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John Maynard Keynes once remarked: "Events . . . will not be shaped by the deliberate acts of statesmen, but by hidden currents, flowing continually beneath the surface of political history, of which no one can predict the outcome. In one way only can we influence these hidden currents—by setting in motion those forces of instruction and imagination which change opinion."

The late social thinker, C. Wright Mills, struck much the same note by saying that what men needed above all else in this age of fact, and what they feel they need, is not only information and the skills of reason, but "a quality of mind that will help them to use information and to develop reason in order to achieve lucid summations of what is going on in the world and of what may be happening within themselves. It is this quality . . . that journalists and scholars, artists and publics, scientists and editors are coming to expect of what might be called the sociological imagination."

It is clear that Jesuit colleges by and large have seen this need, and have met it in varying degrees by developing curricula in different social sciences. The situation has changed substantially since 1940, for example, when not one Jesuit university offered a doctoral program and only a few awarded master's degrees in sociology. But although sociology has been accepted on the college level, there seems little indication that we are ready to fully recognize the field on the high school level. I focus on sociology for several reasons. Courses in economics are relatively well established in many of our secondary schools; political science and psychology as formal disciplines have been relegated to the college level, although many elements of political science are introduced into the normal high school history curriculum. But sociology as a formal course enjoys a more ambivalent status. In some schools it is taught; in others it is not. Many are not sure it can or should be included within the curriculum; others

---

feel that some formal course in sociology should be offered at least to seniors, but they are discouraged by the lack of suitable textbooks and the difficulties of working out an effective and challenging syllabus for the course.

The supposition of this paper is that the sociological study of human behavior provides a basic framework to which the contemporary high school student needs to be exposed. This sociological orientation, or imagination, is necessary if the student is to come to grips with the complexities of the society in which he lives, and if he is to relate himself intelligently to that society. To state this conviction does not solve any problems; it does offer a point of departure. What is the actual status of sociology in our American Jesuit high schools? What approaches to a curriculum are succeeding? What further proposals for high school sociology can be made at this point? The present state of the course is not a cause for elation, not does it give reason for despair. Indeed the situation should spur anyone interested in the subject at this level to meet the challenge and to make every effort to encourage the responsible conduct of such a course within a valid sociological (not theological, ethical, or "common sense") frame of reference.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIOLOGY

Early in the fall of 1963 all the high schools in the American Assistancy received a questionnaire covering various factors involved in the high school sociology course—the number and quality of students, the training of those teaching sociology, the texts used in the classes, and a description of the syllabus followed. At the outset one is struck by the fact that sociology is not conspicuous by its presence in our high school curricula. Of the forty-three schools that returned the questionnaire, twenty (a little less than 50 per cent) offered some kind of course in sociology or social problems on an independent basis. Interestingly, the number of schools offering the course decreases sharply as one moves from the West to the East coast. This is perhaps a more optimistic picture than might have been anticipated. But it is necessary to probe these figures a bit deeper. Of the twenty schools offering sociology courses, nine (45 per cent) have one

2. This coincides with a 1959 statement of the New York State Education Department that "there are very few schools in New York State that offer any courses in sociology." Cf. Stanley E. Grumpp, "The Status of Teaching Sociology in High Schools," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 45 (April, 1961), p. 331.
senior class section enrolled in the course, six (40 per cent) have
two class sections enrolled, another has five sections for one
semester only, and a final school has eight class sections enrolled.
Sixteen schools offer a full year's course; four, one semester. In
eleven schools the course is an elective, in nine of the twenty
schools it is part of a regular course sequence (e.g., French-Scientific). The vast majority of schools (seventeen out of twenty)
give the course in senior year.

A better picture of the over-all status of sociology in our high
schools emerges if we take a somewhat different approach. With
the data available, and using rather rough figures, it would seem
that about 3.2 per cent of our students take sociology some time
during their high school days. These figures would obtain for the
1963-64 academic year. Ward S. Mason, Director of the Teacher
Personnel Statistics Unit of the U.S. Office of Education, reports
that in 1948-49, "the percentage of pupils in the public secondary
day school taking sociology was 3.4 per cent."3

Another factor involved in this prospectus is the training of the
high school sociology teacher. In a recent study of Illinois social
science teachers, it was reported that more than 82 per cent of
those teaching one or more classes in sociology had studied fewer
than thirteen semester hours in the field. Approximately 32 per
cent has fewer than eight hours in the field.4 If this is any in-
dication of the preparation sociology teachers in the public school
system have received, our own figures rank considerably higher.
Of the twenty-three sociology teachers who returned the question-
naire, nine (39 per cent) had fewer than twelve hours in sociology,
seven (30 per cent) had between twelve and thirty hours, three
had master's degrees in sociology and one had done work be-
yond the master's level. Three (15 per cent) had received no train-
ing whatever in the field. Certainly anyone with eighteen credit
hours in formal sociology could do justice to the subject in high
school. But teachers with twelve hours at most in the field are
probably not teaching sociology, but some sort of problems course
employing little, if any, real sociological framework. Twelve hours
of preparation in sociology does not ordinarily prepare one to deal
adequately with the basic concepts and implications of current

3. Ibid., p. 329.
4. Fred L. Wellman, "Social Science Teachers in Illinois High Schools, Their Preparation
and past research in the field. Unfortunately we are far more ready to grant this in physics, chemistry, or biology than we are in the social sciences.

The last factor considered in this sketch concerns the choice and implementation of a textbook. This will, of necessity, overlap into the next part of our discussion on the content of the course itself. The texts designed for high school sociology are, for the most part, not conducive to a conceptually grounded class. At present there are perhaps no more than four strictly high school sociology texts. They vary in orientation as well as in depth. The questionnaire results on this point definitely indicate a general dissatisfaction with the quality of the texts, especially when measured against the caliber of students enrolled in our own schools. Out of the twenty schools teaching sociology, nine (45 per cent) use Neil's *The Common Good*, two use Ross' *Sound Social Living*, three use Cronin's *Problems and Opportunities in a Democracy*, and one uses Broom and Selznick's *Sociology* (a formal college text). The remaining five have developed materials of their own, usually placing strong emphasis on the use of paper-back books. To probe this a bit more: out of the nine using Neil, five are dissatisfied with it; both schools that teach Ross want to change; and one of the three employing Cronin dislikes the book.

Who is concerned about the quality and status of high school sociology? Recent evidence in various sociological circles indicates there is growing concern about the problem, and hence some tangible, if tentative, signs of encouragement. Professor Neal Gross of Harvard is heading a national committee of the American Sociological Association to study the problem under a NSF grant; other regional groups of the Association are following this lead, although the whole organization is clearly lagging behind the American Anthropological and American Economic Associations in this regard. Articles and reports have appeared recently in several journals. And for Jesuits, Loyola of New Orleans' In-

stitute of Social Order and Christ's Blueprint for the South clearly have sharpened our collective awareness to the need for a more developed "sociological imagination" both within the Society and in our students. Still the concrete problem remains. If we are to "sell" sociology to those responsible for planning our high school curricula and if we expect it to attain the position to which it is entitled in the high school social science program, we must have content that will challenge the student and genuinely serve to develop his social awareness.

PROBLEMS OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIOLOGY

In any attempt to inaugurate, improve, or expand programs in social science, particularly sociology, the high schools are faced with serious problems. These can probably be reduced to two general items: uncertainty about the content of the sociology curriculum, and lack of suitable materials at the high school level.

There is no reason why high school sociology should be any less substantive in nature than high school biology or chemistry, especially since the vast majority of our students are college-bound. The seniors are the most apt to be exposed to it, and a rigorous course can ready them for the more demanding academic experience of college. But there is always the problem that students of less than average academic achievement find their way into the sociology program. There is little doubt that our sociology students are, on the whole, poorer achievers than those taking Greek. But it is equally true that our measure of achievement is far more weighted in favor of the language and mathematics students than it is in favor of the history-social science student. Then, too, what precisely does it mean to be a "poor achiever" within as selective an academic framework as we provide? It is not unreasonable to suggest that students who have done poorly in the past can score quite well in a subject such as sociology where their past record means less than it would in fourth year Latin or trigonometry, and where they are challenged with a new and perhaps more intrinsically interesting curriculum. It can also be hoped that as we re-think and develop the high school curricula, the sociology course will be expanded to include a greater number of students; this would give us all the more reason to work out a thoroughly top-level syllabus.

What sociology offers, of course, depends on how one conceives its content. Sociology, just as cultural anthropology and psychol-
ogy, is an attempt to get behind the cloak of rational explanation man wraps around his behavior. In this endeavor it is a decidedly humanistic concern. Now it is important to make this point, for many people both inside and outside the discipline judge that sociology as a scientific field is much happier about its methods than about its substantive knowledge, and that what knowledge there is rests on highly partial evidence incompletely gathered and probably inadequately analyzed. There is some truth here. But not only in sociology does the teaching of the best we know now turn out later to be only half true. Only consider some of the treatises that are regarded as "classical" in the history of sociology—Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, Sumner's *Folkways*, Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, Riesman's *Lonely Crowd*, Mills' *Power Elite*. All these works are either quite innocent of the paraphernalia of formal method or quite excellent over and above their concentration on formal technique; all have managed to say something of lasting importance about man in society. I do not mean to imply that ignorance of formal method is a virtue (Veblen used no questionnaires. Tocqueville was wholly untrained in techniques of field investigation); or that works there methodological apparatus predominates are insignificant. I do imply that something more than method is required to achieve genuine superiority. The reason these writers were great sociologists is that they were humanists first; and if they had not been great humanists they could never have become great sociologists. This concept of sociology is most relevant for anyone trying to teach it on the high school level, for the seminal ideas of literary and political thought lie behind sociology and all behavioral science. Their terms have become cliches—culture, class, motivation, social interaction, the self. But they enshrine data and notions that students will not find out for themselves and that must be taught. One cannot put limits on what is to be transmitted of our understanding of man. Sociology as well as literature and science are part of a "liberal education." To divorce the course from this context, to reduce it to mere current events or classes on how to win friends and influence people or become a better citizen is to betray either an ignorance of the field or an unwillingness to take the necessary energy to translate accumulated knowledge to the level of the maturing high school senior.

