations, among them the Pennsylvania Railroad, Chrysler Corporation, Columbia Broadcasting Company, and so forth. Mr. Ross is a graduate of St. Francis Xavier College (New York) 1913, a Knight of Malta, and board member of various civic and charitable organizations. We are deeply grateful to Mr. Ross for his generosity in coming to St. Louis and for his excellent paper.

FATHER JOHN E. WISE, S.J., is also well known to readers of the QUARTERLY. Father Wise, formerly dean of freshmen at Georgetown University, is at present director of the School of Adult Education at Loyola College, Baltimore.

FATHER CHARLES T. TAYLOR, S.J., is principal of Regis High School, New York City.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, S.J., is dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of St. Louis University. Father Reinert holds his degree in education from the University of Chicago.

Panel on Veterans: FATHER JAMES F. MOYNIHAN, S.J., is in charge of Veterans' Counseling at Boston College, and is a member of the same service bureau at Harvard University. FATHER JOHN F. CONNOLLY, S.J., is dean of the faculty, Loyola University, Los Angeles. FATHER HUGH F. SMITH, S.J., is registrar at University of Detroit.

FATHER LORENZO K. REED, S.J., is principal of Canisius High School, Buffalo, New York, and is the author of the article, *Supervision in Jesuit High Schools*, which appeared in the QUARTERLY and was also published in brochure form.

\* \* \* \* \*

The index for Volume VIII will be distributed with this issue.



# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

## June 1946

---

### CONTENTS

FATHER DE BOYNES' LETTER . . . . .	5
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AT THE ANNUAL MEETING	
<i>Edward B. Rooney, S.J.</i> . . . . .	7
THE PLACE OF THE LAYMAN IN JESUIT SCHOOLS	
<i>Albert H. Poetker, S.J.</i> . . . . .	12
PUBLIC RELATIONS AND JESUIT SCHOOLS	
<i>Thomas J. Ross</i> . . . . .	20
COOPERATION BETWEEN JESUIT COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS	
THE COLLEGE VIEWPOINT	
<i>John E. Wise, S.J.</i> . . . . .	30
THE HIGH-SCHOOL VIEWPOINT	
<i>Charles T. Taylor, S.J.</i> . . . . .	34
A RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE PLAN	
<i>Paul C. Reinert, S.J.</i> . . . . .	38
PERSONAL ASPECTS OF VETERANS' PROBLEMS	
<i>James F. Moynihan, S.J.</i> . . . . .	47
PROBLEMS ON ADMISSION OF VETERANS TO COLLEGE	
<i>John F. Connolly, S.J.</i> . . . . .	51
PRIORITIES FOR VETERANS	
<i>Hugh F. Smith, S.J.</i> . . . . .	56
REPORT ON NATIONAL COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS	
<i>Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.</i> . . . . .	57
PROGRAM OF ANNUAL MEETING, JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION . . . . .	61



The JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

## EDITORIAL STAFF

### *Editor*

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S. J.

### *Associate Editors*

\*RICHARD F. GRADY, S. J.

CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.

JAMES A. KING, S. J.

WILLIAM M. WELLER, S. J.

VINCENT DE P. O'BRIEN, S. J.

JAMES F. WHELAN, S. J.

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

EDWARD B. BUNN, S. J.

*Maryland Province*

WILLIAM J. CODD, S. J.

*Oregon Province*

HUGH M. DUCE, S. J.

*California Province*

MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.

*New York Province*

JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S. J.

*Maryland Province*

WILFRED M. MALLON, S. J.

*Missouri Province*

JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.

*Chicago Province*

JOSEPH J. ROONEY, S. J.

*New York Province*

ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S. J.

*New England Province*

ANDREW C. SMITH, S. J.

*New Orleans Province*

---

\* Serving in the armed forces, chaplains corps.

### ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 EAST 84TH STREET  
NEW YORK 28, N. Y.



# Father de Boynes' Letter

Rome

February 27, 1946

Reverend Edward B. Rooney, S.J.,  
49 East 84 Street,  
New York 28, New York.

Dear Father Rooney:

P.C.

It is a pleasure to avail myself of the occasion of your annual meeting to send a word of congratulation to the Jesuit Educational Association and to express my gratitude to the Executive Director, the various officials, and members for their devoted labors particularly during the trying years of the war.

In addressing Your Reverence I address all of Ours in any way engaged in our high schools, colleges, and universities.

Ever since I had the pleasure of visiting the American Assistancy some twenty-five years ago, I have followed your magnificent apostolate of education with the keenest of interest and have realized that the secret of its success lies in the devotedness of the men dedicated to this ministry of the Society. The world of education today is profoundly disturbed along with the political, the social, the economic, and the moral; but just as in these the real solution to the problems which confront it can be found only in the unchanging principles of the moral law and its derivatives, so in the educational, must we look to those solid principles without which there can be no real formation of man.

In this the Society is particularly favored, possessing as she does a system of education, tried and proven, which, if we cannot activate in all particulars, we must never sacrifice in method and objectives.

It was most gratifying to learn of the splendid records made by the students and alumni of all our colleges in the armed forces, exemplifying again the effectiveness of Jesuit education. In consequence these young men have become more closely knit among themselves and to us, because they now realize the worth of the education they received at our hands.

This, while it carries with it the partial reward of devoted labors in the classroom in the past, should determine us to follow the *Ratio* with all the greater exactitude in the future.

Let there be a revival of the classics in all our schools, at least for selected groups; let a thorough, complete, vital course in philosophy, one that will leave aside obsolete questions and useless speculation, and will



concentrate on the weighty problems of the hour, be the core course of every constituent of our colleges and universities, but above all let the teaching of religion, both in content and in manner, be made a matter of particular study, so that our students may leave us well equipped in the knowledge of their faith, able to give an account thereof, and of such moral caliber as will enable them to live out in their lives the belief they profess in their hearts.

The task before you, Reverend Fathers, is manifold and difficult. Face it with courage and resolve, for the objective is worth every effort you can put forth in its achievement. In this you will progress all the more surely if you will abide closely by the *Instructio* and the Constitutions of the Jesuit Educational Association, in their revised form. I think it better to leave it to the new Father General to give them definitive approbation.

Your apostolate and all those engaged therein shall be in my constant prayers. May God bless your work and make it fruitful unto the greater glory of God.

I commend myself to Your Reverence's Holy Sacrifices and prayers.

Your Reverence's servant in Christ,

N. DE BOYNES, S.J.



# Report of the Executive Director at the Annual Meeting

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

It is two years since the Jesuit Educational Association held its last convention at Atlantic City. A much longer time has passed since we gathered together in days of peace to discuss the peaceful pursuits of educating and training young Catholic Americans. Years of strife and turmoil have intervened; with much sweat and tears we have learned the dreadful lessons of war.

As we look back over the past few years at our educational work we find much to be grateful for, in spite of the inevitable tragedies of war. Our high schools have prospered as did all secondary schools. Their enrollments were never so high. Prosperity in colleges had to be measured by other norms. When colleges were contributing by military programs to the war effort our schools were in front. Twenty-one of our twenty-five colleges and universities operated government sponsored programs of one kind or another. When the A.S.T.P. and similar programs were discontinued, then it became an achievement to remain open. V-E and V-J day found twenty-five Jesuit colleges still running. For many this entailed heavy financial loss. Our schools contributed generously of their Jesuit staffs to the chaplains corps of the armed services. The record of our alumni in the armed services is one which we must never forget or allow to be forgotten. It is our hope that in an early issue of the *QUARTERLY* we may give complete statistics on alumni-in-service, commissions received, and decorations won. Later in our program two former chaplains will tell us their observations on our students in the war. Our trust in God and our hope for the future are perhaps best illustrated by the fact that in the very midst of war we announced plans for the opening of a new college, Le Moyne, at Syracuse, New York.

But now the postwar period is here; Jesuit education faces the present and the future. How will it face them? What will be its objectives? What will be its norms of activity?

In August 1934 Very Reverend Father General sent to the American Assistancy an *Instructio on Studies* whose purpose was to lay down general principles and norms for the administration of our schools and for the preparation of Jesuit teachers to staff the schools. This *Instructio* had been prepared at the end of a long and careful study by a commission appointed



for the task by Father General. To the men of the Assistancy who made this study we of today owe a debt of gratitude. Their names, Fathers Charles F. Carroll, Charles J. Deane, Albert C. Fox, John W. Hynes, Edward P. Tivnan, and James B. Macelwane should be held in benediction.

This *Instructio* was to have been revised after a period of three years. But a series of events over which we had no control made a revision in 1937 impossible. The war then intervened to delay further the revision. For the past few years, however, the American provincials and the Executive Committee of the J.E.A. worked at the revision. It is providential, we think, that word of approval of the revision comes just at this critical time. Many laudable schemes and plans looking to postwar needs have been devised by American educators. In many of them there is much good. They are steps in the right direction. They must, of course, be adapted to the needs of individual institutions and localities. But for a set of general principles and guiding norms that must underlie all Jesuit educational planning I know of nothing better than the *Instructio on Studies*.

If a real Jesuit Educational Association is functioning today, and if this Association has done much to coordinate and improve the work of Jesuit schools, we have the *Instructio* to thank. If the preparation of teachers is carried on in a more orderly way, and if we have larger numbers of men prepared by special studies to staff our high schools, colleges, and universities, again this is the result of the *Instructio*. This very gathering of Jesuits from all over the country is, in a way, a result of the *Instructio*.

We are told that the postwar period is a period of "reconstruction." This can be a misleading term, as it was in the period that followed the war between the States. Reconstruction means to build, to erect, to construct anew. Our task is not to build anew. Thanks to God we weathered the storm of war without too great material losses except in our mission countries. Our educational efforts before the war were certainly in the right direction. For us perhaps it is truer to say that we are in a period of "reconversion"—conversion back to a previous state after a period of war programs and acceleration. Even "reconversion" is not entirely satisfactory; for our efforts should now be directed to do what we did in the past but to do it better. Our objectives and aspirations were always good; methods of attaining them were often faulty. Our efforts now must be directed toward the better achievement of known goals; toward a re-dedication to traditional aims and objectives, and toward the improvement of areas in which we were weak.

A careful study of the *Instructio* will show that it aims exactly in these directions. If we are to attain our objectives and achieve them according to



the sound traditions of Jesuit education, if our schools are to be first class, if our products are to compete on an equal basis with those of other schools (as is their right), then we must first of all be conscious of our objectives; we must provide adequate preparation of our teachers; we must abide by the soundest academic standards; our schools must formulate financial policies and procedures; they must have modern academic organization; we must concentrate on improving what we have and not be oversolicitous of expansion; there must be in each of our schools and in every division of them a conscious Catholic emphasis which reveals itself by emphasis on ultimate aims, on the teaching of religion and philosophy, on an effective desire for entirely Catholic lay faculty. If the prescriptions of the *Instructio* are carried out, each of these areas will be taken care of, for in the *Instructio* provision is made for each item I have mentioned.

For eleven years I have been engaged in visiting Jesuit schools throughout the country; I think I have a sympathetic understanding of their assets as well as their liabilities. I realize that many of our difficulties are financial. In my own observations as well as in reading reports on schools by general prefects of studies, I see clearly that the detailed means of correcting defects or of mapping improvements have been specified in the *Instructio*. If I were asked to state the best general means I know for improving our educational work of the Assistancy, if I were asked for a ten-year plan whose purpose would be to bring our schools to an adequate and desirable standard, I would answer unhesitatingly—Follow the *Instructio*.

In a short time we shall reprint it and send sufficient copies to each of our institutions. I hope that Jesuits, and particularly Jesuit superiors and school administrators, will give it earnest study. It will provide the directions for making their schools better and finer instruments in our educational apostolate.

We have then in our hands a satisfactory postwar program. It was formulated twelve years ago as a result of an extensive study by American Jesuits, of Jesuit educational needs. Strangely enough, the program of this meeting is peculiarly adapted to the present immediate needs of American Jesuit education.

The total enrollment in Jesuit high schools in September 1945 reached an all time high. Here surely is an opportunity and the challenge—twenty-two thousand high-school students, at the most formative period of their lives. We have them in our direct care from five to eight hours a day for four years. The enrollment in our colleges and universities at that same period still showed the drastic effects of the war. The total was 38,823 including philosophates and corporate colleges. But here are the latest



enrollment figures, gathered two weeks ago. We now have in 20 of 25 colleges, exclusive of philosophates and corporate colleges, and universities over 42,786 students. Of these, 14,733 are returned veterans back with us after the sobering experiences of military life and combat. I feel safe in saying that no group of Jesuits in the entire history of the Society was ever given such an opportunity for influencing deeply the lives of so many young people and helping them to grow into mature, educated, Catholic gentlemen. Such maturity of character and mind will be produced in high school by our method of teaching and by instilling in students a sense of responsibility in study and activities. In the college student it will be produced in the same way, but on a college level. The student, both in high school and in college, must be made responsible for his education.

With veterans we will have little trouble. They have matured, many of them beyond their years. They know the value of life and they have learned the value of an education. They wish to have their particular needs met but they are not accustomed to spoon feeding. They neither look for nor want coddling in education. That the veterans in our schools are already a fine influence is reported from all sides. We must capitalize on this influence and use it to restore or strengthen the traditional ideal of Jesuit education—self-activity, self-education, and responsibility of students for their education.

I think the program of this J.E.A. meeting is well adapted to show what the trend of Jesuit thinking should be in order to fulfill many of the directives of the *Instructio*. To indicate a few: Cooperation between Jesuit colleges and high schools, locally and nationally, should be of prime concern. Development of a sound program of public relations is a crying need. The particular problems of our many high schools will be given thorough study in the Denver Institute for Principals for which long-range plans will be made at our meetings this week. The important place of the layman in our schools, our relations with the Association of American Universities, a national accrediting agency, the problem of philosophy in our colleges—all these will be discussed during the next few days. From the discussions will come, we trust, light to guide us during the months and years before us. One might imagine that almost the same problems faced Jesuit education twelve years ago, for in the *Instructio* can be found principles on which to base a constructive program to meet the needs of the present.

In connection with the extraordinary increase in college enrollment, may I mention a few points that have come to my attention. The offices of deans and registrars are taxed with applications and the capacities of our schools are limited. But we must be careful to answer all applications



and to give courteous treatment to all applicants and, especially, to parents.

