

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE
PROPERTY FROM THIS ROOM

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

— MARCH 1962 —

THE DEANS' INSTITUTE, SPOKANE, 1961

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITY

STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDIES

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

UTILITY RATES

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

INDEX VOLUME XXIV

— Vol. XXIV, No. 4 —

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER EDMOND J. SMYTH, S.J., a member of the California Province, is Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of San Francisco. Father Smythe's Ph.D. degree is from Toronto.

FATHER PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J., a former Dean of the Graduate School at Boston College, is Assistant for Higher Education at the JEA Central Office. Father FitzGerald took his Ph.D. in History at Georgetown.

FATHER CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J., a member of the New England Province, is Dean of the School of Education at Boston College. Father Donovan's Ph.D. is from Yale.

FATHER EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J., the President of the JEA, should need no introduction to our readers.

FATHER VICTOR R. YANITELLI, S.J., Vice President for Student Personnel at Fordham, a member of the New York Province, received his doctorate at Fordham.

BROTHER JAMES KENNY, S.J., our JEQ authority on matters pertaining to management, is a member of the New York Province. Brother Kenny is Business Manager and Buyer for Fordham University.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1962

CONTENTS

DEANS' INSTITUTE, SPOKANE, 1961 <i>Edmond J. Smyth, S.J.</i>	197
THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE JESUIT COLLEGE DEAN <i>Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J.</i>	212
THE DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE <i>Charles F. Donovan, S.J.</i>	223
STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDIES, 1961-1962 <i>Edward B. Rooney, S.J.</i>	231
THE ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDENT PERSONNEL OFFICE IN JESUIT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION <i>Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.</i>	240
UTILITY RATES AND THEIR CONTROL <i>James Kenny, S.J.</i>	246
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	250
INDEX TO VOLUME XXIV	253

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.

Assistant Editor

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.

Managing Editor

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.

Advisory Board

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

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOHN M. HYNES, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
LEO B. KAUFMANN, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
FREDERICK P. MANION, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y.

COPYRIGHT, 1962

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Deans' Institute, Spokane, 1961

EDMOND J. SMYTH, S.J.

The proposal for a Deans' Institute originated at Worcester in 1947. Denver saw its realization in 1948. Santa Clara was its locale in 1955. Spokane hosted it in 1961. These crisp sentences give only the chronology of Deans' Institutes. However, the basic literature on the Jesuit College Dean can be found in the three imposing volumes of the published proceedings.¹ The results of the Assistancy-wide Deans' Institutes at Denver and Santa Clara can be measured by the present status of the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities. The value of the Spokane meeting cannot yet be gauged. Yet, the hope of success can be phrased in its concluding resolution:

In gratitude to Almighty God for the graces of the past and the continued gifts of the present, we, Jesuit Academic Administrators, gathered in examining discussion at the third National Institutes for Deans, affirm our debt to the glories of the Jesuit educational tradition and acknowledge our deep commitment to academic excellence. Consequently, although our discussions show that we cannot be content with our present status in the educational world, still we can be proud of our progress and, therefore, pledge ourselves to the pursuit of greater academic excellence for the Greater Honor and Glory of God.

To understand and fully appreciate the background and spirit of this resolution, one would have to study carefully the edited proceedings. Nevertheless, in accordance with past practice,² this brief article will attempt to report to the wider audience of the Jesuit Educational Association the highlights of the Spokane Institute.

For eleven days, August 4-14, 1961, ninety-six official delegates from every segment of Jesuit higher education met at Gonzaga University to consider, argue and reflect on the Institute's theme, "The College Dean's Role in Achieving Academic Excellence." Welcomed in the highest

¹ *Jesuit Higher Education—Administrative Problems*, Denver, Colorado, 1948 (out of print). *Jesuit Education—Its Objectives, Curriculum, and Evaluation*, Santa Clara, California, 1955. *The College Dean's Role in Achieving Academic Excellence*, Spokane, Washington, 1961. JEA Central Office.

² Committee on Reports: Edward B. Bunn, S.J., W. Edmund FitzGerald, S.J., M. J. Fitzsimons, S.J., "Jesuit Deans' Institute—Denver, 1948," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 2 (October 1948), pp. 95-112. Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., "Deans' Institute, Santa Clara, 1955," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII, No. 2 (October 1955), pp. 69-80.

ideals of Jesuit hospitality by the Gonzaga Community and its local committee on arrangements, headed by Father William N. Bischoff, the delegates were prepared for serious discussion. The satisfaction expressed by so many at the Institute's conclusion was in no small part due to the hidden, preparatory work of the Institute's acute Director, Rev. William F. Kelly of Creighton University and his able associates, Fathers Edward A. Doyle of Loyola University, New Orleans, Joseph E. Gough of Rockhurst College and Matthew G. Sullivan of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.

In December 1960, the directors mailed to all proposed participants a tentative program with specific topics assigned to a selected cross section of administrators. Prepared during the following months, the assigned papers were returned to the directors for editing in late March and early April, 1961. Consequently, a volume of some one hundred and forty-four multilith pages was placed in the hands of the delegates in early July to allow for private study prior to the actual Institute.

The directors planned the Institute's program in order to obtain maximum participation from the total membership. Since the papers were studied beforehand, they were not read at the meetings. Each speaker was allowed fifteen minutes to summarize the salient features of his paper in order to set the stage for discussion. As Father Kelly remarked in his opening comments: "It was, then, the responsibility of the delegates to set the tone of the Institute, to make it memorable for initiative and dynamic activity of the total group, or to let it settle into a routine and wooden reading and listening period. The success of the Institute depended totally upon the energetic participation of each delegate." The delegates responded enthusiastically. Controversial statements were challenged; stated positions were argued with vigor; problems were exposed; experiences were shared; insights were gained in an atmosphere of intelligent, frank and critical discussion.

The program was divided into three major sections. To each of these, three days were assigned. The first section, "The Dean and His Relationships with Other Administrators," was chaired by Father Edward A. Doyle; the second, "The Dean and His Faculty" was directed by Father Matthew G. Sullivan; the third, "The Dean's Planning For His Students," was supervised by Father Joseph E. Gough.

Two sessions were conducted each day in the Crosby Library. The morning session was held between 9:30 and 11:30, the afternoon meeting between 2:30 and 5:00. Normally, two or three topics were introduced at each section and the Chairman paced the meeting to the tempo of discus-

sion. Consequently, although much material was introduced, each item of importance received adequate treatment.

In order to give permanent form to the deliberate discussions, nine recorders were appointed. Each scribe, drawn from among the delegates, was assigned to a separate day. Their summaries, reflecting individual personality and style, have now become an integral part of the Institute's Proceedings. Consequently, in studying the Institute as a whole, both the papers *and* the recorders' reports must be examined together.

THE KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Prior to the keynote addresses, the delegates were welcomed to the Oregon Province by Very Reverend Father Provincial, Alexander F. McDonald, and to Gonzaga University by Father President, John P. Leary. Due to an unexpected change of dates for two international meetings, the President of the Jesuit Educational Association, Edward B. Rooney, was unable to be present. His letter of encouragement, read at the opening session, was deeply appreciated.

The two keynote addresses by Fathers Paul A. FitzGerald and Charles F. Donovan set the tone of the Institute and introduced many of the main and recurring ideas which occupied the delegates, both in and out of sessions, for the days of the Institute. Since these two papers also appear as part of this JEQ trilogy on the Institute, it would seem superfluous to summarize or analyze them here. Instead they are strongly recommended to the consideration of the reader whose careful perusal of them will be rewarding. It will be sufficient to note here that the keynote addresses served admirably as an introduction to subsequent topics and discussions.

PART ONE: THE DEAN AND HIS RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

The significance of the papers and discussion of Part One of the Institute was emphasized as one examined the membership roster. The Deans' Institute was actually an Institute for Academic Administrators. Joined with Deans of Arts and Science, who were in numerical superiority, were Province Prefects of Studies, Presidents, Academic Vice-Presidents, Deans of Graduate Schools, Deans of Schools of Business Administration and Education, Directors of Evening Divisions, Deans of Admissions and a variety of associate and assistant Deans.

No longer are our universities and colleges administered by the Father Rector and the Prefect of Studies. They have developed into complex institutions which require a multiplicity of administrators. With complexity and multiplicity, problems arise. To the problem of relationship between deans and other administrators the Institute, consequently, directed its attention.

Fater Donovan had pointed out what a dean was and what he was not. Father Herman J. Hauck emphasized one of the latter points in his statement: "The dean should be less than the president." The president has the ultimate responsibility for the institution; one of which responsibilities is to create a climate within which subordinates will operate creatively.

Since the dean is the delegate of the president, the main problem in president-dean relationships arises in the development and structuring of the concept of delegation. Although the Institute recognized that the dean's position as both advisor to and delegate of the president *and* chief officer of his college and representative of the faculty predicated possible areas of tension, it agreed that these need not reach the breaking point if alertness and resilience were practiced by both parties, and it accepted the summation of Father Hauck:

Knowledgeable and artful as university Statutes may be in their construction, and liberally educated as incumbents may come to their assignments, no two personnel more than president and dean have need for periodic formal Statutes-study and self-study, in concert, as to the letter and spirit of their responsibility and authority. The forces pressing upon them are always centrifugal; they themselves must provide the centripetal balance.

Father Robert W. Mulligan's paper, "The Dean's Relation to Fellow Deans and to the Highest Academic Officer," elicited basic problems. The paper concentrated primarily on the relationship between the Academic vice-president and the dean. In this area, the academic vice-president has a five-fold function:

1. The academic vice-president should promulgate and supervise . . . the over-all principles of Jesuit education, as well as the particular policies of the University.
2. He should stimulate academic growth and development in each college . . . keeping in mind, however, the sharp limitations which the development of education now imposes upon his own expertness.

3. He should initiate studies that will indicate the presence or absence of the necessary means to carry out the objectives of all academic divisions of the University.
4. He should authorize studies to determine the actual effectiveness of instructional and research programs being carried out in relation to publicly stated objectives.
5. Finally, he should be for the deans the normal channel of communication to the President, speeding action on their requests, and, in return, implementing decisions of the President affecting the deans and their schools.

Prefatory to these conclusions, however, Father Mulligan pointed out that there exists an understandable opposition to the office of academic vice-president by deans who question its ability to understand the complexity of the total situation of a college, and who ask why a dean should go to the vice-president on a matter when the final decision will be made by the President. Therefore, he concluded that one might not only regret the actual existence of the office of vice-president, but, more importantly, one might wonder how the office came into being at all.

Discussion of this paper raised the questions of delegated authority, of the authority of the vice-president to overrule the deans, of additional functions of the office. Since it was obvious from the discussion that the functions of the academic vice-president needed clearer definition, the Institute recommended to the Fathers President through the normal channels of the Jesuit Educational Association that

A clarification be given to the function of the office of academic vice-president in view of the responsibilities and authority of the Deans stipulated in the Statutes. In complex institutions, the necessary existence of the office of the academic vice-president should be recognized not only by Deans but by department heads and individual faculty members. Consequently, the academic vice-president should be considered the President's chief academic officer of the total institution with the necessary delegation of powers to provide not only an effective channel of communication with the office of the President, but also to exercise efficient academic leadership.

At the conclusion of his paper, Father Mulligan, speaking of the relationship that should exist between deans, urged very strongly the development of strong *personal* ties, of mutual confidence and respect. Our universities must move forward, not merely according to plan, but according to friendship based on a common love of a common good.

Taking up this theme and relating it to the "Implications for Liberal Arts Colleges from the August 1960 Institute of Jesuit Colleges of Business Administration" Father W. Seavey Joyce presented a realistic picture of the present position and problems of Colleges of Business Administration and concluded:

In general, nothing can be more helpful to a college of business administration than a fair, tolerant, and cooperative attitude on the part of the administration and departments of the arts college. Cooperation leads to mutual strength and to the improved tone of the entire campus.

The second and third day of the Institute developed two major themes: the necessity of cooperation and the need of communication between the dean and other offices in our institutions. No office can be independent. Each ultimately strives, by using different means, to effect the same end, the total and efficient education of the individual student.

The papers on "Cooperation Between Academic Dean and the Dean of Student Personnel," (Father Victor R. Yanitelli) "The Dean's Office: The Academic Clinic," (Father Bernard A. Tonnar) "The Relationship of the Dean and Registrar," (Father John A. Fitterer) "Cooperation Between the Librarian and the Dean in Promoting Academic Excellence," (Father Martin Hasting) "Furnishing the Public Relations Office with the Proper Image of the Students, the Objectives, and the Spirit of the College," (Father J. J. O'Callaghan) "What Assistance the Dean Needs from the Business Officers," (Father Edmond J. Smyth) constantly underlined the necessity of cooperation and the need for communication.

The discussion of these papers resulted not only in a valuable exchange of practical information, answers to specific problems and insights on successful experiments, but also in the following resolutions at the conclusion of the Institute:

Since academic excellence is the responsibility of the entire institution, the Dean should continually examine his relationship with all other administrators by frank and intelligent discussion, so that the avenues of communication be always open. In particular,

a) the Dean should recognize the necessity of the office of the Dean of Student Personnel as an essential means of helping him in the total educative process, and should utilize the services of this office in accomplishing the goals of academic excellence;

b) the Dean should utilize the office of the Registrar as a source of information and cooperate in assisting that office to procure the most efficient means of academic record keeping;

c) the Dean should appreciate the Librarian as one of the most important single academic resources designed to support the Dean's concern for academic excellence;

d) the Dean should cooperate fully with the Office of Public Relations by supplying promptly all information which will help that office to produce the proper image of the institution to its manifold audiences;

e) although the Dean has the responsibility to represent his college's needs to the Budget Committee and the Fiscal Officer with a detailed defense of their reasonableness, he also must have a concern for the financial status of the entire institution.

One other question of importance caused concern to the Institute. Father Robert A. Mitchell's paper, "Registrar's Office: The College Admission Picture in the 1960's," argued for an ideal applicant. He stressed the points that the administration can rationally raise the standards in the college only if the student body improves, and that in the recruitment of the ideal student the admissions officer should have the power to make a firm offer of financial aid, if he feels it is right and prudent to do so. This position was challenged by Father Laurence V. Britt who did not think that the only way to improve was to have the so-called superior student. He doubted the wisdom of on-the-spot commitments for scholarships. Finally, he warned against endlessly raising standards. Jesuit institutions also have obligations to the average student from whose midst come many of our future leaders.