It has been my own experience that students are eager to grapple with the basic and traditional sociological terms such as group, culture, the self, social class, as well as problem areas like delinquency and prejudice and Communism. They plunge directly into such pivotal concepts, and these in turn serve as vehicles for implementing the concrete course material. Concepts such as culture and social structure offer key points of departure for analysis of the family, political man, federal aid to the aged or to education. An understanding of group, social role, status, and social interaction offer important insights into problems of race relations, crime and delinquency, the teen-ager in modern society. The goal in all this is to help the student to view himself in his society as others see him, and to view the problems of that society critically, objectively, and tolerantly.

Perhaps the most persistent danger, however, is to take a therapeutic approach to the course. Despite the fact that “social” appears in both sociology and socialization, a sociology course like a literature or science course should not be transformed into a “personal problems” class. Adolescents, by and large, do not “learn to handle their problems” in class discussions, especially those problems which are important precisely because the child cannot bring himself to talk about them. Indeed if “social discussions” were not carried on in a relatively general, group-approved manner, they would constitute a striking invasion of privacy on the part of the teacher in the classroom. This is not to say that a sociology course does not have more direct contact with the student’s process of socialization—deepening his social awareness, setting up conditions for attitude formation and experimental social reactions. But insofar as any course is made relevant for the student, this sociological perspective will enter the picture. Indeed one cannot teach any type of literature effectively without it.

Intimately connected with the problem of course content is the second problem of a textbook. As has been indicated, all the texts in present use meet with considerable dissatisfaction. When one adds to these the texts generally employed in the public schools the problem remains. All the available text falls short in terms
of consistent application of sociological concepts; consequently they are not only inadequate for a substantively oriented class, but also are generally written on a rather simplistic level. One reaction to this is, of course, to turn to a college text like Broom and Selznick's *Sociology* (already cited) or Young and Mack's *Sociology and Social Life*. Many of these texts, however, are too theoretically oriented for high school seniors, although this is less true of Young and Mack than others. And is it fair to introduce to the high school a text which the average college freshman uses in his introductory sociology course? Conceivably we would want our students to pursue the discipline on the college level. Such continuation does not seem to be stimulated by the re-use of a basic text.

Yet in spite of these problem areas the challenge of sociological education remains. And much can be done, beginning now, to answer it. The following syllabus is offered to indicate how such a course has been established using non-textbook materials of reasonable depth and seriousness, which the average high school senior can handle. What I have included below contains not only what I actually taught through several experimental years with generally average and below-average students (e.g., those normally enrolled in the "academic" course), but also some alternate recommendations and untried possibilities. These latter can serve to widen the horizon of the syllabus so that the product might be more serviceable.

**SOME PROPOSALS FOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIOLOGY**

The course is divided into two basic parts: Problems of Society—first semester; The Possibility of Social Order—second semester. These, in turn, contain a total of six sub-sections: introductory concepts, the notion of culture, social class, a section on problems in American society (delinquency, prejudice, and urban problems), Communism as a solution to social disorder, and the alternate solution contained in the Church's social teaching. A major examination was administered at the end of each of these sections; in this sense the course was not cumulative. The material in the semester examinations was left to the teacher's discretion. I dis-
covered—and this, again, with an average class, not an advanced placement group—that case-studies involving the principles, rather than detailed information, provided a profitable testing instrument. We can consider each of the course-sections in more detail.

Introductory Concepts. This would cover such questions as the nature of sociology, a general idea of its methods, the concepts of society, group, social interaction, social change, power in society, and some initial idea of problem areas in American society (e.g., delinquency, racism, narcotics). The purpose here is to introduce the student into a way of thinking about himself and his world, to give him some familiarity with some fundamental notions of sociology, and to stimulate his interest. Each of the topics can be introduced and illustrated by selections from literature or articles in the field. Lewis Coser’s Sociology Through Literature and Gordon Zahn’s Readings in Sociology provide a number of excellent selections from a variety of sources.

The Concept of Culture. After the general introduction it is important to begin with something as basic as the idea of culture. Not only does it ground the course firmly on a theoretical basis, but it provides the framework for many topics the teacher might like to stress later, e.g., the economics of underdeveloped countries, the sub-cultural aspect of the delinquent gang or ethnic group. Consequently, one would consider at this point in the course, the relation of man to his culture, the way in which man is limited by this culture, how culture affects personality generally and forms the context for any social change, why there are various cultures and how these different cultures find expression in a variety of social institutions. One could also treat the principle of functionalism (“useful purpose”), the differences between cultural relativity and ethical relativity, the root meaning of the concept of race. All this would help the student understand worlds other than his own and overcome simplistic or naturally biased views of U.S. superiority, foreign policy, or immigrant problems. Helpful here would be Clyde Kluckhohn’s Mirror for Man and/or Collin Turball’s The Lonely African. In addition, the teacher could assign special reading reports on primitive tribes, planned interviews with immigrants who came to this country after the childhood or adolescence; he could present case-studies of varying cultural phenomena to illustrate different concepts, have the students report on the movie “The Sky Above and the
Mud Below" or "The Lord of the Flies." Other audio-visual aids might be available from libraries or embassies. In many ways the students find this one of the most interesting parts of the whole course, and it certainly offers a splendid vehicle for teaching many important ideas which otherwise would be omitted or left to chance.

Social Class and Stratification. The study of culture opens up an understanding of social reality; the study of how that reality is structured provides the student with a second indispensable tool for acquiring that understanding. All known societies have classified their members into categories above or below one another on a scale of superiority or inferiority. The process of stratification involves the allocation of individuals to different levels enjoying unusual amounts of status, wealth, power, and prestige. The contrasts between the higher and lower, rich and poor, powerful and powerless, between those who expect deference and those who give it, provide the substance of our social living. It is this aspect of society that we consider here. Vance Packard’s Status Seekers, William Whyte’s Organization Man, C. Wright Mills’ Power Elite or White Collar (both for better students) are possible texts here. I personally found Mills’ books difficult to teach in terms of maintaining student interest; Packard is much more satisfactory and can be supplemented by selected mimeographed pages from Mills or Whyte. Then, too, one could take up the varying values of individualism, pragmatism, activism, security, momism, belief in progress and affluence as these are reflected in advertisements, comic strips, movies, the popular T.V. programs, and the American novel (Sinclair Lewis, John Steinbeck, John Marquand, and Cameron Hawley are obvious examples). Written assignments I have used include a check-list of the good and bad points of American society, an analysis of the values reflected in the student’s favorite comic strip, an assessment of the values projected into the advertisements they see on their way to school, on T.V. Two assignments arising from Packard’s book: an interview with one member from each of the five classes described in Status Seekers, and a report on their visit to three department stores representing upper, middle, and lower class which sell the same type of merchandise. In this last assignment they are to reflect on the customers they see, the advertising and selling techniques and test their observations against Packard’s analysis.
Social Problems in Contemporary America. In the light of what has been taken in the course so far, it is best here to select problems that are directly connected with culture and social class. I have consistently selected crime and delinquency, ethnic prejudice and urban problems. Other topics could be treated, of course; but this depends in great measure on the interest of both the teacher and students as well as upon the given locality. In the area of juvenile delinquency, Harrison Salisbury's Shook-up Generation offers an exceptionally balanced description of the problem. To fill in background for the teacher, Cohen's Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang and Olin and Cloward's Delinquency and Opportunity are strongly recommended. In addition to the class discussions, written assignments might include: a description of the delinquent problem in one's own city or neighborhood, an essay on the meaning and function of "heart" in a delinquent and non-delinquent's life, on the difference between urban and suburban delinquency, interviews and reports about the juvenile court system, the reform school and probation setup, the general prevention of juvenile crime, and finally critical reviews of some of the available educational movies about the problem, such as the Twentieth Century Prudential film, "Generation Without a Cause." In this connection it is often illustrative to spend some time on the normal teen-ager in society, his problems and responses. Coleman's Adolescent Society and Greeley's Strangers in the House provide helpful background for the teacher here.

Regarding the subject of ethnic prejudice, several procedural suggestions seem in order. If the subject is going to be treated, it should be discussed in depth or not at all; and because of the obvious emotional resistances to understanding here, it is most helpful to start with the concrete problem from the Negro's viewpoint and move from this to analysis of the causes of prejudice, the context of prejudice, and the nature of the act of prejudice. For a concrete description of the actual experience of the Negro, John Howard Griffin's Black Like Me or James Baldwin's The Fire Next Time bring this home to a disturbing degree. Griffin's book, written obviously from the standpoint of a white man, perhaps has more advantages here. The teacher could also get a local NAACP representative to speak to the class. For a treatment of prejudice itself—once the ground has been laid—I found that Gordon Allport's Nature of Prejudice the best book available.
Even though time does not usually permit taking the entire book and the student's lack of background prevents it, whatever time can be devoted to it is eminently well-spent. The treatment is clear, precise, interesting, and balanced. It stands as a classic in the field.

If more classes can be devoted to social problems, a third category of urban problems might be considered, specifically the areas of crime and urban renewal. Edwin Sutherland's Professional Thief or one of the better books on the Mafia could be discussed when treating organized crime; current problems in one's own city can provide the basis for discussions of urban renewal. Here too library research and interviews help to make the situation more real to the average high school class.

Communism. With the first semester material behind him the student should now be more aware of the complexities of social living and the problem areas which surround him. Are there no solutions to these problems? What possibilities do exist to ground any hope for social order? It is within this context that Communism and the Social Teaching of the Church can be presented.

Perhaps the best over-all introduction to Communism is the Life booklet on the subject correlating their series on the subject published a few years ago. The book covers the theory of Marx and Engels supporting the Communist movement, the history of the movement itself, and a picture of contemporary Soviet society in Russia and China and in the satellite countries. The students seem to appreciate a thorough treatment of the theory of Marxism here; and I have found them surprisingly able to grasp its basic structure. A reading and critical discussion of Marx's Communist Manifesto can fill out this structure a bit, if permission for the class to read the book is not overly difficult to acquire. With the fundamental Marxist concepts in mind it is much easier for them to interpret the chameleon-like aspect of current Communist positions on foreign policy, colonialism, industrial development. J. Edgar Hoover's Masters of Deceit offers further material by describing the nature and force of Communism in the U.S.A., and current periodical literature is indispensable for an up-to-date picture of Soviet problems. For many students this section of the course turns out to be the most extensive treatment of Communism they receive in either high school or college.