In the matter of enrollment, I am sure our schools have established some system of priorities in admission. Other things being equal, special consideration should, of course, be given to veterans; and a top priority to those who left a school to join the armed forces. They have first claim on available places in our colleges. After them comes those young men who upon graduation from high schools went immediately into the armed forces. In this group, as well as in the group of incoming freshmen just graduating from high school, special consideration should be given to graduates of Jesuit and other Catholic high schools. Such a system of priority is natural and no one could justly complain of it.

In closing, let me assure you that there has been extraordinary union and cooperation among the Jesuit schools of the country during the past few years. This union and cooperation have paid high dividends. Our schools have a common end, a common tradition. By working together we can help each other to maintain those traditions and to attain that common end. So will our schools achieve through education the greater glory of God.



# The Place of the Layman in Jesuit Schools

ALBERT H. POETKER, S.J.

In acceding to the request of our Executive Director to address you on "The Place of the Layman in Jesuit Schools," I could not expect to tell you much that is new or to give you all the answers to faculty problems, but at most to emphasize the seriousness of the problem, to discuss it in broad outline, and to stimulate more universal and organized efforts toward doing something about it.

We are not dealing here with a problem that is treated and answered in the *Ratio Studiorum*. In that sense it is entirely a new problem. It has come upon us in relatively recent years—after the expansion of many of our high schools and liberal arts colleges into universities—since the days when the enrollment of a number of our institutions mounted to several thousand.

Fifty years ago all but five of our present colleges and universities were in existence as Jesuit institutions. Three at best had any university organization. Mostly they were primarily high schools with registrations ranging from 200 to 600. The bigger and better ones might have a few score of true college-level students, but these would probably be outnumbered by the pupils in the preparatory department; i.e., prehigh school, covering the fifth to eighth elementary grades. St. Francis Xavier, New York, ranked very high with 160 college students, 390 in grammar school or high school, and 120 in preparatory. Fordham, its successor institution, probably has at present a higher enrollment than the combined enrollment of all the Jesuit schools in the country fifty years ago.

The inference is obvious. Fifty years ago practically all the teachers in Jesuit institutions were Jesuits. There were, of course, a few lay helpers. For the seven colleges of the Missouri Province fifty years ago the average was four per school. They were collectively included in the province catalogue through the phrase "*Praeterea magistri externi tres, duo, quinque,*" and these took care mostly of the *preparatory* and the *commercial* high-school classes. In those days a lay faculty was simply nonexistent in our institutions.

But now we are conducting 25 colleges and universities with a combined enrollment of 40,000 to 50,000 and 37 high schools with an enrollment of 22,500. And while we have 6,000 Jesuits in the American prov-



ince, those actively engaged in the work of our high schools, colleges, and universities will not exceed 25 per cent of this number or about 1,500. If we depend on Jesuits alone our student-teacher ratio would be about 500 to 1.

Therefore we *must* have large numbers of laymen to help us in our educational work. We must have them not only in professional schools of the university but also in our arts colleges, and even in our high schools. With expanding enrollments their proportion to Jesuits will continue to rise. We must consider them an *essential* and *permanent* part of the organizational structure. Henceforth they will be always with us, and we must do some long-term planning to solve the problem of finding them, improving them, retaining them, and keeping them happy and contented.

I purposely have spent considerable time in contrasting our present-day educational activities with those of our predecessors fifty years ago because I want to dwell briefly on some features of the development. In general, the transition from one picture to the other was a gradual one. It came with steadily growing enrollments, the founding of new institutions, the expansion into new fields of educational activity. The chief factor in making us absolutely dependent on lay assistance in faculty was the establishment or taking over of professional schools after the general policy of expanding our colleges into universities had been adopted. The professional schools of the early days depended on lay faculty even more exclusively than at present. But meanwhile, in the arts colleges and the high schools the layman continued to be looked upon as only a temporary lay assistant, without clear status of academic rank, and certainly without tenure; hardly regarded as a member of a learned profession. Few in number and clearly a minority compared with the Jesuits, they were just convenient "extras" helping out while the need continued, insecure, expected to step aside if the properly prepared Jesuit should be assigned to the college—living up to the province catalogue's anonymity "*praeterea magistri externi quinque.*" Because salaries were low, the best teachers after a few years, found better jobs, and the mediocre became resigned to a hard lot for which there seemed to be no remedy. When special needs arose rectors thought first of Jesuits and importuned provincials to send out scholastics from the juniorate, or to postpone the tertianship of the young fathers, or even to withdraw some of the professors from the Jesuit houses of studies. That attitude still remains, especially in institutions where laymen have always been few in number compared with the Jesuit staff. I suspect it often diverts good Jesuit prospects from the large universities.

Now, if we are going to fulfill our responsibility in conducting efficient, well-managed educational institutions, we must recognize and accept a fairly numerous and diversified lay faculty as a permanent and essential



part of those institutions. And this holds for arts colleges and high schools as well as the universities.

As for the professional schools, it is obvious that we are absolutely dependent on the lay personnel. Here our endeavor must be rather to include a few Jesuits in key positions on such faculties—to act as a kind of leaven among them, to maintain the Jesuit atmosphere, to enable students to have some Jesuit contacts. All these professional units are part of a Catholic and Jesuit university, and they must develop a distinctively Jesuit spirit. Thus, a very few well-selected men might accomplish such a purpose in some basic science, in the schools of medicine, or dentistry, or pharmacy. In engineering, business administration, or journalism, education and law, the opportunity is much greater if the Jesuits were only available—for such subjects as the sciences, mathematics, English, economics, philosophy, and religion. And yet in all these units the Jesuit personnel, even under the best conditions, will be greatly in the minority; these units have never had a chance to expect more.

But it is the arts colleges especially that must become accustomed to depend on lay faculty in larger and larger numbers, and that in every department. There is not a field in which they cannot serve. We have found excellently trained men for our old Jesuit stronghold of philosophy. There is no intrinsic reason why we should not find them for religion.

On the other hand, it is my personal opinion that we should have some Jesuit representatives in all the various departments of our arts college. The same will hold for selected departments of a professional school. In fact, I think it is desirable that, if at all possible, a competent, tactful, and seasoned Jesuit member of the department should act as its director rather than a layman even though the latter may have the advantage of more scholarly, specialized attainment. Laymen will recognize the propriety of this and will not resent working under such a Jesuit. Jesuit members, on the contrary, find it difficult to take their appointments and orders from a lay department director, probably younger and less experienced though perhaps possessed of a higher degree. It is just a natural human reaction and there is no good reason why there should be occasion for its arising. Of course the Jesuit must have enough organizational and administrative ability to keep his house in order. This opinion is even more emphatic with regard to having a Jesuit as dean of the college of liberal arts. It would be a sad confession of our intellectual and administrative bankruptcy if we cannot find a Jesuit dean for the most distinctively Jesuit unit of our universities.

Apart from the need of lay faculty because of our own dearth of men, we need them on other counts:

1. They afford greater breadth of faculty outlook. Without disparaging



in the slightest our own system of Jesuit training, it is helpful to the Jesuit staff, and even more so to the student body, to have greater diversification of academic training represented in the faculty. Different schools of Catholic thought can supplement each other.

2. They render our schools more general and universal in their appeal, more attractive to the average student. They make impossible the old persuasion, common enough a generation or two ago, that our colleges are schools for priests or seminaries.

3. They help us immensely in carrying the name and reputation of the institution into circles only partly reached by Jesuits, professional groups, citizen groups, service clubs, discussion circles, educational associations, learned societies, the great American public who still are somewhat shy of the Roman collar and feel more at home with laymen.

4. In all phases of the Church's apostolic work she calls upon laymen for assistance. Witness the urgency of the pope's appeal for Catholic action, the cooperation of the laity with the clergy in an organized campaign of apostolic endeavor. Surely there is no field in which they can cooperate more properly and more effectively than in that of education.

If I seem to have been unduly insistent on the essential character of the permanent lay faculty for our institutions, it is because there are still those among us who consider our university expansion a mistake. They think with nostalgic longing of the old day when the small liberal arts college served a very limited elite who were destined to become leaders. That was all right in Europe three centuries ago, perhaps more recently in some South American countries, but in America today college education must be and eventually will be the privilege available to every young man and woman capable of profiting from such an education. We cannot turn back the hands of the clock. We must face mass education even on the college level, or, if you prefer, higher education of the masses. Quality need not suffer any more than it suffered in mass production of motor cars or airplanes. I am not suggesting any similarity of production methods. I only mean that far larger numbers of our Catholic population will henceforth enjoy a much higher standard of living than did their parents and grandparents and will demand a Catholic college education; and we Jesuits, the oldest and largest and most successful Catholic group in the business, must be ready to see that they can get it. Since we cannot do it alone, we must find, or better, provide and train a lay faculty to help us accomplish that purpose.

But there is the rub: How to provide a numerous and competent Catholic faculty? How to retain them and keep them with high morale? How to inspire them with that undefinable something that will enable them to fit into and become part of what we speak of as distinctive Jesuit education?



First there is the matter of selection. It is never an easy task. In the not too distant past we have been slipshod and remiss in our methods, especially for lower-level positions—a cursory inquiry around town, a look over lists of recent graduates, perhaps a call on the nearest or most aggressive teacher agency. Now at least we draw up an outline of the position, its responsibilities, and the qualifications desired in the candidate. Catholics with considerable Catholic educational background and practical Catholic living are wanted. This qualification becomes the more important in the positions of higher responsibility and higher rank—deans, department directors, professors, and those where tenure is guaranteed. Rarely does the non-Catholic have that full sympathy and unity of outlook that spell enthusiastic support of a Jesuit school's objectives. The usual sources of information are approached—professional associations, other institutions, the National Roster, teacher agencies, graduate schools, individual leaders in the field.

In many fields of study the number of prospective candidates is woefully low. The personal visit to the campus and conferences with officials should always be part of the procedure. Thorough canvassing of the appraisals by former employers and other references should be made. Stealing a good man from a sister institution should be considered unethical. In such cases the initiative must come from the man himself; and courtesy should at least dictate consulting the officials of the school where he is employed.

If we are going to make much progress with our problem, we must start much farther back than this. We must set up a long-term program of systematic education of faculty. We must locate, while they are still undergraduates, some students who give promise of becoming scholarly and effective teachers, and must propose such career as a life vocation. If we can carefully foster and cultivate a budding vocation to the seminary or religious life, why can we not do the same for promising prospects for the teaching career as laymen? Where needed some form of student aid may be made available. After graduation a graduate assistantship can easily be provided leading to the master's degree. If such work is not offered by the school of his undergraduate study, an assistantship can easily be arranged at some other university. Similarly arrangement can and must be made for graduate assistantships—at Jesuit and non-Jesuit universities—while working for the doctor's degree. It may be advisable at times to offer some subsidy insuring return to the home school faculty on a contractual basis. We must, of course, guard against inbreeding, but there can be no objection on that score where the doctor's degree is from another institution. Besides, our few well-equipped graduate schools should be providing



Catholic Ph.D.'s in a variety of fields for all our colleges. Our common interests are large enough to count on cooperation in this regard.

I know that recruiting programs of this kind were beginning to function before the war. War conditions made their continuation impossible for the duration, but they must now be resumed and expanded and made more common in our institutions. When our whole business is training and preparing men to work for others, we certainly may not neglect to train some to work for us.

There is one type of personality that we might well avoid from the outset: the type that is fundamentally selfish, mercenary-minded, and incapable of thinking in terms of service. Such a character is eager while he is on the receiving end, but will soon be jumping to industry or business or professional practice if the prospect of return is greater. While we can and should make compensation adequate, we shall never be able to compete with industry and business on a purely dollar-and-cents basis. The teacher who has no other concern than financial returns will *de facto* never make a perfectly satisfactory, high-class faculty member.

I should not have to say much on how to retain faculty members or keep them satisfied and with high morale once we have engaged them. There are three general answers: adequate salary, reasonable security, and satisfactory working conditions. The first must not necessarily match the offers from industry and commercial organizations, but it must at least be sufficient to insure comfortable living at a standard proper to the professional university personnel. Here of course the rates change. What was adequate before the war is entirely inadequate now. The rates will probably continue to rise for some years to come.

It is quite essential that a policy on rank and tenure be adopted so that the incoming faculty member will have a clear understanding of his chance of promotion, the procedure followed in making promotion, the university's commitment in the matter of tenure. Details may differ from school to school and may change from period to period, but something carrying official approval should be in published form, and of course close adherence to the policy once it is adopted, is as essential as its adoption in the first place. Exceptions cause endless trouble. Next a general range of salaries for the recognized ranks should also be available. The range must be wide if it is to serve for personnel in the strictly professional schools, medicine, dentistry, business administration, as well as in all fields of the liberal arts college. It may be preferable to adopt different scales for different university units. Automatic increases from year to year are sometimes adopted and may be necessary for the initial years of service, but I think it is a better plan to base increases on annual appraisals of the personnel rather than to make them automatic.



Permanent tenure is no serious burden as long as we have been judicious in faculty selections, but it can be a real problem if our selection is poor and injudicious. In any large university, and more so in secular than in Jesuit institutions, there are faculty members who gradually lapse into "sitters," "quitters," parasites. They depend on tenure to maintain their status. A probational period of from two to three years is advisable to detect such propensity before it is too late.

Adequate security is provided by the tenure we have just discussed but even more effectively by a plan for retirement insurance and annuities. In this age of social security we can no longer ignore the need of such a plan. Life insurance can be combined with retirement insurance at negligible cost or even at no extra cost whatever. There is a new wave of interest in retirement plans among Catholic institutions. St. Louis University, which has just inaugurated one that is to be discussed with you next Friday, claims that nothing has been received with more wholehearted satisfaction and so improved the morale of its faculty as has the adoption of this plan.

Lastly, pleasant working conditions can do much to maintain high morale. This does not necessarily mean light teaching schedules, though of course that is a factor, but such things as good equipment, opportunity for research, travel expenses to professional meetings, or to some specialized institute program, chance for industrial consulting, perhaps provision for housing or a sabbatical leave. Such perquisites and opportunities make university work attractive and compensate to a great extent for a somewhat lower level in financial remuneration.