PART TWO: THE DEAN AND HIS FACULTY

On the fourth day, the Committee on Local Arrangements took charge. Lake Pend Oreille and the extraordinary hospitality of the Brown family will remain a delightful memory. But, on the following morning, the delegates were back at work.

In any institution, the dean has a second group with whom he has relations and for whom he has responsibilities. Tandem papers, "Special Relationships Between the Dean and His Faculty," (Father Hugh B. Rodman) and "Special Faculty Responsibilities of the Dean," (Father J. Barry McGannon) opened the discussion. Father Rodman stressed the fact that a faculty member is a professional and, as such, is expected to be dedicated. Consequently, he should have no major activities that are not connected with his life as a professional scholar. But, practical problems arise when outside activities compatible with a faculty member's professional

competence are available. Moreover, some faculty members consider outside work a necessity in order to have a reasonable standard of living. To guide the dean, not only is a code for governing outside work necessary but also continuous attention to salaries, rank and tenure policies, retirement plans and fringe benefits is imperative. The faculty has a seller's market. Our institutions, therefore, must be prepared to compete for distinguished faculty members if a quality faculty, a necessary component of academic excellence, is to be available.

The discussion of these two papers centered around two issues: the problem of outside work and the question of salaries. In this discussion, the contributions of all the lay deans present added depth to understanding. However, the comment of Dean Herbert Reas deserves special notice. He pointed out that more important than just the salary scale is the sharing of goals between the Jesuits and lay-faculty. This begets mutual understanding, a developing respect, and from these flows the sense of devotion to the school which anchors the layman even if other institutions offer him a better salary.

Father Virgil Roach's paper, "Delegation of Authority," stressed the advantages and difficulties in the use of committees and the relationship of the dean to departmental chairmen. On the first point, discussion brought out the need for on-going studies to update *Statutes* so that the position and function of committees and the extent of delegation be clear. On the second point, Father Roach sagely advised that the important thing is to appoint department heads who are responsible and professionally capable, and then to let them run their departments without too much checking and interference. In order to assist the dean in implementing this advice, the following resolution was passed:

That the Deans study the possibility of introducing a system of rotation for Department Chairmen so that the best qualified man may be appointed in order to effect academic and administrative excellence.

A faculty member has a responsibility to teach and the dean has an obligation to foster effective teaching. But, how does one evaluate effective teaching? Father Joseph Sellinger, as a result of his recent visit to twenty-one campuses on a Carnegie Corporation grant, presented his insights into possible answers in his paper, "The Supervision of College Instruction and Modern Attempts to Evaluate Teaching."

The major obstacle in the evaluation of teaching seems to be the fact that because it is difficult or almost impossible, *deans* have decided that nothing can be done about it. It is for this reason that I say that it seems we have abdicated one of our major responsibilities.

Discussion, however, showed that the deans present had found means to evaluate effective teaching. Since classroom visitation, as one means of evaluation, caused problems to many faculty members, the Institute stressed that it should be used as an evaluative means and help, not as a "police action."³

Since faculty members are an essential part of a university or college, they rightfully expect to participate in the deliberations effecting the progress and development of the institution. Faculty meetings are one of the means commonly recommended to achieve this participation. Father Joseph K. Drane's paper, "Faculty Meetings," proposed, however, that the more appropriate vehicle to provide for participation in the deliberative process was the committee system. Faculty meetings, on the other hand, are better suited to exposition and discussion of topics, conducive to the professional development of the faculty member as a scholar and teacher. But, a faculty meeting must be well planned to be effective. Consequently, Father Drane gave practical suggestions for attaining this objective.

In an informative paper, "The Importance of Congenial Academic Climate and Suitable Facilities for Faculty Members," Dr. Donald White stressed the need of a climate of achievement in which men of ordinary stature are somehow stimulated to extraordinary performance. This climate requires a clear and unequivocal definition of goals or objectives known to administration and faculty alike. Each faculty man must be able to see where he fits in the scheme of things. In practical terms, the man must know where the institution is going; what he is responsible for and how this relates to his satisfactions, income, status and security. This climate, finally, requires that each faculty member must not only be evaluated, but he must also evaluate himself. Commenting on suitable facilities for the faculty, Dr. White remarked that they should be supplied in as far as they are the means necessary to accomplish the objectives desired.

Discussion of these two papers brought out the following points. First, faculty members do not want to run the university. They do want to be consulted. They do not expect to make decisions, but they would like their advice to be asked. Secondly, since faculty participation is necessary and useful, the deans should continually invite faculty opinion.

The Institute's membership were acutely aware of the present and future problem of faculty recruitment if our institutions were to continue

³ In the morning session on August 9, Dr. Rogers B. Finch, Director of University Relations, Peace Corps, addressed the Institute on "The Peace Corps." At an earlier session the Institute had been privileged to hear Father L. C. McHugh of the staff of *America* describe the apostolate of the press and its relationship to education.

their pursuit of academic excellence. Four papers treated various approaches to this critical problem. Father Malcolm Carron opened up the possibility of multiplying the effectiveness of our most talented and skilled teachers through the use of television and the other new media of instruction. Father John J. Long's paper, "Our Sources for Effective Lay Teachers," pointed out our obligations to our present faculty members so that they might have the opportunities to grow as scholar-teachers. Their dedication to their chosen career, in turn, can serve as an example and encouragement to our own students to seek a career in college teaching. Father Laurence W. Friedrich examined the policies of twenty-five Jesuit institutions in assisting teachers without terminal degrees to complete their programs, and Father Julian L. Maline discussed the process whereby future Jesuit faculty members are selected and prepared for college teaching and research.

The dean's obligations and responsibilities as an academic leader are not limited to his own faculty. Father Darrell F. X. Finnegan well argued that active participation in outside organizations, especially of a professional character, is an important duty for a dean. Such participation offers an opportunity for influencing one's peers in other institutions and even the structure of education itself. Mere attendance at meetings, however, is not sufficient. If deans of Jesuit colleges are to be influential, they must be willing to work on committees and contribute to the progress of the professional organization. Only thus can we hope to be symbols of the academic excellence which we claim for our institutions.

PART THREE: THE DEAN'S PLANNING FOR HIS STUDENTS

The eighth day of the Institute was an open day and the variety of activities engaged in by the participants demonstrated their versatility. Returning for the last portion of the proceedings, the academic administrators were specifically reminded of a theme which had run through the entire deliberations. Father John H. Martin in his paper, "The Importance of Communications Between Dean and Faculty and Administrators and Students," emphasized that the more complex the university, the more compelling is the necessity for effective and smooth communications. The lack of communication or the failure of vertical and horizontal channels of communication can undermine morale, nullify authority, stifle initiative, destroy harmonious functioning of parts, breed resentment, suspicion and disloyalty among faculty and students, and can be destructive of leadership to the detriment of academic and administrative excellence. The existence, on the other hand, of effective com-

munications will assist administrators in gathering information and analyzing problems essential for prudent decision making; will unite them into an harmonious educational team; will allow the faculty to participate intelligently in the development of the college; and will provide the climate for an exchange of ideas productive of mature, intelligent undergraduates and loyal future leaders. The summary of this key paper can best be expressed in the words of Roy E. Larson quoted by Father Martin:

. . . it still needs to be emphasized that true communication is less a matter of means than one of mental processes. And since there can be no communication without comprehension, it requires an active posture of thought on both sides . . . For all true communication is education, and all education is necessarily the consequence of communication.

Five papers, which presumed the basic necessity of communications, were devoted to the relationship of the dean to the students. Father Lincoln J. Walsh postulated a priority of the dean's principal functions: academic leadership, curriculum development and the academic needs of students. While admitting that differences in institutions and personalities existed, Father Walsh's paper, "The Dean's Office: Open-Door or Closed-Door Policy," stressed the fact that even though no dean should be obliged to discuss all of the innumerable problems of students, still all students have the right to personal consideration and direction. However, although the dean has the ultimate responsibility for the academic progress of his students, he should utilize the available means (Father Walsh called them screens) as, for example, registrar, counsellors, a clearly written catalogue and student handbook, and properly placed bulletin boards, so that in routine matters the majority of the students can be advised through the appropriate channels of communication. These means are required for efficient administration, but they do not postulate a closed-door policy. On the contrary, Father Walsh advocated an open-door policy which should take every precaution to avoid creating in the minds of the students the impression that the dean has no time for them. Finally, it was urged that an open-door policy also demanded an open-mind policy. There are few things more important to the proper functioning of the dean's office than the creating in the minds of all, both faculty and students, the conviction that the dean is willing and in fact anxious to listen to and accept worthwhile suggestions.

A perennial headache for the dean is registration with its concomitant problem of student advising. "Pre-Registration and Registration Proce-

dures, Assistance and Short Cuts," by Father Eugene H. Korth analyzed the current procedures in seventeen Jesuit institutions. The discussion session gave the deans an opportunity to exchange practical ideas.

Experience has shown that students need counseling if they are to attain academic excellence. Since it is impossible for the dean to do all of this advising personally, he must see to it that the counseling services of the institution function properly, so that the students are disposed, guided and motivated to respond to the challenges of their education. Counseling services are not an aspect of over-administration. Rather, their function is to enable the instructor to be a more effective teacher and the student to be a more successful, satisfied scholar. As Father Joseph F. Donahue stated in the conclusion of his paper, "Directing the Counseling Services; The Use of Advisors,"

The aim of the dean in supporting, encouraging and improving the counseling service and the faculty advisor system is educational: that the student know himself and his goals, and confidently and intelligently utilize his present opportunity to pursue them in that unique moment of his life, the college years.

Students vary in talent. Each college has its share of average, good and excellent students. Obviously, they should not all be treated in the same way. Father Neil G. McCluskey discussed advance placement, compulsory class attendance, freshman seminars, honors programs, independent and foreign study as means for stimulating the talented student in his paper, "Best Methods of Caring for the Talented Student."

Since undergraduate education is not normally the conclusion of studies for superior students, "Effective Graduate Scholarship-Fellowship Programs for Students," was the subject treated by Father Leo P. McLaughlin. From practical, successful experience, Father McLaughlin gave this advice:

The major rule in preparing and encouraging superior undergraduates to consider graduate school for the future is to start from the very beginning of their college career. . . . The whole college should be orientated toward the advantages of graduate studies and the superior freshmen and sophomores should be told in season and out of season that this is a major goal of their college career. Such a long orientation has tremendous advantages not only for the individual himself but also for the college as a whole.

But, this task requires additional secretarial help and, above all, a chairman dedicated to the task of helping students (and, indirectly the college) win scholarship-fellowship awards. Describing the qualification

of this chairman, Father McLaughlin listed five: he must be dedicated; he must have knowledge; he must be able to communicate his enthusiasm; he must have patience; and he must have guile.

In any college striving for academic excellence, a congenial academic climate and intellectually stimulated students must be amalgamated with effective teachers and a research-oriented faculty. Two papers, "The Function of Research and the Jesuit Research Council of America," (Mr. Ralph E. Trese) and "The Dean's Role in Fostering Research and Productive Scholarship" (Father Brian A. McGrath), opened the discussion on this point. Mr. Trese stressed the necessity of research among the undergraduate faculty and developed, from his experience as the Director of the Jesuit Research Council, the theme, "Environment for Research," whereby faculty activity can be encouraged.

Father McGrath upheld the position that there is a false dichotomy made between teaching and research. Teaching is equally primary with research and one presumes the other. In the problem of research encouragement, the dean is a key factor, since he is the catalyst between the administration and faculty. In the concrete order, the dean, if he wishes to encourage and stimulate research must control hours and preparation of classes; must establish a teaching program that will allow for development in a specific field; must provide and protect the conditions and tools for research; and must aid the faculty member to get internal and external grants and foundation aid by formal and informal means.

Mr. Trese, in his presentation, pointed out that local conditions at times had an adverse reaction on productive research, in particular in those institutions in which a large percentage of the Jesuit community look on research as being of much less than secondary importance. He remarked, however, that even though at the present time eighty-five percent of research is done by laymen and only fifteen percent by Jesuits, the presence on our campuses of young well-trained Jesuits is a tremendous potential. The discussion highlighted the problems experienced by Jesuits in their research activities. To help solve some of these difficulties, the Institute recommended to the Fathers President that:

Jesuit faculty members who are able to do scholarly research, particularly young Jesuits assigned to the institution with doctoral degrees, should, throughout the academic year and the summer, be encouraged to pursue their scholarly ambitions and be assigned to duties which promote rather than hamper their scholarly achievement.

The first ten days of the Institute had explored the dean's relationships with fellow administrators, faculty and students. Since it was impossible

to treat of all relationships, the planners of the Institute had to be selective. In an attempt, however, to round out the role of the dean, Father Joseph F. Downey investigated "The Supervisory Function of the Dean in Special Areas." He advocated that the dean should have at least an advisory concern and a residual responsibility implying the power to act and influence the decisions in the areas of library supervision and acquisitions, textbook supervision and campus lectures. Practical suggestions and norms were discussed in order to exercise influence in these selected areas.

All of the papers and discussions had examined the duties of the dean. Each participant, undoubtedly, realized that he had not always been successful in giving due consideration to all his manifold obligations. Past decisions had been made, because of pressure, with impatience, impetuosity and haste. Consequently, it was fitting that Father George T. Bergen should conclude the formal papers with "Planning in the Dean's Life."

Excellence, academic and administrative, requires careful planning. Since the dean is a unique force on the campus, a symbol for scholarship to faculty and students, it was only right that in planning the excellence for his college he should start with his own life.

CONCLUSION

The final session was devoted to evaluation, future plans, recommendations and resolutions, and concluding remarks.

Father William J. Millor presented for discussion and adoption the recommendations and resolutions submitted by his committee composed of Fathers J. Donahue, L. Kauffmann, E. Maloney and E. Smyth. Father Paul FitzGerald expressed his gratitude to the members for their fine preparation, extraordinary faithfulness to the meetings, and the high spirit of fraternal cooperation.

Finally, Father Kelly, Director of the Institute, gave his concluding remarks. He shared with the participants a memorandum from one of the delegates who had pointed out that, although the theme of the Institute was the Jesuit College Dean and Academic Excellence, at no point had academic excellence been actually defined. Father Kelly answered by stating:

First of all, . . . I would like to think that each one of us will go back to his own campus with a more clearly defined notion (although admittedly not with a definition) of academic excellence on a campus and the dean's role in achieving this excellence. This concept will come as a distillation of the ideas from this Institute which were new,

exciting, illuminating and challenging. We should return home better tooled to assume the leadership expected of us

There is no set formula for excellence . . . universally applicable . . . but there have been principles stated here and ideas exposed, and experiences related, and insights manifested which will render every academic leader among us better qualified to help in the achieving of excellence on his own campus.

