

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM

NOV 16 1948

PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO

PRIVATE ROOM

Jesuit
Educational
Quarterly

OCTOBER 1948

INSTRUCTIO PRO ASSISTENTIA AMERICAE

CONSTITUTION OF THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL
ASSOCIATION

JESUIT DEANS' INSTITUTE
DENVER — 1948

VOL. XI, No. 2

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

The account of the Jesuit Deans' Institute at Denver is the work of the Committee on Reports, appointed at the Institute. Members were Fathers Edward B. Bunn, W. Edmund FitzGerald and M. J. Fitzsimons.

FATHER EDWARD B. BUNN, former President of Loyola College, Baltimore, now, besides continuing as Province Prefect of Studies for Colleges and Universities in the Maryland Province, is Regent of the Schools of Nursing and Dentistry at Georgetown University.

FATHER W. EDMUND FITZ GERALD, Rector of Cheverus High School, is a frequent contributor to the QUARTERLY.

FATHER M. J. FITZSIMONS, long identified with the QUARTERLY and former Prefect of Studies for Colleges and Universities in the New York Province, is currently engaged in teaching English at St. Andrew-on-Hudson.

"The Marks of a Superior College" is a paper delivered at the Deans' Institute by DR. RUSSELL M. COOPER, Dean of the College, University of Minnesota. Dean Cooper is well known in the educational field and we are happy to print this solid and interesting account of his views of the modern college.

FATHER ROBERT J. HENLE, while serving in double capacity of teacher and dean of philosophers at St. Louis, has isolated the point of greatest moment in the improvement of the present arts college philosophy course.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

October 1948

Contents

CONTRIBUTORS	66
INSTRUCTO PRO ASSISTENTIA AMERICAE DE ORDINANDIS UNIVERSITATIBUS, COLLEGIIS, AC SCHOLIS ALTIS ET DE PRAEPARANDIS EORUNDEM MAGISTRIS	69
CONSTITUTION OF THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION	87
JESUIT DEANS' INSTITUTE—DENVER, 1948 Committee on Reports: <i>Edward B. Bunn, S.J.</i> <i>W. Edmund FitzGerald, S.J., M. J. Fitzsimons, S.J.</i>	95
THE MARKS OF A SUPERIOR COLLEGE <i>Russell M. Cooper</i>	113
THE PROBLEM OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE <i>Robert J. Henle, S.J.</i>	123

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.

Managing Editor

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Advisory Board

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

OSCAR F. AUVIL, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZ GERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JOHN J. NASH, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
ANDREW C. SMITH, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 EAST 84TH STREET

NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

COPYRIGHT, OCTOBER 1948

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

INSTRUCTIO

PRO ASSISTENTIA AMERICAE
DE ORDINANDIS UNIVERSITATIBUS,
COLLEGIIS, AC SCHOLIS ALTIS ET
DE PRAEPARANDIS EORUNDEM MAGISTRIS

LETTER TO THE FATHERS AND SCHOLASTICS OF THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY

Reverend Fathers and dear Brothers in Christ: P.C.

In August 1934 my reverend predecessor sent to the American Assistancy his "Instructio de ordinandis Universitatibus, Collegiis ac Scholis Altis et de praeparandis eorundem Magistris." It was his intention that its provisions be submitted to a thorough test in practice over a period of three years. In the light of this experiment it would be reviewed and, where necessary, revised, and then formally promulgated as an *Instructio Patris Generalis*. Many unforeseen happenings concurred to prolong this experimental stage, not however without advantages gained for the cause, and now after a lapse of fourteen years the Reverend Fathers Provincial have asked me to give to this revised *Instructio* the permanent and mandatory character intended by its author.

Reverend Father Ledochowski had high expectations of this *Instructio*. Fully aware of the heavy demands it would make on the Fathers and Scholastics of the Assistancy, in whose humble, wholehearted obedience he had complete confidence, he was yet convinced that the benefits it would bring to the educational apostolate of the Society in your country would justify the most exacting efforts. It is a genuine and consoling pleasure for me to witness the realization of his hopes. Every department covered by its prescriptions has been helped by this *Instructio*; and I wish to use this occasion publicly to praise and thank all the Superiors, all the officials, and all the teachers whose spirit of unselfish, fraternal cooperation has made possible these splendid results. A special word of commendation is rightly due to the Inter-Provincial Executive Board and to

the National Secretary for their unflagging interest in watching over the faithful application of what is prescribed by the *Instructio*.

The document which with this letter I am now sending to the Assis­tancy is substantially the same *Instructio* which my predecessor f.m. published on August 15, 1934. (A.R., Vol. VII, pp. 927 seq.) The practical wisdom of that *Instructio*, reflecting the comprehensive study and painstaking care with which it was prepared, is confirmed by the fact that after all these years of experiment it has had to be modified or supplemented in very few of its Articles. It is not my purpose here to review its contents. Every Father and Scholastic who is connected with a High School, College, or University will, as I trust and earnestly recommend, read it carefully and prayerfully. I say prayerfully, because its immediate aim gives it place among the spiritual documents sent to the Assis­tancy.

That aim is to carry up to a consistently high level of achievement the work of the Society in America in the field of education. Now, as we know, according to the mind of our holy founder the work of the Society in this field is primarily a spiritual work. Colleges for externs were permitted by St. Ignatius to help youth advance in upright moral conduct as well as knowledge (Const. P. IV, c. 7, 1); and hence spiritual direction and instruction in Christian doctrine were of prime importance (ibid. n. 2). It is the charity of Christ that has led the Society to assume the direction of Universities, hoping that with the increase in the number of faculties and students a vaster legion might be trained of those who would go forth to the various sections of the country to spread the knowledge and practical faith they had learned from us for the glory of God our Lord (ibid. c. XI, 1). And so it is our duty to provide that all who come to the Society's Universities to acquire knowledge should at the same time acquire habits of conduct becoming exemplary Catholics (ibid. c. 16, 1). And surely if our schools were to graduate men learned in their profession but poorly instructed in their faith and irresolute in its practice and in zeal for its propagation, they would not warrant our present vast expenditure of men and energies. (Cf. my letter de Ministeriis Nostris, A. R., Vol. XI, pp. 319-321).

This spiritual goal, clearly envisaged by St. Ignatius when undertaking the work of schools for externs and repeatedly pointed out to us his unworthy sons, will not only guide us in the choice of schools to be inaugurated or to be discontinued, but will also be the most telling spur to you, Reverend Fathers and dear Scholastics, to serious and persevering study, so that you may in no way fall short of the most able professors

in non-Catholic Universities. "Vestrum est nomine et re non solum viros religiosos, sed magnae quoque doctrinae esse. . . . Quodsi apprime fidem debent colere (sodales Societatis), debent etiam accuratam perfectamque scientiam sibi adipisci et, praeclara sui Instituti vestigia secuti, doctrinarum progressus, quantum possunt et quomodo possunt, sectari, id sibi persuasum habentes se hoc itinere, quamvis aspero, plurimum ad maiorem Dei gloriam et ad aedificationem Ecclesiae conferre posse." Thus spoke the Supreme Pontiff to the Fathers of the last General Congregation (A.R., Vol. XI, p. 57) and His august will, unmistakably made known to us, adds another motive to the obligations of our Institute.

In the *Instructio* also we find emphasis laid on this need of thorough preparation for our future professors and certain means are very prudently prescribed to ensure its attainment. The list of special students appearing during recent years in the annual catalogues of the Assitancy bears most gratifying testimony to the loyal determination of the Reverend Fathers Provincial to implement these provisions of the *Instructio*. While we praise them very sincerely for this, we remind them that, as the work continues and increases and the demand grows for ever higher levels of instruction, these lists too must continue to grow. With their staffs eventually strengthened by these specially trained scholars, your Colleges and Universities should take a more prominent place in that group of centers of learning and culture that by their erudite publications extend their influence far beyond their own walls. Thus you will advance the honor of the Church and the glory of the Creator and Lord of all.

Accept, then, Reverend Fathers and Dear Brothers in Christ, this *Instructio* as a precious legacy from the tireless hands of our late beloved Father in Christ, whose devotion to the best interests and progress of the Society in your Assitancy was second to none. Very humbly I am happy to make it my own and give it, in its present form, my full approval. It will be the norm to be followed by Superiors in governing and administering the Universities, Colleges, and High Schools of the American Assitancy and in preparing professors for the same. Let the united prayers of all members of the Assitancy draw down God's blessings on its faithful observance.

I commend myself to the Holy Sacrifices and prayers of all.

Sincerely in the Sacred Heart,

JOHN B. JANSSENS, S.J.,

General of the Society of Jesus.

Rome

September 27, 1948

LETTER TO THE FATHERS AND SCHOLASTICS OF THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY ANNOUNCING THE NEW INSTRUCTION ON STUDIES AND TEACHING

Reverend Fathers and dear Brothers in Christ, Pax Christi:

I am able at last to send to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy my long promised Instruction on Studies and Teaching, and I gladly use the opportunity to address to each and all a brief message of paternal greeting and exhortation.

To begin my letter with what is uppermost in my mind, I wish to say once more what I have repeatedly said before, that your educational work in the United States has for many years held an enviable and envied record among the world-wide activities of the Society. For my own part, I have watched with much consolation the wonderful growth and development of your institutions, and their manifold opportunities for procuring God's glory and the good of souls, and I have had frequent occasions to admire the generosity of your benefactors and the loyalty of your friends and students. At the same time I have always been solicitous to assist and direct Superiors and teachers in their task, and to animate them to answer to the full the expectations of the Church and of the Society. It is a pleasure for me to render this renewed testimony to the zeal and devotedness of all, as I introduce my Instruction on Studies and Teaching.

It is my wish that this Instruction should be made known as soon as possible in all of our houses. I need not add that it is not intended for the general public. It belongs to that class of domestic legislation which we discreetly confine to the interior of our communities, and carry into execution without calling the world's attention to it.

As you will notice at a glance, the new Instruction embraces the entire period of preparation of the future Jesuit teacher, from his entrance into the Society to the day when he is fully equipped to take up his life's work in some High School, College or University of his Province. It aims moreover at reorganizing our educational institutions, leaving untouched the inviolable principles of our Institute and its Ratio Studiorum, but combining them with approved modern methods, so that our standard may be equal to the best in the country. This is no reflection on the work done in the past. It is an effort to give a new direction

and a fresh impulse to the labors of Ours, corresponding to the needs of the day; an endeavor to produce results better proportioned to the energies expended; a systematized attempt to secure for our educational activities their due recognition and rightful standing among other groups of a similar rank and grade.

To further these ends, I named in December 1930 an inter-Province Commission on Higher Studies, composed of six Fathers who for many months labored with a zeal and diligence worthy of all praise. In August 1932 the Commission handed in a voluminous report containing a complete statement and analysis of our educational situation in the United States, and suggesting means and remedies to bring all our schools to the desired perfection. This report, supplemented by observations received from several Provinces, has supplied the subject matter for the present Instruction which is now communicated to the Assistancy. Its provisions are to be practically and thoroughly tested by way of experiment for the space of three years; they will then become permanent with whatever additions and modifications experience shall dictate.

This brief statement will suffice to make you realize the importance which I attach to the new Instruction. It is the result of years of study, labor and prayer. It is being sent to you in the hope that it will initiate a new era, as it were, of fruitful activity in the field of Jesuit education in the United States, and, among other things, supply that central direction for which many of Ours have been asking so earnestly.

To the Provincials and Rectors, assisted by the National Secretary of Education, is committed the responsible task of watching over the execution of the new Instruction in its various details. They must study it carefully, and find the ways and means of carrying it into effect. This they can only do if they have the whole-hearted cooperation of all their subjects. The Scholastics must be thoroughly convinced that a great deal is expected of them; they must eagerly embrace the studies assigned to them, and do their best to make them a success. The priests, conscious of the apostolic nature of the work of the classroom, will gladly dedicate themselves to it for life, if so ordered by Superiors, and will continue to perfect themselves in the subjects they are teaching. Your combined, unremitting efforts will gradually enhance the reputation of the Society as the leading teaching body of your country, by multiplying proofs of efficiency visible to all. The modern educational world, as we know, calls for more publicity, for greater exterior evidence of scholarship than in the past. Teachers must have degrees, they must write books and articles of scientific value, give conferences and lectures that interest the people,

keep in contact with learned organizations. We cannot afford to ignore these requisites of the modern teacher, though we must try to direct them to the spiritual and supernatural end proper to our vocation. The new Instruction will, I trust, be a safe guide in this matter, as well as in many others.

I cannot sufficiently emphasize my conviction that the success of your future educational work will depend very largely on the cooperation of all in carrying it forward; cooperation of the Provinces among themselves, cooperation of the several Colleges of each Province, cooperation lastly of all the members of the Province, old and young, Superiors and subjects, each unselfishly looking to the general good. This cooperation will have to include the securing of the financial means necessary for the application of the new program. It is easy to foresee that this cannot be done without a considerable outlay of money, and I am well aware of the straitened circumstances of most of your Provinces. Let all therefore make it their duty to help in this matter both directly and indirectly. Besides interesting friends and benefactors in your work, let each apply to himself more strictly than ever what I have so often recommended regarding the practice of poverty and economy, and the reduction of his personal expenses to a minimum. Much money will thus be saved for the *Arca Seminarii* and for the preparation of your teachers, and God will not fail to send special blessings in reward for sacrifices generously made.

I am sending you this Instruction on Studies and Teaching on the four hundredth anniversary of the day when our holy Father Saint Ignatius and his six companions consecrated themselves by vow to the service of God and of the Church. May the memory of that solemn event which meant so much for the future Society of Jesus, inspire you all to walk with courage and perseverance in the footsteps of these glorious fathers and models!