Social Teaching of the Church. This is the last section of the
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course, and the way it is handled depends greatly on the specific content and approach of the senior religion program. Some recent developments in this area would focus on the Church's social teaching as an element of the layman's witness to Christ and His Church through the social apostolate. If this matter is at least partially discussed within the religion program, the sociology teacher's job is made easier, since the social encyclicals themselves are difficult to teach to the modern teen-ager. The problems of the encyclicals are not relevant to the conscious world of the adolescent and the documents are written in a style alien to them. Some of these difficulties can be overcome by taking a case-study approach to the encyclicals, consequently emphasizing the concrete aspects of the problems treated, rather than the solutions they provide. An approach that I have discovered moderately successful is to divide the matter of the Church's social teaching into three categories of the private sphere of business and economics, the public sphere of government, and the world sphere of international organization and cooperation.

Under the heading of the "private sphere" of Church teaching the class would take up such questions as the nature of the business enterprise, the counterflow of money and goods, the stock market, the union movement, and collective bargaining. Here the McGraw-Hill volume American Capitalism (the first in their economic literary series) and past articles from Social Order are helpful. For the teacher, Gamb's Men, Money and Goods as well as Samuelson's Economics are indispensable. For projects the students can play the stock market, interview a union or management leader, read and refute articles in clearly pro-union, pro-management, or socialist newspapers.

As regards the public sphere, the main questions involve the nature of government, the functions of government in society, the notion of subsidiarity, and the various conflicts over federal intervention. CBS's T.V. film The Harvest of Shame provides a vivid presentation of the poverty problem in this country in terms of the plight of the migrant worker; John L. Thomas' chapters on "Economic Insecurity" and "Welfare Functions of the State" from Social Orientations, his articles on the population problem in past issues of Social Order, Senator Eugene McCarthy's essay on subsidiarity, "Government: How Much Is Too Much?" (Social Action reprints, University of Dayton), and
selections from Robert M. MacIver's *Web of Government* offer stimulating material in this area.

The method of handling the international sphere of the Church's teaching would follow the same pattern. Topics include: the economics of underdeveloped countries, foreign aid, the United Nations. Barbara Ward's *Rich Nations and Poor Nations* as well as past *Social Order* articles provide adequate material. As a general reference for this part of the course, Everett J. Morgan, S.J.'s *The Conscience of a Catholic* gives numerous case-studies and a rich fund of bibliographical items, as well as a balanced presentation of the teaching of the encyclicals. If it were not for the length and expense of the book, it would be ideal for the student and teacher alike.

In all this, however, the fundamental supposition is that it is both misleading and somewhat unrealistic to teach the Church's social doctrine to students who are unacquainted with the social situations they deal with. Readings from the encyclicals themselves are secondary and not always necessary to understand the principles at issue. It is certainly not desirable to go back any further than *Mater et Magistra* at the high school level.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

I hope the development of the above syllabus will demonstrate not only what has been taught, but also what can be taught profitably in a senior sociology course. It is in no way complete. All the books mentioned for student use are available in paperback at reasonable cost. Available audio-visual aids, in themselves quite integral to the course, have merely been hinted at. But from what has been said it should be possible to conclude that a high school course of reasonable depth and seriousness can be constructed. To be effective, any syllabus must be flexible and allow room for experiment and differing emphasis. This is especially true when treating such a changing subject as sociology. The sophistication and special environment of the students in each school will figure strongly in the planning, as well as recent and more satisfying published materials. The present article has attempted to indicate the status of high school sociology, various

---

10. The cost of the course outline here would normally run about $8.00. This will vary according to the books selected and the discounts available. But since no other text was required for the course, I did not judge the cost to be out of proportion to that of other courses taught from a textbook and supplementary paperbacks.
problems connected with such a course, and some possible solutions. The proposals are frankly experimental. Only their use in the classroom will show whether teaching sociology in high school can indeed develop the student and enrich the curriculum. It is my own conviction that the challenge deserves to be met.
...the fundamental opposition is that it is
...somewhat unattainable to teach the Church's
...social problems, who are acquainted with the
...social heritage from the individuals them-
...selves, and are always necessary to understand the
...facts. It is actually not desirable to go back any
...number of tastes or studies of the High school level.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The principal points that will demonstrate
...are the following: it is possible to teach
...such a course in social science, although
...available in publications and literature of
...social studies with the utmost care, and
...various persons and organizations. This is
...since this is often considered a changing aspect of
...teaching in the social sciences. The practical article
...statements of high school sociology, various
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HIGH SCHOOL STATISTICS
4 YEAR ENROLLMENT

The American Jesuit High Schools for the Scholastic year 1965-1966 number 53 High Schools. Of these 53 High Schools, 50 are included in this survey with full four-year High School enrollments. The three schools that do not have a full four-year enrollment are: Jesuit High of Sacramento which has only the first three years enrollment and the two new Detroit Province High Schools, St. John’s High School of Toledo and Walsh Jesuit High of Cuyahoga Falls which have enrollment this year for Freshmen only.

On an all-over basis of 51 High Schools, 18 show an increase in all-over enrollment and 33 show a decrease in all-over enrollment. It should be noted that Brebeuf Prep, Jesuit High of Sacramento, St. John’s of Toledo, Walsh Jesuit High of Cuyahoga Falls and Xavier High of Concord show only the increase of a full year since they are all in the process of developing into a full four-year High School. Since the two schools out of the United States, that is San Jose of Peru (a Chicago Province School) and San Mateo of Chile (a Maryland Province School) are appearing in our survey for the first time, we are unable to indicate either an increase or a decrease for these two schools.

On the drawing-boards for new Jesuit High Schools to open in the near future, we have word that the Bishop Connolly High School, a new High School to be opened by the New England Province, will open at Fall River, Massachusetts in September of 1966; the De Smet Jesuit High which will be opened in St. Louis by the Missouri Province will now open in September of 1967. De Smet had been scheduled for a 1966 opening, but ran into legal complications on the purchase of its property and had to go to court to settle the matter. This has delayed the opening of this Missouri Province School for at least a year.

Using the figures for a full four-year enrollment as our basis, five of the High Schools showed a notable increase in numerical
enrollment. The five schools are Colegio San Ignacio with an increase of 168; Brophy College Prep with an increase of 43; Boston College High with an increase of 30; St. Ignatius High of Cleveland with an increase of 28 and Bellarmine High of Tacoma with an increase of 25.

Schools that show a notable increase in all-over enrollment on a percentage basis are: Colegio San Ignacio with an increase of 30.9 per cent; Loyola High of Missoula with an increase of 18.1 per cent; the Cranwell School with an increase of 9.7 per cent; Brophy College Prep with an increase of 7.8 per cent; Georgetown Prep with an increase of 6.6 per cent; Bellarmine High of Tacoma with an increase of 6.0 per cent.

As was noted above in this article, a greater proportion of the American Jesuit High Schools showed decreases in all-over four-year enrollment for the current scholastic year. Ten schools which showed an evident numerical decrease in this four-year enrollment are St. Ignatius of San Francisco with 68; McQuaid High of Rochester with 67; Creighton Prep of Omaha with 53; St. Ignatius of Chicago with 28; Canisius of Buffalo with 27; Loyola High of Towson with 27; Rockhurst High of Kansas City with 26; Bishop’s Latin of Pittsburgh with 25; Regis High of Denver with 25 and Strake Jesuit High of Houston with 22. This might be as good a place as any to indicate that Jesuit College Prep of Houston has changed its name to Strake Jesuit High.

The six High Schools which show an appreciable decrease in all-over four-year enrollment on a percentage basis are: Bishop’s Latin of Pittsburgh with 17.8 per cent decrease; McQuaid Jesuit High of Rochester with a decrease of 9.5 per cent; the Loyola School of New York with a decrease of 8.0 per cent; St. Ignatius High School of San Francisco with a decrease of 6.6 per cent; Strake Jesuit High of Houston with a decrease of 5.6 per cent and Creighton Prep of Omaha with a 6.6 per cent decrease.

The eight largest American Jesuit High Schools on the basis of full four-year enrollment are Loyola Academy of Chicago with an enrollment of 1,580; Boston College High with an enrollment of 1,311 students; St. Xavier High of Cincinnati with an enrollment of 1,229; St. Ignatius of Cleveland 1,148; St. Ignatius of Chicago 1,076; St. Peter’s of Jersey City 1,064; St. Ignatius of San Francisco 1,022 and Loyola of Los Angeles 1,014.

The combined all-over enrollments for the 53 American Jesuit
High Schools run from the largest, Loyola Academy of Chicago with an enrollment of 1,580 to Bishop’s Latin of Pittsburgh, the smallest school with an enrollment of 140. Those who have been reading this article in the past few years will realize that Bishop’s Latin has taken away the title of the smallest American Jesuit High School from Loyola High School of Missoula which has held this position for the past several years. Actually, the 53 Jesuit High Schools break down into three fairly even classifications. There are 15 schools in the classification of 901 to 1,580 students; there are 20 schools in the classification of 501 students to 900 students; there are 18 schools in the classification of 150 students to 500 students.

For those who are interested, we list the schools in their exact order of enrollment from the largest to the smallest. The schools are: (1) Loyola Academy, 1,580; (2) Boston College High School, 1,311; (3) St. Xavier High School of Cincinnati, 1,229; (4) St. Ignatius High School of Cleveland, 1,148; (5) St. Ignatius High School of Chicago, 1,076; (6) St. Peter’s Prep, 1,064; (7) St. Ignatius High School of San Francisco, 1,022; (8) Loyola High School of Los Angeles, 1,014; (9) University of Detroit High School, 984; (10) Marquette University High School, 975; (11) Brooklyn Prep, 967; (12) Creighton, 965; (13) Xavier High School of New York, 956; (14) Jesuit High School of New Orleans, 916; (15) Bellarmine, San Jose, 907; (16) St. Louis University High School, 869; (17) Canisius High, 856; (18) Fordham Prep, 847; (19) St. Joseph’s Prep, 816; (20) Fairfield, 801; (21) Rockhurst High School, 779; (22) Gonzaga Prep, 767; (23) Gonzaga High School (D.C.) 721; (24) Colegio San Ignacio, 712; (25) McQuaid Jesuit High School, 703; (26) Loyola High School (Towson) 676; (27) Brebeuf, 633; (28) Regis High School (New York), 623; (29) Brophy, 596; (30) Campion, 590; (31) Regis High School of Denver, 589; (32) Jesuit High School of Dallas, 574; (33) Chaplain Kapaun, 547; (34) Seattle Prep, 513; (35) Jesuit High School of Portland, 507; (36) Bellarmine, Tacoma, 440; (37) Jesuit High School of El Paso, 422; (38) Scranton Prep, 402; (39) Xavier High School of Concord, 401; (40) Jesuit College Prep of Houston, 396; (41) Jesuit High School, Tampa, 377; (42) Cheverus, 364; (43) Georgetown Prep, 321; (44) Jesuit High School, Shreveport, 301; (45) Jesuit High School of Sacramento, 297; (46) Colegio San Jose (Peru), 244; (47) Cranwell, 243; (48) St. John’s of Toledo, 237; (49) Loyola School, N.Y., 187; (50) Walsh Jesuit High School, 153; (51) Loyola High School of Missoula, 150; (52) Colegio San Mateo (Chile), 141; and (53) Bishop’s Latin School, 140.
For the sake of strict accuracy, we should note that at least 4 of the schools have all-over total enrollments which include primary grades. These schools include Colegio San Ignacio with an all-over enrollment of 712, but with a High School enrollment of 417; Georgetown Prep with an all-over enrollment of 321 but with a High School enrollment of 268; Jesuit High School of New Orleans with an all-over enrollment of 916 but with a High School enrollment of 814; Colegio San Mateo in Chile with an all-over enrollment of 141 but with a High School enrollment of 71. This, of course, would make Colegio San Mateo the smallest school in our listing of the American Jesuit High Schools.