And, I think that he well reflected the sentiments of the participants as the 1961 Dean's Institute closed:

We can all be grateful for the extraordinary interchange of priceless experience, high training, and *esprit de corps* of our closely knit but highly individualized members. These have been marvelously productive days.

Because they hold to a common acceptance of first principles and objectives, Catholic schools and colleges have a special opportunity to work toward what must be established as the primary aim of American education: producing not highly trained technicians on the Soviet model but educated individuals on the American model—men and women who possess wisdom as well as knowledge; compassion as well as high personal standards; convictions as well as disciplined reasoning; sensitivity to beauty as well as tough-minded ability to distinguish between the genuine and the counterfeit; individuality as well as willingness to work together with others toward a common goal. Because teachers in Catholic schools are for the most part dedicated on the basis of religious vocation, their training can be more carefully supervised, their professional careers more systematically organized. Curriculum reform can be achieved more readily than in public education—provided there is a will among Catholic educators to make such reforms.

Sen. William Benton, Publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica

The Historical Development of the Office of the Jesuit College Dean

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.

I

"What's Past is Prologue," is the appropriate maxim cut into the granite facade of the National Archives building in Washington. This proposition might well serve as a fitting motto for the third Institute for Academic Deans sponsored by the Jesuit Educational Association. An understanding of the past will enlighten the present and assist us in charting a path for the future. For this reason, it may be helpful, in this first session of the Institute, to trace in broad outline the development of the Dean's office both in the Society and in this Assistancy. Such a survey will serve to remind the participants to this Institute of the historical frame of reference within which and the historical canvas against which we will discuss the office and function of an academic dean in a Jesuit college or university.

II

In a fairly recent study, the author stated that "experts in higher administration rather uniformly agree that the functions of the Academic Dean fall within four general areas, viz., relations with (a) the administration, (b) the instructional staff, (c) the students, (d) and the curriculum."¹ Over four hundred years ago, the Prefect of Studies at the Roman College was charged with the same responsibility and with the same functions.² This is clear from a study of the early documents of the Society, the rules of the Prefect of Studies, as incorporated in the *Ratio Studiorum*, and the role of both the Provincial and Rector in the educational system of the society. The *Praefectus Studiorum* is obviously and historically the academic progenitor of the modern dean; in fact, the dean is still so designated in the Province Catalogue.

¹ Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J., *The Function of the Academic Dean in American Catholic Higher Education* (Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1951), p. 15. See also Sister Mary Frances, S.S.N.D., "The Office of the Dean of Studies," in *College Organization and Administration*, ed., Roy J. Deferrari (Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), pp. 85-93.

² Allan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education* (Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), p. 78.

Father Jerome Nadal was the first Jesuit to define the duties of the Prefect of Studies. This he did in a series of ten rules which, in general, outline the Prefect's functions as the Rector's assistant in whatever pertains to the administration of studies.³ It was Father James Ledesma, however, who first saw the importance of such an official in the administration of a first rate college. Writing to Father General James Laynez in 1563, Father Ledesma commented upon the condition of studies and discipline at the Roman College and offered suggestions for their improvement. Among other things, he recommended that a Prefect of Studies be appointed. Better still, he recommended that three prefects be appointed, one for the faculty of Humanities, another for the Arts and a third for Theology.⁴ Here for the first time is official and pristine approval for that proliferation of deans which has been sharply criticised on Jesuit campuses. Obviously, the criticism has not come from deans. In any case, we should here acknowledge Father Ledesma's foresight in providing for the fine attendance at this Institute.

Since the fundamental responsibilities of the Prefect of Studies were derived from the Provincial and, more immediately, from the Rector, the functions of the prefect were stabilized through Society legislation in the Constitutions and cognate documents. For this reason, the functions of the prefect survived the Suppression and appear again in the revised *Ratio* promulgated by Father John Roothaan after the Restoration.⁵ Strangely enough, the revival of the office of Prefect of Studies in Jesuit colleges and universities coincided more or less with the creation of the office of dean in other American institutions.

III

Although the Prefect of Studies, or dean, has always been an integral part of the academic administration of Jesuit schools, the same is not true of secular institutions. Harvard College, it will be recalled, was founded in 1636. The office of dean was established, as distinct from an isolated

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁵ It should be recalled that on March 7, 1801, the pontifical brief *Catholicae Fidei* granted canonical status to the small band of Jesuits who had continued to exist as a body in Russia. Under date of March 12, 1804, the General of the Society of Jesus in Russia (Gabriel Gruber) admitted the American ex-Jesuits to affiliation. On August 7, 1814, Pope Pius VII published the Bull *Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum* restoring the Society to its former status in the Universal Church. On July 25, 1832, Father General John Roothaan sent to superiors the revised *Ratio Studiorum*. The history of the Restoration of the Society in the United States and the history of Georgetown College, as the first Jesuit College in the United States, are intimately connected. See John M. Daley, S.J., *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years* (Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 1957), pp. 121-125; see also Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 365-388.

appointment, 234 years later in 1870.⁶ In the establishment of the office of academic dean in colleges of arts and sciences, the following figures may be of interest. In eight large eastern institutions the median year was 1881 with a range from 1854 to 1899. Eight state universities follow with a median year of 1883 and a range from 1871 to 1896. "These two groups of institutions established the office earlier than the small eastern and small western colleges and universities which have median years of 1891 and 1898 respectively."⁷ The administrative accretion was very gradual. "Only 1, of 32 institutions studied, had established the office of dean by 1870; 10 by 1880; 78 percent by 1900. In all the large eastern and state institutions the office of dean had appeared by 1900."⁸ The determining factor in the establishment of the dean's office was not geography but the size of the institution.

"The fact is that the office of dean has been a response to the president's need for administrative assistance."⁹ The expansion of institutions, as we are well aware, brought obvious problems. "As the president's duties became too many and too onerous, his secretary, often called the secretary of the faculty, became dean. This office then took over some of the administrative duties and the president retained a secretary to assist with his immediate work."¹⁰ In several cases the work of the registrar, who preceded the deanship chronologically, had to be divided. Certain duties were then assigned to the newly created dean's office. These were principally educational functions which the president could no longer perform.

The establishment of the dean's office, and the creation of other collegiate officials, has inaugurated the science of academic administration. This is very important. "Within the past two decades students of administration have recognized that the process of decision making is at the heart of the administration of any enterprise."¹¹ Since in the larger institutions especially, the president must necessarily delegate important responsibilities to the dean, the dean in turn participates very intimately in the decision making machinery of the administration. For this reason, the academic dean has been "relieved of many or most of his responsibilities for student affairs." In lieu of those, the dean has assumed in-

⁶ Earl J. McGrath, "The Dean," *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. VII, No. 8 (November, 1936), p. 428. This article is a reliable summary of Dr. McGrath's doctoral dissertation which is no longer in print.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 428.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Sister Mary Frances *op. cit.*, p. 86.

¹¹ John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities* (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), p. 47.

creased responsibility "for budgeting the funds, to be available for the several departments, and for the promotion and selection of faculty members." Not only that, "as the institution grows larger, the responsibility for educational leadership devolves on the dean."¹² This follows a general pattern and the dean in a Jesuit institution has been similarly affected. The difference is that in the case of Jesuit institutions it was a matter of adaptation, not merely one of creation for an *ad hoc* situation. Yet the adaptation was so substantial as to be almost radical.

IV

The office of Prefect of Studies (or dean) in a Jesuit institution has the authority that is derived from experience and antiquity. In this, as in so many other aspects of education, the Society was an innovator and pathfinder. The rather smooth transition from the *Praefectus Studiorum* of the *Ratio*, with his duties clearly defined, to the dean of studies of today, indicates the adaptability of the *Ratio* and the modernity of the Society. A legitimate question may arise here. As the Rector became President and the Prefect became Dean, has there been loss of identity? If, *per impossibile*, Father Nadal and Father Ledesma were to visit a complex Jesuit institution today, would they recognize the Jesuit dean as the lineal descendant of the Prefect of Studies of 1599?

We would hope that a certain family resemblance and fraternal characteristics can still be discerned. In many respects the Jesuit dean has of necessity taken on the external habiliments, activities and manners of his lay counterparts in secular institutions. In this connection, it should be observed that the lay dean no longer conforms to the traditional caricature which was designed to expose his peculiarities. The typical dean was both tweedy and seedy; smoked a smelly pipe; was absent-minded; a kind of academic dutch uncle and aunt all in one. At the present time, nothing could be further from the truth. The academic dean today is a well-dressed, well-groomed man of affairs. In appearance he is similar to a successful banker and has all the *savoir faire* of a board member or businessman. He is well versed in money matters; he is at home on campus committees and at civic functions. He addresses various groups on a variety of subjects; makes trips to Washington and around the world. He is hardly the tweedy type. The danger is that he will become a rotarian. Even so, it does seem unfair to say that "deans in short are amiable fel-

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78. See also Frank L. McVey and Raymond M. Hughes, *Problems of College and University Administration* (The Iowa State College Press, 1952), p. 83.

lows with warm handclasps, great understanding and sympathy, and the fishiest eyes in piscatorial records."¹³

The Jesuit dean is influenced by the same forces and exigencies. Gone are the days when the Jesuit dean of studies would stand in cassock and biretta at his office door, saluting the boys by name, offering spiritual and academic advice, seeing all who wished an audience. Now the dean frequently goes to the office in street clothes, with topcoat and homburg handy, anticipating a full day. His business, after bidding good-bye to his secretary, may take him to the State House for a hearing, to lunch with Foundation directors and to an afternoon cocktail party—for necessary contacts, of course. He will usually return in time to sign his letters and say good night to his staff.

The point, in this admittedly exaggerated description, is to indicate that the Jesuit dean, *Ratio* or no *Ratio*, has, from close friend and priestly advisor of students, become the administrator. This is the important historical development in recent times in the office of academic dean. The dean has been transformed from an academician into an administrator. Two experienced educators agree that, in looking for a dean, "a president may very well consider the option between specialization and leadership. The latter may be the more important of the two . . . : Now and then, emphasis upon the essential of leadership, character, vision, judgment, and a co-operative spirit yields large dividends in the field of education."¹⁴ Many, therefore, are beginning to feel that in choosing a dean, the accent should be upon the *man*; only secondarily upon the *academic* man.¹⁵ This is further proof that the dean has become, with the president, one of the chief administrators on campus. Instead of supervising the students, he supervises the budget (of his school); instead of counseling the students, he hires, fires, or promotes the faculty; he meets with the chairmen, who then meet with the professors, who then meet the students. His role as Prefect of Studies has become subservient to other responsibilities. When all is said and done, the size and complexity of the modern university has made this necessary.¹⁶ Whether this is good or bad will be assessed by other papers.

¹³ Max S. Marshall, "How to be a Dean," *AAUP Bulletin*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter 1956), p. 637.

¹⁴ McVey and Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

¹⁵ "From the teacher's point of view it is not nearly so important that the dean be highly trained in a limited area as it is that he be well read and broadly trained so as to be able to counsel intelligently the representatives of the many departments that look to him for guidance or, at least, for understanding. He should be openminded, unprejudiced, and fair." Arthur F. Engelbert, "The Professor Looks at the Dean," *The Educational Record*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (October 1957), p. 316.

¹⁶ "Speaking of authority, the advent of the administrative hierarchy so prominent in the past few years is due rather largely to the deans. Business managers and other administrative units creep into organizations, following the lead of controllers, purchasing agents, recorders, and

V

Before indicating in detail how the Society has prepared for and adjusted to this changing academic world, it might be helpful to review briefly the history of the organization of Jesuit education in the recent past. For the emerging role of the Jesuit dean took place within this design in the American Assistancy.

Following increased enrollments after World War I, American colleges and universities became more highly organized and complex. Innovations were introduced, standards were raised, new programs initiated. In fact, comparing articles on education after World War I and World War II, one is reminded of the French aphorism: *Plus c'est change, plus c'est la meme chose*. In any case, certain American Jesuits strongly felt that the time had come for a re-appraisal of present policies and recommendations for the future course of Jesuit education in the United States.

Consequently, a group of Fathers, assembled at Fordham University in June, 1920, "had expressed a wish that the Very Reverend Fathers Provincial should call together during the year representatives of our Provinces in America to discuss various plans whereby we might mutually help one another and become more closely united in the Society's great work, education of youth."¹⁷ The Fathers Provincial then appointed a committee composed of representatives of the four American and one Canadian Provinces. This group was to be known as "the Inter-Province Committee on Studies" and met annually from 1921 to 1931.¹⁸ At the very first meeting, "the Fathers assembled (were) unanimous in their conviction that the spirit of the *Ratio Studiorum* cannot be maintained with the present schedule of subjects."¹⁹ In this and subsequent meetings changes were recommended that would preserve the spirit of the *Ratio* in a new curriculum, raise standards, challenge the superior students and ensure the accreditation of institutions by regional associations.

The Inter-Province Committee on Studies gave way to the Inter-Province Commission on Higher Studies which was appointed by Father General W. Ledochowski in December, 1930. This Commission was composed of six Fathers who labored for many months on the task

others. These administrators often have hurdles to jump, the deans. Most of them enter their jobs with some respect for deans; deans not only represent hurdles but they have also attained posts in their academic fields. The respect soon gives way to realization that deans are just persons, which is a fatal day for deans." Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 641.

¹⁷ *Report of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, 1921-1931*, p. 1. This Report is filed in the Archives of the Central Office of the Jesuit Educational Association.

¹⁸ During this period the Assistancy grew from four to six Provinces, adding New England in 1926 and Chicago in 1928.