Recommending myself to your holy Sacrifices and prayers, I am,

Your servant in Christ,

W. LEDOCHOWSKI,

General of the Society of Jesus.

Rome,

15th of August, 1934

INSTRUCTIO PRO ASSISTENTIA AMERICAE

TITULUS I.

DE COOPERATIONE INTER PROVINCIAS ET DE DIRECTIONE IN SINGULIS PROVINCIIS.

ART. 1.

UNIO.—Unionem inter nostras Universitates, Collegia, et Scholas Altas, quam ratio ipsa et nostri Instituti spiritus tantopere commendant, prorsus necessariam reddunt praesentes temporum rationes.

COOPERATIO.—Ad hanc vero unionem procurandam unitis viribus tam Provinciae ipsae quam singuli earum socii cooperari debent.

ART. 2.

ASSOCIATIO NATIONALIS.—Quae cooperatio ut rite procedat, omnino expedit ut vegeta et efficiens "Associatio Universitatum, Collegiorum, et Scholarum Altarum Societatis Jesu in Statibus Unitis" enixe foveatur.

ART. 3.

COMMISSIO INTERPROVINCIALIS EXSECUTIVA.—§1. Administrabitur haec Associatio a Commissione Interprovinciali Exsecutiva, quae ex singularum Provinciarum Praefectis Studiorum Generalibus constabit, quaeque saltem semel in anno conveniet.

§2. Huius Commissionis erit: a) consilia inire de iis quae ad studia et educationem quocumque modo pertinent, eaque PP. Provincialibus et Praeposito Generali tempestive proponere;

b) Provinciales iuvare ut ea quae a legitima auctoritate pro singulis Provinciis sunt ordinata et approbata executioni mandentur.

ART. 4.

SECRETARIUS NATIONALIS.—§1. Huic Commissioni Interprovinciali Exsecutivae ex officio praesidebit permanens Secretarius Nationalis Educationis a Praeposito Generali designandus, qui ad eundem Praepositum Generalem semel saltem in anno plenam de rebus scholasticis relationem mittet; et de iisdem rebus, cum PP. Provincialibus, in congressu annuo consulet.

§2. Is eo loco suam sedem constituet, qui maxime idoneus iudicabitur; rebusque omnibus instruendus erit, quae ad ipsius munus recte explendum requiruntur.

§3. Huius Secretarii officia sunt: a) singularem rei educativae in tota Assistentia curam agere;

b) providere ut Constitutio Associationis, a Superioribus approbata, rite observetur;

c) statum rerum et personarum in nostris Universitatibus, Collegiis, et Scholis Altis bene perspectum habere;

d) congressibus educativis, saltem qui maioris sint momenti, interesse ibique Associationem Nationalem de qua in articulo 2 repraesentare;

e) Superioribus et Officialibus passim consilia et opem praestare in ipsorum cum "Coetibus Accredizantibus" relatione;

f) informationes ad educationem pertinentes prae manibus ad Nostrorum usum habere, earumque digesta aliquoties in anno cum eis communicare.

g) Associationis ephemeridis officialis redactor esse.

ART. 5.

PRAEFECTI STUDIORUM GENERALES.—§1. In maioribus saltem Provinciis, duo constituentur Praefecti Studiorum Generales: unus pro Universitatibus ac Collegiis, alter pro Scholis Altis, et uterque duos habeat consultores seu adiutores; in minoribus vero Provinciis, unus saltem constituatur Praefectus Generalis Studiorum, qui pariter duos habeat consultores seu adiutores pro Universitatibus ac Collegiis et duos pro Scholis Altis.

§2. Horum Praefectorum Generalium munus erit: esse adiumento PP. Provincialibus in omnibus quae ad studia sive Nostrorum sive externorum spectant; speciatim, visitationem scholarum nostrarum statutis temporibus instituendo, ut de progressu obtento, de defectibus corrigendis, de ordinationibus executioni mandandis sibi rationem reddant.

TITULUS II.

DE INSTITUTIONE ALUMNORUM, DE PROFESSORIBUS AC DE
UNIVERSITATUM, COLLEGIORUM, ET SCHOLARUM
ALTARUM REGIMINE.

ART. 6.

PERFECTIO ATTINGENDA.—Universitates, Collegia, ac Scholae Altae omnes summopere connitantur, ut iuxta Institutum nostrum in suo genere perfectionem vere attingant, habita varietatis et exigentiae temporum ac locorum iusta ratione. Quare non tam de Scholis augendis vel de novis condendis quam de iis quas iam habemus perficiendis curare oportet.

ART. 7.

IUXTA SPIRITUM RATIONIS STUDIORUM.—Prae oculis habeantur ea quae Instituti nostri et scholarum nostrarum sunt essentialia et propria, quaeque semper et ubique in praxim deduci debent, qualia sunt imprimis:

1^o. FINIS educationis nostrae praestitutus: i.e. proximum ad Dei cognitionem atque amorem adducere. Proinde haec prima cura debet esse ut discipuli una cum litteris mores christianis dignos hauriant; et in omnibus scholis nostris primas partes obtinere debet moralis et religiosa alumnorum institutio secundum Ecclesiae principia et directiones. Hac ratione pro familia, patria, et Ecclesia viros eminentes praeparabimus; viros, inquam, qui in suo quisque vitae genere, ceteris tam rectitudine principiorum quam soliditate virtutum christianarum praeluceant quique actionem catholicam sub ductu Hierarchiae sollerter promovere valeant.

2^o. MEDIA quaedam peculiaria ad hanc educationem conducentia:

a) Instructio religiosa singulari diligentia tradita, atque aetati et formationi iuvenum adaptata;

b) Philosophia Scholastica, quae simul cum vera religione ad omnes vitae hodiernae conditiones tamquam norma est applicanda;

c) Saecularis nostra docendi methodus, quae non solam eruditionem intendit, sed id praesertim ut totus homo cum omnibus facultatibus rite formetur et evolvatur;

d) Personalis alumnorum cura, qua Nostri, praeter doctrinam et exemplum in scholis praestitum, singulos consilio et exhortatione dirigere et adiuvere satagant.

ART. 8.

SYSTEMA SOCIETATI PROPRIUM.—Siquidem constat inter tot nova et variabilia hodierni temporis systemata paedagogica etiam Scholas Societatis aliquid damni accepisse, valde utile erit ut Commissio Interprovincialis quaestionem perpendat de curriculo nostro scholastico ita disponendo ut principia nostrae Rationis Studiorum necessitatibus hodiernis adaptentur, atque maior stabilitas et uniformitas in omnibus nostris scholis obtineatur.

ART. 9.

IN SCHOLIS ALTIS SACERDOTES DOCENT.—Omnino requiritur ad stabiles traditiones scholasticas fovendas, ut stabiles habeantur Magistri. Ideo Nostri post sacerdotium parati sint ad magisterium perpetuum in Scholis Altis exercendum. Qui sibi persuadeant se munus summi pretii obire, iuventutem catholicam tenerae aetatis solide et religiose instituendo.

ART. 10.

PRAEFECTI STUDIORUM IN SCHOLIS ALTIS.—Studiorum Praefecti in Scholis Altis ad suum munus convenienti gradu et academica institutione, necnon practica administrationis experientia praeparari debent.

ART. 11.

UNIVERSITATUM ET COLLEGIORUM PRAEFECTI ET DECANI.—In Universitatibus et Collegiis, ii qui singulis disciplinis (departments) praeficiuntur, sint in sua materia bene versati, ut plurimum Doctoratu insigniti, et vera administrandi capacitate praestantes; idque a fortiori de Decanis Facultatum dici debet.

ART. 12.

PRAEFECTORUM AUCTORITAS.—§1. Praefecti Studiorum tam Generales quam particulares, Provincialium et Rectorum respectivae auctoritati, ut par est, subesse debent; nihilominus valde convenit ut illis tantum potestatis tribuatur quantum requiritur ut suis officiis efficaciter fungi valeant.

§2. Omnes Praefecti Studiorum Generales, atque omnes Praefecti Studiorum particulares Universitatum et Collegiorum semel in anno ad Praepositum Generalem, et bis in anno ad suum quisque Provinciale scribere ne omittant.

§3. Pertinet praecipue ad munus Praefectorum Studiorum particularium tum in Collegiis tum in Scholis Altis, a) interdum singulos Magistros in scholis audire; b) coetus Magistrorum, juxta programma a Rectore stabilitum, ad progressum academicum inspiciendum et promovendum convocare.

ART. 13.

MUTATIONES VITANDAE.—Quamvis laudandae et fovendae sint iuxta Institutum in subditis indifferentia ad locum et alacritas ad quodvis munus pro Dei gloria suscipiendum, nihilominus Superiores intelligant famam scholarum nostrarum earumque stabilitatem ac progressum postulare ne officiales et professores in suis muneribus frequentius mutantur.

ART. 14.

DOCTRINAE ET GRADUUM AESTIMATIO.—Assidue foveant Superiores in Nostris, praesertim iuvenibus, illam aestimationem quae in Societate nostra erga veram et solidam doctrinam semper viguit, et pro viribus animent et adiuvent eos, qui ob hodiernas necessitates gradus academicos etiam superiores ad Dei gloriam et animarum fructum assequi conantur.

ART. 15.

PROFESSORES TEMPUS HABEANT SCRIBENDI.—Diligenter curent Superiores ut Professores nostri, qui post arduos diuturnosque labores in

suis disciplinis insignes evadere sategerunt, ita ab aliis negotiis liberentur ut sat temporis et otii habeant ad sese magis magisque perficiendos, atque ad opera vere scientifica, sive lectionibus et conferentiis, sive scriptis libris et dissertationibus, in lucem edenda. Vix enim datur via aptior et efficacior ad existimationem peritorum hominum nostris Collegiis et Universitatibus, ipsique Societati, alliciendam, vel medium Instituto nostro magis consentaneum ad divinam gloriam, honorem Ecclesiae, et animarum salutem promovendam.

ART. 16.

STATUA UNIVERSITATUM ET COLLEGIORUM.—Singulae Universitates ac Collegia conficiant et edant Statuta, quantum fieri potest, uniformia, quibus inter alias notitias scitu utiles, normae pro adscriptione, promotione, etc. Professorum clare stabiliantur. Quae Statuta, cum in re educativa valde aestimentur, diligenter in nostris Universitatibus et Collegiis observentur.

ART. 17.

LAICI PROFESSORES.—§1. Professores laici, universim loquendo, in Facultates ne recipiantur nisi qui sint catholici, vera docendi habilitate praediti, atque gradibus requisitis insigniti.

ET DECANI.—§2. Decani laici seligantur qui eruditione, peritia administrativa, fide ac vita catholica emineant.

ART. 18.

GUBERNANDI DIVISIO.—Si in quibusdam Universitatibus, ob earum amplitudinem, necessaria vel utilis aliqua divisio gubernandi videtur, modus huius divisionis instituendae a Praeposito Generali determinabitur.

ART. 19.

FUNDATIONES PECUNIARIAE.—Data opera omnes, maxime Superiores, enitantur fundationes pecuniarias, nostris diebus (si alias unquam) valde

necessarias, in bonum Collegiorum comparare. Quamobrem benefactores prudenter exquirendi sunt, qui nobiscum in rebus educationis cooperari possint et velint.

ART. 20.

RATIO LIBRORUM COMPUTATIONUM.—§1. In singulis nostris Collegiis moderna ratio librorum computationum instituat, sub perito ratiocinario, qui Procuratoris adiutorem agat.

§2. Hi libri, statutis temporibus, a viris peritis (Certified Public Accountants) recenseantur.

RELATIONES PECUNIARIAE.—§3. Si quas ex his pecuniariis relationibus (reports and statements) cum externis communicare expediat, id nonnisi a competente auctoritate fiat; sintque relationes accuratae et sibi constantes, atque exemplaribus apud nos servatis fideliter respondeant.

ART. 21.

RELATIONES EDUCATIONIS.—Simili modo, relationes, annales, elenchi, qui statum educationis singulorumque alumnorum in nostris scholis exhibent, sint accurate confecti et rite ordinati, de anno in annum sibi constant, a competente auctoritate edantur, eorumque exemplaria servantur. Utilissimum quoque erit si Praesides Nostrorum Collegiorum et Universitatum relationem de statu academico et oeconomico quotannis edant, (servatis praescriptis Epit. n. 879, sq.)

ART. 22.

DE BIBLIOTHECIS EARUMQUE CURA.—§1. Inter adiumenta studiorum primum tenet locum bibliotheca. Unde in omnibus Universitatibus, Collegiis, et Scholis Altis, secundum normas vigentes in scholis eiusdem gradus et a coetibus regionalibus praescriptas, bibliothecae sedulo atque impense foveantur.

§2. In singulis igitur scholis, tum librorum tum periodicorum copia vere sufficiens et ad curricula uniuscujusque scholae adaptata, provideatur.

§3. Certa annua ad id summa assignetur, quae alios in usus ne convertatur.

§4. Bibliotheca aptum exigit bibliothecarium, qui ad tanti momenti officium rite parari debet.

ART. 23.

CONVENTUS FREQUENTANDI.—Ad amicas relationes fovendas, atque ad omnimodam status educationis peritiam comparandam, expedit ut non solum Studiorum Praefecti, Decani aliive Officiales, sed et ipsi Superiores locales, et aliquando etiam Provinciales, conventibus Coetuum Educationalium intersint.

ART. 24.