HIGH SCHOOL FRESHMEN ENROLLMENT

Of the 53 High Schools in our present survey for the scholastic year, 1965-1966, 24 of the High Schools show an increase in their freshmen enrollment; 22 of the High Schools show a decrease in their freshmen enrollment; 3 of the High Schools have the same freshmen enrollment as the previous year; 2 of the new High Schools are enrolling their first freshman class; Colegio San Jose and Colegio San Mateo are new to the survey this year so we have no comparative figures.

The following 10 schools show an evident numerical increase in the 1965-1966 Freshman Class: Boston College High School with 49; St. Ignatius Cleveland with 49; Brophy College Prep with 46; Chaplain Kapaun with 44; Fairfield College Prep with 43; Colegio San Ignacio with 41; Jesuit High of New Orleans with 34; Jesuit High of Dallas with 31; St. Ignatius, Chicago with 21; Brebeuf Prep with 18.

The 13 schools with the largest percentage increase, all with at least a 10 per cent increase, are the following: Colegio San Ignacio, 40.6 per cent; Brophy College Prep, 33.1 per cent; Chaplain Kapaun with 31.6 per cent; Georgetown Prep, 27.4 per cent; Fairfield College Prep, 20.0 per cent; Jesuit High of Dallas 20.0 per cent; St. Ignatius, Cleveland, 17.5 per cent; Jesuit High of New Orleans, 15.8 per cent; The Cranwell School, 14.3 per cent; Boston College High, 14.6 per cent; Jesuit High of Tampa, 13.2 per cent; Jesuit High of Sacramento, 10.9 per cent; Brebeuf Prep, 10.0 per cent.

Ten of the American Jesuit High Schools show an evident numerical decrease. St. Peter’s Prep with a decrease of 84; Fordham Prep, 53; Loyola College, 47; St. Ignatius, San Francisco, 40; Gonzaga High (D.C.), 33; Loyola High, Los Angeles,
28; Canisius High, 27; St. Joseph’s High, 22; Jesuit High of El Paso, 15; Strake Jesuit High, Houston, 13.

A decrease in percentage can be noted in the following 10 High Schools: St. Peter’s Prep with a 31.5 percentage decrease in freshmen; Fordham Prep with 24.1 per cent; St. Ignatius, San Francisco with 15.4 per cent; Gonzaga High (D.C.) with 17.9 per cent; Loyola Academy with 11.3 per cent; Loyola High of Los Angeles with a 11.2 per cent; Canisius High with a 11.2 per cent; Strake Jesuit High with 11.1 per cent; Jesuit High of El Paso with a 10.7 per cent and St. Joseph’s Prep with a 10.2 per cent.

SUMMARY-HIGH SCHOOL STATISTICS

There are 53 American Jesuit High Schools appearing in the current enrollment survey for the scholastic year of 1965-1966. The total Freshmen year enrollment for all 53 schools is 10,115 freshmen, an increase of 564 freshmen students for the year 1964-1965 total of 9,551 freshmen. The increase for freshman is 5.9 per cent.

SOPHOMORE YEAR — In all 53 schools represent an enrollment of 8,804, an increase of 220 Sophomores over last year’s total of 8,584 or an increase of 2.6 per cent.

The JUNIOR year shows a total enrollment of 7,936 Juniors or a loss of 31 Juniors from the previous year’s total of 7,967. This represents a loss of 0.3 per cent.

SENIOR year has a very slight increase in the 53 High Schools with an enrollment this year of 7,611 seniors, an increase of 6 seniors over last year’s total of 7,605. The percentage increase is 0.1 per cent.

SPECIALS shows an increase of 182 students this year. The total for this year is 583 Specials; last year’s total was 401. The increase is 45.3 per cent. The total combined enrollment for all 53 American Jesuit High Schools for the scholastic year 1965-1966 including Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors and Specials is 35,049 students. This is an increase of 941 students over last year’s total of 34,108 or a percentage increase of 2.8 per cent.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

GRAND TOTAL ENROLLMENT-1965, 1966

The figures reported as basis of comparison of enrollment in this article are the totals listed under the category of Grand Total. The Grand Total enrollment includes all students enrolled
in the college or university, both full and part time, both tuition and non-tuition courses, and all students enrolled in off-campus extension courses. It should be noted that although we have used the Grand Total enrollment as basis of our comparative statistics, many colleges and universities use the alternate total of full-time enrollment only.

All totals used in the present survey have been furnished us by the Registrars of our 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities. We note this at this time since occasionally enrollment figures which appear in this article seem to be at variance with enrollment figures of the various institutions which appear in their publications and publicity brochures.

The 1965-1966 Grand Total enrollment figures for the 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities show that 25 of our institutions showed an increase in Grand Total enrollment and 3 institutions showed a decrease.

The colleges and universities showing an evident increase numerically in Grand Total enrollment are: University of San Francisco with an increase of 850 students; St. Joseph's College with an increase of 793 students; Fordham University with an increase of 679 students; Xavier University with an increase of 658 students; Marquette University with an increase of 626 students and Santa Clara with an increase of 505 students.

More noticeable are the percentage increases shown in Grand Total enrollment in the following colleges: University of San Francisco with an increase of 17.9 per cent; Xavier University with an increase of 14.1 per cent; Wheeling College with an increase of 13.8 per cent; St. Joseph's College with an increase of 12.1 per cent; St. Peter's College with an increase of 12.1 per cent; Santa Clara with an increase of 11.8 per cent; Loyola College, Baltimore, with an increase of 11.6 per cent.

The three institutions showing a decrease numerically in Grand Total enrollment are Loyola of Chicago with a decrease of 291 students or 2.1 per cent, Seattle University with a decrease of 70 students or 1.7 per cent, and Spring Hill College with a decrease of 145 students or 11.4 per cent.

The eight largest institutions from the standpoint of Grand Total enrollment for the scholastic year 1965-1966 are the same seven schools which have appeared in previous listings with the addition of an eighth school, St. Joseph's College of Philadelphia
which joins this particular listing for the first time. These schools in the order of size in Grand Total enrollment are:

Marquette University – 13,789
Loyola, Chicago – 13,491
University of Detroit – 11,593
St. Louis University – 11,011
Fordham University – 10,018
Boston College – 9,526
Georgetown University – 7,626
St. Joseph’s College – 7,183

The combined Total Enrollment or Grand Total for these eight institutions is 84,287 students or 73.3 per cent of the Grand Total enrollment of 146,103 students of all 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities.

As was noted above many accrediting agencies and educational surveys prefer the listing of full-time students only as a better indication of a university’s standing or status. For this reason, we are listing in the terms of full-time enrollment only the following seven institutions which show the largest enrollments. The schools are as follows:

Marquette University – 8,230
Boston College – 7,741
Loyola, Chicago – 7,226
St. Louis University – 7,150
Fordham University – 6,759
Georgetown University – 6,435
University of Detroit – 5,248

These seven schools show a total enrollment of full-time students only of 48,789 or 53.2 per cent of the full-time enrollment for all the 28 colleges and universities of 90,610 full-time students.

In order to show the comparative size of our various colleges and universities in the American Assistancy, we list the various institutions in numerical order of size of their full-time student enrollment. They are: (1) Marquette, 8,230; (2) Boston College, 7,741; (3) Loyola (Chicago), 7,226; (4) St. Louis, 7,150; (5) Fordham, 6,759; (6) Georgetown, 6,435; (7) Detroit, 5,248; (8) Seattle, 3,486; (9) San Francisco, 3,298; (10) Creighton, 3,063; (11) Santa Clara, 3,035; (12) John Carroll, 2,930; (13) Xavier, 2,480; (14) Gonzaga, 2,373; (15) St. Joseph’s, 2,228; (16) Holy
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Cross, 2,106; (17) St. Peter's, 2,095; (18) Loyola (New Orleans), 2,061; (19) Canisius, 1,891; (20) Loyola (Los Angeles), 1,763; (21) Scranton, 1,627; (22) Le Moyne, 1,470; (23) Fairfield, 1,454; (24) Loyola (Baltimore), 1,029; (25) Rockhurst, 985; (26) Spring Hill, 930; (27) Regis, 793; (28) Wheeling, 724.

INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS

As many of our readers know, the tabular table upon which we indicate the enrollment statistics in the various institutions is confined to 14 categories plus the general category of miscellaneous. Manifestly it is impossible to include a tabular representation of all the various schools and departments in our complex American Jesuit colleges and universities. For the convenience of our readers and to assuage the feelings of the many Registrars who so graciously supplied us with statistics for this article, we give specific listings, in a later portion of this article, of the schools and departments which are listed under the general category of miscellaneous.

In treating of the individual schools and departments as they appear in the tabular table we realize that many would find it a tedious task to go through the tables seeking out information on the various aspects of enrollment for the current scholastic year. Thus, we will try to summarize the salient features of the table for those who wish information on either a specific school or department. In general, out of the 15 categories used in the tabular table No. Two, 10 of the categories show an increase for the current year and 5 show a decrease.

Schools and departments showing an increase for the current year for all 28 colleges and universities are: Liberal Arts, Day; Commerce, Day; Commerce, Evening; Education; Social Work; Medicine; Dentistry; Law, Day; Law, Evening; Graduate.