If in addition to high morale we can impart to at least some of our lay faculty that spirit of consecration to the work of education that we ourselves have as Jesuits, then we are approaching the ideal for this group. Some of the Catholic members can develop it out of a motive of apostolic zeal; others acquire it out of an altruistic spirit of service to youth; still others absorb it by slow inoculation through association with Jesuit colleagues. Whatever be the process, to possess such a man for the institution is as helpful as having a first-rate Jesuit on the job. We may not expect to find many such but each one will be a tower of strength to the institution.

It seems to me I have only been repeating commonplaces. In that case I can be forgiven for adding one more: To carry out the suggestions I have made will cost a lot of money, and to meet the costs means most careful business management. Extravagance and reckless spending in lush years of plenty prepare the way for disaster when the pendulum swings toward depression. We must beware of commitments in the present abnormal upswing which cannot be fulfilled when we settle back to more



normal conditions. We must foresee now the overstaffed condition that will result when the tidal wave of veterans has tapered off, and must know how we can then readjust ourselves. We must always manage the whole institution, its operation and maintenance, its investments and purchases, its various auxiliary enterprises economically, efficiently, on a sound business basis. Here again we can find well-trained, competent, and experienced laymen of incalculable assistance.

Our universities run into budgets from one to several million a year. Sound business management is on the same level of importance as educational management. Without the former the latter becomes impossible, and of the two it is in business management that the Jesuit university administration is more apt to be weak or to fail. Expansion problems in time of prosperity are bad but they are fun; retrenchment problems in time of depression, recession, or war, are worse and besides they are grief; but speaking as one who has gone through the complete cycle, I would say there is no problem as bad as that of salvaging a university after shipwreck. *Verbum sat sapientibus.*



# Public Relations and Jesuit Schools

THOMAS J. ROSS

Shortly after Father Rooney paid me the extraordinary compliment of inviting me to come here, I began to wonder why I had the temerity to accept. The idea of participating in a meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association increasingly took on the proportions of unforgivable presumption. There was this comfort, however. No group, I said to myself, is more understanding than the Jesuits of the frailties of human nature and of the difficulties that human beings get themselves into. So I concluded that in your charity, you would surely understand the difficulty I would be in here tonight.

Then, as material came to hand on public relations of educational institutions, I discovered that this has been occasionally a lively subject in Jesuit literature. A very interesting publication called the JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, "For Private Circulation," it states on the cover, published some six years ago two articles entitled "Putting Jesuit Education before the Public." It was a most enlightening discussion led by Father O'Hara, then a regent of St. Louis University.

I also recalled a speech that I heard Father McNamee, dean of Georgetown, give several years ago and had asked him to send me a copy. It was called "Nature of the Liberal Arts College." From Father Rooney's files and elsewhere came some other illuminating things; for example, "Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association"; "The Philosophy of Catholic Education," by Father McGucken, and a document called "General Statement of Philosophy of the American Jesuit High School."

After reading this material, I felt much better about coming here. Then, instead of wondering why I had had the temerity to accept Father Rooney's invitation, I wondered why I had been invited at all. For it seemed to me in the light of what I had read that I could do little better than to suggest, with all due respect, that you Jesuits should read your own stuff and do something about it. Inquiry developed that the Jesuit fathers who wrote these articles were still in good standing in the Society. And that at least was assurance that what I would like to say here would not be altogether heretical. Nevertheless, in accepting the privilege of talking with you, I am not without that sinking feeling, multiplied many times, that I had back in 1913, facing three Jesuit priests in my oral examinations



in philosophy. Shortly thereafter the college\* itself folded up. I am not suggesting cause and effect, but it is with the becoming modesty of an alumnus of one of your suspended colleges that I appear before you.

You take on one great penalty when you invite a public relations person to speak. Actually, you have to listen to two speeches. One, you may be sure, will be about his own idea of public relations. The other may possibly be on the topic assigned. One reason is that there is so much misconception about the term itself.

It is not defined by Webster. Nearly everyone is interested in it and feels competent to discuss it, if not to practice it. Nearly everyone has a different notion about it. In the decades since the First World War, a great deal has been written and spoken on the subject—a great deal of it nonsense, too. Pamphlets, speeches, articles, books, symposia, and conference studies appear in great number. Only a few weeks ago a speech, entitled "Sound Principles of Public Relations," appeared in the *Congressional Record*. A few days later a columnist reported that Jack Dempsey, the ex-heavyweight champion, was coming to New York to do public relations for a hat store.

Perhaps it is a grave reflection upon those professionally engaged in public relations that so much confusion about it does exist. True it is that there is a great tribe of us. Just prior to the Second World War, the Bureau of the Budget found nearly 3,000 full-time people and more thousands of part-time people employed by 153 government agencies who spent nearly 28 million dollars in one fiscal year on publicity. Doubtless the number has not decreased very much. The military services during the war had thousands of public relations officers on active duty. There are three or four national organizations of people who make a living in public relations work. It is reported that since 1925 the American College Publicity Association has grown from 50 to 500 members.

Apparently, too, nearly every group you can think of is engaged in public relations of one sort or another. Industrial corporations, financial institutions, trade and professional associations, chambers of commerce, and civic organizations, philanthropic foundations, educational, charitable, and scientific institutions, governments, trade unions, religious denominations, political parties, the radio, the movies and the theater—all of these and many more are competing with the routine news of the world for the attention, the interest, and the support of the public, for one purpose or another, through some activity which they call public relations.

So let us make sure of what we are talking about when we talk about public relations. It may help to clarify my observations with respect to

---

\* College of St. Francis Xavier, New York.



Jesuit schools if I give you briefly my definition of public relations, whether applied to Jesuit schools or to the manufacture of automobiles, or the running of a railroad.

You can find almost as many definitions of public relations as there are people talking or writing about it. They confuse advertising, which is one distinct form of publicizing with other distinctly different forms of publicizing. They say public relations when they mean various forms of publicity which are tools of public relations. But among those who may properly be regarded as competent professional authorities, there is substantial agreement as to fundamental principles.

Perhaps it would be better first to point out what public relations is not. It is not just putting up a front or merely telling one's story. It cannot be regarded as a sort of umbrella, or as a new coat of paint to make a badly built house look better. It is not "a fireman, a master of white-wash, or a fixer." It is not primarily publicity. Nor is public relations, as is often implied, defending the interests of big business. It is not just trying to get pieces in the paper or keeping them out.

It has four principal aspects: First, let me define it as a point of view. In this sense of public relations, an individual, a company, an institution or other organization, recognizes that the most important thing is not what it says about itself or what other people say about it, but what it is and what it does; that when a company seeks to make its policy accord with enlightened public opinion it is doing real public relations work. This is the principle of living up to one's public responsibilities; of seeking to deserve, to obtain, and to protect a favorable public attitude.

Second, let me define public relations as an active policy and function of management. In this sense public relations involves all sorts of practical decisions of every-day business beginning, of course, with a sound quality product or service. It involves business policy and those who make the policy. It helps to create and shape those policies which, if sincerely practiced and effectively made known to the public, will be reflected in public good will. In this sense public relations calls for continuing self-examination with respect to everything about a company, minor or major, which is likely to be reflected in the net effect of what people think about it. It is not a separate function although its promotion is often delegated to an able and responsible executive, or to competent outside counsel. It is a way of life expressing itself every hour in attitude and actions affecting workers, customers, and the community.

Third, let me define public relations in terms of techniques that are used to articulate the policy. In this sense public relations includes any expression of an idea or the idea itself; any activity designed to impart information, implant ideas, and influence opinion: press, pulpit, platform,



radio, motion picture, posters, pamphlets, advertising, and other forms of publicity—authoritatively sponsored, not anonymous propaganda.

Fourth, let me define public relations in terms of the activities of those in my profession who work with individuals, corporations, and associations, as public relations counsel. In this sense public relations is concerned (1) with what an organization or institution is and (2) with what people think it is. The function is to advise on policies and practices so that the client may better serve the public interest; to assist the client in understanding public attitudes and reactions; and to inform the public of the client's activities so as to gain popular confidence and good will.

Thus, the first task of anyone concerned with the public relations of an industry is to look not outside to the making of statements to the public, but inside to what is done and the way it is done; to the attitude of the man at the top and the influence of his personality on the business. Unless industry has that conception, printer's ink, the radio, the platform, and the screen are futile. Only with a sound policy established and followed can publicity function successfully in interpreting business to the public. And why should industry bother about all this? Because increasingly it is found that public opinion, favorable or unfavorable, influences the climate in which its affairs are conducted. Even courts are known to read the election returns. It has been appropriately said that public opinion, like the pressure of the atmosphere, is always with us. It brought about the Boston Tea Party and repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. It will be public opinion that settles OPA and, at least in this country, in the long run, what we do about the atomic bomb and U.N.

It is interesting to note in reference to public opinion the enormous extent of the channels of communication and information in the United States. In 1944 more than 35 billion pieces of mail were handled by the United States Post Office. More than 225 million telegrams were handled over commercial land lines. There were completed 35 billion telephone conversations in 1944. The circulation of daily newspapers in 1944 was 46,700,000,000. The dollar volume of the book business has doubled since 1939, attaining a total value of about one-half billion dollars in 1945. There were over 960 broadcasting stations operating in 1945. And remember, the flying time between New York and Rome, for example, is now 19 hours.

Public relations is concerned with public opinion. And, if we are to have our syllogism, let me ask: Is public opinion of any concern to Jesuit schools?

There is considerable literature on public relations for educational institutions. Most of it, however, has to do entirely with publicity. It tells you what is news; how and where to look for it; how to prepare it so



that it will be well received by an editor. It deals largely with the do's and don'ts for getting pieces in the papers. It covers in great detail the techniques of publicity. The periodical, *School and Society*, seems to have something to say on the subject in almost every issue, and, likewise, the *Journal of Higher Education*.

But, as indicated early in my remarks, what I regard from a professional point of view as the most pertinent material about our subject—public relations and Jesuit schools—is contained in the writings of Jesuits themselves. So if what follows seems like an *argumentum ad hominem*, it is only because, in my opinion, the suggestions already made by Jesuits to Jesuits in their own literature not only recognize the need and desirability of public relations for Jesuit schools but also meet many of the tests of sound public relations principles.

What do you do, if anything, to implement them? Do you really expect the job to do itself whether or not you organize to do it? Those in other walks of life have not found it so.

It is not my purpose to propose a specific program of public relations for Jesuit schools. That calls for more intensive study and planning than I have had either opportunity or factual data to do. The only possibly useful service I can perform here tonight is, first, to point out, as I have done, the principles of public relations which, in my experience seem to be sound; secondly, to suggest that affirmative organized action is necessary to secure the desired results.

Going back to these principles, there is no question that Jesuit educators recognize the first essential of public relations, namely, the primary importance of what the schools do for their students. There is considerable question, however, as to whether Jesuit educators recognize public relations as an active policy and function of management in the sense of undertaking positively to make known what they do for the purpose of securing favorable public opinion. There is also considerable question as to whether to the extent that they do make such positive efforts, they are doing an adequate job. I realize this takes money.

In a manufacturing industry, public relations begins with the integrity of the product; in a public utility, with the quality of the service. The objective of both is favorable public opinion—satisfied customers, employees, stockholders, and other groups of the public, including government, whose patronage or attitude may determine the success or failure of the enterprise.

What are the equivalents in a Jesuit school? The first equivalent is the product—Jesuit education. I shall not attempt to define it, but one of the best definitions of it is found in the prospectus of the newest Jesuit institution of higher learning which my friend, Father Bouwhuis, was good



enough to send me. It says: "The avowed purpose of the Jesuit code of liberal education as exemplified at Le Moyne is the development of the true Christian and real American."

The second equivalent respecting public relations of a Jesuit school as compared with public relations for an industry is the public support to which Father O'Hara refers in his reasons for wanting to put Jesuit education before the public, in other words, favorable public opinion. He defined the needed support this way: "(1) the prayers of the faithful in increasing measure; (2) wider demand for Jesuit education, so that with increasing numbers to choose from we may be able to select those whom we are best fitted to educate; (3) greatly increased financial aid, so that, freed from the taxing strain of financial worry, from the necessity of working with inferior and inadequate equipment, and from the heavy burden of clerical detail which should be borne by trained clerks, we may focus our attention on our vocation as religious and on our profession as educators; (4) in short, such recognition and appreciation of our educational ideals and accomplishments as will evoke the spontaneous and unsolicited cooperation of the hierarchy and laity."

What can public relations do about these equivalents? It could do a great deal if it has the opportunity to function and receives the cooperation it should have from Jesuit educators themselves. I do not believe that public relations in any important sense can improve the product so to speak, but I do believe that if the philosophy of Jesuit education were better understood in this country, Jesuit schools would more readily obtain the support they deserve and should have. Was it not recently that Harvard and Princeton openly declared a return to principles of education long espoused by Jesuit schools?

You may recall that Father O'Hara said that the effectiveness of Jesuit educational work was handicapped by the lack of knowledge by hierarchy and laity and by non-Catholics of the extent and value of Jesuit educational endeavor. He pointed to an enrollment in 1939 of 15,000 in secondary schools and 45,000 in colleges and universities; that these Jesuit schools, constituting only 13.7 per cent of all Catholic colleges and universities, educated 39.4 per cent of all the students of Catholic institutions; that Jesuits were carrying the burden of Catholic education in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and social work, and most of it in law. Ignorance of Jesuit educational work, he said, accounts for their failure to obtain greater general public support.

Now it is true that the *extent* of Jesuit educational work offers many opportunities of a public relations nature, but from a more fundamental point of view, the idea of the *value* of Jesuit education offers far greater opportunities. This is especially true today. If some of those who so



readily give their funds to the support of other colleges and universities had a greater knowledge and understanding of Jesuit education as against what is taught in the institutions they support, I believe the Jesuit schools would enlist a greater public interest and in turn a greater material response.