AFFILIATIO CUM COETIBUS ACCREDIZANTIBUS.—Perpensis hodiernis adiunctis, necesse videtur ut nostrae Universitates, Collegia, et Scholae Altae apud respectivos Coetus "Accredizantes" affiliationem (membership) adipisci studeant, utque semel affiliata inter cetera eiusdem ordinis instituta praecellant.

ART. 25.

RELATIO CUM EPISCOPIS.—Singulari diligentia studeant omnes superiores ut nostrorum Collegiorum relationes cum RR. Episcopis et auctoritate ecclesiastica sint amicissimae. Ad quem finem sedulo curare debent non solum ut debito obsequio et reverentia benevolentiam et cooperationem RR. Ordinariorum sibi comparent et retineant, sed ut re et opere comprobent nostra Collegia esse centra activitatis catholicae, semper prompta ad RR. Episcopos in eorum pro Ecclesia et religione consiliis et laboribus iuvandos et sustinendos.

TITULUS III.

DE MAGISTRORUM PRAEPARATIONE.

ART. 26.

CANDIDATORUM DELECTUS.—In Societatis candidatis admittendis eo maior delectus habendus est, quo magis vocationes iam nunc numero et qualitate abundant. Quare ii prae ceteris accipiendi sunt qui ingenio et indole praecellunt, quique spem praebent se etiam in opere educationis postea cum fructu laboraturos esse.

ART. 27.

EORUM PRAEPARATIO SCHOLASTICA.—Ad modum praeparationis scholasticae optandum est ut candidati "curriculum medium studiorum classicorum" i.e., duos priores Collegii annos, ante confecerint quam Societatem ingrediantur. Qui statim post Scholam Altam absolutam recipiuntur, mediocritatem in studiis superasse, atque hac de re indubia testimonia exhibere debent.

ART. 28.

NOVITIORUM STUDIA.—Salvo praecipuo fine Novitiatus, qui in studio propriae vocationis et perfectionis atque in solidarum virtutum amore et exercitio consistit, curent Superiores ut studia Novitiis concessa serio et ordinate, et quidem sub optimis Magistris, peragantur, atque imprimis ad latinam linguam quam optime addiscendam dirigantur.

ART. 29.

IUNIORATUS STUDIA.—§1. In Iunioratu is debet esse disciplinarum liberalium cursus, quem Apostolica Constitutio "Deus Scientiarum Dominus" iis imponit qui ad Philosophiam progressuri sunt, quemque Americanum educationis systema praerequirit tamquam superiorum disciplinarum fundamentum.

QUAENAM.—§2. Liberalium vero disciplinarum nomine veniunt: lingua vernacula, linguae classicae et modernae, historia, mathesis, scientiae quae vocantur naturales, notiones paedagogicae.

DISCIPLINAE SUPPLENDAE.—§3. “Si quis Scholasticus e schola media venerit, in qua una vel plures disciplinae, de quibus §2, omnino non sint aut saltem non sint satis traditae, Superiores curent, ut secundum normas a Praeposito Generali datas, illarum disciplinarum studium suppleat superetque examen, generatim antequam ad Philosophiam vel saltem priusquam ad eiusdem examina admittatur.” (Cf. *Rat. Stud. Super.* (1941), N. 126)

ORDO STUDIORUM.—§4. Sequendus est studiorum ordo a Praeposito Generali pro singulis Iunioratibus approbatus, qui, quantum fieri poterit, uniformis esse debet. Nihil tamen obstat quominus iam tunc singulorum Scholasticorum individuae inclinationis ac aptitudinis aliqua ratio habeatur, qua prudenter postea dirigantur ad illas disciplinas, ad quas sunt promptiores, quaeque speciales vocari solent.

ART. 30.

PHILOSOPHIAE DIVISIO.—§1. “In exponenda Philosophia scholastica materia in tres annos ita distribuatur ut singulis annis hac vel simili ratione diversae partes tradantur: anno I Logica, Critica seu Criteriologia (Epistemologia), Ontologia; anno II Cosmologia et Psychologia; anno III Theologia Naturalis et Ethica cum Iure Naturali.”

§2. “Approbante Praeposito Generali Philosophiae materia etiam ita disponi potest, ut primis duobus annis omnes eius partes tradantur, servatis ad tertium annum difficilioribus quaestionibus, sive ex omnibus sive ex quibusdam partibus. Quae tamen distributio, ubi legitime introducta est, sine nova Generalis approbatione ne immutetur.” (*Rat. Stud. Super.* (1941), N. 131)

ART. 31.

STUDIA SPECIALIA. BACCALAUREATUS ET GRADUS MAGISTRI ARTIUM.—Peractis Iunioratus et Philosophiae curriculum Scholastici quoad eius fieri possit, ii praesertim qui magistri scholarum futuri praevidentur, ad aliquam universitatem catholicam mittentur (salvo *Epit.* 325,2) ut disciplinae illi speciali incumbant quam Superiores, auditis Professoribus, Decanis, et Studiorum Praefectis, determinabunt, atque his studiis vacabunt usque dum Baccalaureatum et gradum Magistri Artium consequantur. Qua in re maxime omnium cooperatione opus est, ut quam aptissimae universitates seligantur, ibique Scholastici omni modo iuventur.

ART. 32.

CURSUS PAEDAGOGICI.—Providendum est vel in Philosophiae vel in studiorum specialium curriculo vel in utroque, ut illi cursus de paedagogia (e.g. principia, historia, psychologia, administratio, methodus docendi generalis et particularis, experimenta docendi) suppleantur, qui iuxta hodiernas normas requiruntur.

ART. 33.

MAGISTERIUM.—§1. Post gradum Magistri Artium receptum, plerumque Scholastici Magisterium per unum vel duos annos exercent, in quo ut plurimum Assistentium munere fungentur Professorum stabilium illarum disciplinarum ad quas bene praeparati sunt in eis progressum facere enitantur.

“TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS.”—§2. Nihil tamen obstat, immo commendandum est, ut eo ipso tempore quo Scholastici ad gradum Magistri Artium sese praeparant, Magisterium exercent per modum “Teaching Fellowships”, nempe inferiores aliquot suae disciplinae cursus docendo et simul superiores prosequendo.

MAGISTERIO EXEMPTI SPECIMEN DENT DOCENDI.—§3. Quos magisterio eximi et statim ad studia altiora applicari Superiores satius esse duxerint, illis nihilominus opportunitas non desit specimen praebendi suae capacitatis in docendo.

ART. 34.

STUDIA SPECIALIA AD DOCTORATUM.—Theologia et Tertia Probatione rite peracta, ii quos Superiores elegerint, studiis ad Doctoratum in sua disciplina requisitis operam dabunt, in Universitate vel nostra vel aliena, si fieri potest, catholica, atque ad finem intentum apprime apta. In casibus specialibus, Scholastici, peracto Philosophiae cursu, statim ad Doctoratum a Provinciali mitti possunt.

ART. 35.

RELATIO CUM ERUDITIS SOCIETATIBUS.—Ad progressum continuum in doctrina stimulandum et ad eam Societati conciliandam in campo

educativo auctoritatem, quae ex commercio cum viris eruditis profluere solet, Superiores Scholasticis ad Magistralem gradum proVectis facultatem facere possunt eiusmodi societatibus scientificis adhaerendi, haecque relationes etiam tempore Theologiae perdurare poterunt, dummodo nihil nocumenti sacris scientiis afferatur.

Romae, die 27, mense septembris, anno 1948.

JOANNES BAPTISTUS JANSSENS

Praep. Gen. Soc. Jesu.

CONSTITUTION OF THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Jesuit Educational Association.

ARTICLE II—MEMBERSHIP

All Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign missions, shall be members of the Association.

ARTICLE III—OBJECTIVES

1. In general, the objectives of the Association are to promote and make more efficient all educational activities of American Jesuits.
2. Specifically, the objectives are the following:
 - a. Cooperation of member institutions in furthering the aims of Catholic education.
 - b. Promotion of scholarship and research in Jesuit institutions, and publication of the results of such scholarship and research.
 - c. Conservation of the permanent essential features of the Jesuit educational tradition, and the necessary adaptation of its accidental features to national and local needs of the time.
 - d. Increased academic efficiency of all Jesuit institutions.
 - e. Effective presentation of the Catholic philosophy of life.
 - f. Corporate cooperation with other educational associations, Catholic and secular.
 - g. Collaboration with Jesuit educators and Jesuit educational institutions in other countries on the common problems of Jesuit education.
 - h. Experimental study of educational problems in America.
 - i. Provision for wider knowledge in the United States of the Jesuit educational system, its theory and its practice.

ARTICLE IV—DIVISIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. The Association shall comprise a National Body, Regional Groups, and Provincial Groups.
 - a. The National Body shall include all the educational institutions conducted by American Jesuits.
 - b. There shall be three Regional Groups:

- (i) *The Eastern Regional Group* shall comprise all Jesuit educational institutions of the Maryland, New York, and New England provinces.
 - (ii) *The Central Regional Group* shall comprise all Jesuit educational institutions of the Chicago, Missouri, and New Orleans provinces.
 - (iii) *The Western Regional Group* shall comprise all Jesuit educational institutions of the California and Oregon provinces.
- c. There shall be as many Provincial Groups as there are Jesuit provinces in the United States.

2. The National Body and each group, both Regional and Provincial, shall be divided into two departments: a Department of Higher Education and a Department of Secondary Education.

3. The purposes of these various divisions of the Association shall be the following:

- a. The purpose of the National Body shall be to discuss problems of concern to the Association, and to recommend necessary legislation to the Board of Governors through the Executive Director.
- b. The purpose of the Regional Groups shall be to exchange ideas and to further in the respective regions the objectives of the Association. These Regional Groups shall make recommendations to the respective Provincial Superiors concerning policies and problems of education common to the region. It shall belong to each Provincial Superior to decide in conjunction with his Province Directors of Education, and their consultants, what recommendations made by the Regional Group shall be carried out in his province.
- c. The purpose of the Provincial Groups, which ordinarily shall include at their meetings only representatives of a particular province, shall be to discuss the educational policies and problems of the institutions of their province, and to make recommendations accordingly. It shall belong to the Provincial Superior to decide in conjunction with his Province Directors of Education and their consultants what recommendations made by the Provincial Group shall be adopted in his province.

ARTICLE V—OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. There shall be National, Regional, and Provincial officers.
2. National Officers: These shall be the Board of Governors, the Executive Director, and the Executive Committee.
 - a. The Board of Governors shall consist of the Provincial Superiors of the Jesuit provinces of the United States.
 - b. The Executive Director shall be nominated by the Board of Governors, and appointed by the Very Reverend Father General of the Society of Jesus.
 - c. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Executive Director, Chairman *ex officio*, and all the Province Directors of Education.
3. Regional Officers:
 - a. There shall be a Standing Committee consisting of the Province Directors of Education of the region to administer all matters pertaining to the meetings of the Regional Group.
 - b. The chairmanship of the meetings of the Department of Secondary Education of the Regional Group shall rotate among the Province Directors of Secondary Education of that region.
 - c. The chairmanship of the meetings of the Department of Higher Education of the Regional Group shall rotate among the Province Directors of Higher Education of that region.
 - d. A secretary *pro tempore* shall be appointed by the chairman of each department for each meeting of the Regional Group.
4. Provincial Officers:
 - a. There shall be a Province Director of Secondary Education to assist the Provincial Superior in all matters pertaining to secondary education.
 - b. There shall be a Province Director of Higher Education to assist the Provincial Superior in all matters pertaining to higher education.
 - c. Each of these officials shall have two consultants to aid him in promoting the efficiency of the educational work of the province.
 - d. In provinces where the same person holds both these offices, he shall be assisted by two consultants for each department: two for higher education, two for secondary education.
 - e. Province Directors of Education, together with their consult-

ants, shall be appointed by the Provincial Superiors of the respective provinces.

- f. The *ex officio* chairmen of the provincial meetings of the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Secondary Education shall be the respective Directors of Education in the province.
- g. The chairman shall appoint a secretary *pro tempore* for all such meetings.

ARTICLE VI—GOVERNMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION

A. National.

1. The national authority in the government of the Association shall rest with the Board of Governors. Consequently, all recommendations of the Executive Director and of the Executive Committee, all resolutions passed at the national meetings of the Association, as well as all actions of the Executive Director that affect the educational policy or practice of the whole membership of the Association, shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors.

2. Recommendations of the Executive Director or of the Executive Committee that affect only one or other province shall be subject to the approval of the respective Provincial or Provincials concerned.

3. The duties and powers of the Executive Director shall be:

- a. To call meetings of the Association, as provided in Article VIII, 1, b, c, d, e; and Article VIII, 4, a, b.
- b. To prepare in cooperation with the Executive Committee the program for all meetings of the Association, mentioned in Article VIII, 1, b, c, d, e.
- c. To present to the Board of Governors at their annual meeting his own recommendations, the recommendations of the Executive Committee, and the resolutions passed at the national meetings of the Association.
- d. To make annual reports to the Very Reverend Father General of the Society of Jesus on the general status of Jesuit education in the United States as well as of individual institutions.
- e. To represent the Association officially either personally or by delegate at meetings of other educational associations.
- f. In cooperation with the Executive Committee to nominate members to the various commissions, to submit problems to them for study, and to see that their reports are presented to him in due time.

- g. To receive reports from the Province Directors of Education on the educational institutions of their provinces.
- h. To see that all recommendations of the Executive Committee approved by the Board of Governors are duly observed by the members of the Association.

4. School Visitations:

- a. In order to secure that broad view of Jesuit educational activity in the United States necessary to his position, and in order to fulfill more effectively the duties of his office, the Executive Director shall, from time to time, visit the Jesuit educational institutions in the United States.
- b. Before making such visits, the Executive Director shall secure the approval of the Provincial Superior concerned and, on completion of his visit, present to the Provincial Superior his findings and recommendations.