¹⁹ *Report*, p. 3.

assigned to them. "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." As a result of this report, Father Ledochowski issued the famous *Instructio* with a covering letter under date of August 15, 1934. This *Instructio* was to be put into operation at once; its provisions, tested for a period of three years, to become permanent at the expiration of that date with whatever modifications were found to be necessary.²⁰ At the same time, Father Daniel O'Connell of the Chicago Province was appointed National Secretary of Education.²¹

Due to a number of unforeseen events (which included the revision of the *Ratio Studiorum*, the promulgation of the Apostolic Constitution on Studies and World War II), fourteen years elapsed before the revised and permanent *Instructio* was given to the American Assistancy. In a letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy, September 27, 1948, Father General John B. Janssens noted that "the document which . . . I am sending to the Assistancy is substantially the same *Instructio* which my predecessor f.m. published on August 15, 1934."²²

Meanwhile, in October, 1937, Father Edward B. Rooney was appointed National Secretary of Education to succeed Father O'Connell.²³ The Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association was first approved by Father Ledochowski on July 31, 1939, and the organization as we know it today began to function.²⁴

VI

It is within this framework of reorganization, provincial expansion, academic growth and physical development that one must view the changing role of the Prefect of Studies in a Jesuit institution. Since the office of Prefect of Studies or dean is now second in importance to the president, qualifications for this appointee were early made a part of

²⁰ Letter of Father W. Ledochowski to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy, *Acta Romana*, S.J., Vol. VII (1932-1934), p. 920-922.

²¹ Letter of Father W. Ledochowski to the Provincial Superiors of the American Assistancy, August 15, 1934, *Ibid.*, pp. 923-926. The text of the *Instructio* follows in the *A.R.*, Vol. VII, pp. 927-935.

²² *A.R.*, XI (1948), pp. 568-571. The text of the revised *Instructio* follows, pp. 571-579. For a detailed account of events leading up to the promulgation of the *Instructio*, see Matthew J. Fitzsimmons, S.J., "The *Instructio*, 1934-1949," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (October 1949), 69-78.

²³ The title Executive Director used in the J.E.A. Constitution for the National Secretary of Education, was later changed to President of the J.E.A.

²⁴ The revised Constitution for the J.E.A. was later approved by Father Norbert de Boynes, Vicar General, on February 9, 1946. The Constitution (with the *Instructio*) has been printed for private circulation (J.E.A., New York, 1948).

every agenda. At the 1933 meeting of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, the Fathers made the following recommendation:

In order that those who take up the office of Dean may gain advantage from their predecessors, it has been moved by the Fathers assembled that a committee of three . . . compile a booklet of instructions for deans. All those who hold, or who have held the office of Prefect of Studies, are urged to help the committee in the compilation of this booklet. It is suggested that some of our younger men who show aptitude for this office should be given experience as assistants to the deans.²⁵

The Committee repeated this recommendation in subsequent annual meetings, urgently advising "that those who are destined for such work be given an opportunity to familiarize themselves with their duties well in advance by assisting experienced officials and even by attending suitable courses in universities."²⁶

In developing this point, the Commission on Higher Studies appointed by Father Ledochowski was very forthright in its criticism and explicit in its recommendation. Noting, first of all, that "adequate administrative organization in many if not most of our Jesuit institutions has been strangely and sadly conspicuous by its absence," the Commission then prescribed the remedy.²⁷ From among heads of departments, "the choice and appointment of deans whether of colleges or of schools in a university should normally be made. Any "trial and error" method on this point in the future will be as fatal for our Jesuit institutions as it has been regrettable in the past."²⁸ Moreover, continued the Commission:

If there is one thing more than any other which has most frequently and most seriously baffled our best efforts throughout the American Assistancy, it is the universal lack of special training of individuals in administration. The all-pervading and persistent indifference with which this regrettable lack has been viewed in the past has been nothing less than disastrous in the lives of our men and of our institutions as well. Placed in administrative positions as dean or principal, for which he was absolutely untrained and, in too many instances, equally unfitted by character or disposition, many a man failed utterly, as he was bound to fail, while the college or high school became so demoralized that he had to be removed, only to be replaced by another man as unfit as himself, with identical results for the school concerned.²⁹

²⁵ *Report of the Inter-Province Committee, 1921-1925; 1927-1931*, p. 33.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²⁷ *Report of the Commission on Higher Studies of the American Assistancy of the Society of Jesus, 1931-1932*, p. 168.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-170.

These incisive comments were not without effect. The recommendation of the Commission that deans should be academically qualified and professionally trained is incorporated quite explicitly in the *Instructio*. Article 11 reads:

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.³⁰

In addition, the dean is to be given authority commensurate with his position and sufficient for his purposes, as indicated in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the same *Instructio*:

PRAEFECTORUM AUCTORITAS.—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.³¹

This legislation was then translated into practice through the Constitution of the J.E.A. which, in turn, is implemented in part through its permanent Commissions. "The functions of these permanent commissions shall be to study specific problems in their respective areas."³² The Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges, composed exclusively of deans, is therefore designed as an appropriate council for discussing common problems, sharing experiences, initiating programs and projects, formulating principles and policies for the better administration of the dean's office. If the commission acts with vigor and singleness of purpose, it could perform a powerful service in giving valuable advice for the preparation and training of new deans. It can also help to bring old ones (who sometimes die) up to date. One of the best ways of doing this is through a full-fledged, completely candid and professional presentation and discussion of major problems in plenary sessions. Such was the Deans' Institute held at Denver, in 1948. This represented a giant step forward.

VII

"The proposal to provide an Institute for the undergraduate college administrators of the American Assistancy originated at the Holy Cross

³⁰ *A.R.*, XI (1948), p. 574.

³¹ *A.R.*, XI (1948), p. 574.

³² Constitution of J.E.A., Art. VII.

meeting of the Executive Committee . . . in the spring of 1947."³³ This proposal was then approved by the Board of Governors in May 1947 and it was decided to hold the Institute at Regis College, Denver, in the summer of 1948.

It was early agreed, in discussing the purposes of the Institute, that any attempt to attack all the problems that beset American, especially Jesuit, collegiate education, would lead to superficiality and dissatisfaction. "It was, therefore, determined that this Institute would devote itself to administrative problems almost entirely, and that the criterion for inclusion in the agenda would be twofold, namely, the significance of the area toward improvement of the academic effectiveness of the college and the immediacy of the administrative problems in relationship to academic quality."³⁴ To put it succinctly, the purpose of the Institute was to increase "academic quality of the Jesuit College through administrative functioning."³⁵ With this purpose clearly before it, the Denver Institute then attacked the problem of "quality through administration" from twelve different headings or departments that related directly, or even obliquely, to this theme. The treatment was exhaustive and can be studied in the voluminous *Proceedings* of the Institute which makes up a volume of over 300 pages. The apposite, candid and practical resolutions sponsored by the Institute attest the seriousness of its purpose and reflect the fruit of its deliberations.

It would not be possible nor even desirable to review in detail the sessions of that Institute. Rather, the point here is to recognize and understand the cohesive progression of and the natural academic articulation between the themes chosen for successive institutes. The comprehension and implementation of one depend upon the foundation laid by another. The second Deans' Institute illustrates this truth.

Having established at Denver the basic connection between administration and academic quality, the second Deans' Institute, which met at Santa Clara in the summer of 1955, examined and explored the fundamental scope of academic *Objectives, Curriculum* and *Evaluation* pertaining to Jesuit education.³⁶ These aspects of Jesuit education, of course, cannot be discussed in a vacuum; they must be tied to a tangible goal. This goal is a quality college, with quality students receiving a quality education. Consequently, the administrator must know the objectives of

³³ *Proceedings of the Institute for Jesuit Deans of the Jesuit Educational Association* (Regis College, Denver, 1948), p. 1.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.* In order to aid the discussions at Denver, a volume reporting facts and policies in Jesuit colleges was prepared and placed in the hands of participants prior to the Institute. This item entitled: *Academic Policies and Practices in American Jesuit Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Schools of Business Administration* (Saint Louis, Missouri, July 1, 1948).

³⁶ *Proceedings of the Santa Clara Institute for Jesuit College Deans*, August, 1955 (J.E.A., New York, 1955).

a Jesuit college, he must administer a curriculum to that end and he must also be familiar with the machinery for self-evaluation in order to compare the effort with the result. These several parts are usually isolated for the convenience of discussion, but they are in reality closely related as indicated by Warren G. Findley in his address to the delegates at Santa Clara. "Just as reference to clearly stated objectives is basic to sound curriculum building, in the same way an evaluation program to be sound must be built with reference to the objectives of the institution and its instructional program."³⁷

The correlation, the articulation and the successful prosecution of such a program is primarily the responsibility of the academic dean. If he does this well, with courage and consistency, he will achieve the immediate goal toward which all these means conspire. The immediate goal is academic excellence. This, of course, is easier said than done.

In order to do it, the dean must be resourceful and skillful in his dealings with other administrators, with the faculty and students. This, in fact, is the theme of the third Deans' Institute which follows logically and naturally from the first two. In a sense, the first two Institutes revolved around the basic business of the dean's office; this Institute is concerned with the precise details and specific means necessary for achieving a definite goal, which again is academic excellence in faculty and students.³⁸ Nothing can be more important.

VIII

One final word may elicit a generous response. In researching recent institutes and conferences on deans and the dean's office, one becomes increasingly aware of the paucity of serious writings on the office of academic dean. This is in contrast to the full length portraits that have been drawn of the college president by present or past incumbents of that office. There is no such literature to light the path of new deans or to broaden the vision of old "pros."³⁹ The gold that will be mined at this Institute, mixed with the deposits that were panned in 1948 and 1955, should prove a treasure house of source material for one who would write a definitive study of the office of dean in a Jesuit college. Perhaps someone here will be found trained for and equal to the task.

³⁷ "Existing and Needed Tests of the General Outcomes of Jesuit Higher Education," *Ibid.*, p. 145.

³⁸ For some excellent papers on the role of the dean in College of Business Administration, see *Proceedings of the Institute on Business Administration*, August 1960. (Regis College, Denver). This Institute was also sponsored by the J.E.A.

³⁹ The answer is hardly to be found in W. Storrs Lee's *God Bless Our Queer Old Dean* (New York, Putnam, 1959).

The Dean's Responsibility for Academic Excellence

CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.

As I set myself to compose this address on the responsibility of the dean for academic excellence, there was ringing in my ears the definition of a dean I had recently heard from one of the deans at Harvard. "A dean," he said, "is an academic handy man." His implication seemed to be that there is more emphasis on the handy man aspect of the role than on the academic. Indeed, a swarm of deans brought together for ten days as we are might well spend their time in lamentation and mutual commiseration over the diminished status, the dubious influence, and the equivocal authority of the dean in a modern college.

A century ago the college president was the dominant academic figure on campus. That was the era of scholar-presidents, often philosopher-presidents, like Mark Hopkins of Williams, McCosh of Princeton, Noah Porter of Yale, Wayland of Brown and Tappan of Michigan. The simplicity of their institutions at that time enabled these men not only to teach and to earn international reputations as scholarly writers while acting as presidents, but to take personal charge of the academic administration of the college.

As colleges grew in size and complexity, many of them becoming universities, the president no longer had time for personal scholarship or even for the direct administration of the college academically. As we know, the president was forced to enter the careers of high finance, public relations, architecture, construction and platform oratory. In this situation the dean, though responsible to the president, became the central academic figure and chief academic administrator of the institution.

But the dean's days on his administrative Olympus were few. Colleges and universities kept growing, adding students, adding faculty, adding disciplines, adding schools. Just as the time came when the president had to relinquish the academic reins to a dean, so the day arrived when the massive responsibilities of the dean had to be shared with subordinate functionaries such as department chairmen, registrars, directors of admission, deans of men, academic and personal counselors, public relations officers, and placement personnel. The dean suddenly found his power drained, his influence dissipated. But the worst was not yet. Universities

continued their growth and the dean, who had once been unique on campus, found himself one of a crowd. Deans multiplied to such an extent that eventually a dean of deans or academic vice-president was appointed to coordinate the academic efforts of a complex institution. And now the dean, who by this time could be called a 'mere' dean, saw some of his authority pulled upwards by the vice-president and the rest of it pulled downwards by his subordinates. And when things had reached this pass, it is easy to see how a dean could conclude, in the spirit of the Harvard man quoted earlier, that if an administrator is supposed to be a good office man, then a typical dean in a modern college is merely a good office boy.

There is a certain plausibility in this portrayal of the dean's present status. But it would be a serious misconception of the true role and responsibility of the dean were one to conclude that the dean's sphere of influence has been constricted to his office staff or that his stenorette offers him his only chance to dictate. After all, the diffusion of administrative leadership that has taken place in the expanding collegiate enterprise is paralleled by what has happened in American industry and business. As organizations have grown, authority has been decentralized and delegated. Top business executives have not been made weaker by this transition. They have become stronger, more valuable, more highly remunerated, as they have developed skills of indirect and cooperative administration. As a matter of fact, should any dean here suffer from a deflated self-concept, I suggest that he consider the number of people—and the variety of their supposed talents—appointed to assist him in academic administration. Following the reasoning of St. Ignatius that a leader should be willing to do and capable of doing what he asks his subordinates to do, we may presume that a dean has a registrar's competence in handling details, a chairman's dedication to academic excellence, the supportive attitude towards students of a counseling psychologist, the outgoing warmth of a recruitment officer, and so on.

But although the modern dean accomplishes much of his task through the delegation of authority, through the supervision of subordinates, through committees and through group dynamics, I submit that he is still a unique academic force on the campus; he is unique in his responsibility, and therefore in his authority, regarding academic excellence, and this both by statute and by circumstance. Most statutes declare the dean to be the top officer of academic administration in his college, responsible to the president or the president's delegate, the academic vice-president. But besides this legal source of authority there is what may be called the moral source of authority, namely, the nature of the dean's

office as it has developed in the United States. And while it is comforting to have statutes to turn to for clarification or support when particular doubts or conflicts arise, in the academic community perhaps the more broadly accepted source of the dean's authority is the nature of his task, which in a sense the statutes recognize rather than create.

The president, with the trustees, remains the ultimate decision-maker in all areas. The president has not shed academic authority or responsibility. He has entrusted it to his dean. The dean is the president's academic *alter ego*. I will return in a moment to the relationship between the dean and president. First I want to speak of the relationship of the dean to the faculties. I use the word faculties in the plural deliberately, because even in a single-purpose college there are departments, and the members of departments tend to have the characteristics and create the problems that are associated with the faculties of autonomous schools.

Departments aspire to autonomy or tend to assume autonomy. They are apt to be aggressively self-centered and in relation to the total institution exert a centrifugal influence. This is not something to be stopped, but controlled. A department that single-mindedly pursues departmental excellence and furthers departmental interests gives evidence of a professional vigor and dedication that administrators pray for. But there is needed a man on the spot and at the top to hold together these centrifugal forces of an institution. This is the dean, who encourages and delicately moderates, who coordinates, balances and harmonizes the efforts of the departments.