Schools and departments showing a decrease in general categories are: Liberal Arts, Evening; Engineering; Nursing; Pharmacy, Miscellaneous.

As far as the individual categories are concerned, readers of this article may find the following summaries of interest: Liberal Arts, Day; in 28 colleges has a total enrollment of 48,131 an increase of 4,145 students or a 9.4 per cent increase over the last year’s total. Liberal Arts, Evening; with 18 schools reporting shows a total of 12,351 students or a loss of 1,553 students and a loss of 12.6 per cent. Commerce, Day; reporting in 21 schools shows a
total enrollment of 2,927 students, an increase of 1,900 and an increase of 17.2 per cent. Commerce, Evening, with 16 schools reporting shows a total enrollment of 7,403, an increase of 290 students or 4.1 per cent. Education; with 6 schools reporting has a total enrollment of 4,562, an increase of 6,048 or 15.3 per cent. Engineering, with 7 schools reporting continues the same downward trend that it has evidenced in the past several years with a 15.3 per cent loss. The total enrollment this year is 3,544 or a loss of 541 students. Nursing; in 9 schools shows a minimum loss of 20 with a present enrollment of 3,303 nursing students. The loss is 0.6 per cent. Pharmacy; with an additional 2 schools reporting shows a present enrollment of 414 or a loss of 69 students or 16.7 per cent over last year’s enrollment. Part of this loss of course is due to the fact that Loyola University of New Orleans has closed its school of Pharmacy. Social Work or Service has only 3 schools reporting in our Table No. Two, but actually there are 4 schools of Social Service. However, Loyola University of Chicago reports its enrollment in Social Work as an enrollment in their graduate school total. Enrollment for the 3 schools listed in our table is 720 students or an increase of 168 students or 30.4 per cent. Medicine; with 5 schools reporting has an increase of 62 students for a total enrollment of 1,883. The increase is 1.7 per cent. Dentistry; with 7 schools reporting has a slight increase in enrollment this year with 2,093 students as a total enrollment. The increase is 23 students or 1.1 per cent. Day Law with 12 schools reporting has a present enrollment of 3,569 students, an increase of 280 students; an increase of 8.5 per cent. Evening Law; with 11 schools reporting has an increase of 136 students and a present enrollment of 2,030 students. The increase is 7.2 per cent. With 23 Graduate Schools reporting, there is a present enrollment of 22,622. The increase is 2,366 students or an increase of 11.7 per cent. Since Miscellaneous has so many varying factors and entries which differ greatly from one year to another any comment on either increase or loss in this category would seem to be of little value.

The category Miscellaneous has always been a bone of contention for the various registrars. It is of course impossible to list on our Master Table all Schools and Departments maintained by the 28 American Jesuit Colleges and Universities. We try to give a separate classification to the Schools or Departments which
maintain the higher enrollment figures or which a majority of the various institutions maintain. The question of increase or decrease does not enter into the category of Miscellaneous other than that the numbers included in this category would add to the increase or decrease of an individual institution in the Grand Total Category.

For the sake of information and with the hope of placating our registrars who have so graciously contributed all the statistics which make up the backbone of this article, we list the various schools or departments which are classified by us as Miscellaneous in this present survey.

FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT

As was indicated in last year's report the figures on freshmen enrollment includes statistics from all undergraduate schools. Reports of freshmen previous to last year's report included freshmen only from Liberal Arts, Commerce and Engineering. Of the 28 colleges and universities concerned, 19 institutions show increases in freshmen enrollment; 9 show decreases.

*Increases numerically* in freshmen enrollment most notable were listed at the following schools: St. Joseph's College with 217; University of San Francisco with 211; John Carroll with 135; Creighton University with 93; Xavier University with 77; Seattle University with 69; Gonzaga University with 68; University of Scranton with 60; Loyola University of Los Angeles with 56.

Institutions showing an *increase in percentage* of freshmen enrollment for the current scholastic year are: University of San Francisco with 28.2 per cent; Loyola of Los Angeles with 15.6 per cent; St. Joseph's of Philadelphia with 14.6 per cent; University of Scranton with 14.1 per cent; Creighton University with 13.1 per cent; Wheeling College with 13.1 per cent; John Carroll University with 10.7 per cent; Fairfield University with 10.4 per cent and Xavier University with 10.2 per cent.

Of the 9 institutions showing a decrease in freshmen enrollment, we call your attention to only 6 institutions since the decreases in the other 3 are minimal. The institutions showing an evident *numerical decrease* are: Loyola University of Chicago with a 387 freshmen decrease; University of Detroit with 169; Fordham University with 136; Boston College with 131; Georgetown University with 108; Holy Cross College with 69.

The *percentage decrease* in these colleges are: Loyola, Chicago with a 22.7 per cent freshmen decrease; Holy Cross College with 11.5 per cent; University of Detroit with 11.3 per cent; Fordham University with 10.2 per cent and Boston College with 8.1 per cent.

Total freshmen enrollment for 1965-1966 for the 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities is 25,349 freshmen. This is an increase of 227 freshmen over last year's total of 25,122. The increase is 0.9 per cent.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY GENERAL SUMMARY

The 28 Jesuit colleges and universities report a total of 90,610
full-time students for the current scholastic year. This is an increase of 6,271 full-time students over the last year's total of 84,339. The increase is 7.4 per cent. Part-time totals have an increase of 603 students for a total of 44,706 part-time students. The increase is 1.3 per cent. The combined full and part-time totals for the 28 institutions is 135,316, an increase of 6,874 students over the previous total of 128,442. The increase is 5.3 per cent. Extension and Low Tuition courses had a total of 10,787 students to make the grand total for 1965-1966 for all 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities of 146,103 students. This is an increase of 6,931 students over the last year's total of 139,172. The increase is 4.9 per cent.

ENROLLMENT IN EDUCATIONAL HOUSES OF OURS

TERTIANSHIPS: PORT TOWSENDE—33 Tertians; AURIESVILLE—43 Tertians; DECATUR—22 Tertians; POMFRET—24 Tertians; CLEVELAND—34 Frs., 21 Brothers. The total number of Tertian Fathers in the United States Tertianships is 156 Fathers. There are 21 Tertian Brothers at the Brothers' Tertianship at CLEVELAND.

THEOLOGATES: ALMA—31 in First Year; 28 in Second Year; 20 in Third Year; 27 in Fourth Year, for a total of 106 Theologians. NORTH AURORA—22 in First Year; 24 in Second Year; 22 in Third Year; 25 in Fourth Year, for a total of 93 Theologians. ST. MARY—49 in First Year; 36 in Second Year; 42 in Third Year; 43 in Fourth Year, for a total of 170 Theologians. WESTON—20 in First Year; 22 in Second Year; 20 in Third Year; 28 in Fourth Year, for a total of 90 Theologians. WOODSTOCK—51 in First Year; 59 in Second Year; 59 in Third Year; 50 in Fourth Year, Special 2—219 plus 2 for total Theologians. Assistanty totals for the five American theologates are: 173 in First Year, 169 in Second Year; 163 in Third Year; 173 in Fourth Year, for an all-over total of 678 Theologians plus 2.

PHILOSOPHATES: ASSUMPTION HALL—24 in First Year; 23 in Second Year; 30 in Third Year, for a total of 77 Philosophers. NORTH AURORA—29 in First Year; 28 in Second Year; 10 in Third Year, for a total of 67 Philosophers. FUSZ MEMORIAL—57 in First Year; 61 in Second Year; 51 in Third Year, for a total of 169 Philosophers. SHRUB OAK—80 in First Year; 52 in Second Year; 61 in Third Year, for a total of 193 Philos-
ophers. MOUNT ST. MICHAEL—43 in First Year; 49 in Second Year; 35 in Third Year, for a total of 127 Philosophers. WESTON—36 in First Year; 26 in Second Year; 33 in Third Year, for a total of 95 Philosophers. Assistancy totals for the Six American philosophates are: 269 for the First Year; 239 in Second Year; 220 in Third Year, for a total of 728 Philosophers.

JUNIORATES: PLATTSBURGH—No Juniors. LOS GATOS—30 in First Year; 20 in Second Year, a total of 50 Juniors. QUEEN OF PEACE—No Juniors. MILFORD—23 in First Year; 10 in Second Year, for a total of 33 Juniors. COLOMBIERE—16 in First Year; 13 in Second Year, for a total of 29 Juniors. WERNERSVILLE—11 in First Year; 18 in Second Year, for a total of 29 Juniors. FLORISSANT—23 in First Year; 16 in Second Year, for a total of 39 Juniors. SHADOWBROOK—22 in First Year; 19 in Second Year, for a total of 41 Juniors. GRAND COTEAU—14 in First Year; 10 in Second Year, for a total of 24 Juniors. ST. ANDREW—27 in First Year; 22 in Second Year, for a total of 49 Juniors. SHERIDAN—20 in First Year; 14 in Second Year, for a total of 34 Juniors. ST. BONIFACIUS—26 in First Year; 20 in Second Year, for a total of 46 Juniors. Assistancy totals for the 10 American juniorates are: 212 in First Year; 162 in the Second Year, for a total of 374 Juniors.

NOVITIATES: PLATTSBURGH—13 in First Year; 14 in Second Year, for a total of 27 Novices. QUEEN OF PEACE—13 in First Year, 11 in Second Year, for a total of 24 Novices. LOS GATOS—20 in First Year; 19 in Second Year, for a total of 39 Novices. MILFORD—20 in First Year; 33 in Second Year, for a total of 53 Novices. COLOMBIERE—21 in First Year; 22 in Second Year, for a total of 43 Novices. WERNERSVILLE—21 in First Year; 30 in Second Year, for a total of 51 Novices. FLORISSANT—15 in First Year; 24 in Second Year, for a total of 39 Novices. SHADOWBROOK—25 in First Year; 21 in Second Year, for a total of 46 Novices. GRAND COTEAU—25 in First Year; 13 in Second Year, for a total of 38 Novices. ST. ANDREW—25 in First Year; 30 in Second Year, for a total of 55 Novices. SHERIDAN—23 in First Year; 20 in Second Year for a total of 43 Novices. ST. BONIFACIUS—25 in First Year; 23 in Second Year, for a total of 48 Novices. Assistancy totals for the 12 American Novitiates are 246 in First Year; 260 in Second Year, for a total of 506 Novices.
House Totals for the various Novitiate-Juniorates are as follows:

PLATTSBURGH — 27 Novices, No Juniors, House Total 27.
QUEEN OF PEACE — 24 Novices, No Juniors, House Total 24.
LOS GATOS — 39 Novices, 50 Juniors, House Total 89.
MILFORD — 53 Novices, 33 Juniors, House Total 86.
COLOMBIERE — 43 Novices, 29 Juniors, House Total 72.
WERNERSVILLE — 51 Novices, 29 Juniors, House Total 80.
FLORISSANT — 39 Novices, 39 Juniors, House Total 78.
SHADOWBROOK — 46 Novices, 41 Juniors, House Total 87.
GRAND COTEAU — 33 Novices, 24 Juniors, House Total 62.
ST. ANDREW — 55 Novices, 49 Juniors, House Total 104.
SHERIDAN — 43 Novices, 34 Juniors, House Total 77.
ST. BONIFACIUS — 48 Novices, 46 Juniors, House Total 94.