In this connection I should like to see a public relations policy for Jesuit schools which would stimulate the preparation and circulation of such ideas as those expressed by Father McNamee in the paper to which I referred on the "Nature of the Liberal Arts College." "In this new American way of life," he says, "so dearly purchased by the death of countless youths, the liberal arts college must assist in the restoration of those pristine values, timeless and eternal, which were so highly prized by the founder fathers of this nation. Liberal arts colleges are the repository of the ancient tradition of free men and the men who founded this nation were the product of that tradition. All democracy in its deepest aspects is based upon the brotherhood of man because of the fatherhood of God." How many people, businessmen and others, who are disturbed these days by collectivist statism, think of Jesuit schools and the philosophy of their teaching in any such terms? I wonder if their attitude is not more influenced by a misunderstanding based on what a few Jesuit writers have had to say on the subject of labor.

I should like to see a public relations policy on the part of Jesuit schools that would attempt to make clear to a wider circle of people such ideas as are contained in the document entitled "General Statement of Philosophy of the American Jesuit High School." This, it appears, was prepared by Jesuit principals at West Baden in 1940. It is a closely typed, mimeographed affair with little, if any, appeal to the reader but it is the most convincing statement I have ever seen of the sound objectives of a Jesuit high school as a secondary school, as an American school, as a Catholic school, and as a Jesuit school. I wonder how many people in this country, thinking of the support Father O'Hara mentions, have any such ideas about Jesuit schools?

It was my good fortune to have an opportunity to read these documents. A public relations program for Jesuit schools that would encourage as a matter of policy and function and organization the preparation and circulation, through accepted but altogether dignified techniques of publicity, of such material as this, would seem to be a very sensible undertaking.

In this matter of writing and publication there is also authority for my suggestion in what Jesuits themselves say. Father Schoder, in an article on "The Need for Jesuit Writers" says: "The Jesuit, with his unrivaled training in the humanities, philosophy, the sacred sciences, and the Spir-



itual Exercises, should be the best fitted of writers—apart from the uncontrollable factor of inborn genius. The problem is not in having good matter to say but in how to give it adequate form. This is the province of the art of expression. Whether the Jesuit is in duty bound to cultivate this art (obviously with a view to its regular employment in publication) is not a problem. We happen to have a rule which settles the matter.”

It is perfectly natural that in your consideration of public relations, question should arise as to whether the support desired for Jesuit schools would be better obtained by local endeavor than by national endeavor. These are not alternate but complimentary ideas.

For the efficacy of local endeavor, let me cite the successful campaign recently completed for Le Moyne College. There, due partly at least to a very keen sense of public relations on the part of Father Bouwhuis and a well-organized effort, a community, which in important quarters seemed to question seriously the desirability, if not the need, of the Jesuits coming in at all and was rather frank and critical, was so dealt with, that it oversubscribed the funds sought. What occurred was that the Jesuits at Syracuse with the help of the Bishop, followed a simple, definite, well-developed public relations program designed to gather a substantial sum of money, to build up a potential student body, to prepare industry, business, and labor to accept Le Moyne graduates, and to exert the influence a college should exert in the community.

Having this paper in mind, I asked Father Bouwhuis to give me his comments. Again, if you will forgive me, I quote a Jesuit to Jesuits on organizing for public relations: “We had a sort of central core of ideas,” Father Bouwhuis said, “which were repeated over and over again until they were accepted. . . . Unless a college has a definite program, knowing exactly what it wants to put forth as its position, has definite phrases that should define with precision, has some alert person who keeps constantly informed about public reactions to the college program, the college is not going to be favorably received over a long period of time, nor will it have the influence it should have in its area. This is merely stating in other words that the college must have a live, energetic, alert public relations official with the necessary resources for effective action.”

Those engaged in alumni work for other colleges offer interesting comment. One of them, who is recognized as somewhat of an authority in this field, concludes that the Jesuits must be doing a good educational job because, he says, so many non-Catholic alumni are favorably impressed by Jesuit college alumni. This is significant, he adds, because this is not the result of any deliberate attempt to sell the merits of Jesuit education. And, he asks, why is not alumni relations, not just in terms of athletics and money raising, one basis of a good public relations program for Jesuit



schools? He is rather critical in a specific way of such general public relations work as Jesuit schools now carry on. There is, he says, too great a turnover in the top personnel in charge of public relations in Jesuit institutions. The public relations people are rarely expert because of budget limitations and the failure on the part of the college heads to recognize the work as a full-time, all-year-round activity. They think they can do it themselves with their left hands. Most of the colleges, he says, are willing to spend money on this only when raising funds or when some specific problem arises. Often the person is a member of the working press, doing it part time. Very seldom, he says, are the Jesuit colleges represented by top people at meetings of the American College Publicity Association.

It is also natural that some should think of public relations derogatively in terms of sales promotion or high-pressure advertising. Of course, the best criterion of Jesuit education in the United States is the quality of the product of Jesuit education. It is said, too, that the best way to publicize Jesuit education is to make it publicize itself through its scholars, writers, the leaders among its alumni, etc., and that Jesuit membership and active participation in general educational and learned organizations is the best sort of propaganda. What I suggest is that there should be an affirmative policy of encouraging, planning, and organizing to publicize such activities. It is wishful thinking to believe that these activities will publicize themselves. They won't unless you organize to make them do so. You cannot, as is too often the rule, substitute persons for organization, and disregard, because you are priests, the worth-while things that businessmen find it necessary to do in order to achieve the results you, too, wish to accomplish. That is the tendency of the clerical mind, and I say so with all due respect. It is characteristic of Catholic schools, of Catholic hospitals.

There is no good reason why sound principles and practices that have been found effective and necessary in a business or in nonsectarian schools and colleges or nonsectarian hospitals should not be adopted in Jesuit institutions. To do so involves no sacrifice of the primary purpose. On the contrary, the primary purpose would be furthered by it. Why should any Jesuit college, for example, be without the support of and the benefits to be derived from a lay board that would be permitted to function in somewhat the way that lay boards function in behalf of non-Catholic institutions? Is it partly because in the Jesuit colleges there is a reluctance to take these lay people into the administration's confidence and to let them know frankly what the situation in the college really is? This is an important aspect of public relations, one that cannot be put on or taken off like a glove. To be worth while, it should be a continuing policy of the college management.

Public relations, as a policy and function of management so far as



Jesuit schools, especially colleges, are concerned, would require such a development. It would require, for example, a willingness and positive desire on the part of the school authorities to tell what you do with the funds you get from tuitions and other sources—to tell, for instance, how a college is run. It would call for an annual report comparable with annual reports of business corporations. Such a practice would widen the circle of those who, even without such information, admire and wonder how the Jesuit fathers do so much with so little, or think the Jesuits a very wealthy order.

There is nothing radical or even new in these rather generalized if not disjointed suggestions. Let me refer you to subparagraph (i) of paragraph 2 of Article 3—Objectives, in the "Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association." It states as one of the specific objectives: "Provision for wider knowledge in the United States of the Jesuit educational system, its theory and its practice."

The endeavor should be organized and, at the risk of arousing Father Rooney's wrath, my suggestion is that whatever is or may be done at the local level, and that is highly important, one step toward the greatest effectiveness in the public relations of Jesuit schools would be to establish competent public relations assistance on the staff of the executive director of Jesuit education and to recognize the function as an essential in all areas. If you read *School and Society*, you will find reference to a Joint Committee on Public Relations for Educational Institutions of the Methodist Church. Why not something of that nature for Jesuit schools?

Functioning as it does elsewhere, the public relations task of Jesuit schools would be to develop an organized program of creating, actuating, and coordinating opportunities to make more people more aware of what you do.

Generally speaking, considerations somewhat similar to those confronting businessmen also confront you. They are busy making things. You are busy giving young people a Catholic education. In ultimate worth, who can find an adequate or appropriate yardstick to compare the importance of these respective activities? If they find public relations both necessary and desirable, how much the more should you?



# Cooperation Between Jesuit Colleges and High Schools

## THE COLLEGE VIEWPOINT

JOHN E. WISE, S.J.

I regret that Father McNamee\* could not have discussed this topic. In the outline he had drafted, he proposed an accurate examination of the type and ability of the student in our high schools, as had been done for our colleges by the Jesuit Educational Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges in 1942. The Commission sponsored a testing program for all freshmen in Jesuit colleges in order to compare our students with those of other colleges who had taken the same national tests. The results were favorable, and we had the satisfaction of having proof to that effect. There were certain important qualifications, however, which would be helpful in directing our programs.

Perhaps a similar cooperative study could be made of the Jesuit high-school student, since reliable and inexpensive testing agencies and evaluative procedures exist, I believe, for such a study. One must know well the material with which he works successfully to "induce from the potency of matter the desired form."

A second point noted by Father McNamee concerned noticeable defects in the product of Jesuit high schools. He also observed a lack of coordination in the English and history programs, making an even more extended observation that high-school methods sometimes imitate those better used in college, with a resulting neglect of essential rudiments and skills. The high school should observe a clear-cut gradation of objectives, similar to those so well stated in the Ratio of 1599.

In line with such comments and proposals, I would like to add my own thoughts on the subject. I will sum up my own criticism of the Jesuit high-school product as lacking the perfection of what I might call intellectual neatness, and as being deficient more than he should be in social consciousness. Both of these statements, obviously, need explanation and substantiation, but I think I might outline the whole picture before de-

---

\* Father S. F. McNamee was preparing to give this paper but circumstances prevented him, especially the untimely death of Dr. Walter O'Connor, registrar for many years at Georgetown. Father Wise generously agreed, at short notice, to take part in this discussion.



scending to the criticism of detail. The whole picture is decidedly favorable. There are few boys, except those lacking the necessary ability or those suited more to vocational training, to whom you and I would not first recommend a Jesuit high school for the best education obtainable. This would be from a conviction of fact rather than from any exaggerated or poorly applied loyalty to Jesuit schools. Many people would and do agree with us. Our high schools are flourishing because of the excellence and reliability of the enduring training, intellectual and moral, which they afford. Criticism is for improvement, and should be constructive.

What does "intellectual neatness" mean? It means an ordered possession of facts, sound habits of thought, and healthy awareness of goals yet to be attained. There is one element which does not fit very well under this heading, but which is closely related to such mental power and vision, and that is the intellectual curiosity or the keen incentive to attain further goals. Ambition is closely related to achievement, and if the attainments mentioned under "intellectual neatness" are present, the student will very likely want more of such satisfying accomplishment.

Let me give an example. This example will be given, it is true, from a college teacher, but the application to proportionate secondary-school goals will be obvious. With this teacher there was an entirely orthodox curriculum, Virgil and Horace, Demosthenes and Homer, Milton and Tennyson. There was an ordered possession of facts because the facts were presented by one who knew them and who was interested in them and who was interested in their transmission. The habits of thought, the appreciation, the cultural ideals, the refinement of taste, became somewhat habitual with the student *secundum modum recipientis*, because they were inspired by like qualities in the teacher. Now no student with the very definite achievements of such a school year could fail to want more of the same, as far as this might coincide with his talents, his particular fields of interest, or occasional leisure. Here was an "intellectual neatness," ordered possession of facts, sound habits of thought, and awareness of goals yet to be attained.

Let us take an approved Jesuit high-school curriculum. The following is that of the Maryland Province. Four years of Latin, English, and religion for all students. Three years of mathematics for all, two years of a modern language, and at least one year of history and one year of science. An extra year of mathematics or of history must be taken in senior. Classical students take two years of Greek; science students two years of high-school science in place of Greek. There can be few objections made to this program. Modern language is taken in the last two years so that it can be continued in college. According to the opinion of some, another year of Greek might be added, perhaps as an added choice to that extra



year of mathematics or of history. But it is an excellent program, better than I know of in any other secondary schools.

Nevertheless, why do some Jesuit high-school graduates entering Jesuit colleges do so poorly in English, some times lack initiative, have little desire for more Latin, know so little what they are going to do or why? Putting aside the human factors of adolescent indifference and the natural indecision of youth, there are certain reasons for which the Jesuit high school is not to blame, but which constitute a special problem for Jesuit high-school graduates in Jesuit colleges. The surroundings are familiar. The ways of the teachers are familiar, and the boy knows "some of the ropes." A couple of tough and able teachers in freshman help remedy this situation. But still the Jesuit boy does not sufficiently excel his fellows, at least in general academic achievement. This is a fact established by records, by statistics, and by experience. Why does he not excel, as a type, if our high-school program is so ideal? Here again we have at least some consoling factors. Jesuit colleges are sometimes not as selective of their students from Jesuit schools as they are of applicants from other schools. The Jesuit student usually makes out better in the arts course than in the science curriculum. But even these possible compensating factors do not explain away the situation. There is room, therefore, for some constructive criticism.

In English the fundamentals should be stressed. In freshman year college I have taught a course in English with a text, *Writing and Thinking* by Foerster and Stedman, but this textbook contained some matter proper to high school if not to grammar school. Laborious words and sentence correction must be a part of every high-school curriculum, or else it will continue to be stressed beyond all reason in college.\*

In Latin, I must again draw a parallel from college. In college, at least, the content of the Latin course should be doubled or trebled. The reason why many of our students do not like Latin is because they do not get enough of it. Science students in college work very hard; arts students can get by without much work. Such a condition is not due to the subject matter, because language students in graduate school, for example, have just as much a task as students in any other field. The Ratio, it is true,

---

\* Here I will make a recommendation, which is incidental, but at least interesting. No boy should graduate from a Jesuit high school without learning to typewrite. I think this could be a requirement to be fulfilled by the end of second-year high school. If the course cannot be introduced in the school, the boy can get it on his own in some outside agency, perhaps in the summertime. Mention is made of this item here because of its modern connection with clear writing and thinking. I do not hold that thought necessarily becomes clearer on the typewriter, but I do hold that the work can be done more quickly and neatly this way, and without all the drudgery usually associated with composition. In this way it is connected with writing more and better English.



prescribes intensive work on a relatively small amount of matter, but it also makes provision for extensive work, "whole books," as it says, which do not have to be mastered with the same exactness as shorter passages, but mastered as to essential understanding and content, which can only come from wide reading as well as from intensive study. Thus, English can be remedied by absolute and consistent insistence on fundamentals; Latin, by increasing the content.

Most Jesuit schools could mark more strictly. The better preparatory schools in the East make no fetish of high marks. Their students are thus enabled to keep their standing better in college. This is a point of intellectual neatness, too, knowing just how one really stands on an intellectual level, without having a false impression of one's ability.