The dean is the symbol of and the spokesman for the academic aspirations of the total college. While seconding the drive towards the attainment of limited and immediate goals of particular professors, departments or divisions, the dean steadfastly seeks to raise the sights of faculty members, department chairmen and all officers of the college to the universal, transcendent goals of the institution.

Ideally the dean is a scholar so that he readily identifies with and is accepted by the faculty as a colleague. But it should not be forgotten that the dean is, in no pejorative sense, a company man. He represents the institution. His primary commitment is to the special purposes and academic ideals of his institution rather than to the claims of a detached scholarship. This may be a source of difference or tension between the dean and some faculty members.

In his recent book, *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*, John Corson says, "A minority among the members of most faculties have thought deeply and analytically about educational programs. . . . Most faculty members are subject-matter specialists; few are educators in a

comprehensive sense." Paul Woodring made a similar observation recently in the *Saturday Review*. "The professor's emotional identification," he wrote, "is with his field—history, physics, mathematics, literature, psychology, or whatever it may be. He may serve his instructorship at Harvard, then move on to Wisconsin as an assistant professor, to Stanford as associate professor, and then to Princeton as a professor. If he started out as a historian he remains a historian in all these universities and his commitment to history is much deeper than his commitment to any university." The same point was made by Caplow and McGee in *The Academic Marketplace*. They found that the greater the reputation and achievement of a professor in his discipline and the higher the prestige of the institution employing him the more likely the professor is to place his first loyalty with his discipline rather than with the institution. Perhaps this is as it should be where scholars are concerned. But if this is true, then there exists the grave necessity of asserting, selling, and securing the achievement of the comprehensive educational goals of the institution despite the scholarly detachment of individual faculty members. And the dean is the officer charged, by statutes and by tradition, with this important task.

Let me specify just three areas in which the dean's institutional viewpoint should modify the thinking, or at least the behavior, of department chairmen and faculty members.

First let me speak of the place of the student in the academic economy. I take it that despite our worthy concern for research, for the pursuit of truth, and for excellence of faculty, a college or university still has as its major obligation the academic excellence of the students who come to it for education. I know many academicians who would quickly retort that research, faculty prestige, and student achievement are not unrelated or mutually exclusive. The third, they would say, is the result of the other two. To a very great extent this is true. Still I think some of our strongest faculty members need reminding that none of us would be here but for the students, that students are not intruders or of secondary significance in the collegiate enterprise or merely means to further the professors' research projects. Someone has said that in the education of young children the primacy of the individual should be the first consideration, but that with college students the primacy of the discipline should be recognized. I think we can all agree with this proposition. But accepting the notion of the primacy of the discipline does not justify attitudes of indifference, much less disrespect towards students. I was happy to read in an address given at the meeting of Jesuit deans of men last March by Father Patrick Ratterman, Dean of Men at Xavier, a call

for the elimination of the idea that students are to be seen but not heard, a call for constructive attitudes towards students and a recognition of their maturity and capacity for responsible participation in collegiate matters.

The dean, of course, can set a good example by his own relationship with individual students and with student groups. There is a danger here, of course. The dean must not be maneuvered into the position where he is regarded by the staff as the students' big brother and therefore anti-intellectual. Of course, no dean can be immune from perverse interpretations of his acts and attitudes. But there is no incompatibility between a genuine and uncompromising dedication to scholarship of the highest order, in students as well as in faculty, and a simultaneous conviction that an education of young men and women that we expect to be humanizing, liberalizing, and Christianizing in its effects should be humane, liberal, and Christian in its process. With all due respect to the faculty and its importance in the complex of higher education, I would point out that some faculty members are transients, whether Jesuit or lay. They are with us a few years and then they are gone. But our students, if they survive, are ours forever. They have chosen us. They have put their future in our hands. They will carry our degree through their lives. They will bear our formation to the grave. Our responsibility to them is not light. And the most passionate devotion to scholarship will not excuse perfunctory teaching or counseling of students. I think a major duty of a dean is to try to create or encourage among his faculty not a sentimental attitude towards students, but a recognition of their dignity and their importance to the purposes and destiny of the institution. It is the academic excellence not of robots or of faceless members of a mass but of human beings, persons, and brothers in Christ that the college and its faculty exist to foster.

Secondly a university or college faculty is, we say, a community of scholars. We know that the word community can have a merely geographical or also a social and moral connotation. Administrative leadership at the supra-departmental level is needed to insure a spiritual and intellectual community among the faculty. Departments tend to be self-absorbed and isolationist. This leads to ignorance of and indifference to the activities of other departments and often to inter-departmental rivalries. Not merely in the interests of harmony, but in order to communicate to all staff members the larger academic perspectives of the institution as a whole, the dean should devise means—through social gatherings, joint meetings, symposia, lectures, or more subtle strategems—to foster mutual understanding and respect among the several departments

or divisions of the college. But the intellectual life of an institution of higher learning is more than the sum-total of the disciplinary or even inter-disciplinary interests of its faculty. It is more than the sum of the formal teaching and formal research that is done. A college or university is, to adapt Barzun's phrase, a house of intellect in the broadest sense. Where a vital community of scholars exists, there you have a dialogue concerning problems too recent to be found in textbooks, too broad or elusive to be confined to one course or department; problems like the peace corps or the ecumenical movement or the freedom riders.

The dean is the figure who stands for this larger intellectual life. The dean is the one who, while contriving and conspiring and cooperating for the strengthening of each department and each member of each department, at the same time promotes among faculty and students a wide-ranging curiosity, a generous intellectual life, an involvement in the things of the mind and the problems of man, transcending departmental and curricular boundaries. Many other people can and do assist the dean in establishing a vital intellectual spirit and a reputation for general cerebral vitality on a campus. But the dean is the one answerable for this matter; he is the only officer of the university charged with the promotion of academic excellence in this comprehensive sense.

The third point has to do with what Professor Robert Pace of Syracuse University calls institutional press. Several studies of collegians made in recent years reveal the discouraging fact that colleges often are not having the effect upon students that they aim to have and think they are having. Indeed it appears that in not a few instances, the college is changed more by its students than the students are by the college. Pace uses the concept of press to express the dominant and effective drive of an institution, under the leadership of students or faculty or both, towards certain broad outcomes such as intellectualism, social conformity and success, or rebellion.

I think we would agree that if an institution does not control its press, if not the institution but its students determine the spirit of the college, then it should close its doors, because the school is being educated by the students, not the students by the school. I have been asked in this opening address to speak of colleges and universities in general, not of Catholic institutions. But on this point of institutional press it is necessary to indicate that a Catholic college cannot allow the spirit of the institution to be set by the faculty independently of the administration. Individual faculty members and whole departments may have valid but limited goals which do not contradict yet do not coincide with the comprehensive religio-intellectual goals of the institution. Once again it is the

task of the dean, who is spokesman for the president and the trustees and whatever larger tradition or system of education they represent—it is the task of the dean to raise the sights of the faculty, to keep before them the ultimate ideals of the Catholic college and to indicate the means and the attitudes and the atmosphere appropriate for the pursuance of those ideals.

This is the office of an academician not of a preacher, because this concerns the vision of truth and of scholarship that are proper to and only possible in a Catholic setting. I can think of no better summary of the insistent message of Catholic scholarship it is the dean's duty to give to his faculty than the ringing words of Dietrich von Hildebrand in his essay on Catholic higher education.

Catholic Universities are therefore necessary for the sake of truly adequate objective knowledge, not by any means merely for the protection of the religious convictions of the students. They are needed as the institutions where Catholic thinkers and men of science, supported by a truly Catholic environment, informed in their attitude by the spirit of Christ and of His Church, shall be enabled by a really unbiased, truly liberated and enlightened intelligence to penetrate adequately to reality and to achieve by organized team-work that *universitas* that is nowadays so urgently needed. . . . A Catholic university would have no meaning, if it were nothing but a collection of Catholic men of thought and science, while following the model of the modern university in its general atmosphere. It requires an environment imbued with prayer; as an organism it must in its structure and in the common life of its teachers among each other and with their students be thoroughly Catholic. The students must breathe a Catholic air and Catholic spirit which will make them into anti-pedantic, humble, faithful, metaphysically courageous men of winged intelligence and yearning, and therewith capable of truly adequate and objective knowledge. The demand for a Catholic university must therefore be pressed in the name of such adequate knowledge, and not by any means only in the interest of 'Catholics.'¹

This is the message of collegiate purpose, of Christian scholarship that the dean is privileged and obligated to propound.

I spoke a while ago of the dean as the president's *alter ego*. By this is not meant a rubber stamp. Indeed it might be more appropriate to call the dean the president's academic conscience. The president has the ultimate responsibility for the academic excellence and the academic well-being of the total institution. But the president has many other responsibilities

¹Dietrich von Hildebrand, *The Conception of a Catholic University in The University In a Changing World*, Walter M. Kotschnig, edit. (London, Oxford U. Press, 1932) pp. 219-220.

and other responsible advisors besides his dean. The dean should be an active, disturbing, and persuasive conscience to the president. As a member of the top administration, the dean should of course have a seasoned sense of fiscal responsibility. This is something that many faculty members and even some department chairmen lack. So in dealing with faculty members and department chairmen the dean should interpret the fiscal situation and indicate the limits of fiscal possibility. But when the dean speaks to the president, he knows there are others to recommend caution and honestly advance non-academic interests, so he should be a vigorous advocate of the academic, of faculty welfare, of student advancement, of the central intellectual interests of the institution. The dean does not serve his president well by being a timid or easily discouraged exponent of academic excellence. The dean stands at the president's side as the spokesman for the faculty and every member of the faculty, as the spokesman for each department and division, as the spokesman for the intellectual aims and vitality of the college, as the spokesman for the ideals, the press of the institution. The dean's position here is critical. In none of his other roles is he in a more strategic position to further the interests of academic excellence than when he advises the president. Diplomatically and cogently, he must press the case for scholarly advancement even when it costs money, as it usually does. If he has the two qualities Dean Devane of Yale cites as the most necessary for his trade—patience and cunning, he will help the president do his academic duty without at the same time making plans to get a new dean.

Speaking at a conference of academic deans, Brown's former president, Henry Wriston said, "The functions of a dean are as the sands of the sea—myriad. I shall not attempt to enumerate them, but sort out a few grains from the shelving beach." I make the same apology. Out of the countless ways in which a dean generates, encourages, promotes, and rewards academic excellence, I have given only a few examples. I have chosen just a few grains; and, making no pretensions to being an oyster, I have been unable to serve you pearls.

MOST ERUDITE

Let us be the most erudite historians, the most experienced scientists, the most acute philosophers; and history, science and philosophy will not be divorced from religion.

—Archbishop John Ireland

Status of Special Studies

1961-1962

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

It is just twenty years ago that we began publishing in the *Quarterly* an annual report entitled "Status of Special Studies" in the American Assistancy. The first report was published in the September 1942 issue of the *Quarterly*.¹ A few comparisons between the figures yielded by that report and the present one, as well as by other statistics of the American Assistancy for the years 1942 and 1962, may be of interest.

In 1942, the American Assistancy comprised seven provinces with a total of 5,712 Jesuits. Today, the Assistancy numbers 11 provinces with 8,101 members. In 1942, there were 90 special students, 63 priests and 27 scholastics; while today there are 314 Jesuits engaged in full-time special studies. Of these, 202 are priests and 112 are scholastics. It is obvious that the total of 314 special students is the highest total recorded since we began to publish the annual reports. For those who prefer to deal with percentages rather than with numbers it may be interesting to note that the 90 special students reported in 1942 represented 1.5% of total manpower of the American Assistancy; today's 314 represents 3.9% of our total manpower.

I. COMPARATIVE STATISTICS, 1957-1962

	57-58	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62
Full-time Graduate Students	247	260	292	293	314
Priest Graduate Students	158	169	177	178	202
Scholastic Graduate Students	89	91	115	115	112
Candidates for Ph.D.	133	164	174	183	196
Candidates for Other Doctors	22	22	29	27	39
Candidates for M.A.	44	34	34	43	27
Candidates for M.S.	30	20	33	20	17
Candidates for Other Masters	3	9	5	7	10
Candidates for Other Degrees	4	6	6	6	6
Special Studies but No Degrees	11	5	11	7	19

Leaving our comparisons with figures of twenty years ago and examining the data given in Table I for this year and last, we may discover more interesting facts. For example, this year there is an increase of 21 special

¹ Volume V, p. 129.

students over last year. There are 24 more priests and 3 less scholastics devoting full time to special studies this year than last. The total of 235 studying for the doctorate this year is an increase of 25 over last year's 210 doctoral students, but the number of those working for a master's degree has declined from 70 in 1961 to 54 this year. In 1960-1961, those seeking degrees other than the usual doctor's or master's degree numbered 18; this year, their number is 16. The total of those engaged full-time in special studies, but without a degree objective—at least an immediate one—increased from 7 last year to 19 this year.

Similar interesting comparisons might be instituted between this year's figures and those for the previous years shown in Table I.

II. DEGREE SOUGHT

	<i>Buffalo</i>	<i>California</i>	<i>Chicago</i>	<i>Detroit</i>	<i>Maryland</i>	<i>Missouri</i>	<i>New England</i>	<i>New Orleans</i>	<i>New York</i>	<i>Oregon</i>	<i>Wisconsin</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Ph.D., New	3	6	8	2	7	2	8	1	5	2	10	54
Ph.D., Continued	5	15	13	16	9	13	14	7	20	8	22	142
S.T.D., New	2	2	1	1	3	.	4	.	2	1	.	16
S.T.D., Continued	2	2	1	2	.	1	.	.	.	1	9
Other Doctor, New	1	1	1	.	.	1	1	1	.	.	1	7
Other Doctor, Continued	3	1	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	1	7
(Total Doctors)	11	29	26	20	21	16	29	9	28	11	35	235
M.A., New	4	2	.	3	8	.	.	2	2	21
M.A., Continued	1	.	1	.	.	2	2	6
M.S., New	3	1	.	.	.	1	3	.	1	.	.	9
M.S., Continued	1	1	2	2	1	.	1	8
Other Masters, New	1	2	.	.	.	2	5
Other Masters, Continued	1	1	.	.	.	2	.	.	1	.	5
(Total Masters)	5	4	8	4	1	6	16	.	1	3	6	54
Other Degrees, New	1	1	2
Other Degrees, Cont'd	1	1	.	2	4
No Degree, New	2	1	.	.	2	.	6	.	5	1	1	18
No Degree, Continued	1	1
TOTAL 1961-1962	18	35	36	24	26	22	52	9	34	15	43	314
1960-1961	11	34	30	24	23	32	45	11	31	11	41	293
Plus or Minus	+7	+1	+6	—	+3	-10	+7	-2	+3	+4	+2	+21

Using the same general categories as those listed in Table I, Table II gives a breakdown of degree and non-degree students by province. This table enables one to see at a glance the status of the special studies program of each province of the Assistancy since it gives both province totals and the number of candidates of each province studying for the different

degrees or for no degree. For purposes of further study, Table II also lists last year's province totals, and indicates this year's increase or decrease.