The 506 Novices and 374 Juniors form a total of 880 in the American novitiates and juniorates.

To summarize, the enrollment in the various Houses of Formation of the American Assistancy for the scholastic year 1965-1966 is:

156 TERTIANS in five tertianships: 679 THEOLOGIANS in five American theologates; 728 PHILOSOPHERS in six American philosophates; 374 JUNIORS in 10 juniorates; 506 NOVICES in 12 American novitiates; The total of men in training in the 38 American Houses of Formation is 2,443 Jesuits.

For the sake of comparison with last year, there were 196 TERTIANS, 701 THEOLOGIANS, 768 PHILOSOPHERS, 403 JUNIORS, 596 NOVICES for a total of 2,664 Jesuits in Formation. The loss for the present year over last year’s total is 221 Jesuits.

MINOR SEMINARIES: Students listed in the category of minor seminaries are students preparing not for the Society, but for the Diocesan clergy, but are under the direction of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. CORPUS CHRISTI — 17 in First Year; 20 in Second Year; 15 in Third Year and 8 in the Fourth Year for a total of 60 students. RYAN-FRESNO — 30 in First Year; 20 in Second Year; 21 in Third Year; and 6 in Fourth Year for a total of 77 in High School. It also has 11 in First Year college and 12 in Second Year college for a total of 23 college students and a grand total of 100 students in training. AIBONITO — 5 in First Year; 13 in Second Year, 5 in Third Year and 8 in Fourth Year for a total of 31 students. St. PHILIP NERI which is a school for delayed vocations conducted by the Society has an enrollment of 85 students. We do not list the students at Mundelein Seminary in Chicago since although Ours teach at the Seminary, the
Seminary itself is not under our jurisdiction.

STUDENTS UNDER JESUIT INSTRUCTION
IN 123 SCHOOLS UNDER
JESUIT ADMINISTRATION
AMERICAN ASSISTANCY 1965-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Institutions</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>146,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses of Formation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Seminaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Philip Neri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>183,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jesuit Educational Association
### High School Enrollment 1965-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ONE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Specials</td>
<td>Totals 1965-1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College Preparatory</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine High School (Tacoma)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Latin School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High School</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf Preparatory School</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Preparatory School</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Prep School</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Jesuit High School</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheverus High School</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio San Ignacio (Puerto Rico)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranwell School</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton Preparatory School</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield College Preparatory School</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham Preparatory School</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Preparatory School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga High School (D.C.)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga Preparatory School (Spokane)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit College Preparatory (Houston)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (Dallas)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (El Paso)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (New Orleans)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (Portland)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (Sacramento)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>202 + 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (Shreveport)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School (Tampa)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Academy</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School (L.A.)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School (Missoula)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School (Towson)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola School (N.Y.)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette Univ. High School</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAulay Jesuit High School</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis High School (Denver)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis High School (N.Y.)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst High School</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ignatius High School (Chicago)</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ignatius High School (Cleveland)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ignatius High School (San Fran.)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s High School (Toledo)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s Preparatory School</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Louis University High School</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Preparatory School</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Xavier High School (Cincinnati)</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton Preparatory School</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Preparatory School</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit High School</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh Jesuit High School</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier High School (Concord)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier High School (N.Y.)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio San Jose (Peru)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio San Mateo (Chile)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals 1965-1966 | 10,115 | 8,804 | 7,936 | 7,611 | 583 | 35,049 |
| Totals 1964-1965 | 9,551 | 8,584 | 7,967 | 7,605 | 401 | 34,108 |

Increase or Decrease | +564 | +220 | -31 | +6 | +182 | +941 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE TWO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate School</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Social Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesuit College</th>
<th>Other Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, New Orleans</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, Chicago</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's College</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-1966</td>
<td>+2,366</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1965</td>
<td>+4,145</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase or Decrease</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College and University Enrollment, 1965-1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Educational Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate School</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Social Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesuit College</th>
<th>Other Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, New Orleans</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, Chicago</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's College</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-1966</td>
<td>+2,366</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1965</td>
<td>+4,145</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase or Decrease</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jesuit Educational Association
### Composite College Statistics, 64-65, 65-66

#### TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Increase Decrease</th>
<th>Freshmen Enrollment</th>
<th>Increase Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>Numerical Percentage</td>
<td>Numerical Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>9,526</td>
<td>9,329</td>
<td>+ 197 + 2.1</td>
<td>1,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>+ 35 + 1.2</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>+ 147 + 3.9</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>+ 165 + 7.5</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>11,018</td>
<td>10,339</td>
<td>+ 679 + 6.6</td>
<td>1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>+ 215 + 2.9</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>+ 75 + 2.9</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross College</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>+ 112 + 5.6</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll Univ.</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>+ 264 + 6.1</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Moyne College</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>+ 8 + 0.5</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola College</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>+ 300 +11.6</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Univ., Chicago</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>13,782</td>
<td>- 291 - 2.1</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Univ., L.A.</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>+ 230 + 9.9</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Univ., N.O.</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>+ 206 + 5.5</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>13,789</td>
<td>13,163</td>
<td>+ 626 + 4.7</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>+ 50 + 5.0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst College</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>+ 175 + 8.0</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's College</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>+ 793 +12.1</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>10,782</td>
<td>+ 229 + 2.1</td>
<td>1,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's College</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>+ 347 +12.1</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>- 70 - 1.7</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>- 145 - 11.4</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit</td>
<td>11,593</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>+ 451 + 4.0</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of San Francisco</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>+ 860 +17.9</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Santa Clara</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>+ 505 +11.8</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Scranton</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>+ 66 + 2.4</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling College</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>+ 89 +13.8</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>+ 658 +14.1</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>146,103</td>
<td>139,172</td>
<td>+6,931 + 4.9</td>
<td>25,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Challenge of Our National Jesuit Institute

C. J. Crusoe, S.J.

No one even casually acquainted with modern educational trends will deny the increasing importance that is attributed to the evaluation of achievement. Accrediting boards, testing agencies, research councils have come of age. Committees are set up to investigate and report on areas as varied and diverse as the student drop-out at Grade 8 level or the problem of the articulation of secondary and college curricula. While there may be some basis for the complaint that we are in danger of permitting testing and research to replace teaching, and of over-emphasizing how you teach rather than what you teach in our schools, is not this the normal dislocation which accompanies changes and growth in organisms, institutions and society at large? Nor should this situation seem too surprising when we consider how closely educational systems—if they are to be vital and efficient—must represent the cultural social values of a nation and, in a lesser degree of the community, not only in the past but increasingly in the present. Should we be surprised, then, to find that the tremendous changes in our present world—social, technical, and to some extent, ethical—have repercussions of great moment in the school as well as in the home, the Church and other institutions?

The ever-present problem of discerning what is of perennial value, what is truly essential in the process of education, is increased ten-fold by the rapidity of change, the shrinking of our world by modern methods of travel and communication and the doubling of our scientific knowledge—it is now said—every five years. Rash indeed would be the educator who would claim to have all or even most of the answers. But if ever in our history there was need of an openness of mind, an attitude of readiness to carefully analyze data, to make use of empirical methods, to be willing to apply the tools of research, it is today. And I submit that, despite human error and scattered evidence of superficial, frothy, even "lunatic fringe" research activity, there is an increasing record of solid educational achievement. Numerous new and valid procedures, new and basic policies, not only dealing with school administration but with objectives, have evolved or are evolving from this present ferment of investigational activity.
Now if I have understood correctly the purpose of this opening address, it is my privilege and duty to clarify the objectives and aims of the Institute. Let me now do so. As I see it, we are gathered here for the express purpose of conducting an experiment in self-evaluation and self-appraisal, in keeping with the best norms of educational practice. Our members have first-hand experience with the educational systems of some five of our Canadian provinces and their professional training embraces varied schools of education. The program calls for position papers, discussions and seminar groups on the basic topics of school life and administration. We are convinced that the outcome of such a dialogue will be an objective and valid appraisal of our present efficiency and a gaining of new insights for the improvement of our final product. At the risk of over-simplification, I am prepared to state the challenge of this Institute as follows: In view of the aims and objectives of Jesuit education,

1. How well are we conducting our schools today?
2. How can we improve them both now and in the face of future changes and development? I now find that this paper falls into three natural divisions:
   a) A consideration of Jesuit educational aims.
   b) A partial but accurate report on our present educational activities as an aid to your own deeper and wider probing during the sessions.
   c) Some suggestions and leads for your own discussions of present and future improvements.

(a) At the risk of carrying coals to Newcastle, I am going to restate the objectives of our Jesuit apostolate in education. I do so for two reasons. It is quite impossible for us to make a valid appraisal of our present educational work unless judged by our over-all objectives and within that frame of reference. Secondly, there is today a good deal of questioning, if not criticism, of the value of our Secondary School apostolate. Since much of this questioning is directed toward our apostolic aims, rather than towards methods (though there is quite rightly some of this latter), I feel justified in setting down the following outline.