The point about social consciousness had better, perhaps, be left to another paper for development. It has to do with civic consciousness, with the understanding and practice of social justice and of Christian charity. Many of the objectives of the I.S.O. would be suggestive. The interracial question has place here, as does the modern labor movement and its implications. Some of the high-school classes afford occasion for inculcation of correct principle, some do not. Again, the question of teacher interest and equipment is paramount. Social works, community projects, common in many Catholic girls' schools and colleges, should be associated in our high schools with the sodality. Certain civic endeavors, discussion forums, model senates, and so forth, come naturally within the province of extra-curricular activities. Since our high schools are, in an important sense, public institutions, participation in community projects should not be neglected. The student will not be a stranger later on to civic and social projects. He should be a leader in them, learning this self-responsibility in school.

In concluding, I would like to return to a point mentioned in the beginning. Let us find out with the greatest possible exactness the ability and achievement of our present high-school and college students. There is no greater incentive to ordered effort than the possession of facts. I believe it was the experience of one of our colleges, in using a national testing program, that the rating in the beginning was not very good. Some objected that the values for which we strive were not properly tested by such a norm. But year after year the rating improved, without any loss, I presume, of objectives proper to Jesuit schools. Such cross-fertilization is fruitful. The Jesuits of the Renaissance utilized the existing educational setup, infusing into it new life. We should do the same. Our schools will thrive, not by isolation, but by continuous advance with advancing times. Our principles are safe. When too many concessions have been made to deleterious modern programs, it was because we did not really know



the nature of those programs, or lacked knowledge of the fundamentals of our own. Know the Jesuit educational system, the "Jesuit Code of Liberal Education"; know the school world in which that program operates today; and, finally, know the boy given to us to educate. These norms will enable us to evaluate the product of the Jesuit high school and college, and knowing our good points and deficiencies is a necessary step for continuous improvement.

## THE HIGH-SCHOOL VIEWPOINT

CHARLES T. TAYLOR, S.J.

The purpose of this paper is to present the high-school point of view on the question of cooperation between the American Jesuit college and the American Jesuit high school. Naturally, the key word is cooperation. We are to discuss a relation whose two terms are so often taken for granted that their definition and analysis are quickly passed over, in order to stress the all important note of cooperation between the two. However, how can we intelligently set out to find a solution to a problem if the factors involved are not sharply defined?

Our American Jesuit high-school catalogues are annually reminding Ours and informing the uninitiated public that the famous Ratio Studiorum is the basis for our educational program. Accepting this statement at its face value we are committed by our written word to operate preparatory high schools of a very definite type and not terminal institutions or high schools preparing for any college. So the foundation for insisting that we operate classical preparatory schools is our public written statement that such is our clear intention in the matter. The Epitome, of course, allows us to operate nonclassical schools. Number 397 states: "*Scholae tamen non Classicae Instituto minime repugnant, et ubi necessitas vel magna utilitas id suadeat, laudabiliter erigi possunt, sed cavendo ne studia classica inde detrimentum patiatur.*" So much for our *de jure* stand. How close to this pattern are we in everyday practice? Is our curriculum so planned that the poetry and rhetoric years of the Ratio will crown the first four years and leave us a product similar to the graduate of the lycée and gymnasium? Is our high-school diploma the entrance slip to the two upper years of the Ratio ideal, or is it intended to assure the graduate that he has satisfactorily *completed* something. If we follow the Ratio, as we claim we do, then our graduate has completed *grammar*, and is ready to appreciate the poetry and rhetoric of the classical masters.

If our graduate is not in a position to go on to the Ratio college, then we should delete the chauvinistic reference to the Ratio and state clearly that Blessed Anthony Baldanucci High School is either a terminal institu-



tion where besides receiving good practical, proximate, "ad hoc" training for life, the boy is also spiritually and socially developed, or a school getting the boy ready for some B.S. course in any Catholic college.

Now when we come to our American Jesuit colleges they either offer the poetry and rhetoric years of the Ratio as complementary courses to the classical preparatory four years or they do not. If they do, then they too can keep the words Ratio Studiorum in their catalogues and they will have real meaning. If they do not, then they are offering courses to boys who are not primarily interested in acquiring the "perfectam eloquentiam" of Quintilian, and who, to say the least, are following the Ratio Studiorum *a longe*.

To come back to our key word: cooperation; and to discuss it from the high-school point of view. Which high school? The Ratio high school? The strict classical course preparing a boy for poetry and rhetoric in a Jesuit college, or the watered-down course tantamount to what is usually offered in any non-Ratio Catholic high school? Which college? The B.S. college of business, education, etc., or the A.B. college of the classical tradition? This paper will discuss the high-school point of view on cooperation between the traditional four-year American Jesuit preparatory school and the traditional two-year Jesuit college course in classical poetry and rhetoric followed by two years of philosophy.

What are our American Jesuit colleges doing for the *best* students of our high schools? Do all our colleges offer scholarships to the boys who are honor students in our high schools? The basis for these awards need not be grades only, but can be excellence in studies as well as proficiency in extracurricular activities. This paper is not a detailed blue print on how to do this; it is concerned with pointing out the fact that scholarships offered to such deserving boys would be a powerful incentive for them to do well in high school. If all our colleges in all our provinces did this, they would be receiving some half-dozen high-school honor students each year. This little group of the best-trained Jesuit high-school boys would pay dividends to college freshman deans. Accepting a half-dozen scholarship boys will not seriously hurt the college budget. You may be sure the procurators will be unsympathetic, but after all we should expect them to be—that's their job; ours is to train Catholic leaders.

If this method, the first practical suggestion for cooperation between the high schools and colleges, does not appeal to college deans, then let them run a competitive scholarship examination for Jesuit-trained boys who are honor students in high school. No dean would oppose this on educational grounds, even the procurators wouldn't do that.

May I take this occasion to thank publicly the administrative faculty of Fordham University for its wonderful cooperation in granting scholar-



ships before the war, *during* the war, and after the war to graduates of New York City Jesuit high schools who academically and in extracurricular work are in the judgment of their faculty considered worthy of this award. Would it be considered lacking in good taste in a paper such as this to express the fond hope that the example of Fordham, looked at from the high-school point of view of cooperation, might be imitated by her sister institutions of learning? Is this asking too much? Cannot our boarding colleges at least grant tuition scholarships? The means will never be taken until the end is first put down as something very desirable. The initiative rests with college deans.

The second practical suggestion on how colleges can cooperate with high schools is that in admitting boys to college, preference be given to Jesuit students whose scholastic records place them in the upper 10 per cent of their graduating class. According to our theory these are the students best fitted to receive our two last years of classical training.

We are not claiming that our high-school graduates are necessarily better than those of other Catholic high schools. We feel certain they are not inferior, and we feel that equity demands that they receive preference, especially if they are certified by our high-school principals to be in the upper 10 per cent of their graduating class.

The third practical suggestion is that high-school principals be informed two months in advance of college competitive entrance examinations, and that the scope of the examinations be indicated, so that the boys can prepare for them. It will then be the job of the high-school authorities to publicize these examinations, and to urge as many good students (not necessarily honor students) as possible to take them. In connection with this it would not be altogether out of place to request college deans to come themselves or send their public relations men to the high schools, and let the boys know what advantages their colleges offer, how anxious they are to have Jesuit boys, and finally, let them cite some examples of alumni of the high schools who have brought credit on their high school by the excellent showing they made in their college courses. This external approach will be much more convincing than any talk on Jesuit colleges given by the high-school authorities. In order to have the dean's talk remain with the boys, it is suggested that it be placed in summary form on one large piece of mimeographed paper and that it contain all the pertinent facts on location of college, date of competitive test, date of admissions, tuition, etc. To put it briefly, let Mohammed come to the mountain. If our mountain is not worth coming to, pray tell me, where will you dig for gold? Moreover, it would not be out of place for our colleges to invite the graduating class to the college and have them spend the day there getting first-hand information at the very source itself.



Finally will the work be followed up by sending catalogues to the library and the student counselor? Will posters be sent for the school bulletin board? How many high-school principals have their mail baskets filled up with prolific literature from non-Catholic colleges?

Practical suggestions number four: At least one of our colleges holds an annual oratorical contest to which about eleven Jesuit high schools send their best speakers. The high schools know the competition is keen and work hard to turn out truly representative candidates from the schools. Here you have the best in oratory from our high schools. If this were an athletic contest, the winner would never leave the college that night without some one connected with the college speaking winged words to the youngster. This is just one extracurricular activity. What contests for our high schools are being conducted in dramatics, writing, and Latin sight translations? Of course, the assumption is always made here that our colleges should really be scouting for this fine intellectual freshman material.

The fifth and last suggestion: Our colleges are not graduate or professional schools, and their students are boys from seventeen to twenty-one, still in their formative period and still expecting so much from Ours. I have learned from one reliable high-school source that college boys come back to the high school and complain about the indifference of Ours in college. Classes are taught and taught well, and that is all. There is no personal contact with the students; no organized, enthusiastic, efficient, extracurricular activities; and except for imparting knowledge most of Ours have no spiritual or inspirational effect on the students. How can we expect boys who experience this treatment to be zealous for their colleges and to communicate this zeal to the seniors back in the high schools? However, this is another issue and I must be content with merely pointing out the fact which is true, *sensu aiente*, of one prominent Jesuit college.

In summary then, the traditional Jesuit high school would appreciate the following points of cooperation from the traditional Jesuit college:

1. Scholarships to honor students.
2. Preference to Jesuit boys in admission, if they are in the upper 10 per cent of graduating class.
3. Advance notification of competitive examination for *all* Jesuit high-school seniors.
4. Scholarships for excellence in speech, dramatics, Latin, etc.
5. See that the college students sell their colleges to their high schools by being enthusiastic about the enthusiastic Jesuits they meet daily in all the phases of college life.

You have heard my solution of the case. I am sure there are objections. If even one objection provokes discussion, or contributes a real, worthwhile solution, then this paper has not been wholly inadequate.



# A Retirement and Insurance Plan

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

## INTRODUCTION

Most papers and discussions on retirement and insurance plans emphasize their advantages and desirability but have little to offer in the way of practical suggestions for the installation of a plan in an educational institution. It is taken for granted in this paper that a retirement and insurance plan is an absolute necessity for any college or university; the whole emphasis here will be on a practical "modus agendi."

If constant reference is made to the plan recently inaugurated at St. Louis University, there is no intention of implying that this is the best possible scheme. Rather, the committee which was responsible for its formulation is of the opinion that it acquired a great deal of information which might prove useful to other Jesuit colleges and universities.

## HOW TO DECIDE ON A PLAN

Last November the Board of Trustees appointed a committee of three, with the writer as chairman, to investigate the possibilities of a plan for St. Louis University. The first question we faced was: How does one go about deciding on a plan? We found that there are two ways, one easy, the other very difficult. We might have followed the simple alternative of reading literature on various existing programs, consulting institutions which have them in operation, and on the basis of this evidence, arrived at a decision. Instead we chose the hard way, and we are now convinced that certain unique features of our plan would never have been discovered if we had used the easy method. The committee let it be known publicly that St. Louis University was "open to bids" on a retirement plan. During the long months of November and December, we were seriously tempted to doubt the wisdom of the method we had adopted. Wisely enough, every insurance company chose a representative who was an alumnus, or at least a Catholic who was convinced he had a right to special consideration. To each of these representatives we submitted payroll data: sex, date of birth, date of employment, and basic salary of those whom we intended to include under the plan. Each company was given an opportunity for several private interviews with the committee, a time-consuming, exhausting process. Eventually, the committee had in its hands six final proposals.



## TYPES OF PLANS

What had we learned from these interviews? That there are, in general, four distinct types of retirement programs: Retirement Fund Insurance, Group Annuity, Straight Money Purchase Annuity, and Weighted Money Purchase Annuity. An outline of the main features of each follows:

1. *Retirement Fund Insurance* is a combination of life insurance and retirement annuities, with a portion of the annual contribution allocated to purchase insurance and the remainder accumulating for the annuity. In the earlier years of service the insurance feature consumes about 20 per cent of the premium, decreasing each year until about the fifteenth or twentieth year of service, when the entire payment is applied to the annuity. The committee found two objections to this type of plan: First, the primary purpose of a retirement plan is not to build up large insurance estates; the goal should be the maximum amount of pension obtainable for the premium available. Secondly, a rigid medical examination is required to determine insurability. Of an average faculty, probably 25 per cent to 40 per cent of the persons affected could not pass this examination. Certain companies submitting proposals—e.g., New England Mutual and Acacia Mutual—write only this type of plan and hence were eliminated because of the objections just stated.

2. *The Group Annuity* plan always affords the largest possible annuities for the money invested. These higher annuities are effected because the insurance company can discount the expected mortality on the entire group of participants. The major objection to a group annuity plan is the fact that no company will guarantee its group annuity rates beyond five years. This introduces an element of uncertainty which is highly undesirable, both for the institution and the individual faculty member.

3. *The Straight Money Purchase* plan calls for a flat deduction of a certain percentage of each individual's salary, e.g., 5 per cent with the university or college matching the contribution, thus purchasing a retirement annuity for each faculty member to the amount that such a total premium can buy. This plan results in one evident inequity. By contributing, for example, 5 per cent of their salary to be matched by the institution, the older faculty members can accumulate only pitifully small pensions in the years of service remaining. Such a plan would be satisfactory for the younger members of the faculty, but would cause dissatisfaction in a university in which there are laymen who have dedicated twenty, thirty, or forty years of their lives to its service.

4. *The Weighted Money Purchase* plan is an adaption of the plan just described. The annuity available is weighted by taking into consideration both years of *past* service as well as years of future service. The percentage to be paid on past and future service depends, of course, on the



amount of money which the institution wishes to contribute to the plan. Such a scheme provides a more equitable distribution of the retirement benefits among the younger and older faculty members. After careful consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of the four types, the committee recommended the weighted money purchase plan.