Taking the data given in Table II and ranking the provinces according to their absolute total number of special students, we find the following interesting list: *New England*: total 52, priests 27, scholastics 25; *Wisconsin*: total 43, priests 21, scholastics 22; *Chicago*: total 36, priests 24, scholastics 12; *California*: total 35, priests 29, scholastics 6; *New York*: total 34, priests 28, scholastics 6; *Maryland*: total 26, priests 19, scholastics 7; *Detroit*: total 24, priests 16, scholastics 8; *Missouri*: total 22, priests 12, scholastics 10; *Buffalo*: total 18, priests 12, scholastics 6; *Oregon*: total 15, priests 10, scholastics 5; *New Orleans*: total 9, priests 4, scholastics 5.

This order changes considerably if instead of listing according to the absolute number of special students, we institute a comparison between the percentage of the total manpower of the Assistancy in each of the 11 provinces and the percentage in each province of the total number of special students. Here is the result of such a comparison: *Buffalo*, with a manpower ranking eleventh (3.72%), ranks ninth in special students (5.73%); *Detroit*, tenth in manpower (6.72%), seventh in special students (7.64%); *New Orleans*, ninth in manpower (7.43%), eleventh in special students (2.87%); *Chicago*, eighth in manpower (8.15%), third in special students (11.46%); *Oregon*, seventh in manpower (8.42%), tenth in special students (4.78%); *Wisconsin*, sixth in manpower (8.88%), second in special students (13.69%); *Missouri*, fifth in manpower (9.32%), eighth in special students (7.01%); *California*, fourth in manpower (10.04%), fourth in special students (11.15%); *Maryland*, third in manpower (10.25%), sixth in special students (8.28%); *New England*, second in manpower (13.66%), first in special students (16.56%); *New York*, first in manpower (13.86%), fifth in special students (10.83%).

From the data furnished by Table II, we can also rank provinces according to the number of doctoral students in each. Here is what such a ranking would show: *Wisconsin*, 35; *California*, 29; *New England*, 29; *New York*, 28; *Chicago*, 26; *Maryland*, 21; *Detroit*, 20; *Missouri*, 16; *Buffalo*, 11; *Oregon*, 11; *New Orleans*, 9.

An examination of the various master fields in which Jesuit special students are engaged, as seen in Table III, should enable us to draw conclusions on the educational needs of the American provinces. Here are some. This year, Jesuit special students are engaged in forty-one general fields of study. The two fields that claim the largest number of students are those which might be designated as the ecclesiastical and math-

IV. SCHOOLS

	Buffalo	California	Chicago	Detroit	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Wisconsin	Totals
Al Hikma*	6	6
Biblical*	.	.	1	.	.	1	2
Boston College	.	.	1	1	.	.	6	.	1	1	.	10
Bonn*	.	.	1	1
California	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	.	1	.	.	4
California, Berkley	.	2	2
California, L.A.	.	1	1
California Tech.	.	1	1
Case Tech.	.	.	1	1	2
Catholic U.	.	.	2	.	3	3	1	1	2	.	2	14
Chicago	.	1	4	2	7
Chicago Conservatory	.	.	1	1
Columbia	2	1	1	.	1	.	1	.	2	.	.	8
Cornell	1	.	.	1	2
Creighton	1	1
Detroit	.	.	.	1	1
Duquesne	1	1
Edinburgh*	.	1	1
Fordham	5	1	3	1	.	3	7	1	6	3	.	30
Freiberg*	1	1
Georgetown	.	2	1	.	4	.	3	1	3	.	1	15
Gregorian*	3	5	4	1	5	1	4	1	.	3	4	31
Harvard	.	1	1	2	3	2	6	1	1	.	1	18
Illinois	.	.	1	.	.	1	1	3
Indiana	1	1
Institut Catholique*	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	2	.	.	.	4
Institut Liturgie*	.	.	1	1
Institut Filosofia*	1	1
Iowa	1	1
Javeriana*	1	1
Johns Hopkins	1	.	.	.	1	.	4	2	.	.	4	12
Kansas	1	1
London*	.	2	1	.	.	1	4
Louisiana	1	.	2	.	3
Louvain*	1	.	1	4	.	.	6
Loyola, Chicago	1	.	4	2	.	1	.	1	.	.	3	12
Lumen Vitae*	1	.	.	2	.	.	.	3
McGill*	.	.	1	1
Marquette	.	1	7	8
M.I.T.	.	1	2	.	1	.	.	4
Massachusetts	1	1
Michigan	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	2
Munich*	.	2	.	1	1	.	4
New York City	1	.	1	.	1	.	.	3

* Non-United States schools

IV. SCHOOLS (continued)

	Buffalo	California	Chicago	Detroit	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Wisconsin	Totals
North Carolina		3		1	1	1					1	7
Northwestern	1	1	1	1		1					2	7
Notre Dame									1			1
Oriental Institute*							1		1			2
Ottawa*		2	1									3
Oxford*			1	1	1							3
Paris*		1										1
Pennsylvania			1				2				2	5
Princeton											1	1
Rome*											1	1
St. Louis	1	4	1	4		3	2		1	2	3	21
Simmons							1					1
Sorbonne*											2	2
Southern California				1								1
Stanford		1										1
Strasbourg*		1										1
Syracuse											1	1
Texas				1								1
Toronto*							1					1
Vienna*											1	1
Washington						1				2		3
Wayne							1					1
Weston							2					2
Wisconsin	1				1						1	3
Woodstock				1								1
Xavier			1									1
Yale										1		1
Yeshiva									3			3

* Non-United States schools

Anthropology (1) at Pennsylvania; *Architecture* (1) at Princeton; *Art* (1) at Sorbonne; *Astronomy* (1) at Georgetown; *Biology* (14) at Boston (1), California (1), Catholic U. (3), Columbia (1), Fordham (2), Johns Hopkins (3), St. Louis (1), Munich (1), Wisconsin (1); *Business Administration* (5) at California (1), Harvard (2), New York (1), St. Louis (1); *Canon Law* (4) at Gregorian; *Catechetics* (3) at Lumen Vitae; *Chemistry* (17) at Boston College (2), California (1), Case (1), Fordham (3), Iowa (1), Johns Hopkins (2), Loyola, Chicago, (3), Massachusetts (1), McGill (1), Pennsylvania (2); *Classics* (9) at Columbia (1), Fordham (3), Harvard (2), Marquette (1), Oxford (1), Stanford (1); *Communication Arts* (2) at Michigan State (1), S. California (1); *Drama* (1) at Northwestern; *Economics* (14) at Boston College (2), Georgetown (4), Gregorian (2), Johns Hopkins (1), M.I.T. (1), New York (2), North Carolina (1), Wisconsin (1); *Education* (13) at Catholic U. (1), Chicago (1), Creighton (1), Fordham (3), Harvard (1), Illinois (1), London (1), Marquette (1), St. Louis (2), Wisconsin (1); *Engineering* (4) at Cal. Tech. (1), Case (1), Catholic U. (1), Northwestern (1); *Geophysics* (1) at Columbia; *History* (11) at Catholic U. (1), Fordham

IV. SCHOOLS (*continued*)

(1), Georgetown (1), Gregorian (1), Harvard (2), London (2), Pennsylvania (1), St. Louis (1), Washington (1); *History Ecclesiastical* (3) at Catholic U. (1), Gregorian (1), Oriental Institute (1); *Arabic* (6) at Al-Hikma; *English* (25) at Boston College (1), Catholic U. (1), Columbia (1), Duquesne (1), Edinburgh (1), Fordham (3), Harvard (2), London (1), Louisiana State (1), Loyola, Chicago, (1), Marquette (1), North Carolina (6), Oxford (2), Pennsylvania (1), Xavier (1); *French* (1) at Harvard; *German* (3) at Marquette (2), Northwestern (1); *Oriental Languages* (4) at Chicago (1), Harvard (1), Oriental Institute (1), Rome (1); *Spanish* (3) at Mexico (1), Javeriana (1), St. Louis (1); *Law* (6) at Columbia (2), Georgetown (2), Harvard (1), Yale (1); *Library Science* (2) at Simmons (1), California, Berkley (1); *Literature* (3) at Fordham (1), Indiana (1), Paris (1); *Mathematics* (23) at Boston College (2), Catholic U. (4), Chicago (3), Georgetown (1), Harvard (2), Johns Hopkins (1), Kansas (1), Notre Dame (1), St. Louis (1), Syracuse (1), Washington (2), Wayne (1), Yeshiva (3); *Medicine* (2) at Louisiana State (1), Marquette (1); *Middle East Studies* (1) at Harvard; *Music* (2) at Chicago Conservatory (1), Harvard (1); *Philosophy* (31) at Bonn (1), California, Berkley (1), Fordham (5), Freiburg (1), Georgetown (1), Gregorian (4), Louvain (5), Munich (3), St. Louis (8), Toronto (1); *Physics* (26) at Boston College (1), California (1), Catholic U. (1), Chicago (1), Detroit (1), Fordham (3), Georgetown (1), Harvard (1), Johns Hopkins (5), Louisiana State (1), M.I.T. (3), St. Louis (6), Texas (1); *Physiology* (1) at Chicago; *Political Science* (4) at Fordham (1), Georgetown (3); *Psychiatry* (2) at Georgetown (1), Marquette (1); *Psychology* (19) at California (1), Catholic U. (1), Fordham (3), Illinois (2), Loyola, Chicago, (7), Marquette (1), Northwestern (1), Ottawa (3); *Scripture* (5) at Biblical Institute (2), Sorbonne (1), Vienna (1), Weston (1); *Sociology* (10) at Boston College (1), Columbia (2), Cornell (2), Fordham (2), Harvard (1), Loyola, Chicago (1), Michigan (1); *Speech* (3) at Northwestern; *Theology* (26) at Gregorian (19), Institut Catholique (3), Institut de Liturgie (1), Strasbourg (1), Weston (1), Woodstock (1).

Continued from page 233

science fields. Ecclesiastical studies with 36 students in philosophy, 26 in theology, 5 in scripture, 4 in canon law, 3 in ecclesiastical history, 3 in catechetics, account for 72 students; the math-science field has 87 students: physics 26, mathematics 23, chemistry 17, biology 14, engineering 4, astronomy 1, geophysics 1, physiology 1. Together, these two general fields account for 159 of the entire total of 314 special students.

From Table IV we learn that this year American Jesuits are doing special studies at 72 different educational institutions; 48 of them in the United States and 24 abroad. While many schools are represented by a single Jesuit special student, 9 universities account for 163 of the total of 314 special students. These universities with a number of Jesuit special students attending them are as follows: Gregorian, 31; Fordham, 30; Saint Louis, 21; Harvard, 18; Georgetown, 15; Catholic University, 14; Johns Hopkins, 12; Loyola (Chicago), 12; Boston College, 10.

It might be interesting to note that of the 293 special students listed in

last year's report on the Status of Special Studies during the 1960-1961 academic year, 84 American Jesuits received their degrees; 13 completed requirements and were awaiting the granting of the degree; 71 continued to be candidates, and 13 discontinued special studies. The degrees actually conferred were as follows: S.T.D., 8; Ph.D., 27; Eng.D., 1; S.S.L., 2; LL.M., 1; LL.B., 1; A.B. (Oxon), 2; M.S., 11; M.A., 31.

I have remarked on more than one occasion that such a program of special studies represents a tremendous investment of men and money, but it does more than this. It represents a Society commitment to an ideal of scholarship. The Society cannot afford to send every single Jesuit on to graduate work, but through its program of special studies in the American Assistancy the Society has clearly manifested its ideal. To respect and emulate that ideal is the duty of every person whether or not he has had the advantage of special studies. Surely the Society has a right to expect that when the question, "Where are the Catholic intellectuals?", is asked Catholics will be able to point to an impressive number of them in the Society of Jesus.

IT IS NECESSARY

It is obvious that in the existing keen competition of talents, and the widespread and in itself noble and praiseworthy passion for knowledge, Catholics ought to be not followers but leaders.

It is necessary therefore that they should cultivate every refinement of learning, and zealously train their minds to the discovery of truth and the investigation, so far as it is possible, of the entire domain of nature.

—Pope Leo XIII

The Origin and Purpose of the Student Personnel Office in Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education

VICTOR R. YANITELLI, S.J.

The purpose of the Student Personnel Office in Jesuit Institutions of higher learning is to be found primarily in its origins. Strangely enough, the beginnings of Jesuit concern with Student Personnel are merely one of the latest developments in the evolution of American education.

The Dean—whom we now call the Academic Dean, Dean of Studies or Dean of the Faculty—is himself a relative newcomer to the history of the American college.

In fact, the Academic Dean is just about one generation ahead of the Dean of Men. E. J. McGrath in his *The Evolution of Administrative Offices in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States*,¹ lists the offices as they grew out of the delegated authority of the president: the librarian was the first followed by the secretary of the faculty, registrar, vice-president, dean, dean of women, chief business officer, alumni secretary, assistant dean and dean of men. While the Dean of Studies became firmly entrenched in the American College landscape circa 1891, it was not until the early 1920's that the Dean of Men became an accepted part of the total educational picture.

As in all periods of transition, there was much booting about of titles, functions and purposes. As early as 1911, a professor at the University of Oregon poked fun at the proliferation of deans of arts and science, deans of freshmen, deans of men, deans of women, deans of divisions, departments and schools and, finally, a Dean of Deans. "What, pray," he asked, "is all this deanerie about? . . . Would it be imagineable, I wonder, for this snobbery of deans to die a natural, hasty and certain death?"²

Obviously, the abolition of the Dean never came about, else there should be no cause to discuss the office of student personnel. More than

¹ Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1936, pp. 192-195. See also Edward A. Doyle, S.J., "The Functions of the Dean and His Office," in *Functions of the Dean of Studies in Higher Education* (ed. DeFerrari), Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1957, pp. 3-12.