The Catholic Church must by its mission bear witness to Christ at all levels of learning. The means used and the types of institutions embodying her teaching and ideals vary from the missionary catechetical class to the doctoral work of a Catholic university. The Jesuit high school is set within the Church of whose mission it is a part. The mission of the Church is to produce the
Christian person; the mission of the Jesuit High School is to produce the educated Christian person—at least at the Secondary level of maturity. The school, as distinct from other agencies in the Church, forms students in Christian wisdom. In the Jesuit view, education includes the development and perfecting of the total human being. Hence no education is complete unless it includes the intellectual, moral and religious formation of the student. To this formation all the activities and all the personnel of the school must contribute, according to their own natures and functions within the institution. Long and wearying have been the discussions regarding the primacy of the intellectual or the spiritual. For our purpose it is, I think, sufficient to say that a Jesuit school—as a school—must, by its very nature, train and develop the mind to a high degree of academic excellence; as a Jesuit school, it must offer moral and spiritual training of an equally mature calibre, for they are integral parts of the formation of the student. To these basic elements of our educational process various extra-curricular activities are added in that degree possible, to thus round off the profile of the Jesuit High School graduate. While not attempting to offer a complete description of the ideal graduate, it is safe to say that a Jesuit High School aims to produce a young man, who, in addition to his fine intellectual development, is a person of sound character based on an awareness of basic religious and moral principles, loyal to legitimate authority, yet retaining initiative and independence consonant with his level of maturity. Perhaps even more do we strive to help him acquire a proper sense of values, gained not so much through instruction as by the living example of his teachers and the Catholic climate of a school truly dedicated to the intellectual apostolate, in all its fullness and power for good. In a word, we hope to set him solidly in the Christian Catholic way of life.

Undoubtedly, it was some such concept of the role of the Jesuit school which prompted Ignatius, at heart a missioner for Christ in foreign lands, to establish some 50 colleges and foundations during his own generalate. To these institutions went many of his most talented recruits, despite the multitudinous calls from mission lands and from kings and princes who wanted court preachers and city-wide missioners. "Even before Ignatius' death," writes J. W. Donohue, "the education of youth was a characteristic work of the Society." At the time of the Suppression (1774), the Company of Jesus conducted some 700 schools and was, says Ranke (no friend of the Society), "the School Master of Europe."
Nor did the new Society abandon those earlier ideals. Ten years after the restoration in 1824, Pope Leo XII on restoring to us the Roman College said, "I bequeath this work and responsibility to this Society of Jesus which was restored by Pius VII, of happy memory, most especially for the purpose of undertaking the education of youth in letters and morals."

But it may be argued, and in fact it often is, that this is ancient history. "New times, new apostolates" is a very frequently heard slogan. And certainly, changing social structures demand adaptations in the apostolic ministry, in education, and in most areas of modern living. But if we may believe the documentary witness of the Society's highest authority, the apostolate of the schools is one of those perennial, permanent ministries of our Society. As we all know, the General's letter in 1947 on the Selection of Jesuit Ministries placed our schools in the four primary apostolates of the whole Society. But that is almost 20 years ago. So I have brought here copies of letters or addresses made in the last five years on the importance of our schools as a primary ministry of the Society. For the sake of brevity, I shall merely mention them—1960, on The Ministry of Teaching; 1962, address to the Educational Conference of the Italian Assistancy; 1963, address to the International Conference of Jesuit Educators, at Rome, at which I was present; 1964, a letter on the occasion of the 150th Anniversary of the Restoration of the Society. All point out the permanent and primary value of the ministry of our schools. Finally, this very summer of 1965, there was a letter sent to the Jesuit Education Conference at Amiens. In this, the present General, P. Arrupe, himself a priest-missioner, a former director of social welfare services, writes as follows: (You will permit me to offer you the translation—for various reasons.) "On every side we hear many objections to the apostolate of our schools. It is said that the Fathers involved do not perform a truly priestly function. But you, dear Fathers, know from your experience that this is most false and that your priesthood, properly lived, gathering up all human values in the redemptive act of Christ, spreads throughout your role of educator of young Christians. They come to know Christ in and through you. It is said too that other ministries today are more apostolic. I simply don't believe it, for nothing is more useful to contemporary society than to prepare for it young men of character and balanced firm personalities which it needs so badly." He then lists a number of other criticisms, e.g., that our
schools cater to the wealthy; that we may overstress the intellectual formation, etc. Even granting that this obtains in some cases, he affirms that the whole history of our pedagogy and methods gives the lie to any such conclusion 'that this is our proper way of proceeding. He points out that our schools must be:

1) Open to prudent change and faithful to the mentality of our generation.

2) Among the most competent and academically influential in our present society. We simply can't tolerate in our schools mediocre standards or an ultra-conservative "closed" attitude. For both these conditions destroy the apostolic worth of our schools or at least greatly diminish them.

Finally, and I quote, he says: "This is certainly not the time to lessen the efforts that we put into the apostolate of our schools, which I consider a primary work (capital), but rather to adapt our schools even more to the world which is being formed under our very eyes."

It is very evident that the Society considers the apostolate of our schools of primary importance because of the intrinsic value of this work. It is not a question of quoting authorities or appealing to past traditions. In August, 1962, Father Janssens (the General) wrote regarding the advancement of Secondary education in Italy. "We are dealing here in fact with a work of primordial importance in the Church of God. If we forsake it, in order to free all our men for baptizing, preaching and hearing confessions, within 30 or 40 years we will be faced with a society that is completely secular; where there is lack of an educated Catholic laity, the Church cannot long endure."

It is encouraging, as we are about to begin our study and evaluation of our schools, to realize what a strong mandate we have for this ministry not only in the past but even at the present moment. But it is likewise a very sobering thought to realize that our responsibility to see that our schools are truly 1) schools of academic excellence, and 2) centers of apostolic and Christian formation, is likewise of the greatest moment.

(b) I think it is now proper to consider our second point—how well are we conducting our schools within the norms and objectives of the Society? Since we expect to do a good deal of soul-searching in the next few days, my purpose is to touch on a few main points which may serve to stimulate and provoke thoughtful discussion. Before proceeding along these lines, I would like to make several observations.
The first is that we Jesuits, by and large, tend to be hyper-critical of our efficiency and our organization, at least when talking among ourselves. Now while this can be a source of discouragement (which is bad), I readily grant that it is the lesser of two evils. God protect us from the fools's paradise of self-complacency and similar stages of euphoria. But—"in medio stat virtus." Let's be objective. It is relevant to compare ourselves with our regional counterparts, while still striving for the ideal. The record of history shows, says E. J. King, author of "Other Schools and Ours" that the implementation of ideals is one of life's greatest challenges. While, with Tennyson, we continue "to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield," we must also, with Browning, recall "a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for."

Again, we must remind ourselves frequently that educational evaluation can only go so far. There are intangibles in the intellectual and even more in the spiritual realm which can't be objectively appraised, nor do they appear in statistics. While not seeking to hide behind any vague facade of such generalities, it is a fact that schools deal with the mind, spirit and soul of youth, and principles and attitudes can't be weighed or measured. This in no way denies that, with experience, we can make some valuable and, I think, valid "educated guesses" based on various external signs and manifestations of the viewpoints of our students.

A third thought which occurs to me is that we must not rest content because we have set up the normal offices and structures of school organization. These are necessary, and they are the means to permit the real work of the school to be done. Their absence generally indicates basic weakness, but their presence does not guarantee an effective end-product. A school is no stronger than its personnel—"nemo dat quod non habet." The competent, devoted, dedicated service of the whole school team is the key to success for they are responsible for the over-all learning process, the inculcation of proper attitudes and ideals, and the growth in knowledge and competence required in the world of today. I would not claim that this is measurable, but I think its presence or absence is capable of detection by a moderately discerning eye.

Earlier I said we should be objective. Let me practise what I preach by giving you a modest report on your achievement of the past five years. In due time we shall indicate shortcomings
and points for self-improvement which you may consider worthy of discussion during your sessions.

While bricks and mortar do not make a good school, proper facilities are important. It is pleasant to report that within the past five years three new high schools of excellent caliber have been erected and a fourth has had major alterations and improvements. The two schools which have kept their status quo have done so due to external factors, one provincial and one regional, over which we had no control. Certainly within the next year or two this uncertainty will be removed. Two of our schools have entered into the Catholic “public school system,” with evidence of considerable gain by both parties. I think I am justified in saying that there is an increase in morale and self-assurance in most of our high schools. In several of our schools, fairly severe financial problems exist; so far, I am not aware that we have permitted this to affect the basic excellence of the education offered.

The attainment of academic excellence is, as we have seen, an essential element in the schools of the Society. How does one measure this and report on it? You are all too experienced and knowledgeable to believe that good exam results indicate a first-class school. But the fact does remain true that they are the best single criterion of academic achievement which we have. And for what it is worth, may I offer this comment, based on long experience and observation: a school which is not meeting with academic success, especially when competing with external norms, is nearly always found to be mediocre and under par in other areas of achievement. Perhaps our General, P. Arrupe, does know what he is talking about! The intimate relation of excellence and apostolicity in our schools merits, I believe, your thoughtful consideration.

Looking at the academic record of our schools, I find that none of them have fallen below the general average of the Province in which they are located. Some have done exceedingly well, equaling and, in at least two cases, showing superior records to the best city schools in their district. My conclusion is that in all our schools we are doing solid, valuable work in the academic area, but superior work is not being done by some. Hence there is room for improvement but not reason for discouragement. As part of the academic picture, I should like to mention that our growth in professionalism, which has always been a problem because of our long academic training, has been improving, even
though slowly. I have no intention of encroaching on the papers of Fathers Meagher and Boyle, but I think it is only fair to point out that all our principals hold at least Master's degrees in education. In the past, too much of this work has been done the long hard way of Summer Schools but there has been definite improvement of late. The vexed problem of our scholastics' professional certification I leave to your discussions and will be attentive to your suggestions.

I am rather hesitant in reporting on a most important but equally intangible area of school effort—the Christian Catholic training which we are giving our students. Let me say quite bluntly—if we are not at least striving manfully to set our young men's feet on the road to virtue and wisdom, then we are not Jesuit educators and should get out of the business. But how does one judge this? We have no valid examinations or questionnaires to guide us. We cannot conclude that, because the school has various religious organizations and has the machinery for teaching and guiding our youth, we are doing a fine job. We might say that the absence of this organization would indicate definite shortcomings, but its mere presence is no guarantee. Nor is it fair to judge a school's religious vitality by vocations. There are too many factors and too many variables involved. But if in a school over some years vocations are nil or very few, I think we are justified in saying that either we aren't doing the job, or else we are not attracting the right type of student. This is the explanation offered by some of our schools in Italy and France. With regard to our own schools, I am prepared to say that most are doing good solid apostolic work and several are certainly in the category of the excellent. Again, there is room for improvement and I shall be very disappointed if our present session does not help to clarify problems and give us freshened viewpoints through a fraternal exchange of ideas and experiences.