5. The functions of the Executive Committee shall be:

- a. To administer actively the affairs of the entire Association.
- b. To inaugurate the study of educational problems and to promote their effective solution through the various commissions and other instrumentalities of the Association.
- c. To pass on all recommendations made by the National Body.
- d. To draw up programs for the national meetings.
- e. To nominate members of the permanent commissions and of special committees, according to need.

B. *Regional.*

The functions of the Standing Committees of the Regional Groups, consisting of the Province Directors of Education, shall be to administer all affairs pertaining to the meetings of the Regional Groups.

C. *Provincial.*

1. The functions of the Province Director of Secondary Education and of the Province Director of Higher Education shall be to supervise all matters pertaining to the educational work in the province.

2. It shall be the duty of the Province Directors of Education to visit all the educational institutions in the province, and to report on them:

- a. To the Very Reverend Father General.
- b. To the Provincial.
- c. To the local Rector.
- d. To the Dean or Principal.
- e. To the Executive Director of the Association.

ARTICLE VII—COMMISSIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. The following permanent commissions shall be created by the Board of Governors:

- a. Commission on Secondary Schools.
- b. Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges.
- c. Commission on Professional Schools.
- d. Commission on Seminaries.
- e. Commission on Graduate Schools.

2. Members of these permanent commissions shall, except as provided in paragraph 3, be nominated by the Executive Director in conjunction with the Executive Committee. Appointment to the commissions shall be made in each instance by the Provincial Superior of the nominee.

3. The Commission on Seminaries shall consist of the deans of the Jesuit philosophates of the United States.

4. The functions of these permanent commissions shall be to study specific problems in their respective areas. The chairmen of the commissions shall present the results of their findings to the Executive Director of the Association a month before the spring meeting of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall determine whether it be advisable for the chairmen of the respective commissions to make reports at the annual meeting of the Association.

5. The personnel of these various commissions shall be announced at the annual meeting of the Association.

6. Members of the commissions shall be eligible for reappointment.

7. The chairmen of the permanent commissions may, after consultation with the Executive Director, and with due approval of the individual Provincial Superiors concerned, appoint special committees to assist them in the study of problems within their area. These special committees shall make their reports to the chairmen of the permanent commissions.

ARTICLE VIII—MEETINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION

A. *Meetings.*

1. National Meetings.

- a. The Board of Governors shall meet once a year. At this meeting the Executive Director shall, as provided in Article VI, A, 3, c, present for approval his recommendations, those of the Executive Committee, and the resolutions of the National Body.
- b. The Executive Committee shall meet twice a year. One of these meetings shall immediately precede the national meeting of the Association.

- c. The Association shall convene once a year in a general session of both departments during the week that the National Catholic Educational Association holds its annual convention.
- d. The Department of Higher Education and the Department of Secondary Education shall convene separately during the same week.
- e. The permanent commissions shall meet:
 - (i) Once annually at a time immediately preceding the general meeting of the Association.
 - (ii) At such other times as the chairmen of the commissions may think necessary and the Board of Governors approve.

2. Regional Meetings.

- a. The Regional Groups shall meet at least once annually, at a time and place approved by the members of the Board of Governors concerned.

3. Provincial Meetings.

- a. With the approval of the Provincial Superior, these meetings shall be called at least annually by the respective Province Directors of Education.

4. Special Meetings.

- a. With the approval of the Board of Governors, the Executive Director and the Executive Committee may call meetings of representatives of special groups, v. g., instructors in philosophy, instructors in classics, etc., at such time and place as seem best suited for this purpose.
- b. The meetings of the associations of Jesuit philosophers, scientists, historians, and representative groups in other fields, shall convene at the time and place of the convention of the national associations to which they belong. At each of these meetings a chairman and secretary shall be elected.

B. *Minutes of Meetings.*

1. A secretary *pro tempore* shall be appointed to record the minutes of all meetings, national, regional, and provincial.

2. The minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee shall be sent to the Executive Director, to each member of the Executive Committee, to each member of the Board of Governors, and to the Very Reverend Father General.

3. The proceedings of the national meetings of the Association shall be published in the JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY.

4. The minutes of the regional and provincial meetings shall be sent:
 - a. To the Very Reverend Father General.
 - b. To the Provincial Superior of the Provinces concerned.
 - c. To the Executive Director of the Association.
 - d. To all members of the Executive Committee.
 - e. To all rectors, deans, and principals of the province or provinces represented.
5. The minutes of all special meetings referred to under Article VIII, A, 4, shall be submitted to the Executive Director of the Association by the secretary *pro tempore*.

C. Voting Procedure.

1. In the Executive Committee each member shall have one vote.
2. At national, regional, and provincial meetings of the Association each unit of an institution shall have one vote to be cast by the official representative of the unit of the institution. In addition, each member of the Executive Committee shall individually have one vote.
3. In case a member of the Executive Committee holds the directorship of both higher and secondary education, he shall be entitled to two votes in any meeting.
4. In case of a tie vote at any meeting, the Executive Director of the Association shall cast an additional vote.
5. At special meetings, as referred to under Article VIII, A, 4, each individual of the group present shall be entitled to one vote.

ARTICLE IX—ORGAN OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. There shall be an official bulletin of the Association to be known as JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY.
2. The editorial staff of this QUARTERLY shall consist of an Editor, a Managing Editor, and an Editorial Advisory Board.
3. The Executive Director of the Association shall be the Editor of the JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY. The members of the Executive Committee shall constitute the Editorial Advisory Board.
4. The Managing Editor of the QUARTERLY and the Associate Editors shall be nominated by the Executive Committee. Appointment in each instance shall be made by the Provincial Superior of the nominee.

ARTICLE X—AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Proposed amendments to this constitution shall be submitted by the Executive Committee to the Board of Governors. Such proposed amendments shall not become part of the constitution until after approval by the Board of Governors.

Jesuit Deans' Institute

Denver—1948

Seventy-eight Jesuit college administrators and "official observers" attended this Institute from Tuesday, August 3, 1948, to Friday, August 13, at Regis College, Denver, Colorado. In their memories will be mingled the view of the Rocky Mountains, brooding to the West, permanent and snow-capped, symbolic, it may be, of the solidity and cool-headed quality of the proceedings, the pervasive hospitality of Regis College, in spirit and actuality, the intensive and satisfying daily sessions, and the universal satisfaction with a work well-planned and executed.

This report will strive to relate to the wider audience of the Assistancy what took place at Denver and give details for the foundation of the enthusiasm felt by those who attended the Institute. The sessions of this summer deal with the manifold problems of the expanding dimensions of college work, of whose detailed purpose and workings, secular education is as uncertain as Catholic colleges.

"United purpose and concerted action" would stand well as a sub-title to this report. That impressive phrase and rallying-cry was first used by Father General Ledochowski, in his letter of December 8, 1930, constituting a Commission to study American Jesuit education. The context of the quotation is well worth repeating:

"Our first need therefore in regard to Higher Education in the United States seems to be *united purpose and concerted action*. For though we admit that there are and ever will be in so vast a country many variations and dissimilarities, yet no one will deny that in our handling of educational questions there are certain points of agreement upon which we can unite, certain principles that represent the teaching methods of the Society and from which we cannot afford to depart. Our Ratio Studiorum has not ceased to be a safe guide in many things, in spite of the revolutionary systems of modern education. We must consequently find a way of working together, of pooling our interests, as it were, of eliminating all petty rivalries, if such there are. Instead we must offer one another helpful cooperation, supplying and supplementing one another's needs and deficiencies; we must have, and people must know that we have, a fixed common program upon which we present a united front, and that certain things they are looking for can always be found with us, no matter in what province or in what section of the country our colleges and universities are situated."

THE PROGRAM

Within the limits of this report it will be difficult to convey, with any adequacy, the multiple details of the Institute. It comprised sixteen sessions, thirty-two hours of formal discussion, in addition to several evening sessions on topics of more specialized interest, such as nursing education and adult education, and continuous special committee meetings. The program gives evidence of these abundant details. The general subject of Admission of Students covers the perennial problems met by deans; selective admissions, entrance by examination or by tests, and transfer students. The second general topic, Qualitative Standards Within the College, covered the grading systems and grade studies, elimination of students for poor scholarship, qualitative requirements, and norms for conferring of honors. Supervision of instruction was, perhaps, the most pertinent division of the topic, Problems of Instruction. The latter topic included a discussion of text-books and syllabi, sectioning of students on basis of ability, testing programs, majors and concentrations, and comprehensive examinations. The fourth day of the Institute was given to the consideration of, first, administrative organization of the college, the functions of the dean and the registrar, the divisional and departmental organization of the faculty, and, secondly, the curriculum of the first two years of the college, modern languages, English, religion, and social studies. On the following day, various aspects of faculty problems were on the agenda. From the general subjects, rank and tenure, contracts, salary scales, retirement, faculty handbook of instructions, to details such as "who pays expenses to conventions?"! Student Personnel Service proved to be a topic of wide ramifications. Various programs of freshman induction, of counselling, of student activities, indicate the wide field of discussion. The Religious Life of the College was the topic of the final day; students Mass, retreats, moral and religious courses for non-Catholics, spiritual counselling. On the last evening, after committee reports, a summary of the discussions was masterfully presented by the Director, Father Mallon, who ended his summary with an impressive, immediate program for fulfilling in their respective institutions by the deans, the plans and, one might say, the vision glimpsed in these days of fraternal and professional discussion.

Two interesting and profitable additions to the sessions were provided by two visiting lecturers, Russell M. Cooper, Dean of the Arts College of the University of Minnesota, and Earl J. McGrath, Dean of the College, University of Iowa. Dr. Cooper discussed the "Marks of a Superior College." His paper appears in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*, and readers may appreciate for themselves the sound views and the results of his wide experience presented therein. Dr. Cooper, whose teach-

ing field was political science, was "drafted" into educational work, and had examined over 60 colleges for the North Central Association. Two of his recommendations will be mentioned later, namely, Educational Research Bureau, and Pre-College Institute, a forum for faculty members before the opening of the college.

Dean McGrath spoke on "The Objectives and Procedures in General Education." As editor of the quarterly "General Education," now in its third year of publication, he is the outstanding exponent of the movement in the country called "General Education." This term, he stated, is synonymous with liberal education, but it was adopted because its proponents claim that the so-called liberal arts colleges have become, for the most part, pre-professional schools and have lost the objective of liberal education. Dean McGrath claimed that the purpose of General Education was the "intellectual and spiritual development of the student." Therefore, the student would be acquainted with all the sciences and humanities, not many facts about many subjects; but by means of limited and representative subject matter, to go from subject matter to principle, and thus experience the discipline of careful, analytical study. He lamented the lack of religion and philosophy in college education, as students need one or the other as an anchor for their lives. In one case, his paper was an explicit encomium of Jesuit education. It was evident to his audience, however, that his strong, sincere praise was from the outside looking in! Lengthy discussions followed the papers of the lecturers, and both expressed in private their appreciation of the audience and its keen and pointed questioning. It may be interesting to note that a third lecturer was unable to attend as he was engaged at the time in the Hawaiian Islands. He proposed, however, that if the sessions were held over for one day, he would come by plane from Honolulu and so be able to attend.

THE PLAN

In giving this description of the Program, we have anticipated the chronological order and must return for a few words on the planning of the Institute. The proposal to provide an institute for college deans originated at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the JEA in the Spring of 1946. The Board of Governors approved the recommendation and, the Very Rev. Joseph P. Zuercher, S.J., Provincial of the Missouri Province, assigned Father Wilfred M. Mallon, S.J., to direct the Institute. In October, 1947, the Executive Committee discussed and approved the preliminary plans. The next step was noteworthy. In place of submitting what might be a theoretical set of problems, the method adopted insured

that the questions should first come from those immediately concerned in college administration. Blanks were prepared on which to submit problems and questions for discussion and sent to all prospective participants. The hundreds of questions and problems submitted were then tabulated, organized in units, and on this basis a very detailed questionnaire was prepared. The questionnaire was sent to each of the twenty-seven Jesuit liberal arts colleges and to each of the fourteen autonomous schools of business administration. All institutions returned the completed questionnaire together with quantities of blanks, forms, reports, studies, syllabi, and all other materials in use in the various colleges which might be of interest or use to the assembly of deans. The facts reported in the returned questionnaire were tabulated, and a volume of 134 pages *Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Schools of Business Administration*, which included all the policies, practices, and opinions reported by the deans. This was done to assure that without loss of time all participants in the Institute would have comparatively complete knowledge, prior to the discussions on the Present Policies and Practices of Jesuit Undergraduate Education. This bare account does little justice to this volume prepared by Father Mallon. It is a document of permanent value, giving in tabulated form what amounts to a vivid picture of our colleges at this period of their development, of actual value to administrators, and which should provide matter for history and research for future students. Under the familiar headings, Admission Policies and Practices, Curriculum, Instruction, Qualitative Standards, Degrees, Student Personnel, Faculty, are not only reported the answers to the questionnaire but these responses are tabulated by totals and percentages that make an easy grasp of the contents. Comments and opinion on the various topics are also listed. Forty-five pages of Appendices contain (1) an excellent up-to-date bibliography of 212 volumes on Higher Education (11 pages), (2) an annotated list of Educational and Learned Societies (13 pages), (3) Academic Practices in Seventy-seven Selected Non-Jesuit Colleges (10 pages), and (4) The Criteria of the Association of American Universities and Phi Beta Kappa Society.