² Edward Thurber, "What, pray, is all this deanerie about?" in *The Nation*, Nov. 13, 1913, p. 457. See also W. Storrs Lee, *God Bless Our Queer Old Dean*, New York, Putnam, 1959, pp. 34-35.

that, the very fact that student personnel services more than ever are being discussed in Jesuit Colleges and Universities, is itself a proof that the "snobbery of deans" has caught up with us. Perhaps it might be more accurate to say that the history of American education has thrust it upon us. The heavy pressures of growth in enrollment, addition of faculty personnel, the elaboration of Master's and Doctorate programs, the multiplication of student services and the demands for excellence in what is essentially the profession of educators, created the need for an office functioning under a college or university official whose job embraced all the duties that a busy Dean of Studies could no longer perform.³

The Prefect of Discipline became the first Jesuit officer to assist the Dean of Studies now rapidly becoming swamped with the demands of syllabus, curriculum, and teaching staff. At first the Prefect of Discipline attended only to the conduct of the students and to their attendance at class. This spread to the dormitories and where students were in residence, his work made demands of him around the clock so long as the students were on campus.

The area of assistance to the Dean of Studies was gradually widened to include student counseling first on the spiritual level but now also on the technical level of the emotions. Then followed student health and the coordination of student activities outside the classroom. Out of this expanding area of college and university needs has come the Office of Student Personnel in Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

Therefore, the first conclusion to be drawn is that the primary purpose of the Jesuit Student Personnel Office is to assist the Dean of Studies in getting the job of education done. To lose sight of that all-encompassing purpose for any reason whatever would be tantamount to making the Office of Student Personnel a center for supervised fun and games. True, the Dean and the whole process of Jesuit education is coming to lean more and more on the Office of Student Personnel to get the total job done. On the other hand, the Office of Student Personnel would have no reason to exist in the Jesuit system once it *conceptually* cut itself off from the work of the Dean of Studies. This relationship in idea, namely, that Student Personnel, though a non-instructional office, still performs truly educational services which combined with the efforts of faculty and administration, contribute to the fulfillment of the college or university's objectives, seems to be essential to the idea of the role of Student Personnel.

Nor are these services really new to the Jesuit system of education.

³ See F. L. McVey and R. M. Hughes, *Problems of College and University Administration*, Iowa State College Press, 1952, pp. 104-105.

From its very beginnings in the pre-*Ratio Studiorum* years of 1570, one finds a Father Ledesma working out the plan of study for the *Collegium Romanum* and including in it a place for the theatre as a student extra curricular activity designed to supplement the work done in the classroom: "De Dialogis, Comoediis, tragoediis exhibendis."⁴ The first *Ratio* of 1586 contains a section that could well apply to our modern day Dean of Men and Jesuit Student Counselor: "Tuenda disciplina et pietas."⁵ The *Ratio Intermedia* of 1591 also makes provision in both upper and lower grades for "Pietas et disciplina morum."⁶ Finally, the *Ratio Definitiva* of 1599 gives a somewhat detailed outline of the duties of the Prefect of Studies wherein the first rudimentary policy on admissions is defined, the establishment of an annual Prize Day and the procedures on dismissal are set down together with a rather clear moral code to be observed by the students.⁷

The Prefect of Studies, or Dean, if you will, seems to have been assigned certain work to do amongst the students that could properly be called student personnel. Hence, it might be concluded that student personnel work had a place of some sort closely affiliated with and complementary to the academic work of the Dean.

Therefore, one might conclude even further, that if a philosophy of Jesuit student personnel can be said to exist, the keystone in its structure would seem to be the idea of service. For it is this central idea that governs the purposes of the office, the duties of its incumbent and determines the lines of its organization. In the light of this central idea, the function and organization of the Student Personnel office take on a coherent rationale. While a Dean Briggs of Harvard may conceive his function in life as simply "to make things easier for the faculty," perhaps Dean Donald DuShane of Oregon best described the office in terms of the person of the dean: "The Dean," he says, "is a student-minded or student-oriented faculty member who has administrative responsibilities." He goes on to explain the definition as a threefold relationship of the student personnel officer with the students, with the faculty and with the administration. "Maybe in a way," he goes on to say, student personnel people are the one "cohesive element in the institution."⁸

⁴ Corcoran, S.J., Timothy, *Renatae Litterae saeculo a Christo XVI in scholis Societatis Jesu stabilitae*, Dublin, University Press, 1927, pp. 101-102.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 178-180.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 220-222; 240-245.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 302-312. See especially n. 43: "Nihil in atrio nec in scholis, etiam superioribus, patriatur armorum, nihil otiosorum, nihil concursationum atque clamorum; nec iuramenta, nec iniurias verbo aut facto illatas, nec inhonestum aut dissolutum quid in eis permittat. Si quid acciderit, componat statim et cum Rectore agat, si quid est, quod atrii quietem ullo modo perturbet."

⁸ Cited in Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

In relation to the fundamental function of the college or university, the student personnel officer is expected to be a disciplinarian and a policeman as well as a guardian and counselor. He must be aware of the academic life of his institution, the curricula, standards of admission and above all, the aims and purposes of the faculty, while at the same time he must see to it that student councils, student clubs and all student affairs contribute somehow to the achievement of those purposes. He is an interpreter of administrative policy to the student and a protector of students' rights before the administration. He must reassure troubled parents, find help for the needy and maintain good public relations with the local police.

In the ideal student personnel office—there may be one in heaven but there most surely does not exist one on earth—not only are activities and services provided to keep students busy and out of mischief, but the activities and services are planned to provide a sequence of experiences of increasing complexity or responsibility which helps to interrelate all phases of the students' total educational experience.⁹ What this means basically is that the student personnel program bears some relation to the instructional program and that both make for the "harmonious development of the entire man,"—and in a Jesuit institution one may add the words, "to a full and balanced Christian maturity."¹⁰

It is to this end that the student personnel office must be organized. It may be said that just as the purpose of the office has derived primarily from its origins, so too, does its organization derive from its purpose. Regardless of the size or complexity of the institutions, regardless too, of the variety of functions performed by the office, there is a basic kind of organization which may be followed by all.

Most of these services—and here it seems that a periodic examination of conscience seems to be in order—stem from a common desire to help faculty in producing a more receptive atmosphere for learning, to help administration move the machinery of education more smoothly, to help students to achieve at capacity all that the total educational experience can provide for them. Therefore, it is essential that the director of this division deal with the interpretation of established policy and be the final authority for the determination of relative jurisdiction of the services offered by the division. One man must be responsible.¹¹

⁹ See Paul L. Dressel, "The Interrelations of Personnel Services and Instruction," in *Personnel Services in Education*, University of Chicago Press, 1959, pp. 246-258.

¹⁰ See *Jesuit Education Association*, "Statutes: Conference of Jesuit Student Personnel Administrators."

¹¹ See Esther Lloyd-Jones, *A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill, 1938, p. 3.

Beginning from the Dean of Men who serves as the disciplinary arm of the Dean of Studies in a single unit school, all the way up through the intermediate gradations of our more and more complex institutions, this fact is paramount: the Dean of Men, the vice-president, whatever his title, must have the authority to carry out the function of his office. Administrative patterns may vary from Jesuit College to University, but without this first authority, the student personnel officer is left in the anomalous position of bearing responsibilities, some of them burdensome, and having none of the power to carry them out.

Esther Lloyd-Jones lists more than 200 titles in the personnel field, all referring to non-instructional staff, ranging from YMCA Secretary to Dean of Chapel, from Associate Registrar to House Mother.¹² And yet, neither the titles nor the functions of the office can say anything relative to the success of the institution employing them. "Actually," says Dr. Jones, "the success of each institution will be largely determined by its ability to *find its job*, to undertake only as much of a program as it can carry out honestly, to select students who can profit by its resources, to leave to other agencies everything else. There can be no standard degree, no standard college, no standard student personnel program."¹³ It behooves us then, to do some home work, on the broader scope of the Institution and the relation of the student personnel program to it. The program must be integrated with all the programs of the college or university. "The functions (within the office of student personnel) must be coordinated with each other and with the entire college."¹⁴ So speaks the American Council on Education.

The educational significance and meaning of the student personnel function has been long validated in the American Academic world. What has not been achieved anywhere, except in small degrees, has been the integration of student personnel work with the total academic program of the institution. For this reason our job in the next decade will be, I believe, an increasing effort to make this integration a reality. It will mean that we must study and get to know our own institutions; that we must clarify our own goals (we need no longer justify them), approach our work professionally, seeking always to learn more about our jobs, to know what other American colleges and universities are doing. It will mean that we can no longer take for granted that the Society's training is enough to provide competence, especially in the fields of guidance and counseling. It will mean that our spirituality has a more

¹² See Esther Lloyd-Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-32.

¹³ Lloyd-Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁴ American Council on Education Studies, "The Administration of Student Personnel Programs in American Colleges and Universities," 1958.

solid theological and psychological grounding, and that sociologically we understand something of what is happening to the young men and women who come to our Jesuit colleges and universities. In brief, it will mean a whole new re-orientation of ourselves with reference to the job we do and the institution we serve. Student personnel work is emerging from its infancy in Jesuit colleges and universities. It is for us now to shape its growth intelligently, in full harmony with the *Ratio Studiorum* and the ideals of Jesuit education, *ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*.

TOP CONNECTION DESIRED

A young man calling Loyola University of Chicago recently asked to be connected with "The Dean." The operator pointed out there were several deans within the University and asked which particular dean he wished. After a thoughtful pause, the caller decided he wanted the "Dean of Deans."

Utility Rates and Their Control

JAMES KENNY, S.J.

I should like to begin this article by quoting an excerpt from the 20th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission.

“Regulation, if it is to be a worthy substitute for competition, must similarly be able continuously to make it impossible for a public utility company to charge prices higher than it could charge if an efficient and economical competitor could reasonably be expected to enter the field and capture the market.

“The story of utility regulation, however, has been, in the main, a story of increasingly elaborate and protracted procedures devised by representatives of private companies to delay or circumvent the efforts of regulatory bodies to achieve these objectives. The reason for this appears obvious—having obtained a status substantially free from competition, these companies now seek by the establishment of elaborate techniques to regain the arbitrary control of costs and rates which would be theirs under unregulated monopoly.”

There are many popular misconceptions concerning utility rates, but three, I believe, warrant our special attention at this time.

1. Many business officers of commercial firms and institutions of higher learning have the erroneous impression that State Public Service Commissions establish utility rates and compel the utility companies to see that customers receive the lowest rate—and that such action is subject to enforcement.

The fact is that for all practical purposes utilities actually establish their own rates. State Public Service Commissions recognize the fact that initiative for making and changing rates lies with the utilities themselves. Utilities are subject to varying degrees of regulation in most States. However, in actual practice, the interpretation and application of rates by utility companies are given broad latitude and vary greatly. In the final analysis, state Public Service Commissions are fundamentally concerned with the “overall” picture of rates—and then only with respect to the total annual revenue yielded a utility company.

2. Another commonly accepted fallacy is the belief that the Federal Power Commission exercises direct authority over utility rates.

The fact is the Federal Power Commission has no control over your local electric or gas rates. The Public Utility Act of 1935 gave the Fed-

eral Power Commission regulatory powers over interstate wholesale rates of electric utilities. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 broadened regulations by the Federal Power Commission to include transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce. Sounds good—doesn't it? But you do not buy utility services on an interstate basis. Therefore, the Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction over your rates.

3. Perhaps the most widely believed misconception of business officers is that their utility companies automatically give their institutions the most preferential rate obtainable.

The truth of the matter is, the power companies themselves state that the selection of rates is the customer's responsibility. Since the full facts are often not available to the customer, the selection of the lowest rate is commonly a matter of guesswork for anyone but skilled analysts with unlimited rate information. It is interesting to note that one of the largest utility companies in the country offered a university an illegal contract to purchase city steam.

Once you realize that the burden of responsibility for the determination of rates lies squarely upon the shoulders of the business officer—the next step is to do something about it. When buying any other commodity for your institution, you are critically concerned with how much that commodity costs and whether or not you are getting full value for your purchasing dollar. The same concern should obtain when purchasing your utility services. In among the complexities of your utility bills, you may uncover a source of financial loss which has been secretly draining dollars out of your institution for years. As an alert executive, it is your duty to clamp down on any needless waste.

It is indeed strange that the presidents and seasoned business officers of our institutions who buy shrewdly in every other respect often are blind to loopholes in power contracts through which steady losses have been trickling for years. Because of the complexities of utility rate structures—because of limited regulation or lack of regulations—because of failure to secure what is their just due—many of the institutions of higher learning are literally throwing away money—money that can be saved if the proper action is taken.

Behind these economies is a small band of specialists who call themselves utility rate consultants. In recent years, a growing number of cost-conscious commercial firms of all sizes have retained these consultants to ferret out overcharges by utilities; to seek out the most favorable rate among complex rate schedules, and to recommend changes in equipment or operating procedures that would reduce outlays for utilities services.

A utility does not automatically give either a commercial firm or a college or university the "best" rate when more than one rate is available. A resort hotel *saves* a thousand dollars a year by changing the *water* in its swimming pool after midnight instead of earlier in the evening when water rates are higher. It usually is up to the customer to select the most advantageous rate and it is his responsibility to ask for a more favorable rate if changed conditions entitle him to it. Although rates usually are approved by state regulatory bodies, nearly all states place the burden of rate selection on the consumer and do not compel utilities to see that the customer receives the lowest rates.

Electrical rates probably are the most complex, varying according to the amount of power used by the customer at any one time and how the power is used. For instance, there may be different rates for heating and air conditioning as well as for lighting and cooking. Added to these intricacies of rate selection are a host of factors which may modify basic rates. A power rate may be adjusted to reflect a change in the price of the fuel used by the utility in generating electricity. Rates may be modified if a customer has his own reserve generating plant. In some cases, special rates may be created for individual large customers. Special rates and conditions are set up on which you cannot obtain information—even from official sources—for some public service commissions have no knowledge of agreements made between utilities and customers.