#### CHOICE OF INSURANCE COMPANY

Having decided on the general type of plan we wished, our next step was to choose an organization to underwrite the plan. Some companies were eliminated because they do not write the type we had chosen. The reasons for not choosing the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association will be discussed in a later section. Eventually, it came to a choice between the John Hancock and the Lincoln National Life Insurance Company. Both are among the fifteen largest in the United States; both are thoroughly reliable; both write almost any type of contract at the same rates. Our choice fell to the Lincoln National chiefly because of two factors: the industry, understanding, and courteous service which they brought to our problem, and the ingenuity and flexibility of the plan which they proposed. These deciding factors will be better understood after a brief resume of the main features of the plan eventually adopted.

#### MAIN FEATURES OF THE PLAN

*Eligibility.* All full-time lay faculty members and administrative employees who meet certain length-of-service requirements are eligible to participate. Smaller institutions may wish to include all employees—secretarial, janitorial help, and so forth. If, as in our case, an institution feels it cannot afford to do this, we would advise against trying to name specifically those who are eligible, e.g., registrar, librarian, and so forth. Difficulties of interpretation are sure to arise. For example, what do you mean by the term librarian? To obviate this difficulty we have stated that all full-time teachers and, in addition, any administrative officer or employee designated by the president of the university may participate.

The plan was inaugurated on January 4, 1946. Those who had already completed one year of service with the university on this date were immediately eligible for participation; those who had not been employed a full year will become eligible on January 4, 1947. For future employees, we have somewhat reduced the usual "waiting period." They become eligible two years following the first January 4 after the date of their employment.

At the inauguration of the plan, participation for employees was voluntary. In accordance with the advice of everyone consulted, however, participation was made obligatory for all future employees. They will be so informed during negotiations preceding actual employment.



The retirement age is set at 65, and no one can participate who is beyond that age. At present there are six or seven teachers on the faculty who are over 65. Retirement arrangements have been made for them independently of the plan itself.

*Method of Calculating Benefits.* This is one of the best features of our plan. Let us suppose that a school has an annual payroll of \$50,000, and decides that it can afford 5 per cent of it (or \$2,500) for a retirement plan. The college could purchase this plan by contributing 5 per cent of each faculty member's salary, this amount to be matched by another 5 per cent obtained through payroll deductions from the participants. If this system were applied rigidly, with no account being taken of *past* service, it would be found, as mentioned before, that the older members of the faculty will receive shamefully small annuities. How can that same amount of money be spent so that the annuities are distributed more equitably? Our company helped us work out a formula which sounds quite complicated at first but which is actually quite simple in application. Each teacher's annuity equals the sum of two amounts:

- A.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 per cent of the employee's basic annual wage multiplied by the number of years of full-time service prior to his date of participation.
- B.  $\frac{2}{3}$  of 1 per cent of his basic annual wage multiplied by the number of years of future full-time service from date of participation to retirement age.

Example

<i>Basic Annual</i>			<i>Future Service</i>
<i>Present Age</i>	<i>Salary</i>	<i>Past Service</i>	<i>to Age 65</i>
35	\$3,000	4 years	30 years
4 yrs. of past service	$\times \frac{1}{2}$ of 1% ( 2%) $\times$ \$3,000		\$ 60
30 yrs. of future service	$\times \frac{2}{3}$ of 1% (20%) $\times$ \$3,000		\$600
Total			<hr/> \$660

Therefore, the monthly retirement benefit would be \$660.00 divided by 12 or \$55.00.

At the university it was found that application of this formula results in a respectable annuity for everyone. The average annuity for those participating in the plan at present is 20.78 per cent of their basic salary. The average for men under 40 on the faculty is 24.2 per cent; for men over 40, the average is 17.9 per cent of their salary. Some of the younger men can look forward to an annuity as high as 28 per cent, whereas a small number of older men, who have had very few years of past service, will receive only about 15 per cent.

*Retirement Date.* As mentioned before, in common with most plans, we set the retirement age at 65. Therefore, those who are 55 or younger when they begin to participate must retire at 65; those between 56 and 60 retire after 10 years of participation; those between 61 and 65 retire at 70.



*Employee's Contributions.* Here, we think, is the most unique feature of our program. In the standard pattern all employees contribute the same percentage, e.g., 5 per cent or  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, regardless of their age or the number of years during which contributions must be made. As a result, the younger teachers have a well-founded suspicion that they are helping to purchase not only their own annuities but also those of the older men who will be contributing to the plan a much shorter time. Here, again, by trial-and-error method, the company helped us discover that by dividing the faculty members into three age-groups and establishing a sliding scale of contribution, we could still accumulate the amount of money necessary for the desired annuities. The schedule adopted is as follows:

ages 21 to 34 inclusive—3 per cent of monthly salary  
ages 35 to 49 inclusive—5 per cent of monthly salary  
ages 50 to 65 inclusive—7 per cent of monthly salary

This monthly rate continues at the original percentage even when a faculty member reaches a higher age-group. However, if he receives an additional annuity because of increased salary, he will contribute toward this additional annuity at the rate proper to the age when the increase was received. In the plan, as it is operating currently, the employees of the university are contributing annually a total of \$14,312 as compared with the university's total contribution of \$17,924.

*Termination of Employment.* What happens if an employee leaves before retirement age? In every plan he always receives everything he has put into the plan. Moreover, in our plan, if he leaves after 5 but before 10 years of participation, he receives 25 per cent of the university's contribution; after 10 but before 15, 50 per cent; after 15 but before 20, 75 per cent; after 20 years, he receives all of the university's contributions.

*Optional Modes of Settlement.* Our plan offers the employee at retirement age the maximum number of optional benefits: a monthly allowance for life with 60 payments (5 years) guaranteed; a monthly income with 10 or 20 years guaranteed; a cash settlement; a monthly income during the joint lifetime of the participant and a designated beneficiary. This choice need not be made until retirement age is reached. All of these options are based on actuarial calculations and will yield exactly the same total if the participant lives to his expected age as determined by mortality tables. If a participant dies before retirement age, his beneficiary receives, in addition to the life insurance to be discussed immediately, an amount equal to the total contributions he has made.

*Life Insurance.* As mentioned, our committee was of the opinion that the primary purpose of a retirement plan is not to build up large insurance estates. However, some form of insurance is obviously desirable and



extremely appealing to teachers, especially in Catholic institutions, who have never received sufficiently high incomes to enable them to purchase the insurance they should have. Each participant in our plan receives a group life insurance policy in accordance with the following schedule:

<i>Basic Annual Salary</i>	<i>Insurance</i>
\$0 to \$2,399.....	\$1,000
\$2,400 to \$3,199.....	2,000
\$3,200 and over.....	3,000

When his salary is raised to a higher bracket, a teacher will receive the corresponding increase in insurance coverage. Unlike fund insurance, this policy is given without any evidence of insurability through a physical examination.

In the original plan adopted by the Board of Trustees, this insurance was to be granted at the time when an individual became eligible to participate in the retirement plan. Hence, new faculty members were to participate in both the retirement and insurance benefits only after two years of full-time service. However, when the representatives of the company held their first interviews with the members of the faculty who were immediately eligible, the insurance feature caused such favorable and enthusiastic comment that it was decided to amend the trust agreement so as to allow eligible employees to secure the insurance policy 90 days after they have begun full-time employment.

Unlike the retirement annuity, the cost of the insurance is paid entirely by the university without any contribution by the employees. This is extremely attractive since the purchase of an equal amount of insurance by a private individual would represent a considerable investment. On the other hand, because of the large amount of insurance purchased by the entire group, the cost is so extremely low that the institution can well afford to pay it in exchange for the good will created.

When the individual leaves the university either before retirement or upon reaching retirement age, the insurance policy ceases to be in effect. However, the employee can convert the policy directly with the company for any type of insurance he wishes and without evidence of insurability.

*Other Details.* (1) As far as administration of the plan is concerned, it may be of interest to note that the plan is governed by a trust agreement entered into between the officers of the university (Board of Trustees) and the appointed trustees of the plan. In our case the original committee of three appointed to investigate the possibilities of a plan were appointed cotrustees. The comptroller of the university, one of the members of the committee, is designated managing trustee. These trustees own and hold the contracts; the faculty members merely receive certificates setting forth the pertinent facts in the original contract.



(2) Any trust agreement of this kind must be approved by the Internal Revenue department. This was easily secured even though our plan had features not ordinarily found in such schemes.

(3) For protection, the institution should make sure that the trust agreement reserves to the university the right to change, modify, or discontinue the plan if the necessity should arise. In spite of the most careful planning, occasions might arise similar to the depression of the 30's during which an institution might be forced to abandon or at least to interrupt the plan.

(4) One common difficulty was avoided in our case by sheer good fortune. When a retirement plan is inaugurated in effect each faculty member receives a 3 per cent, 5 per cent, or 7 per cent reduction in pay. This may cause considerable hardship, and some institutions have solved the problem by raising all salaries 5 per cent on the effective date of the plan. We deliberately began our plan in January 1946, at the precise time when the Federal Government reduced the rate of the withholding tax. For the majority of our faculty, the amount which they gained in salary by the reduction of the tax was about the same as that which they began to contribute to the retirement plan. As a result, their so-called "take-home" salary was almost exactly the same before and after the plan began.

#### REASONS FOR NOT CHOOSING TIAA

Why did we not choose the plan of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York? There were at least four reasons:

1. TIAA's rates are not guaranteed. They can be and actually have been changed several times over a period of years. This leaves the suspicion that someday the plan might cost more than the institution could afford. Moreover, faculty members dislike promises concerning a future annuity based only on currently effective rates.

2. TIAA writes only individual contracts with each faculty member, whereas our committee, after investigation, saw many advantages in having a pension trust in which the contracts are owned by the trustees of the plan.

3. The rigid TIAA plan does not admit of flexible arrangements, such as a sliding scale of contributions, which we consider the best feature of our plan. Each institution has its own problems and needs, and a satisfactory retirement plan must be made to order.

4. Since TIAA has no field agents, they conduct business almost exclusively by mail. Hence their service suffers considerably. In this connection, let me suggest that the committee considering a plan should always have at least one layman in its personnel. We deliberately appointed our



comptroller to the committee since we wanted the reactions of a typical lay married employee of the university. In this way we had a rather accurate gauge as to how various plans and their details would be received by the faculty. After much correspondence with TIAA our comptroller remarked: "If I should die before retirement age, I would hate to think of my wife settling affairs by means of these cold-blooded letters and tables which TIAA sends out." Of course, by not having field agents, TIAA can afford lower rates. But even here we were disappointed. Actually, their rates are only about 10 per cent lower than those of commercial companies, and this reduction in cost did not offset the objectionable features of the TIAA plan. Let me emphasize the value of personal service. Nothing can replace it. If an institution can secure the services of a Catholic representative of the company who is willing to spend almost unlimited time in private conferences with each member of the faculty, a man who will be on hand as soon as a case of termination of service or death occurs, the value of this personal care is worth far more than the 10 per cent saving under TIAA. Our experience to date has more than justified this conviction. Incidentally, agents are available in all parts of the country who do not work with any particular company but who, after determining an institution's needs, may choose an underwriter who can best satisfy these needs.

#### COST OF THE PLAN

Obviously, the major question for Jesuit rectors and procurators is: Can the institution afford such a plan now, and, if so, will it be able to afford it ten or twenty years from now? The present annual cost of the university of the entire program is \$20,425 or 6.3 per cent of our payroll. As mentioned before, \$17,924 of this total is the university's contribution to the retirement annuities; the remaining \$2,501 is the total cost of the group life insurance. Obviously, as we hire more faculty members this total cost will increase, but new faculty members will necessarily mean increased income due to larger enrollments, and these two factors should counterbalance.

Moreover, many overlook the fact that during the years to come, there will be substantial recoveries, so that the cost of maintaining the plan in future years will be materially reduced. The reductions will come from three sources: (A) In the event of death of an employee, the company refunds to the trustees all of the contributions made by the institution for this employee. Over a period of years it is certain that a number of faculty members will die before retirement, and the refund can be used to help meet the cost of the plan. (B) The annuity policies will pay dividends to the trustees annually starting with the first year. These dividends constantly increase and will be available to help reduce the operating cost. (C) In



the event of termination of employment prior to retirement, the recoveries of the cash values purchased by the institution's share of the contributions will often be substantial and these, too, can be used to defray expenses.

#### BROCHURE

It is advisable to have a pamphlet printed which will explain the main features of the plan from the viewpoint of a teacher. Copies of this brochure may be given to present employees and used when negotiating with prospective faculty members. In our case the insurance company assumed the cost of printing this brochure.

#### CONCLUSION

The retirement plan at St. Louis University is, of course, still very young. But it has been submitted to the scrutiny of our eligible faculty members and their reaction has been most enthusiastic. As one professor remarked: "The university made more lifelong friends by this one step than by any other I can think of." When the plan was inaugurated, there were 93 faculty members immediately eligible, 84 of whom entered the plan at once. Twenty others are participating in the insurance, but are not yet eligible for the retirement plan. Of the nine who did not enter the plan, four or five have other sources of income and have already taken care of retirement and insurance security; the other five or six had pressing financial problems which prevented immediate participation, though they hope to enter the plan next year. We do not know of a single case of refusal to participate because of opposition to or dissatisfaction with the plan itself. Hence, we are convinced that the university has taken a long step forward in its Christian, Catholic relationship with our lay faculty, and we recommend most energetically the adoption of some such plan by other Jesuit colleges and universities.



# Personal Aspects of Veterans' Problems\*

JAMES F. MOYNIHAN, S.J.

The increasing number of veterans who are either seeking entrance or returning to Jesuit colleges has indeed opened up numerous problems which call for many amplifications, if not modifications, of procedures in handling them. I suppose that we can coordinate most of these procedures under the general heading of guidance, since the term has taken on of late an extension which allows for the inclusion of any kind of problem, procedure, or technique, which we may use in effecting the personal, educational, and vocational readjustment of veterans.

All problems are best seen in the light of the personality with the problem. This has become the healthy frame of reference which the guidance movement has assumed today in its endeavor to consider the total personality and to remember at the same time that he is and always remains an individual. Before entering into more explicit considerations of veterans' problems, it might be well to say a few words about the veteran himself who has come or returned to us. This may well throw more light on the problems he may bring and the organization of our methods in handling them.