The program of the Institute, therefore, was drawn up to conform to the suggestions of the deans with reference to the most pressing problems and significant questions. The Director of the Institute requested seventeen of the prospective participants to assume responsibility for presenting policies and facts and making recommendations, covering approximately half of the items on the agenda, as well as for leading discussion on the items they introduced. The remaining items were similarly presented for discussion by the Director. The procedure of the Institute was that of *large group* discussions. Prepared discussion leaders,

for the most part, presented the problems, the policies and practices of Jesuit institutions drawn from the volume, *Academic Policies and Practices*, the practices in other institutions, local practices in their own institutions, and then made recommendations or resolutions of the problems raised. Group discussion and exchange of experience and opinion followed as each item of the program was presented.

The Institute adhered to its essential policy that it was in no sense a legislative body. At various stages in the discussion, formal expression of opinion was called for on questions and problems, but it was clearly understood by members of the Institute that such expression was corporate opinion and not authority for revision of practices. The same principles will apply to the volume now in process of preparation, the *Proceedings* of the Institute. We may recall here that the Institute included all deans and assistant deans of the liberal arts colleges, all regents or Jesuit deans of schools of business administration, members of the Executive Committee and several "official observers."

With all the plans well formulated, nothing now remained but to await the arrival of the participants by train, plane, and auto, in the bracing air of "the mile-high city," the "beginning of the West."

FULFILLMENT

At the hazard of emphasizing the obvious, we must repeat again that it is difficult to give an adequate account of the many subjects discussed at the sixteen sessions. A representative sampling may be attempted. In reference to the student body, the question of admissions is perhaps dominant. How should a college select its student body, and what are the best means? The various methods were well presented and discussed. But in the background is the question peculiar, perhaps, to Catholic and to Jesuit colleges. How selective will your policy be when the alternative for the student will be the secular or state institution with its accompanying dangers? The following excerpts from the discussion of this problem may indicate some of its complexities:

When candidates give indication of doing a low-quality college course or of doing it with a bare chance of passing success, what shall be the policy of the Catholic college? Increasing criticism comes from members of the hierarchy, from priests, and from Catholic parents, and is based on the proposition that every Catholic youth should and must get his college education in a Catholic college. These questions follow: How is that possible if the Catholic college will not admit him? Are Catholic colleges becoming snobbish now that there is a flood of college students whereas they insisted on the validity

of the proposition when times were not so good? Circumstances surrounding the individual case differ. In some instances members of the clergy have little concept of academic standards, yet they would be the first to ridicule and complain if the local Catholic college were of low quality and reputation. An historical incident is the following: one Catholic college, many years ago, when it was weak and had a poor reputation offered one scholarship to one boy from each parish in a fair-sized city. There were many parishes but only two boys used the scholarships. The explanation given by several pastors was that they could not recommend that college to boys who had great professional possibilities.

In some instances the parents are thinking with their hearts in place of their heads. They follow the normal weakness of accusation to defend a son or daughter lacking in ability.

In some instances, it is true that a state university will accept a student, or, it is so asserted. We, it is claimed, by refusing him admission, force him to go there to the danger of his salvation. In some of these instances the state university is forced by law to do so; or forced by public pressure to exercise such an admission policy, but knows that the student will be weeded out; or has enough watered-down programs to let such a student puddle along, and by reason of its position it does not lose reputation by having such programs.

In the circumstances given, deans would be forced to three possible, ironical, solutions: (1) admit practically all Catholic applicants; keep with herculean efforts a high standard which eliminates them; then postpone the argument when it is time drop them; (2) admit such students, but have programs designed to occupy their time without allowing them to get under the feet of competent students. This would involve discretion to determine assignment to this program and consequent action; (3) admit such students in numbers; put them in ordinary classes; try to keep them so that they will be in a Catholic college and so that criticism will be eased; and lower the quality of the college, so that competent students would not come to it because of risks to their careers.

In this matter, a solution was seriously offered for Jesuit colleges, that they adopt some form of "honor and pass" students, giving a top education to the former and preventing the latter from endangering their faith in a secular school.

The simple and time-worn matter of grading students may become complicated when the question is asked, What is meant by a C grade, or define adequately an A grade? Study of grading is a common academic procedure, but when instituted, its conclusions can be a source of panic to routine teachers. The following was offered by one member in the discussion:

My recommendations would be (1) letter grades in four passing categories; (2) descriptive statements to clarify the meaning of the grades and no use of numerals in such descriptions; (3) making clear by description that C is the grade for average work and that everything above it is a mark of distinction, with A being reserved to designate the highest possible product of the Jesuit college—and it can't be that when 25 per cent of the students get it.

With our increased student enrollment and consequent increase of sections in the same course, the question was asked on the policy of requiring all teachers of sections of the same course to use the same text-books. Eight of the 27 colleges replied that they had no such policy. The following comments were made on this fact and are reported here to indicate that much thought may be behind a simple administrative requirement.

It is probable that institutions may be convinced of compelling reasons for this policy. I should think such reasons might be as follows: (1) To allow the greatest liberty to the individual teacher to use the text which suits his method and objectives best. (2) To avoid what may be considered excessive influence on teachers and excessive domination of their work. (3) To provide for a variety of approaches to a subject so that there will be wholesome differences, as well as opportunities for students to capitalize most on teacher originality. (4) To keep peace in the face of teachers who have traditionally been as autonomous as Erasmus or who have violent textbook allergies, particularly if someone else recommends a text. (5) Simply not having had the time to consider policies or to see to the administration of a common-text system.

The advantages I see in the common textbook for all sections of a subject, with a rare exception for unusual circumstances, are these: (1) Every course in a college should hew straight toward the total purposes of the college, and the textbook used is of real importance to achievement of purposes. How a college can assure itself that its objective in Sophomore English is being achieved if one teacher uses a textbook based clearly on a historical approach, and another on appreciational approach, I can't see. The same is true of Modern Language texts which use the direct method and have conversation aims as compared with the text based on the traditional grammar approach. The same is true of science texts, some with a distinctly liberal-arts conception of purposes, other with a clear professional approach. (2) All credit given in a particular subject, regardless of section, is the same on record; but there are texts in the same college subjects which clearly contribute to maximum demands on students, and there are texts far less demanding. This is true of all fields with which I am familiar,

of language texts, science texts, and especially true of history and social studies texts, and of philosophy texts. It appears to me that unless a college uses the same textbook in all sections of a course, it can have no assurance that even nearly equal demands are made, unless it goes to the extraordinary labor of profound analysis of texts in a subject. (3) Each course in college, particularly at the lower division level and in continuation fields as English, foreign languages, mathematics, and in philosophy, is a stepping stone to something higher. It is difficult to see how there can be clearcut progress toward clearcut objectives unless teachers of each succeeding course can assume that the same definite procedures and content have been mastered by all who come up to the next course. Years ago, I had definite experience of this in Philosophy. Experiment proved that it was just as easy for a student with no preceding Philosophy course to pass one which required four prerequisite courses as it was for a student who had the four prerequisite courses; and that was because each teacher of philosophy was using the textbook of his own choice and making demands according to his likes. By the time they came to the fifth course in the sequence, teachers could presuppose very little. Their job was that of trying to make out an examination fair to all people who have used different texts. (4) There is one further reason. Sameness of texts in all sections, we may hope, conduces toward unity of effort and purposes among teachers. They have common ground. Independence of teachers in the matter of textbooks, I think, conduces to an unwholesome psychology of teacher autonomy over against a more desirable member-of-a-team frame of mind.

It may be noted that the wider question of the need of Jesuit textbooks to meet Jesuit aims was not mentioned as the need is universally felt and would require full-time discussion.

The conclusions of a discussion on syllabi for college courses may be of interest:

They require faculty members and administrators to think about the express objectives of a course.

They assure common procedure toward objectives on the part of all teachers of that course.

They assure common and equal demands in all sections of a course.

They make it possible for a Department to have a complete picture of its contribution to the college objectives, and for a college administrator to know, rather than take for granted, the content and procedures of courses for which he is responsible. When syllabi are given to students, they provide for definiteness of content and work so that they know where they are going; and they place on the student the responsibility for

meeting the demands of the syllabus without constant reminders and prodding; and they protect against much loss of time when the teacher must repeat the details for successful completion of a course.

As the Institute was, in one sense, a "workshop" for deans, all the discussions pertained to their office. In discussing the Administrative Organization of the College, special consideration was given to the functions of the dean. The reasons for this emphasis were stated as follows:

A major problem of the Jesuit college, whether autonomous or a part of a university organization, is the lack of clarity of the functions of the dean. In the growing complexity of administration, this problem is increased by the degree to which essential functions become independent of the dean and, similarly, by the degree to which non-essential functions remain his personal job, thus preventing him from carrying out functions which cannot be delegated.

Thus, there is a tendency for departmental administration, for library administration, for personnel administration, to drift away into autonomous units; whereas the clerical and house-keeping routine, which no one else wants to assume, remain too largely in the dean's office. This, of course, is often the fault of deans who hold the details and routine work, office management, and janitorial service, and are then far too overwhelmed to give the study, attention, and leadership essential to the office.

We know that in the Society, the office of *Prefectus Studiorum* is provided for in the *Ratio* and more recently in the *Instructio*. So the method chosen of presenting the functions of the dean was to describe his office as accepted in the American system of college education, and allow the observer to draw qualified conclusions therefrom. We shall give two excerpts from this lengthy description, presented at the Institute, of the dean's place in American education which may enlist the reader's amazement and consequent sympathy.

"Essentially, the dean is a delegate of the President in the administration of the educational program of the college, as the Business Manager is his delegate in financial administration. These two were the only delegates until complexity and size demanded further distribution. The single business manager could no longer deal directly with all the problems of his office. There gradually evolved such offices as Purser, Purchasing Agent, Accountant, Budget Director. Reason dictated that all

these be inter-related and subject to the one delegate of the President, the Business Manager. Each of these is a delegate of the Business Manager, not of the President.

"In the areas of educational administration, complexity and size also demanded subdelegation of functions, such as the evaluation and recording functions, the administration of teachers and curriculum and direction of the personnel service, to cope with enormously increased student problems. All of these are essential parts of the educational program; yet in this area of delegation there has been a tendency to set up autonomous offices directly responsible to the President. Theoretically, at least, whatever is done by persons exercising the functions of registrar, examiner, recorder, Dean of Men or Personnel Director, by department or divisional head or by the librarian, is done as a delegated function of the officer charged with educational administration; and it is unsound administration to give such offices autonomy. It is true that the more complex the institution and the more exhausting the total functions of the Dean are, the more autonomy will necessarily be delegated; yet the larger voice in major policies must always remain the prerogative of the Dean. There are two basic principles of administration, namely, (1) that all functions contributing to a single objective must be interrelated and coordinated, and (2) that functions related to a single objective cannot be autonomously delegated away from the coordinator responsible for its achievement."

The second excerpt lists the *Functions of the Office of the Dean*, with the emphasis that all these functions are attached to his office though not necessarily performed by him *personally*, and can be delegated to other executives or clerks. The functions are listed under Faculty, Curriculum, and Student Administration:

"The Functions of the Office of the Dean are the same regardless of type and size of institution. The difference between large and small will be in the amount of delegation and the degree of autonomy given to delegates. Two facts should be kept in mind in considering this problem, namely, (1) the functions attached to the Office of the Dean need not be performed personally by the Dean; (2) subdelegates will normally perform the duties allocated to them with responsibility, initiative, and energy in proportion to the degree of authority and autonomy granted to them.

"*Faculty Administration:* (a) Responsibility for faculty quality through employment, retention, evaluation, and advancement. (b) Supervision of instruction, directly and through delegates, since ultimately responsibility for its quality rests with the Dean. (c) Study and evaluation of quality of instruction. (d) Initiation of programs of instructional im-

provement, rather than becoming solely an "approver." (e) Leadership and organization of programs of faculty improvement; keeping faculty abreast of trends. (f) Creation of service conditions most conducive to quality of faculty contribution and instruction, for example, relief from routine, equipment, library facilities, leaves of absence. (g) Harmonizing conflicting demands and overlapping of functions, and promotion of evenness of quality throughout the institution. (h) Organizing and directing schedule making and teacher assignments directly or through delegates. (i) Coordination and ultimate control of budget of all departments and divisions.

"*Curriculum Administration*: (a) Continuing study of curriculum in relation to objectives. (b) Initiating programs of curriculum improvement in areas of general and advanced education, in provision for different ability levels. (c) Stimulating departmental studies of curriculum but retaining authority for approval of departmental regulations. (d) Planning and coordinating catalogs and schedules. (e) Coordinating departmental service in curriculum overlapping.

"*Student Administration*: Academic Affairs: (a) Voice in determination of admission policies and in their application to individuals. (b) Classification of students. (c) Approval of student programs and assignment to classes. (d) Granting exceptions for changes of course, etc. (e) Managing attendance regulations. (f) Educational counselling of students. (g) Cooperation in off-campus influences on student life. (h) Administering program and graduation requirements. (i) Research on student academic life, admissions, grading, student loads, measurement, alumni success. Activities and Welfare Affairs: (a) Personal acquaintance through measures, ratings, interviews. (b) Initiative and voice in personnel service, that is, personal counselling, vocational counselling, health, educational problems, finances, off-campus life, placement and follow-up. (c) Initiative and voice in program of extracurricular activities; in diagnostic and remedial procedures; in religious development of students; and in disciplinary administration. "All of the above are functions belonging to the Dean's Office. The amount of delegation will depend on the position of the dean in the institution and the size and type of institution; but all are related to the total responsibility, namely, the total development of the student, and none can be divorced from him.