Here, I should like to dwell for a moment on the consideration of special rates. The Federal Power Commission rate series #4 states:

"A relatively large amount of energy, however, is sold to industrial customers and to large commercial customers in wholesale quantities under terms and conditions of special contracts. A special contract for electric light and power is any agreement, contract or understanding, written or verbal, made by an electric utility with any other party. Hence, there are many rate schedules that are in reality special contracts. An account of all the schedules revealed the fact that there are several thousands of such schedules in each of which not more than three customers are served. While some utilities stated the number and submitted brief digests of their special contracts, the majority did not do so. Therefore, the number of such contracts and the amount of business done under them is not known at this time."

Naturally, Gimbel's does not tell Macy's about merchandising scoops or other special deals. Nor do utilities broadcast every special rate contract they negotiate. Many state commissions have no knowledge of certain agreements made between utilities and customers. Who, then, in fact does know? Well, obviously, the contracting parties know—but

they do not volunteer the details of their special contracts, sometimes not even to Public Service Commissions. Somehow, you have to discover their existence and application to your circumstances—or to negotiate your own special contract yourself. Unless and until you do, you may be overpaying thousands of dollars for electricity, gas, steam or water.

Personally, I think perhaps one of the most effective approaches is to put the whole problem into the hands of an experienced organization of skilled rate analysts who have demonstrated their ability to save millions of dollars for utility users all over the nation.

When a utility consultant is retained, the usual procedure in handling your account is not to disturb your relations with the utilities. Invoices for the previous twelve months are analyzed to determine whether you are entitled to any refunds on any overpayments. Where the nature of overcharges suggests refunds over longer periods, additional bills will be requested. A thorough technical study and investigation of all your utility costs is further made to determine if any special rates or riders on standard rates can be obtained to give you additional savings. Reports and recommendations are sent to you for approval. Drafts of letters are supplied for you to send to the utilities. The consultant stays completely and discreetly out of the picture at all times. With these recommendations, you usually have the necessary facts to secure favorable action from the utilities. You can make specific demands instead of just accepting what the utilities choose to give you.

Many commercial firms have realized sizeable hidden "profits" by hiring a utility rate consultant to guide them through this maze of rate technicalities; to review their utilities bills; to check their meters for errors and to perform other tasks aimed at lowering utility costs. Some firms, of course, have their own engineering staff to help hold down utility outlays. "The average consumer is a layman in the selection of the proper rate schedule and these people are experts," said an executive of F. W. Woolworth Co. In a ten year period, a large New York consulting firm helped Woolworth make savings "and get utility bill refunds totalling \$251,000.00" half of which the consultant received in fees.

Utility outlays are an enormous part of the running of our colleges and universities. Although many of the larger universities may have their own engineering departments to check on these services, rate consultants insist they usually do a better job and make an additional saving. When you purchase utility service, apply standard purchasing procedures. It will prove to be an economy essential to the efficient operation of your institution.

News from the Field

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY has recently expanded its program to include six-week academic sessions in both Europe and Mexico for 1962. These sessions will be held at the University of Salzburg and the Instituto Tecnológico of Monterrey, respectively.

Dr. Rocco E. Porreco, Director of the Summer School, has stated that the new addition promises to be "the best and most economical program of summer study ever offered by an American university."

The European program, to be conducted at the University of Salzburg from July 9 to August 18, has been arranged in cooperation with the Institute of European Studies. This organization, which has been in existence for the last ten years, will aid the students in most of their non-academic problems. The Institute will have a representative in Salzburg to serve as an adviser to the students. The I.E.S. will also conduct two optional field trips to Western Europe and to Poland and the Soviet Union.

The entire academic program is under the direction of the Summer School. Courses will be offered in French and German, History of Colonialism, Ideology and Political Structure of the Communist Bloc, and Philosophy of the West and the Nuclear Age. The total cost of the program is estimated to be \$800, exclusive of the field trips.

The program for Mexico is to be conducted at the Instituto Tecnológico of Monterrey. Courses offered include Imaginative Literature, The Victorian Novel, Spanish, and Business Administration. The session runs from July 14 to August 24. The cost of this program is \$320, exclusive of all transportation.

92 STUDENTS DEPARTED FOR ROME, February 20, to become the first class at the Loyola of Chicago new Roman center. While in Rome, students will take courses, attend seminars and make excursions to galleries, museums and theaters. In mid-June the semester will conclude with 12-day tour across Europe to England. At the Roman center full credit courses will be conducted by four Loyola faculty members as well as visiting lecturers from the University of Rome. Program of studies will include archeology, classics, history, education, modern languages, philosophy and theology. Through the cooperation of the Italian government, the University has obtained for its use a new modern

building complete with classrooms, dormitories, dining hall and recreational facilities. With establishment of the new center, Loyola becomes the only Jesuit American university to conduct an independent undergraduate-graduate program of study overseas.

A NEW LAW LIBRARY has been donated to the University of Santa Clara, it was announced by Very Rev. Patrick A. Donohoe, S.J., university president. The funds for the \$350,000 structure were presented by Oakland attorney Edwin A. Heafey.

Heafey, an alumnus and former deputy district attorney of Alameda County, has long been active in California State Bar activities, serving as its president in 1957-58. The new facility will bear the donor's name as the "Edwin A. Heafey Law Library."

The two story building will adjoin Bergin Hall, which presently houses the law school, and will contain approximately 18,000 square feet and more than 100,000 volumes.

Administrative offices, seminar rooms, student publications office, conference rooms and a recording room will make up the second floor. The ground floor will include a 7,900 square foot reading room and library offices and 6,000 square feet for book stacks.

Spring Construction. Father Donohoe said the addition will permit the enrollment of the School of Law to increase to 300 students, about twice its present size. Construction is expected to get underway this spring.

Libraries made the news with two grants to two university libraries. *Loyola of the South* has been granted joint permission with the International House of New Orleans to microfilm some 400,000 of the most important documents relating to Spanish Colonial rule in Louisiana. The papers cover several periods including 1763 to 1803 when Spain ruled New Orleans and Louisiana. They have remained for centuries in the libraries of several Spanish cities. Permission to microfilm was granted by the Spanish government after some two years of negotiation. Presently, plans are under way to seek permission from the French government to microfilm documents pertaining to the French rule of Louisiana.

The Ferdinand Perret Library of Spanish-American Colonial Art has been presented to *St. Louis University* Pius XII Library. Two unique works comprise the reference guide. One is a 16 volume "Encyclopedia of Spanish-American Art in manuscript format and the other is "The

Index of the Perret Encyclopedia of Spanish-American Art in the Americas and the Philippines." The material which reflects the Christianizing influence of Spanish culture on native arts chronicles the works of some 2,088 artists. Established in 1945, the reference collection deals with paintings, sculptures, and engravings of the Spanish Colonial period (1492 to 1825) in all the Americas, including islands in the Caribbean and the Philippine Islands. It records all art of the Colonial period which can be attributed to a definite artist.

Derricks among the palm trees has been the scene at *Loyola University of New Orleans* but the quest has been not for oil but for soil borings for the four new buildings due to go up on the southern campus. Scheduled to start "about the first of the year" are a student center-cafeteria, a student dormitory for 400 men, an addition to the Faculty residence, and a heating-cooling building.

The *University of Detroit* purchased the Chrysler Corporation building for the relocation of its Dental School. Dinan Hall, the present site of the University of Detroit Dental school, will be demolished to make way for a new expressway. Compensation paid for the old building will help pay for the purchase and equipping of the new Dental school. The new building will provide for both increased clinical facilities and an increased enrollment. The structure of the new building lends itself very easily to the task of reconstruction and adaptation.

ENROLLMENT CORRECTION

The following corrections should be made in the enrollment figures for *SPRING HILL COLLEGE*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 153, 154:

PAGE 153

Freshmen 358 this year, 417 last year, loss of 59.

PAGE 154

Totals 1,359 1,338 -21 -1.5% 417 358 -59 -6.06%.

The registrar reports that due to error one entire classification of new students had been omitted on his original report.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

INDEX TO VOLUME XXIV

June 1961-March 1962

Academic Excellence, Dean's Responsibility for; C. F. Donovan, S.J.	223
American Jesuit University, Objectives of; R. F. Harvanek, S.J.	69
Annual Meeting JEA 1961; W. C. McCauley, S.J.	5
Atlantic City JEA Meeting; Walter C. McCauley, S.J.	5
Ayd, Joseph D., S.J.: Both Noble and Rewarding	53
Both Noble and Rewarding; Joseph D. Ayd, S.J.	53
Business Education, Trends in; W. S. Joyce, S.J.	30
Catholic Philosophy of Education; Julian L. Maline, S.J.	88, 133
Coat of Arms of JEA	124
College Dean, Office of; P. A. FitzGerald, S.J.	212
Dates, Foundation American Jesuit Provinces and Schools; E. F. Mangold, S.J.	184
Dean, College Development of Office; P. A. FitzGerald, S.J.	212
Deans' Institute, Third Annual; E. J. Smyth, S.J.	197
Dean's Responsibility for Academic Excellence; Charles F. Donovan, S.J.	223
Donovan, Charles F., S.J.: Trends in Teacher Education	35
The Dean's Responsibility for Academic Excellence	223
Education, Business; W. S. Joyce, S.J.	30
Education, Catholic Philosophy of; James W. Sanders, S.J.	88, 133
Education, Graduate; L. W. Friedrich, S.J.	40
Education, Impact of Modern Development on; B. A. McGrath, S.J.	23
Educational Developments in Secondary Schools; G. R. Sheahan, S.J.	15
Education, Teacher; C. F. Donovan, S.J.	35
Educational Principles for Jesuit Secondary Schools; Julian L. Maline, S.J.	50
Enrollment Statistics; Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.	151
Felten, John N., S.J.: Humanism and Hunger	46
FitzGerald, P. A., S.J.: The Historical Development of the Office of the Jesuit College Dean	212
Foundation Dates, American Jesuit Provinces and Schools; Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.	184
Friedrich, L. W., S.J.: Trends in Graduate Education	40
Gonzaga Deans' Institute; E. J. Smyth, S.J.	197
Graduate Education, Trends in; L. W. Friedrich, S.J.	40
Harvanek, Robert F., S.J.: The Objectives of the American Jesuit University	69
High School Religion Teachers Speak Up; John F. Kramer, S.J.	109
Historical Development of the Office of the Jesuit College Dean; Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J.	212
Humanism and Hunger; John N. Felton, S.J.	46
Impact of Educational Developments on Our Jesuit Secondary Schools; Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J.	15
Impact of Modern Developments on Education; Brian A. McGrath, S.J.	23
JEA Annual Meeting 1961; W. C. McCauley, S.J.	5
JEA Coat of Arms	124

Jesuit College Dean, Historical Development of Office; P. A. FitzGerald, S.J.	212
Jesuit Scholarly Publications (1960-1961)	167
Jesuit University, American, Objectives of; R. F. Harvanek, S.J.	69
Joyce, W. Seavey, S.J.: Trends in Business Education	30
Kenny, James, S.J.: Utility Rates and Their Control	246
Kramer, John F., S.J.: High School Religion Teachers Speak Up	109
Liberal Arts	58
McCauley, Walter C., S.J.: The Atlantic City JEA Meeting	5
McGrath, Brian A., S.J.: Impact of Modern Developments on Education	23
Maline, Julian L., S.J.: Educational Principles for Jesuit Secondary Schools	50
Mangold, Eugene F., S.J.: Enrollment Statistics	151
Foundation Dates American Jesuit Provinces and Schools	184
News from the Field	61, 126, 189, 250
Meeting, JEA 1961 Annual; W. C. McCauley, S.J.	5
New Approach to a Catholic Philosophy of Education; James W. Sanders	88, 133
News from the Field	61, 126, 189, 250
Objectives of the American Jesuit University; Robert F. Harvanek, S.J.	69
Origin of the Student Personnel Office in Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education, The; V. R. Yanitelli, S.J.	240
Philosophy of Education, Catholic	88, 133
Religion, High School; J. F. Kramer, S.J.	109
Rooney, Edward B., S.J.: Special Studies, 1961-1962	231
Sanders, James W.: A New Approach to a Catholic Philosophy of Education	88, 133
Scholarly Publications, Jesuit	167
Secondary Schools; J. D. Ayd, S.J.	53
Secondary Schools, Educational Development in; G. R. Sheahan, S.J.	15
Secondary Schools, Educational Principles for Jesuit; J. L. Maline, S.J.	50
Smyth, Edmond J., S.J.: Third Annual Institute for Deans	197
Special Studies, 1961-1962; E. B. Rooney, S.J.	250
Statistics, Enrollment; Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.	151
Student Personnel Office, Origin of; V. R. Yanitelli, S.J.	240
Teacher Education, Trends in; C. F. Donovan, S.J.	35
Third Annual Institute for Deans; E. J. Smyth, S.J.	197
Trends in Business Education; W. Seavey Joyce, S.J.	30
Trends in Graduate Education; L. W. Friedrich, S.J.	40
Trends in Teacher Education; Charles F. Donovan, S.J.	35
University, American Jesuit, Objectives of; R. F. Harvanek, S.J.	69
University Education; B. A. McGrath, S.J.	23
Utility Rates and Their Control; James Kenny, S.J.	246
Yanitelli, Victor R., S.J.: Origin of the Student Personnel Office in Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education, The	240

Omitted from INDEX TO VOLUME XXIII:

O'Malley, William J., S.J.: Wanted: Drastic Surgery for English	227
---	-----

EDUCATION DOUBLES EARNING POWER

An adult male with four years of college will earn, on the average, more than twice as much in a year as a man with less than an elementary school education and \$1,500 a year more than a high-school graduate, according to recent testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Education by Lyman V. Ginger, president, National Education Association.

Dr. Ginger cited Census Bureau statistics that showed the median income in 1956 of men 35 to 54 years who were year-round full-time workers was \$3,025 for those with less than eight years of school; \$4,182 for those who completed eight years; \$4,700 for three years of high school; \$5,179 for completion of high school; \$5,763 for three years of college; and \$6,625 for four or more years of college.

"For the individual, education represents earning power and a better material life," Dr. Ginger said. "Education is also economic power for his community and for his employer. Comparisons of income and education levels by states typically show a high correlation between the state's ranking in median school years completed and its ranking on per-capita personal income. This is particularly striking at the bottom of the scale: in 1950 the 10 lowest-ranking states on school years completed were also the 10 with the lowest per-capita personal incomes."

The estimated lifetime income for men with no formal education is \$58,000; 1-4 years, \$72,000; 5-7 years, \$93,000; 8 years, \$116,000; 1-3 years of high school, \$135,000; four years of high school, \$165,000; 1-3 years of college, \$190,000; and four or more years of college, \$268,000.