We had been led by the literature which appeared during the war to expect that the typical veteran would be a bitter, hardened individual who would present many psychological problems. Fortunately, this has not been the case. He is not, in general, an embittered individual nor has the number of emotional problems he presents been as great nor as serious as had been anticipated. There may be many reasons why symptoms peculiar to the war situation have cleared up in more normal circumstances, and the chief reason may well be that rehabilitation through college life and activities has proved to be the shortest route to readjustment and that the school is a good bridge from military to civilian life. At the same time, we must not be led by this to overlook the possibility and the actual presence of enough psychological problems which call for special and individual attention. It has been my experience that many of these come from the simple war neurosis type who looks upon the fact that he had such a lapse as a character defect which he finds it very difficult to admit. There is

---

\* Paper presented in a panel discussion on "Veterans in Jesuit Schools."



no "la belle indiffrence" with this type of neurosis. It bothers the veteran a great deal, and only through sympathetic and individual attention can he be led toward sufficient release, insight, and decision in the face of the facts, as to make his readjustment adequate and relieve much personal confusion.

Comparative studies were much easier during the period in which the veteran constituted a leaven within our collegiate student bodies. We found him, in general, more mature and better directed in his thinking relative to college and life objectives. As a result, he has done superior work. Many are career- or vocational-minded in their selection of curricula, yet not in the case of many, to the extent that they do not realize or want to attain the values offered by courses in philosophy, religion, and the liberal arts. It may be that some who see in the college degree a prestige value for job placement, will need further encouragement along this line in initial counseling interviews.

The majority, by poll, feel that the war experience has had some effect upon them. The bad effects more frequently reported are increased nervousness and irritability; while the good effects are an intellectual broadening and greater maturity. Many, in their visits to the guidance officer, report in the beginning a lack of ability to concentrate, which apparently worries them. For the most part, this appears to be due to a certain academic rustiness and with suggested study-aids clears up. There are more married veterans and more marital problems, some as a result of hasty war marriages, others traceable to the housing situation, which has necessitated living with in-laws. They are, as President Conant of Harvard termed them, 'the hurry-up boys,' at least in the beginning, but many of them want to or need to slow down as they find that acceleration and integration (like beer and milk) do not mix.

In counseling them in two guidance centers, one primarily educational in its focus, the other vocational, I have found a sufficiently large number, who, because of their regimentation in the armed forces, have either lost or never developed a healthy sense of self-direction. As a result, they may try to place the burden of the selection of courses or a life career entirely in the hands of a guidance counselor or in the results of a mere battery of tests. Guidance counselors are not helping the veteran when they assume the veteran's responsibility for thinking out his own decisions.

It may be said that the veteran has offered an impetus and a challenge to college guidance programs. Conditioned by his experience in the armed forces and in his dealings with the Veterans Administration, he has been led to expect guidance and is most receptive and appreciative of it when it is offered to him. Many are placing great emphasis, sometimes too much,



on test results. Others are receiving their initial guidance from well-meaning but ill-informed relatives and friends, or, in some cases, from quack counselors who have sprung up because of the lucrative possibilities of this field where trained personnel are still scarce. Many, as a result, will come to us with problems that have been initiated by poor guidance and poor interpretations based upon some of the tools of guidance which are still weak. Many of our personality, interest, and vocational tests fall into this category. We shall have to reinterpret many profiles and be ready to offer sound, scientific counseling along both educational and vocational lines if we are to meet the challenge of the veterans and are not going to hold back from the present guidance movement (as we did from the testing movement after the last war), especially now that guidance is reaching a critical period in its growth and is looking to philosophy rather than to mere psychology for its basis.

Colleges are becoming more aware of the work of placement, realizing that in the past they have been spending four years developing a product and have given little time to its distribution and sale. Our Catholic graduates frequently cite this as one of our weaknesses. This calls for much better and more dynamic placement organizations with counselors who are better orientated toward the world of work and the fields available to our graduates. It certainly calls for much more contact with personnel officers in industry and business, if we are to have Catholic leaders in these fields, as well as in the professions.

And yet, while we become more aware of vocational counseling and placement, we must not neglect the other equally important phases of guidance. There will be many educational problems, many of them not much different from what we found prior to the war. Many veterans never had any real study skills and certainly did not develop them in the armed services, and, of course, the perennial problems of remedial reading and remedial English (which we inherit from the high schools and, further back from the grammar schools) are still with us. Our tradition as Jesuit teachers and confessors does, I believe, condition us to look for personal and emotional factors where at face value a problem may seem to be merely an educational or a vocational one. Many of these we are equipped to handle, but college counselors should know when to refer special cases for more specialized treatment.

In our handling of veterans' problems it is well for us to recall that motivation and the establishment of life ideals must come before educational and vocational guidance if both are to be effective and if the college course and the life career are to become realistic parts of life. In effecting this, religious guidance has, of course, the ascendancy. But in all our guidance procedures, be they formal or informal, organized or not organized, it



is essential that the veteran have a part in planning his own future and that the initiative come from him. To do otherwise is not to help the veteran. In all our guidance procedures we have much to offer the veteran, but there is a basic function underlying all techniques and this is: "To assist the veteran through counsel to make wise choices, adjustments, and interpretations in connection with critical situations in his life in such a way as to insure continual growth in the ability for self-direction."



# Problems on Admission of Veterans to College\*

JOHN F. CONNOLLY, S.J.

The problems of admitting veterans to college, in general, resolve themselves into these two:

1. Are the veterans, or is this particular veteran, prepared to pursue profitably and successfully the curriculum in which he wishes to enroll?
2. Just how much advanced credit standing should be given to the veteran for in-service educational experiences?

All our colleges and universities have quantitative and qualitative requirements for admission specifically stated or understood. Generally speaking, it seems that these requirements should not be waived. Applicants for admission are expected to present high-school units in specific subjects; they are expected to present a certain number of qualifying or recommending units; or they are expected to qualify for admission by successfully passing entrance examinations. The various criteria for admission which are calculated to prognosticate probable success in college work should be applied in the case of veterans as well as nonveterans.

The question then arises: Should our admissions officers accept as a sound basis for admission, in lieu of quantitative and/or qualitative requirements, a certain percentile rating in the USAFI test of general educational development? In other words, should we accept this test as being sufficiently indicative of probable success in college to waive specific quantitative and/or qualitative requirements? The test is "designed to measure the extent to which all the educational experiences of the veteran, particularly his informal or self-educational experiences, contributed to his ability 'to carry on' in a program of general education or to his educational development of the type which otherwise might have resulted from attendance in an academic high school."

In a letter of April 9, 1946 Dr. Thomas N. Barrows, director of the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences of the American Council on Education, stated, "Virtually all institutions are accepting veterans on the basis of the General Educational Development test. The qualifying requirements are varied. Generally speaking, those who accept all high-school graduates are using the American Council recommendation

---

\* Paper presented in a panel discussion on "Veterans in Jesuit Schools."



of a minimum standard score of 35 on each test. Those which are more selective in choosing civilian students are using higher requirements. For example, those who normally admit civilian students in the upper half of their high-school class are demanding an average score of 50 in the General Educational Development test. In a few instances even higher scores are expected."

As an experiment at the beginning of the present term Loyola University accepted on the basis of the G.E.D. test ten veterans over twenty-one years of age who had not completed high school. The percentile rating required was 80. This rating, if the test has the validity claimed for it, signifies that 80 per cent of the high-school graduates in the country would, in taking the G.E.D. test, score below the men admitted. The veterans accepted on the basis of the G.E.D. test are doing very satisfactory work.

Before admission these veterans were required to take, together with other freshmen, psychological and placement tests. The California Test of Mental Maturity and the California Achievement Test have, since they were first administered two semesters ago to incoming freshmen, shown a high correlation with the quality of work done. We calculated coefficients of correlation from data obtained from the California Test of Mental Maturity, the California Achievement Test, and the G.E.D. test. The results showed coefficients of correlation above .80. I might note here, before passing on to another problem, that veterans accepted on the basis of the G.E.D. test were accepted as special students, and will not be regularized unless they complete the first two semesters in the university with a C-plus average. At the time of such completion the work of the first two semesters will be validated. Thus far our experiment seems to indicate ample justification for accepting veterans on the basis of the G.E.D. tests.

Another problem dealing with the admission of veterans to college results from the fact that some veterans have been misled on the credit-hour value of in-service experiences. In consequence, they become academic shoppers, going from college to college in quest of what they call "the best deal," or the greatest credit evaluation toward a degree. A few days ago a veteran came to the registrar with all his in-service and out-of-service records. He admitted quite frankly that he was seeking the institution which would allow him the most credit. He showed evaluations of his in-service work given him by two universities in Los Angeles and by a university out of the state. One university granted him twenty-four credit hours toward his degree, another twenty-seven, and the third thirty-six. Actually the Tuttle Guide recommended that he be given twenty-four credit hours. We were able to apply only eleven of the recommended twenty-four credit hours toward the fulfillment of degree requirements in



the curriculum in which he wished to enroll. This is not an isolated case of the shopper. Usually our evaluation of in-service experience does not give the applicant the amount of credit he is seeking.

The various curricula of our colleges and universities have been organized so that they present to the student an ordered and integrated program of courses, determined after long and thoughtful consideration and calculated to produce, as far as is possible, a close resemblance to the ideal of our philosophy of education. It seems to me that we should make reasonable substitutions of in-service educational experiences for courses required in our various curricula. However, since our curricula are so definitely organized, and the requirements are so specific, and the number of electives so limited, relatively few substitutions can be made. Hence arises the problem, should all the veteran's in-service work, for which the Tuttle Guide makes recommendation for credit on the college level, be placed on the veteran's permanent record even though much of it does not count toward his degree or is not used to satisfy elective requirements?

It seems to me that our admissions officers should not be burdened with the task of validating in-service experiences which are not applicable toward the degree. Many of a veteran's in-service experiences for which the Tuttle Guide makes recommendations are of doubtful academic content. The validation of such in-service work would demand a test program beyond the facilities of most of our schools. However, it does seem that records of in-service work which might be applicable in another curriculum, or in another university, or for some other purpose, should be presented so that the veteran may have a secure repository for his complete academic records against the day when they might be of use to him, as in transferring to some other curriculum or to some other institution or for other purposes.

Another problem in admitting veterans to college arises from the fact that the qualitative and quantitative requirements for admission were completed by the veterans four, five, six, and even seven years before seeking admission to college. This problem is experienced particularly in two fields of study prerequisite to admission to college, namely: the fields of mathematics and languages. From the results of placement tests one gathers that the deficiency in prerequisite mathematics is extremely common, so common that it does not seem feasible to require the veterans to register in high school "brush-up" mathematics courses for which they will not be granted degree credit. It is a practice in some institutions to require that students enrolling in engineering or chemistry take a review course in high-school mathematics, even though given under the collegiate title "Engineering Mathematics," during the first semester in college. Students taking a "brush-up" course have received and do receive college credit.



Should we not follow the same plan in the case of the many veterans who actually present the required mathematics credentials from high school but who, because of the lapse of time since leaving high school, are unprepared to plunge immediately into college mathematics courses? Incoming freshmen and transfer students who had not previously completed the required courses in college mathematics could be sectioned on the basis of placement tests. Inadequacies in prerequisite knowledge could be removed in a relatively short time so that all the veterans would have an opportunity of completing the college mathematics requirements in the normal number of semesters.

Deficiencies in prerequisite language requirements seem to cause even a greater difficulty than mathematics deficiencies. The vast majority of freshmen who come to us from public high schools, I might even say from all high schools, other than our own, have completed only two years of a language. Even veterans who have completed with recommending grades the language courses required for admission to college are, generally speaking, unprepared to follow the standard sequence of college courses in the same language as taken in high school. In some cases six or seven years have elapsed since the veterans completed the second year of the language course. Refresher courses will not adequately remove deficiencies. Either the veteran must choose another language to satisfy the college requirement, or he must be required to repeat part or all the language course taken in high school. Hence arises the question: If part or all of the high-school language prerequisite is repeated in college, should credit earned by such repetition count toward the fulfillment of degree requirements?

There are arguments pro and con. The question was proposed at a general faculty meeting and it was the consensus of opinion that if a language department head, after the administration of placement tests, judged the repetition of courses necessary, degree credit should be granted for such repetition. Moreover, in such cases the veteran should be advised of the difficulty which might be experienced by him should he go on for graduate work in another institution.

Many other problems confront admissions officers. I will mention only one more. Students who attend college prior to induction into military service and who did not maintain entirely satisfactory grade-point averages seek readmission. Their in-service records, the results of aptitude tests, and other criteria for judging a man's capacity to do college work, indicate that the applicants are capable of doing satisfactory or even high-grade college work. Their attitudes have changed; their motivation is much greater than when they previously attended college; maturity has brought to them a greater appreciation of the importance of a college education. The question then arises: Should the rather unsatisfactory prewar scholastic



record count against them? Should they be required to make up grade-point deficiencies incurred before the war, or should they be permitted to begin anew not impeded by deficiencies?

This problem was proposed at a general faculty meeting, and it was recommended that such veterans be given probationary standing during the first semester after returning to college and that, if during that probationary period they maintained a C-plus average, their previous academic debits or liabilities should be erased. This certainly would be a startling departure from academic procedures of the past; and in the eyes of some, undoubtedly, a violation of the sanctity of the permanent record. However, I think the faculty recommendation deserves consideration in view of the fact that in many cases the returning veterans may be considered academically different persons from those who left the college to enter military service. I was interested in finding out that the University of California, where admission procedures are mechanized to the highest possible degree, follows the kindly procedure recommended by the faculty of Loyola University.



# Priorities for Veterans\*

HUGH F. SMITH, S.J.

Because of the increased number of applicants for admission to the University of Detroit, a policy of priorities had to be established.

1. All former students, who left school to enter service, are readmitted upon request.

2. Veterans from local high schools and graduates of this year from the same schools are next in line. Special effort was made to assure a place for students from Catholic schools. Letters were written to all principals of Catholic schools and to the pastors where parish high schools are conducted to request prompt application on the part of their seniors.

All graduates of Jesuit high schools, qualified to enter college, have been accepted. This includes the local high school, out-of-state, and foreign schools.

3. Those who attended other colleges before entering service come next. Jesuit colleges, other Catholic colleges, and nonsectarian colleges are considered in this order. Those now attending another college are urged to stay there. If there is good reason for transfer and if the student is well qualified, his application is considered. No students are admitted for the summer who are regular students at another school.