"There are some areas which permit of delegation with relative autonomy given to the delegate; there are others which permit of delegation of action but not of policy; and there are others which can no more be delegated than can the physician delegate the interview with the patient. The one thing that cannot be delegated is *responsibility for educational leadership*, and with consequent activity in the direction of faculty quality and improvement, instructional improvement, curriculum im-

provement, and student learning. All other things can be delegated in some fashion, but these can only be delegated in the sense of stimulating initiative and securing cooperation.

"Therefore, the problem of college administration is one of determining what to delegate and to whom, so that the responsible administrator may have time to study and do those things which cannot be delegated and on which depends the quality of the institution."

Another important discussion which occasioned much interest was that of Student Personnel Service and the various forms of testing and guidance included within its scope. This is a somewhat delicate subject. No words were minced in describing the attitude of the majority of faculty members. The danger is that too often the meaning of personnel service is limited to guidance of abnormal cases and the whole program is considered a "crack-pot" enterprise at best. It will take time for balanced evaluation and acceptance of this work in the college field. All the good ideas when actualized will result in expert guidance of the students in academic, vocational, and personal direction, and will save for many the tragic waste resulting from lack of direction in these fields. Jesuit education has always stressed "personal contact and interest in the student." This worthy aim will, by means of this service, be systematized and assured for all, and removed from the personal or subjective uncertainties. Only three of the twenty-seven colleges reported satisfaction with their personnel service and two of the three qualified their answers. The situation points to the wisdom of the plans for the special Institute on Guidance now in preparation by the Jesuit Educational Association, and to be conducted in the summer of 1949 at Fordham University, and open to members of the Assistancy.

As the fourteen separately-administered Schools of Business Administration were represented at the Institute, a special session was devoted to their particular interests. As these schools have attained a prominent place in Jesuit Education, it may be well to report their objectives as presented at the session. The general objectives of collegiate education for business are the same as those of liberal or general education, and from 40-50 per cent of the undergraduate business curriculum is taken in liberal or cultural subjects. The proximate or specific objective is the training for competence in business management. This objective was clarified in the following manner:

"It is not the purpose of collegiate education for business to train a student for a job. That is the task of the vocational school or the business college or on-the-job training program. The purpose is rather to train him for a career, that is, to enable

him to rise above any particular job into a position of responsibility and trust. This does not mean that a business administration graduate can expect to step into a managerial position immediately after graduation. He will generally have to start from the proverbial "bottom of the ladder" until he acquires the experience that must supplement academic training. But one who has had this training will learn more rapidly from experience than one who has not.

"This distinction is not always understood (1) by students, who chafe at having to take courses outside the field of their specific interests; (2) by counsellors, who recommend business administration to high school students or graduates merely because they show an interest in bookkeeping or salesmanship; and (3) by college administrators, who look with disdain on a college of business administration as a technical or trade school."

REFLECTIONS

In this section we shall attempt some reflections on the proceedings of the Institute, endeavoring to point out some of the impressive ideas that were discussed or what can be inferred from the many facts presented. Such reflections would differ with the participants so the following are offered with the defense of subjective viewpoints.

"Clarity of Objectives" was a phrase that filtered through much discussion of plans and problems. It seems that this great virtue of prudence, adopting means to ends, must be constantly exercised in educational work. No matter how tiresome the repetition of the word "objectives" may become, it is necessary to insist on it in the widespread organization of the Society's work in education. The frequent retort that we have been four hundred years in education is not a substitute for careful revision and application of both general and specific purposes. There is the recurring danger that we take for granted that we know what we are doing, but this complacency is quickly shattered when we attempt to formulate not only the aims of undergraduate instruction but the aim of any particular subject. It goes without saying that this conscious sense of direction will improve the teaching or tend to revision of methods in a teacher's work.

In the volume, *Academic Policies and Practices*, are four pages of statistics on the proportions of Jesuits and laymen teaching in twenty-three undergraduate colleges and tabulated according to numbers of hours and percentages taught by each. Seven of the more common subjects were chosen for the review: English, history, mathematics, modern languages, philosophy, economics, psychology. In English, for example, Jesuits teach 655 hours or 24 per cent; laymen teach 1813 hours or

67 per cent. In history, the percentages are: Jesuits 32 per cent, laymen 66 per cent. In mathematics, Jesuits 24 per cent, laymen 67 per cent. In philosophy, Jesuits 74 per cent, laymen 20 per cent, secular priests 1 per cent and laywomen 5 per cent. The percentages in the other subjects listed are completed by the teaching hours of secular priests, Brothers, and laywomen. The conclusion is that in these basic subjects, Jesuits teach 35 per cent and laymen 65 per cent. The sciences were omitted in the tabulation; if included they would decidedly lower the percentage of Jesuit teaching.

What reflections may occur to the reader? Are these figures startling to the uninformed, appalling to others, or merely interesting to the initiated? To put it another way: in Jesuit colleges, to what extent does an individual student come in contact with Jesuit instruction in the classroom? Are our lay teachers sufficiently acquainted with the basic aims and methods of traditional Jesuit teaching? Are any efforts made so to instruct them? Is this imbalance of lay teachers merely the result of the post-war influx? All indications seem to point to the contrary, and, as a forecast of the future growth in student enrollment and consequent increase in lay faculty, it may be interesting to recall a statement read at the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association in Saint Louis, 1946, by Father A. H. Poetker, S.J.:

"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 days 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."

(*Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. IX, No. 1, June, 1946, p. 13)

One approach to the problem of informing or refreshing the faculty in the policies and vision of the school, is a means that is finding favor in many colleges. It is called a Pre-College Institute. The faculty assembles for a few days before the opening of school and by means of discussions, reviews the aims of the educational work of the college and the place of individual subjects in relation to the total over-aim.

The committee on resolutions offered two pertinent proposals. We wish to discuss one of them. The idea was made explicit on the second day of the Institute in the paper of Dean Cooper. He described the usual manner of finding the solution to an academic problem. A committee of the faculty is appointed. Generally, after lengthy discussion, a member proposes a solution and it is generally accepted by the weary members of the committee and the problem is considered settled. In so doing little or no effort has been made to collect pertinent data, to find what solutions have been attempted in other schools, nor sufficient time expended to know the problem fully, or no method is employed to evaluate or check on the solution after a period of one or two years. In other words, none of the apparatus of solid study or research has been used and the subjective opinion of a few faculty members has been the norm. Dr. Cooper noted that all advance in medicine, in engineering, in industry, has been accomplished by research. This has not been so in the equally important subject of education. If any definite impression of a need was clear in the discussions of the Institute it was the necessity of having a central source of solid information, derived from wide knowledge and research, to which Jesuit schools may refer for information the ever recurring problems arising from a national or local source. Therefore, the resolution referred to, suggested that thought be given to an increase of trained personnel in the Central Office of the JEA in order that educational research may be carried on as an aid in making current approved educational practices more effective on an Assistancy basis. This may appear difficult of achievement at present or in the immediate future, but in human affairs when an idea or proposal is presented and accepted it tends to realize itself in action. Or, as one delegate remarked, "the realization dawned on me for the first time of the tremendous importance and possibilities of the JEA Central Office."

The final reflection is the following: all legitimate satisfaction arising from the breadth of view in the problems discussed, the grasp of them by administrators present at the meeting, the indication of the vigorous desire of progress, and the solid good accomplished, may be somewhat realistically checked by the following facts. The Association of American Universities is accepted as the highest national and international accrediting association. The national academic Honor Societies of highest repute

are the Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi. Of the twenty-seven Jesuit colleges, no Jesuit institution is a member of The Association of American Universities and only seven are on the approved list of institutions. No Jesuit college has a chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa, and, in the science honor society, Sigma XI, one Jesuit institution has a chapter, and two have preliminary "clubs."

In estimating the reputation and quality of a school, American educators attach paramount importance to approval or membership in the three associations mentioned above. Meeting their standards and criteria would not interfere with a single aim of Jesuit education. Membership in the two national Honor Societies is considered a measure of the stimulation of the students to scholarship, with the subsequent proof that students wish to continue advanced work in their fields. Such membership would help our students in their competition with the products of other American colleges. Have they not a right to this help?

With the mention of these cold facts, we end our reflections.

SUMMARY

One member of this Committee on Reports summarized the benefits accruing from the Institute. His list of benefits includes not only the immediate results but the future possibilities that were revealed in this cooperative effort. They may appear somewhat elevated to those who did not experience the stimulation provided by the sessions but they will, at least, be an impressive ending to this account of the Institute.

Benefits Derived from the Institute:

The general opinion is that the Institute has been of inestimable value in the benefits the participants have derived from it, both personally and as representatives of their respective institutions. Likewise, the unity, organization, initiative, and perspective of the entire system of Jesuit colleges have been enhanced immeasurably.

The recently appointed deans, in particular, found in the Institute a school of comprehensive and realistic instruction in all phases of their office. This immediate contact with the seasoned and well-advised judgments of so many college administrators is more profitable than many years' experience in an isolated office. Those who have already had many years of experience as deans felt the broadening influence derived from an exchange of experimental knowledge. They had ample opportunity to correct, deepen, and stabilize their own understanding of the principles and practices of their office.

On a broader plane, such instruction derived from careful discussion could not fail to have a deep influence on general policy in American

Jesuit colleges. No other single influence, in recent years, will have been more effective than this Institute in shaping and strengthening educational policies in Jesuit education.

This influence on policy derives from several elements. First, the live discussion on the broad basis of college organization, of natural and valid regional differences affecting such organization, has been, frankly, a revelation to some deans, and, both provocative and stimulating to all. Secondly, because they were unable to achieve uniformity in all things, even if it were desirable, the deans were compelled to search more deeply and to realize more vividly the principles of unity. In particular, each was led to examine carefully local practice and to distinguish clearly principles of policy from mere pragmatic practice and local custom. Thirdly, the widely divergent practices sometimes led to a lively discussion of the fundamental principles of the apostolic mission of our education. On the other hand, the objective and professional treatment of problems advanced very noticeably the appreciation of the need of university and college organization and the use of clear statutes. Finally, this service to policy was a grave desideratum in American Jesuit colleges. In accomplishing it, so appreciably and opportunely, the Institute amply justified its existence and performance.

Perhaps the most important result, though the least tangible, at present, is the elevation of morale of Jesuit administrators. The individual dean has often been beset by anxiety and worry lest he act on too narrow premises or from an isolated position. The Institute has furnished the reassurance of national and sound practice. Relieved of such anxieties, a dean, like any captain of an essentially offensive organization, when assured of the security of his base of operations and the wide flanks of his organization, can devote his undivided attention to plotting and executing a further advance.

The discussions which clarified the office of the dean as the educational leader of his institution, have enabled him to lift his vision not only above personal perplexities but even beyond his institution toward the influence which it should exercise on the community at large.

Moreover, no one could have attended the Institute without having conceived a lofty estimation of the intellectual capacity and educational leadership manifested by its members. It would be a pity, if we, through false diffidence or mere familiarity, failed to recognize our potentiality as one of the strongest educational influences in American life. It is a pity that this potentiality has been so little realized and, comparatively, so ineffectual on the American scene, for reasons which are difficult to define. If the Institute shall have inspired with sufficient confidence and stimulated one or more of these deans to speak out, to write in permanent

fashion, or to assume the active leadership in educational work in his community or State, it will have done an extraordinary service to American education itself.

With all due reserve, the attitude of the visiting lecturers, and the expressed opinions of one of them may be taken as valid indications of the respect and deference which render organizations of which they are leading members susceptible of our influence.

Assured of their own sound position on a national plane, deans can now more effectively in educational organizations and meetings work positively toward exercising influence on them.

The Institute has been an almost perfect example of how these same results can be achieved within each institution. For example: (a) the research and preparation of factual data; (b) the analysis and detailed understanding of it by the chairman of the meeting or convention; (c) the preparation of printed and permanent data to serve for further consideration and study; (d) the rapid and efficient manner of holding a meeting and discussing matters with the elimination of superfluous or futile discussions; (e) the ordering of matter and strict adherence to agenda of each meeting with prompt convocation and dismissal; (f) above all, the sound realism of being satisfied with limited objectives, general recommendations, or even an expression of reasoned difference of opinion, without requiring vain perfectionism and absolute uniformity.

Finally, in my opinion, the Executive Committee in inaugurating, the Board of Governors in authorizing, and Father Mallon in preparing, organizing, and actually presiding over the Institute, have done more for Jesuit college education than has been done in our experience.

(Signed) *Committee on Reports.*

Edward B. Bunn, S.J.

W. Edmund FitzGerald, S.J.

M. J. Fitzsimons, S.J.

The Marks of a Superior College

By RUSSELL M. COOPER

When one attempts to assay the qualities of a good college he is impressed anew with the bewildering variety of facets characterizing the modern institution of higher education. It would be as impossible as it is futile to attempt a discussion of all these factors. At the outset we must select those features which seem most important in fulfilling the true purposes of the institution.

Fortunately, it is not necessary to insist upon a particular set of purposes or basic philosophy as requisite for a good institution. There is in American higher education today a wide variety of philosophies and programs, and undoubtedly representative colleges can be found for each which maintain a high degree of excellence. We may therefore avoid the temptation in this instance of speculating about philosophies of education, and center instead upon those qualities which point towards sound performance, whatever the philosophy.

I am proposing, therefore, that we endeavor to be as concrete and practical as possible. It has been my good fortune during the past eight years to visit over sixty colleges and universities in the United States, spending from one to several days on each campus, talking with faculty, students, and administrators concerning educational programs. In no instance did I go in as an inspector but rather as a person vitally interested in the problems of higher education and anxious to learn about good practices as well as to give some suggestions on occasion concerning the problems.

Proceeding on this basis, it has been heartening to discover how freely the individuals have discussed educational practices and how earnestly the average educator is seeking to improve his services. The smug complacency which characterized many campuses in the past is fast disappearing to be replaced by an humble recognition of need and an open-minded desire to find ways of better helping the students.

It is surprising how quickly one can get the "feel" of a campus. There is a spirit and atmosphere that is unique to almost every institution and which seems to permeate faculty and student body alike. The longer one remains on the campus the more these impressions become refined and explicit. The visitor is able to point to factors in the student body, faculty or administration which seem to be responsible for college morale

and which mark it as an inferior or superior institution. It should prove interesting to examine these factors in some detail.

MARKS OF A SUPERIOR STUDENT BODY

Let us look first at the students themselves, for they are the beginning and end of all education. In the last analysis, no college is any stronger than the graduates it produces, and through them it must be measured. The number of graduates who are listed in *Who's Who*, the number who go on for graduate education even to the Ph.D., the number who have received signal recognition for public service—all of these factors have been widely used in interpreting the strength of institutions. In many cases, however, it is doubtful whether the college can be credited with full responsibility for alumni success since the original selection of the student body is so rigorous that high performance is virtually assured, irrespective of what the college does to them.

Selection of students is of course important, not so much because of the credit which superior students may ultimately reflect upon the institution, but rather because of the necessity that institutional services be extended to those who can best profit from them. These are not necessarily the students with highest intelligence quotients. A study of last year's freshmen at the University of Minnesota yielded a correlation of only .29 between ACE scores and grade achievements during the first year in the college of Science, Literature and the Arts. This study, which confirms other analyses of a similar character, shows that high school rank, which correlated .52 with grade achievement, is a better determiner of academic success than the ACE score, though the factors considered together are better predictors than either taken separately. Nevertheless, such matters as interest in further education, acceptance of the spirit and philosophy of the institution, and a demonstrated capacity for leadership, also are powerful determinants of whether the student will succeed in college and go forth to make a proper contribution to society.

A personnel officer in Chicago who hires many college graduates once remarked to a friend of mine that he was always impressed with applicants who came in from a certain small college in Iowa, for the questions they asked usually related to such matters as: "What is the purpose of the work to be done?" "Will it fully utilize my particular interests and talents?" These questions were so different from the usual inquiries about "How much money will I get?" "How few hours will I have to work?" that the personnel officer was anxious to visit that college to discover what made its students different. From my knowledge of the institution, the student body is fairly well selected and has better

than average native ability although it is not outstanding in these respects. Over the years there has grown up a tradition emphasizing these values in the classroom and in extracurricular activities and this spirit has gradually become the atmosphere of the campus.

One can best appraise the intellectual vitality of a student body not by the assignments which are punctually performed but rather by the activities of the students in their "off-duty" time when no staff member is around to supervise. For example, in many colleges, one can find little groups of students who gather together in the dormitories to hear classical records or symphony and opera performances on the radio—without the encouragement or the knowledge of any professor. I know of one college which has a "Poetry for Fun" group that meets every Sunday afternoon to read and discuss poetry which various members have discovered and enjoyed. At other institutions, one is impressed with the vitality of student forums and discussions on controversial topics of social importance. In many cases these students are already actively engaged in political and community affairs, while in other institutions, the student body is amazingly apathetic. In some colleges, the browsing shelf of the library, containing the latest and best books in all the fields of thought, is the most active spot in the building, while in other institutions, the library seems to be used only for preparing assignments. It is in these activities, where students are relieved from professorial surveillance, that we can determine whether education is really making a difference in their inner desires and habits. It is astonishing how different the record is as one moves from one campus to another.

MARKS OF A SUPERIOR FACULTY

Some people attempt to measure a faculty by the simple technique of counting the proportion of members with Ph.D. degrees or with national honors and publications. Such criteria are useful but they by no means tell the full story. I once visited a faculty where the president boasted, and apparently with truth, that he had a larger proportion of Ph.D.'s on his staff than did any other college in the country. Moreover, he insisted, a considerable group had been trained at Oxford and other European universities. With such resources, one might expect this institution to be a center of intellectual ferment; and indeed there is considerable productivity within the staff, but there is little evidence that the students have achieved comparable erudition. Indeed, one could point to several faculties of less scholarly distinction who seem, nevertheless, more successful in developing creative, independent, and mature thinking in their students. High scholarship in the faculty is important but is not

enough, particularly if one is interested in sound teaching as well as in research publication.

It is important that the faculty and students come to know one another intimately, that the professors be able and anxious to strengthen the assets of the students and to remedy their faults. In turn, students must be free to take their questions to the professors and to feel that they are getting helpful and sympathetic answers. Without such student-faculty interplay the teaching process becomes essentially a matter of mediating facts which might as well be done by a phonograph as by a human personality.

Such devotion to the students is impossible if the professor is teaching a heavy load of courses with classes so large that it is humanly impossible to get acquainted with the members. One of the tragedies of post-war education has been the ballooning of class sizes with the consequent loss in personal contact. Nevertheless, some colleges are making progress in restoring these vital human elements by eliminating non-essential courses, relieving professors of some of their routine busy work, and increasing the staff in crowded areas. A professor who teaches ten hours a week is more likely to be refreshing and challenging to students than a professor with sixteen or eighteen hours of teaching whose only hope is to "get by" on his hurriedly scanned notes of a previous year. At this point, faculty and administrators must work closely together to make sure that the emphasis is upon quality of performance, and not upon the quantity of classes met or the number of students contacted.

To the extent that the faculty load problem can be resolved, there should also be an opportunity for the professors to engage in some kind of fundamental research. This may relate either to the subject matter of their field or to their procedures for teaching it. In either case, pursuance of research undertakings and the publication of reports will give the professor continued self-respect, as well as student esteem, and will keep his mind fresh and venturesome.

The prevention of dry rot in a college faculty is one of the most crucial administrative responsibilities and it is encouraging to note how effectively many presidents and deans have succeeded in keeping their staffs alive and dynamic. There are many devices for insuring this continued faculty growth. One of the most valuable is the development of a faculty institute at the outset of the college year in which members may discuss the current issues and trends in higher education, perhaps with the addition of an outside resource person, and may consider the implication of these ideas for their own institution. A few days spent in cooperative thinking and planning with respect to institutional problems will almost inevitably give the faculty a new perspective on their job

and a new determination to cooperate better with their colleagues in the development of a sounder educational program. The reservation of one or two faculty meetings per month for the continued consideration of books on higher education, reports of faculty sub-committees, and similar themes will help to keep this spirit alive. A little money spent in assisting faculty members to attend professional meetings off campus also pays rich dividends.

One of the most valuable ways of developing a sound professional attitude is to engage in continual study of the educational process itself. Research on the nature and needs of students, the effectiveness of current programs and the attitudes of alumni will sharpen the issues and point the road to reform. Indeed some colleges today never make an important educational decision without first collecting all the relevant facts—though it must be admitted that snap judgments, vague hunches, and imitation still prevail in altogether too many institutions. In the universities of America where self-study is strongest, educational growth seems also to be most conspicuous. An increasing number of colleges are setting up bureaus of institutional research as a foundation for all future educational planning.

By these tests, then, may one get the measure of a faculty: that it comprises professors who are carefully selected and well-trained, that they have a sincere concern for the welfare of their students and are allowed time to manifest this concern, that they remain dynamic and creative, ready to experiment and conduct probing researches calculated to promote professional growth.

MARKS OF A SUPERIOR ADMINISTRATION

The morale of the students and faculty is almost certainly a reflection of the spirit of the administration. One can hardly overestimate the importance of the administrator in the ultimate determination of the institution's welfare.

This is particularly striking when the administrator proves deficient, for then the effect on the faculty morale is immediate and devastating. There is, for example, one young university president inexperienced in the art of faculty cultivation, who has antagonized virtually the entire college community by his high-handed appointments to important positions without consultation with members of his staff, by his pressure for reforms along his own preconceived notions, and by the defensive egotism which tends to insulate him from the hirelings who form the faculty. It matters not that the man himself is brilliant in his field, that the appointments he has made have been on the whole of very high

quality, and that his educational proposals are often sound. By his attitude and conduct he is destroying the self-respect and independent spirit of his staff and through sheer frustration large numbers of them are now seeking employment elsewhere.

The successful administrator must always remember that student growth is the fundamental aim of education and that the administrator is merely an agent for helping the faculty to promote this growth most efficiently. He must remember that whatever the educational program on paper, it is the faculty who must go into the classroom and make the program work. Unless the faculty members sincerely believe in the program, feel that they are identified intimately with its inception and its success, and eagerly strive to carry it through, it remains merely a blueprint in the president's office.

The president and the dean must therefore have the rare ability to stimulate and guide, though without domination. They must assume many educational responsibilities and carry them through successfully but without egotism. They must recognize themselves as essential parts of a complex intellectual organism which can thrive to the extent that all the organs work harmoniously and cooperatively together. They must recognize that creative leadership involves more than being a stubborn watchdog of the treasury. It implies also strenuous effort to find the means for financing and implementing proposals arising within the faculty and student body which hold promise of significantly advancing the educational welfare.

An administrator must find ways of keeping himself perennially informed and alert. This is a hard job. One of the greatest hazards of administration arises from the incessant pressure and the vast amount of routine detail. It is easy for the dean or president to become so preoccupied with the mechanics of keeping the machine running smoothly that he has no time to read, he loses his perspective, and goes intellectually sour. The able administrator, however, seems always to find a way of delegating responsibilities to other persons, thus maintaining a perspective over the entire program with a freshness of spirit and a breadth of vision that will be a constant inspiration to his staff.

MARKS OF A SUPERIOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Since in the last analysis, the educational program can be no stronger than the persons participating in it, we have been concerned at the outset with ways for measuring and strengthening the contribution of those individuals. Nevertheless, as has been noticed, even with the best of personnel, educational programs may stagnate unless there are conscious and

continuous efforts to meet the students' needs more effectively. How may the visitor to a college campus determine whether a dynamic educational program is really in operation?

A simple criterion, though one often ignored, is a clearcut statement of institutional objectives towards which all persons in the college are constantly striving. Most institutions include a beautiful statement of ideals in the college catalog stressing a determination to develop good citizens, strong character, well-rounded personality, and other important virtues. In many institutions, however, faculty members go their several ways teaching their courses from day to day, utterly oblivious to the practical ways in which they are responsible for implementing those broad institutional policies. It is essential that a faculty translate its basic objectives into practical and explicit subordinate goals in order that each staff member can understand his proper function in the total enterprise. In other words, there must be carefully-thought-out statements of objectives for each of the departments, for every course, and indeed, for every lesson assignment, as well as for the non-curricular aspects of college life, if the broad purposes are to be truly realized. To the extent that these goals are then analyzed and measured through careful evaluation and research, the institution will become ever more conscious of its purpose and aware of the strong and weak points in its program.

Among the more important objectives, one must include some concern for the well-rounded general education development of students. There are many philosophies and approaches to general education but they all agree in their determination to make the student a more competent person in the ordinary, non-professional aspects of daily life. They agree that he should have some conception of the principles and processes of the natural world on which our entire civilization rests. They agree that he should become informed about problems of public policy, and prepared to assume his responsibilities as a citizen in a democracy. He must also nurture his inner self, developing a philosophy and commitment to a set of ideals for personal and social living. He should increase his enjoyment and participation in the arts, in literature, and other experiences which will enrich his understanding and appreciation of life. He must also satisfy those vital personal needs of choosing a wise vocation, preparing adequately for marriage, maintaining his physical and mental health, and achieving a poised, persuasive personality. These things are important for success in life irrespective of whether the student is to become a doctor, lawyer, farmer, teacher, or day laborer.

The difference in general education programs arises not so much from the goals to be realized as in the means for achieving these ends. Some institutions are convinced that familiarity with the great thoughts and

traditions of the past is the best possible orientation for meeting the problems of the future. Other institutions believe that the problems themselves must be attacked head-on with only such references to the past as seem necessary for the solution of these contemporary issues. Some colleges seek to satisfy these broad needs by a simple requirement that students should take work from all divisions of the curriculum. Other institutions maintain that a spread of electives among these departmental courses means the inclusion of much material unimportant for the layman and that a whole new set of courses explicitly designed for general education purposes must be organized. It has not yet been proved whether one program of general education is necessarily superior to another, and much more experience and research is required in the field. In judging the strength of a college, it is enough for the present to insure that the faculty has a clearcut conception of its general education objectives and has clearly thought out the procedures for achieving them.

Just as the general education program must be continually reexamined to insure that it is meeting the requirements of our day, it is equally important that the advanced work leading to specialization in various fields be likewise continually readapted to ever-changing demands. It is now recognized in many institutions that an ordinary departmental major may provide superficial preparation for some vocations and that indeed a kind of inter-departmental major may give a sounder grasp of the field for some professional purposes. For example, many colleges now encourage their potential prospective teachers of high school science to major in all the sciences rather than in just chemistry or zoology, since they will probably have to teach the broad science field and in any case must see the interrelationships among the sciences. Social science teachers are encouraged to major in the broader social science field instead of simple economics or history. The almost universal testimony from the superintendents indicates that such teachers will have adequate technical background for high school teaching and will be more capable of interpreting for the students the broad implications and meanings in the field. One may note also in the preparation of engineers, doctors, lawyers, and others a new emphasis upon the social implications of those professions and upon the responsibility of practitioners for the general welfare. The atomic scientists are evidently going to make sure that individuals specializing in that field understand not only the physics, but also the social difficulties which surround any new developments.