4. A special group is formed of the students in the V-5 program now being permitted to choose a school. When possible, these will be accepted.

In regard to nonveterans the university is accepting the normal qualified load. It was not deemed advisable to suspend relations with the high schools for even one year.

To prevent "shoppers," no evaluation of credits for students who had attended other schools, either before or during service, is made prior to the acceptance of the applicants. Also a ten dollar registration fee, which is applied to the tuition should the applicant be accepted and returned to the applicant should he be refused admission, has been put into effect. In the case of veterans the fee is returned directly to the veteran after he has begun classes. There has been no complaint on the part of the V.A.

---

\* Digest of paper presented in a panel discussion on "Veterans in Jesuit Schools."



# Report on National Council of Independent Schools

LORENZO K. REED, S.J.

The National Council of Independent Schools is an organization which was formed shortly after the beginning of World War II. It is made up of the thirteen principal associations of private or independent schools. At present no individual schools are members. The JEA is a charter member. Father Edward B. Rooney, S.J., is a member of the Executive Board.

The purpose of the National Council is to unite the independent schools, to consolidate their position, to enable them to present a united front, to protect them against unfavorable action by various agencies, to resist discrimination against them. It also serves as a clearing house for information useful to independent schools.

Examples of some of its activities include:

Obtaining recognition of independent schools on the same basis as public schools in action by the War Manpower Commission permitting schools to designate some of their personnel as "essential" to the war effort.

Collecting and passing on to member schools information regarding facilities available for dealing with high-school veterans who have not received diplomas.

Survey of congestion in colleges, difficulties of admission, possibilities of later admission with advanced standing for work done in postgraduate courses, and so forth.

Establishment of a permanent commission to promote cooperation between independent schools and colleges.

The importance of the National Council has been recognized by its admission to membership in the American Council on Education and on the College Entrance Examinations Board.

The Commission on the Relation of Independent Schools to Colleges and Universities is a permanent commission of the National Council. Six members compose its membership: Chairman, Herbert W. Smith, Francis W. Parker School, Chicago; W. L. W. Field, Milton Academy and Secondary Education Board; Alice C. Lloyd, University of Michigan; Mrs. Ruth W. Crawford, Smith College; William E. Scott, University of Chicago; and Father Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.

Among the activities of the Commission have been:

To represent to the regents of the University of Wisconsin the unfairness of a strict quota for out-of-town applicants based automatically on relative



standing in the graduating class, without recognition of the fact that independent schools are usually college-entrance schools which have a far higher percentage of graduates well prepared for college than most public schools do.

To attempt to modify some of the examination procedures of the College Entrance Examinations Board.

To represent to the proper authorities the constant slurs cast upon independent schools as a class by members of the faculty of a school of education in a prominent Eastern university.

To establish the National Registration Office.

The National Registration Office (NRO), briefly, is a clearing house of the records of all graduates recommended to college by member secondary schools. Its purpose is to validate secondary-school records by offering a comparison between the high-school grades of recommended graduates and the freshman college grades of the same students. Thus, we high schools validate our records by proving that the students whom we recommend to college actually do good work in the colleges which they attend.

I can best explain the work of the NRO by describing the report which the cooperating colleges actually receive each year. (The 1945 reports on Canisius High School were here distributed for the perusal of those present.)

In this annual report each school occupies a separate page. The total number of graduates of the year and the number who would be recommended to college are shown. Each college which this school's graduates attend is given a separate row in the tabulation. The report is broken down into five subject fields and a total, in each of which comparison is made between the average high-school and college grades of the whole group of the school's graduates attending this college in the five-year period. Both high-school and college grades are translated into a common point scale which permits comparison between subject fields, between schools, and between colleges. Thus, one can see at a glance the achievements of a school's graduates in each college which they attend, in comparison with the grades the same students had in the high school.

Naturally, in its first year, this report did not reach its full usefulness, because for several reasons it was not typical of future reports. It includes only the graduates of 1944, so that the number of students included is small, and the number of different colleges represented in the graduates of any school is also small. Besides, the class of 1944 is not a representative group, because many of these boys went directly into the service. However, the report will go on including records of graduates for a five-year period, always containing the records of the five latest years. Hence the record will gradually become more representative and will always be up to date.



The following points about the NRO are to be noted:

The compiling and tabulating of records is being done by the office of the College Entrance Examinations Board, which also handled the administration, scoring, and tabulating of results of the Army-Navy qualifying tests during the war.

The school itself decides which individuals are to be included in the report. This is governed by the records actually sent in to the NRO office each year by the school.

The NRO is concerned only with the comparison between high-school and college records of the whole group of recommended students from one high school in each college which they attend. It does not furnish information about individual students.

It is the responsibility of the school to take the initiative in requesting colleges to send in the records to the NRO and it is the school's responsibility to check up and make sure the colleges actually do send the records.

In the 1945 report the introduction stressed the fact that the graduates of 1944 entering college did not make a representative group, and that allowance should be made for that fact in interpreting the record. Incidentally, the records of 1944 and 1945 graduates who have entered the service may later be included in the cumulative report if the school so wishes.

We recognize that a better comparison between school and college records could be made if the record of the first *two* years of college could be compared with the entire high-school record. At present this is impossible because of the pressure of clerical work in college offices.

We recognize too that at present the cost of this service is rather high. We hope that as more schools join the cost to individual schools can be lowered; and that as colleges use the service and appreciate its value to them they may be persuaded to share the cost. The present fee to member schools is \$20.00 plus \$1.50 for each graduate whose record is submitted.

Some advantages to schools with membership in the NRO are: Added prestige, beyond that of accreditation by the regional accrediting association. This prestige is definite and weighty in the eyes of the cooperating colleges. Most colleges will give to members of the NRO the same privileges which they give to schools accredited by the regional associations. Colleges will consider that the mere fact that a school is a member of the NRO is proof of excellence. Weak schools will not dare to submit to this comparison of their graduates' records.

Validation of school's marks for those colleges which do not admit by certification. That is, colleges which demand entrance examinations need not rely entirely on test scores, if they can turn to the actual record of the school's recent graduates in other colleges of similar standards.



These records give objective evidence of our contention that even those not in the highest brackets of our graduating classes can do good work in college, and will tend to relax some restrictions against those below the first quarter in the graduating classes.

In areas where the accrediting agency is autocratic or arbitrary, membership in the NRO reduces the threat of loss of accreditation. Many colleges will extend to member schools of the NRO whose records are good the same privilege which they grant to accredited schools of admission by certificate only. Thus, the NRO strengthens our independence against domination by accrediting agencies.

Schools have a complete record of the college work of their recommended students, college by college, in comparable form on the same scale, together with the high-school record of these same graduates on the same scale.

Since the records are divided into five subject fields, comparisons can be made between school and college grades in the same field. Thus, the strength or weakness of any department in the school can be determined, e.g., English poor, science marks too strict, and so forth.

The school can compare its results in a certain college with the results obtained in the same college by graduates of a few anonymous schools. This is done by means of a sample report which is sent to schools, showing the complete record of some schools which are not named.

The NRO seems definitely to have caught on. In its first year 300 colleges have agreed to cooperate; sixty-nine independent schools joined. The results will be of value to schools, especially during this period when all colleges are swamped with applications and are selecting applicants rather carefully.



# Program of Annual Meeting

## Jesuit Educational Association

St. Louis, Missouri, April 23, 25, 26, 1946

### GENERAL MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 8:00 P.M.

St. Louis University

*Presiding*, REV. PATRICK J. HOLLORAN, S.J.

GREETINGS.....Very Rev. Joseph P. Zuercher, S.J.  
*Provincial, Missouri Province*

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.....Rev. Edward B. Rooney, S.J.

#### COOPERATION BETWEEN JESUIT COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS

*The College Viewpoint*.....Rev. John E. Wise, S.J.

*The High-School Viewpoint*.....Rev. Charles T. Taylor, S.J.

THE LAYMAN IN JESUIT SCHOOLS.....Rev. Albert H. Poetker, S.J.

### RECEPTION AT OFFICES OF THE QUEEN'S WORK

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 4:00-6:00 P.M.

Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J. and staff cordially invite all delegates to attend.

### J.E.A. COMMISSION MEETINGS

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 4:00 P.M.

Meeting of J.E.A. Commission on Graduate Schools

Meeting of J.E.A. Commission on Seminaries

### DINNER MEETING

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 6:00 P.M., MELBOURNE HOTEL

*Presiding*, REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

#### CHAPLAINS REPORT ON JESUIT STUDENTS IN THE WAR

*An Army Chaplain*.....Rev. Stephen J. Meany, S.J.

*A Navy Chaplain*.....Rev. Francis V. Sullivan, S.J.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND JESUIT SCHOOLS.....Mr. Thomas J. Ross,

*Senior Partner, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, New York*



## MEETING OF SECONDARY SCHOOL DELEGATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 9:30 A.M.-12:00 M.; 2:00-4:30 P.M.

St. Louis University

*Presiding, Morning Session*—REV. RICKARD R. ROONEY, S.J.*Presiding, Afternoon Session*—REV. JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.

## EXPERIMENT IN ENTRANCE

EXAMINATIONS.....Rev. Maurice E. Van Ackerman, S.J.

## REGISTRATION OFFICE OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS.....Rev. Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.

REPORT ON REVISION OF LATIN SERIES.....Rev. Robert J. Henle, S.J.

## SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR PRINCIPALS,

DENVER, COLORADO.....*Round-Table Discussion*J.E.A. COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS....*Report and Discussion*Revs. J. J. Foley, S.J., *Chairman*, F. J. Shalloe, S.J.

C. J. McDonnell, S.J., L. A. Reilly, S.J.

## MEETING OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE DELEGATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 9:30 A.M.-12:00 M.; 2:00-4:30 P.M.

St. Louis University

*Presiding, Morning Session*—REV. ANDREW C. SMITH, S.J.*Presiding, Afternoon Session*—REV. WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.

FACULTY RETIREMENT PLANS.....Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES..Rev. Wilfred M. Mallon, S.J.

## COLLEGE LEVEL WORK:

*Definition and Discussion*.....Rev. James F. Whelan, S.J.

## J.E.A. COMMISSION ON LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES:

*Report on Philosophy in Jesuit**Colleges*.....Revs. W. C. Gianera, *Chairman*, P. A. Roy, S.J.

J. R. Maxwell, S.J., J. F. Quinn, S.J., L. A. Walsh, S.J.

## PANEL ON VETERANS IN JESUIT COLLEGES:

*Personal Problems, Admission, Educational and Vocational**Adjustment and Guidance*..Revs. J. F. Moynihan, S.J., *Chairman*,

J. F. Connolly, S.J., H. F. Smith, S.J., M. S. Sullivan, S.J.

## LOCAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

Rev. Patrick J. Holloran, S.J., *Chairman*

Rev. Rickard R. Rooney, S.J.

Rev. Wilfred M. Mallon, S.J.

Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.



## MATHEMATICS

"Why do so many students acquire a distaste for mathematics and stop studying it when they are no longer required to take it? What I stated in the previous chapter about the teaching of mathematics for generations has direct bearing on this question. The students have been required to remember formulas and equations, and learn the techniques involved. They have worked problems similar to those worked in class by the teacher. Memory and imitation alone are required. Little or no emphasis is placed upon understanding of the ideas involved. The student soon concludes that these formulas and techniques are to be of no service to him later, so why do more than pass the course and get the credit?

"Mathematics on its own merits has a primary place in the curriculum of the liberal arts college, not when taught merely as a collection of isolated exercises and a means of making the student work, but when presented in a manner which will sharpen the intellect and quicken the imagination. To learn to state a definition with precision and use it in a proof, to understand the conditions involved in a proposition and see how each condition figures in its proof, to follow through the reasoning in a precise theorem—these are experiences which are bound to sharpen the mind of any student who does his utmost to meet the demands upon his powers. As he proceeds with such experience he will learn to appreciate a demonstration involving intuition, originality, and imagination. He will derive aesthetic satisfaction as he realizes what mathematicians call the elegance of a proof. Then when he undertakes to describe in his own words the steps and ideas involved in establishing the proof of a proposition, he will be getting training in precise writing, the kind in which so many students are deficient. . . .

"Since mathematics is applied extensively in the natural sciences, and each of them, as its principles are developed, becomes more and more mathematical, mathematics is considered by many to be one of the natural sciences and is so classified. This classification is misleading because it concerns only one aspect of mathematics. It is as much an art as it is a science, just as music is as much a science as it is an art, although such a conception of music may seem surprising to some. Throughout the ages the great philosophers have been mathematicians also. And yet many undergraduates who plan to choose philosophy for their field of concentration, or are already engaged in its study, fail to take courses in mathematics beyond required courses. And you find graduate students in philosophy who have never taken a college course in mathematics. As undergraduates and graduate students, they take formal courses in logic, often only if they are required to do so, without having the experience in concrete logi-



cal thinking which comes from the proper study of algebra, geometry, and the calculus. . . .

"Whether mathematics has its rightful place in the curriculum of the liberal arts college and in the secondary schools depends upon the attitude of the teachers and the character of textbooks used. There are teachers who hold that a freshman, and certainly a high-school student, is not mature enough to comprehend the precise definition of a mathematical term, or an accurate and complete demonstration of a theorem. Consequently, they water down mathematics and the textbooks cater to their demands. Maturity in mathematical thinking (or any other kind of thinking) is not a matter of the age of the pupil but the result of experience, and if appropriate experience is withheld, maturity will never develop.

"The character of the textbooks used in a course is of fundamental importance. In fact, the textbooks constitute a pretty good index of the purpose of the course and the teacher's function in it. This statement may be questioned by a teacher who thinks that there is not available a book of the quality he desires. It cannot be fairly questioned by a teacher who uses a text of inferior quality when he knows of a better book, on the ground that the latter is harder to teach and that the book he has chosen is good enough for his group of students. Years ago Professor Alfred Whitehead wrote: 'Whenever a text book is written of real educational worth, you may be quite certain that some reviewer will say that it will be too difficult to teach from it. Of course it will be difficult to teach from it. If it were easy the book ought to be burned; for it cannot be educational.' " Luther P. Eisenhart, *The Educational Process*, Princeton University Press, 1945,