It is interesting to note also the number of institutions that are putting more stress on independent, creative student activity. There is growing dissatisfaction with the old system in which professors dictated their information to student note-takers, and in which graduation depended

largely upon the students' strength of memory at examination time. Research evidence shows that such facts are soon forgotten; indeed, in an Illinois study, 77% of specific zoology facts were forgotten within fifteen months. The concern now is for placing more responsibility upon the student's own shoulders, requiring that he solve problems, develop and defend his own ideas, and gradually assume the responsibilities of a mature student in the field. The post-war enrollment has been an obstacle to this emphasis upon the individual student's productivity, but some professors have found ways of surmounting even those difficulties. They become administrators supervising the self-directed activities of students, coaching where necessary but letting students carry the ball.

There is probably also some relation between the amount of equipment provided for educational purposes and the quality of instruction achieved. It has long been recognized that science departments need well-equipped laboratories, history departments need up-to-date maps, and fine arts departments need their instruments and equipment. Universities have been somewhat slower to accept the importance of expenditures for visual education and for auditory devices, but these also are proving valuable aids to learning and will doubtless be used more and more in the future. As with any other mechanical device, such equipment is no better than the way it is used, but as professors become proficient in adapting these materials to the course, they are becoming an integral part of education and a mark of strength in the program.

The college that is concerned with the individual welfare of its students, is of course prompted to develop a sound personnel program. The increasing enrollment is placing a new challenge upon these programs but many colleges are maintaining their good service despite the pressure. They usually find it necessary to consolidate services under professional direction, to offer in-service training for faculty counsellors, and to provide special facilities for handling difficult cases. To help the student understand himself and his problems, universities are expanding their testing programs for measuring not only the student's academic aptitude but also his achievement in various fields, his special interests, and his emotional stability. While personnel work must always maintain a sympathetic relationship between student and counsellor, the solution of problems requires that the interview go beyond simple "fatherly advice" to include careful and realistic assessment of all the factors involved.

Alongside personnel activity, there is increasing attention to the educational importance of extra-curricular life. It has long been recognized that living conditions and general campus associations have tremendous influence upon character development and student attitudes towards intellectual values. It has likewise been noted that students of retiring

dispositions may go through college without any participation in activities, deprived of both social participation and leadership development. On the other hand, some students are heavily overloaded with activities to the detriment of their scholarship and the lowering of their standards of performance. Some universities, therefore, are providing staff assistants to help students achieve higher standards in extra-curricular performance and to sensitize them to the important personnel values derived from such activity. To ignore responsibility for this important aspect of education is surely to evade the college's obligation for the total student welfare.

When one visits a campus, these attributes of student life, of faculty-administrative relations, and the total educational program quickly become manifest and stamp the institution as being sound and forward looking or as a college that is marking time, attempting to educate the students of today with the philosophy and methods appropriate to a generation ago. The large number of institutions that are taking their professional responsibilities seriously, steadily seeking to improve the quality of their product, is one of the most heartening signs in American education today. There is hope that the colleges will truly measure up to the fateful responsibilities of our time.

Discussion

1. The most important single factor in quality of a college is institutional research. In the small college this might involve only a part-time man, otherwise engaged in a personnel service, educational psychology, etc.

2. It is essential that such a man be the agent of a faculty committee on institutional research, rather than a member of the administration; and the faculty members should be the type that will win respect for research projects.

3. Typical studies that might be helpful to start faculty interest:

a. The backgrounds of the student-body.

b. The records of the seniors, to see to what extent they have achieved the broad education the college claims it is giving.

c. A controlled experiment in use of correct English.

d. A measure of student retention of facts, to indicate to the faculty the importance of procedure rather than facts in instruction.

4. The Graduate Record Examination is admittedly the best present measure of a rounded education, but it is not the best possible. It is too much concerned with facts.

5. The most effective job of student rating of teachers was done at Michigan State College at the request of the faculty. The results of a very detailed questionnaire were analyzed and given to the teachers and to the administration. Such student pools are a good thing, but not sufficient for appraising a faculty member's worth.

6. Supervision of instruction is essential. The psychology should be this: "Here we are interested in good teaching. We shall visit your classes, and then we shall talk over teaching problems with you in the interest of making your teaching most effective."

7. The problem of training of college teachers is a serious one. Every graduate school should have at least a course in college problems for its students planning on college teaching. Then, too, there should be a program of practice teaching far more effective than the present system of fellowships. The idea of broader Ph.D. programs is gradually taking hold. The narrowness of specialization of our faculty training is one of the most serious handicaps to the objectives of general education. In larger institutions each department should probably have facilities for supervising instruction, for measuring it, and for providing technical services in such areas as construction of examinations.

The Problem of Philosophy in the Liberal Arts College

ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J.¹

The position of philosophy in the liberal arts program has been the subject of repeated discussion both in the Jesuit Educational Association and in the Jesuit Philosophical Association. Our continued attention to this subject is due to the very proper desire of our superiors and of all of us to assure the place and function of philosophy in our colleges. Now, I shall state a set of purposes which I think we shall be able to agree summarizes what we expect philosophy to be and to do. These purposes are not new to you, and I offer them only as a basis for future discussion.

We expect philosophy, religion, and to some extent, theology to function as a core curriculum through which we can achieve the unification of the intellectual and moral life of our students in Christian wisdom. This demands, of course, the development of the corresponding habits of mind in the student. If we achieve these goals, students after graduation will have the ability and desire to read in these subjects and to discuss them intelligently with other educated people. Furthermore, they will be able, in some degree, to defend and apply the principles

1) Author's Note:

This paper is substantially the same as given at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, San Francisco, March 29, 1948.

In the subsequent discussion it appeared that there were present in the Association two distinct ways of thinking about philosophy. The one presented in this paper thinks of philosophy primarily as an intellectual life in the student; the other thinks of philosophy as a content involving certain sequential areas and theses that should be covered. I believe this latter is a mistaken view when applied to the liberal arts program, but the choice between the two ways is a matter of philosophical and educational theory and must be made within a school by those who are teaching the philosophy program.

Some feared that a program planned in function of an actual faculty would be unstable because of faculty fluctuations. Of course, no program should be built on a single individual; there must be a certain stability and continuity. On the other hand, no successful department can be built up if the teachers are being constantly changed, and such a practice has therefore been frequently criticized by the Generals of the Society.

of Faith and of reason. I think we would all agree that if our schools produce these effects, we can feel certain that philosophy has therein its proper place and influence.

Now these are qualitative criteria and difficult to measure. I am perhaps not misinterpreting past discussion when I say that it indicates that administrators have been asking in effect whether these criteria can be translated into some sort of scale that can be more easily applied to our schools. Can we translate them, for example, into terms of hours, textbooks, course sequences or syllabi? Could we lay down a minimum of hours or courses, devise a standard set of textbooks, or map a program that could be a standard for all Jesuit liberal arts colleges and would give deans a satisfactory test of their own department of philosophy? I may say at once that, while textbooks and syllabi are not unimportant, I do not believe this can be done and I believe further that any attempt to do so would put a handicap on the development of our departments of philosophy and, worst of all, would draw our attention and energy away from the central problem we are facing in the teaching of philosophy.

Naturally, hours must be given to philosophy, courses planned, textbooks selected, and programs drawn up. But what gives the entire value and efficacy to these hours, textbooks, and courses? Isn't there just one realistic answer? Does not their effect depend upon competent and enthusiastic teachers? Suppose we put down twenty or twenty-five or thirty hours of philosophy in our program, is that any guarantee at all that philosophy is achieving its purposes? Unless you have competent teachers, it merely records time misspent. Put a good textbook or a good syllabus in the hands of an incompetent or disinterested teacher and what will be achieved? I would fear not merely that the objectives would not be achieved but even that positive harm would be done.

Hence, I am convinced that the central problem is that of obtaining interested, enthusiastic, and competent teachers. The one primary concern of administrators should be to obtain competent teachers who in turn will have to be trusted to solve the question, for their particular school, of hours, sequence, textbooks, and syllabi.

Therefore, I think the one problem to which all of us, deans, department heads, philosophy teachers, whether in universities, colleges, or scholasticates, should direct our attention is the problem of securing and maintaining competent teachers. Everything else is, to my mind, beside the point and therefore wasted effort, and without the teachers any mechanical criteria which we set up will result in self-deception and unwarranted complacency.

The problem presents itself as a domestic one, first of all, and I shall put it in the form of two questions.

1. Why is it that, despite our long regular training in philosophy and theology, men do not come out of it competent to teach college philosophy or college religion?

Look at what our regular course is: three years of philosophy, four years of theology—seven years of a young man's life devoted exclusively to study. Look at what we are told it should be; a time exclusively devoted to studies, under the direction of the best available Jesuit professors. Every talent, we are told, should be developed, and every opportunity given to men of promise. This is the burden of all our directives from the Society. The educational training of ours should be of the highest calibre. "*Necesse est,*" said Father Ledochowski, "*omnia removere studiorum impedimenta, omnia adjumenta comparare.*"¹ I believe that the Jesuit course, taken in itself, is a magnificent educational program and opportunity. Yet among us it does not produce its full effect. In seven years we do not produce any number of men competent to teach college philosophy and inspired to make of it their apostolate—one which indeed is more ascetic perhaps than that of direct apostolic work and no whit less important. We can and do achieve this result with young laymen in five years. Why don't we do it with Ours in seven years?

My second question is this:

2. Why is it that so many young priests who, with or without doctorates, are assigned to teach philosophy do not develop as philosophy teachers but often become less effective?

I shall suggest some possible answer to these questions which will perhaps contain the elements of a solution.

A—How many men come to the teaching of philosophy with the conviction that it is a full-time and important apostolate? Do they not often feel that the routine of study and teaching cuts them off from apostolic work? If this is their attitude, they cannot give themselves *totis viribus* to this one task; they will seek other works and give at best only a part of their time to their own development and to their teaching. Should we not drive home to the scholastics from the novitiate onwards that teaching is intrinsically an apostolate and that successful teaching, especially in college, is an exacting profession?

B—Our men have not been prepared to develop themselves. The interest in personal development, the realization of its continuing neces-

¹*De Ministeriorum atque Operum Delectu Nostrorumque ad Ea Institutione, Romae, Apud. Curiam Prae. Gen., 1933, par 9 (page 26).*

sity, and above the requisite habits and knowledge of method are lacking.

C—They do not realize that good and outstanding teaching, especially in philosophy, flows from a vigorous intellectual life. One cannot teach a set of theses or formulae worked out last year or ten years ago. Philosophy must be presented with present insight into problem and solution. Nor can one ever exhaust the depths of understanding in any course or any part of a course; one must constantly progress in understanding, or else insight congeals into formulae, inspiration condenses into routine. But to live this intellectual life one must once have experienced it and must be profoundly convinced of its necessity. And it requires a measure of leisure; for the philosophic life is a contemplative life.

D—Finally, too often the conditions necessary for a strong intellectual life, for self-development and further study are not present. To provide these conditions and to safeguard them, seems to me, of primary concern to administrators. The young priest, with or without a doctorate, comes enthusiastically to his college work. He is given a heavy burden of teaching; odd jobs about the college are assigned to him; he becomes involved in sodality work or convert instruction or confessions. He receives little direction, little encouragement in private study. Thus overburdened, he wears himself out in work; there is no leisure to think or study; no incentive to do so. He becomes a teaching hack and a willing worker in any external project. Under such conditions improvement, let alone great and inspired teaching of philosophy, is impossible. Often indeed the result is disgust for the classroom and the loss of another man from educational work.

I repeat these are the essential problems and should be of immediate concern to all administrators. Any other method of facing the question of philosophy teaching is superficial and ultimately valueless.

Once we have a group of competent teachers in a college or university, the program will then grow and develop from their own vigorous life of teaching and philosophizing. Two obvious principles will guide the construction of the program:

1—It will aim at forming philosophical habits rather than at "covering" an amount of matter. Of course, in any case, a certain body of philosophical truth will be taught, but, since philosophical truth exists only in minds and in philosophical thinking, the content will be determined by the need and capacity of the student's mind for such thinking. We do not aim to teach our students all philosophy; we should aim to give them philosophical insights and intellectual life. This is the essential.

2—The philosophy sequence should be integrated with the general liberal arts program. We aim to educate philosophically not to produce specialists in philosophy.

The program should be constructed in function of actual faculty, of the general arts program, of the quality and interest of the students. In other words, a program cannot be drawn up in the abstract and imposed from without; it must grow up within a definite school in definite circumstances.

And when such vigorous realistic programs are worked out, we will begin to get the textbooks and syllabi we need. A philosophy textbook cannot be tailored on demand; we can't *order* a textbook in philosophy.

I therefore do not believe that we face the problems of teaching philosophy when we discuss hours, textbooks, sequence, or syllabi. The one imperative need is to produce and maintain a group of competent teachers leading an enthusiastic and vigorous life of philosophical contemplation and teaching. To the degree in which we achieve this objective, philosophy will flourish as it should; otherwise, we will be dealing in administrative fictions.

THE COLLEGE AND WRITERS

“What a talented student can get from first-class college instruction in writing is about this: He may be spared years of wasteful fumbling, and at least temporarily he may be deterred from selling out or wasting himself on cheap and trivial ends. Almost certainly, he can become a better and more honest writer than he could in most other environments. For at least the period of his college life he can write the stories which seem to him true and honest and meaningful, instead of runting himself trying to write stories that other people tell him to write, or that the commercial media will buy. He can perhaps get some notion of how high a calling literature is—and there are perilously few places where he can get that, any more. Even his chances to arrive at it by himself are jeopardized by the confusion or perversion or abdication of standards all around him.”

Reprinted from “New Climates for the Writer”
by Wallace Stegner, *New York Times Book Review*,
March 7, 1948, p. 20.