(c) Our third and final topic of discussion, and it will be restricted, lest I bore you, deals with identifying those areas which need improvement and, wherever possible, working out in these coming sessions, practical solutions. May I offer the following points merely as suggestions which may stimulate worthwhile discussion:

1) Are we, as a group, keeping sufficiently abreast of progress and development in various educational areas through research and guided investigations? I have been somewhat worried by the difficulty I met in getting a leader for discussion in this field.
Withdrawal from our counterparts in our professional field is anti-Ignatian. I know that many of you are overworked but to remain alive in your field you must read, and would you consider the wisdom of some type of summer refresher course, at least every 3-5 years?

2) The aggiornamento in the Church reaches far and wide and definitely must find very substantial support in our schools, which rightly claim to be one of the strongest formative agencies in the life of a young man. At the moment there is considerable unevenness in our schools. Is not this an opportunity for us to hammer out a general policy which will enable us to introduce through the liturgy and the Biblical study of our Religion classes some of the newer orientations and emphases which, as far as we can now judge, will become part of our religious heritage? How valuable is this suggestion – that a term or a least a half term within the next school year be given to the study of the main Vatican II decrees in our Senior classes?

3) The tremendous upsurge of Psychology and its implications has reached our schools. This presents a variety of problems and I will touch on one only which to me seems to merit your attention, even though at the moment I doubt if we can find a complete solution. May I put it in focus? It seems to me that the schools in our Province were beginning to handle the problem of integrating the role of the Student Counsellor into the system. I think it is correct to admit that there is a certain built-in tension between the role of the counsellor and that of the administrator and even of the teacher. The objectives and the method of approach are different, even though all are working for the development of the student. As a result we are asking one man to be at the same time chaplain and director of a religious program for the school, while increasingly he is pressured by society for some degree, at least, of psychological counselling. As I see it, it can’t be done. But until superiors can appoint two men for this area, perhaps in your discussions you may find some general agreement on policy. Certainly at the present moment, counsellors have been appointed to be chaplains, directors of religious programs and, to whatever degree they are able, counsellors in the more psychological areas. Identity and referral of troubled cases seem to me to be the very most they can hope to do in our present limited manpower situation. Your consideration of this problem and recommendations will be gladly received.

4) A fourth and final point I should like to mention deals with
the increasing importance of the layman in our Jesuit system. I feel certain that this group has advanced well beyond the ancient concept that laymen were a necessary evil or even a grim necessity. We have no difficulty in seeing them as collaborators, complementing our own work and adding a new dimension, that of the apostolic layman. I wish this were accepted throughout all our Jesuit world. Just last week, I received some documents from Spain and French Canada which made interesting and provocative reading. The one report clearly states that laymen in their schools were not apostolic and could only be considered as hired workers rendering a service for economic remuneration. The second pointed out that their laymen considered the school (Catholic or otherwise) a temporal service (i.e., non-apostolic) rendered to society in which they shared and they were to be judged and remunerated on the basis of this strictly cultural or social service. The wheel has here come full turn and my immediate question is: What are we Jesuits doing in the system? I would like to see you discuss the practical problem of how we can improve the present collaboration with our lay staff, so that they will share in our apostolate in a more efficient and, this is important, more highly responsible manner.

May I close this paper with a brief quotation from our present Father General’s message to the assembled French Jesuit educators at Amiens last August. I feel that it is most apt in its application to our group:

"First and foremost, a school which wishes to be faithful to the mind of St. Ignatius ought to play a decisive role in that region or locality in which it is placed. It should act with boldness and with immense confidence, frankly facing the problems of its time and ready for all necessary changes, even the most profound, in order that it lose nothing of its apostolic vigor and effectiveness. Two conditions are required for this:

1) The school must be progressive and alive, prudently but realistically adjusted to the mentality of the times.

2) The students must be urged toward the highest ideals and an ever greater seriousness in their work, that they will be among the most competent and influential of their generation."

I submit that this is a most worthy ideal for us to strive to emulate.
A University Business Officer's Guidelines for Construction

Brother James Kenny, S.J.

The experiences of college and university business officers during the past five years have taught them that a successful building project requires the enlightened combination of at least seven important factors. These factors are worthy of a brief restatement and better understanding by all those responsible for major construction programs.

The first of these factors is an adequately documented program which describes exactly how the new space is to be used. Such a program should have the concurrence of a committee appointed by the president of the institution to represent the several areas of responsibility for the project. If the building is to be used as a teaching facility, each of the disciplines to be served should participate in planning that part being designed to meet its particular needs. If the facility is a housing or food service unit, the programming committee must have the best judgment of the dean of student affairs and the director of food services.

And although presidents have sometimes unfortunately neglected the point, committees of this sort should also include the director of the physical plant who will be expected to operate and maintain the building. In addition, the officer responsible for coordinating the total campus development plan should have an opportunity of determining that the unit will be an integral part of the total college program. Finally, the college business officer should always be a party to the work of the planning committee if he is going to be expected to justify the cost of the new building.

As the work of the planning committee progresses, detailed minutes of their conclusions should be distributed to all concerned. These minutes should ultimately represent a complete description of the program for the project. This record becomes the basis upon which the architect makes his preliminary drawings.

The second factor essential for a successful building program is adequate financial planning. This may seem to be self-evident, but responsible college administrators do not all agree on a definition of "adequate financial planning." On many campuses college building have been planned only in terms of the dollars available
to finance their construction. Plausible arguments can be presented in favor of this procedure, but it should not be acceptable if it is the exclusive basis from which planning begins.

A more desirable approach would be to ask the planning committee to define what should be included in the new building. But this procedure also has its characteristic weakness which stems from the anxiety of programming committees to design the absolutely ideal building rather than one simply adequate to meet their needs. Business officers have learned to seek that point at which the wishes of those planning buildings can be brought reasonably within the reach of available funds. Deciding upon this point of delicate balance becomes the final responsibility of the president of the college. It is not always an easy decision to make but neither should it be agonizingly difficult. Here are some of the considerations which, properly weighed, can contribute to sound decisions.

To begin with, experience has demonstrated that any given number of students require a specific number of square feet of building plus a given amount of equipment for which a positive price can be determined. It has also been rather well established that housing and food services and related auxiliary enterprises can be self-liquidating when correlated with actual total enrollments. For example, the point of diminishing returns for self-liquidating housing and food projects is an enrollment of approximately 350 or fewer students. With enrollments of 500 to 1,000 students, the gain in excess of income over expense is rapidly accelerated because overhead expenses remain almost constant.

The definition of adequate financing of new campus construction has been subject to an evolutionary process. These new concepts must be well understood by all college business officers and should be equally well understood by their presidents.

For instance, college presidents and their business officers are aware nowadays of an innovation in the financing of construction. Traditionally, the financing of the construction of academic buildings from tuition and fees was considered most ill-advised, if not impossible. It was certainly frowned upon by accrediting agencies who have, in the past, regarded tuition and fees as being dedicated to teaching salaries and expenses. A change in attitude toward this concept has resulted principally from the Education Facilities Act. As a matter of fact, the provisions of the act encourage the building of teaching facilities to be financed with long-term loans supported from tuition and fees.
Still, this method of financing educational buildings ought only to supplement the traditional method which aims at providing the total cash from capital fund campaigns, legislative appropriations, gifts from donors, or from federal grants as provided by the same act. Other recent developments, such as lease-back and living endowment programs, have also helped to change our thinking about ways of financing construction.

No college president has to be reminded of the necessity for a carefully developed financial projection of the income and expense from all these sources for at least ten years as a basis for considering the extent to which his budget can be committed to debt service. It would be equally presumptuous to advise presidents against long-term debt service commitments based upon any large percentage of income from annual gifts, grants, alumni and friends.

Experience has thus finally established that the logical approach to any educational building should be in terms of what is needed, how much it will cost, and how much of the cost is available from any or all sources. The reverse procedure of beginning with how much we do have or can get, and how much or what it will build, and what kind of program it can provide, is no longer acceptable.

The selection of an architect, which is the third factor contributing to a successful building program, should be made in the light of several considerations. College presidents have learned that an institution pays exactly the same fee for the highest quality of architectural talent as for the least competent. Publicly supported institutions frequently have little voice in selecting their architects. This is not necessarily a disadvantage, but it must be recognized as imposing restrictions. Regrettably, many appointments for state-financed projects have been based upon political considerations rather than upon the specialized training and experience expected of architects assigned to college projects.

A conventional procedure followed by many of you is to select five or more architectural firms to whom an invitation is extended for a formal interview and presentation of their qualifications. Such interviews are usually conducted before a committee consisting of the president, the chief business officer, one or more trustees who are members of the appropriate trustee committee on buildings and grounds, and several representatives from the faculty programming group.

During the interview, the architect should be asked to describe
the size and personnel of his company. He should show photographs of comparable projects which his firm has designed. He should discuss his philosophy of architecture and his method of working with the programming committee. He should describe his technique for translating the program into a building design and his approach to relating the exterior appearance of the building to the general architectural character of the campus. During his presentation, an architect should demonstrate an understanding of the overall concept of a university or college campus as an expression of the nature of the institution.

In making a final selection from among architects, it is exceedingly important to discuss their services with other clients for whom they have done work to determine that they are successful in keeping their designs within the limits of fixed budgets. References should be contacted about the results of the bidding on their projects. Questions should be asked about the number of change orders and the effectiveness of supervision during construction. The group doing the interviewing should feel that the personality of the architect is such as to ensure satisfactory working relationships during the program.

The fourth factor which is most important in any new construction is the necessity for obtaining a realistic annual operating cost of the proposed project. There is perhaps no disservice more grave than that of many architects who are either unwilling or unqualified to brief their clients concerning the day-to-day operating costs which the proposed construction will involve. In this computer age, when more sophisticated equipment is appearing almost daily, when estimates and projected expenses are readily available, and when major costs center around mechanical design, it is incumbent upon all concerned with the project not only fully to understand the total construction cost but, equally important, to understand and appreciate the annual operating expenses. Moreover, it is essential that these expenses be projected over a period of years so as to include repairs and replacement of equipment along with the increasing cost of labor and material. I know of one institution which constructed a four-and-a-half million dollar building and was most anxious that it be fully air-conditioned, little realizing that the cost of implementing this decision would be $40,000 annually. Had it investigated or had it been informed of this rather large expense, it might very well have modified its demands.

After these first four factors which have been mentioned are
correlated, a campus building project is probably well under way.

The next, and fifth of the seven factors, is a critical one not adequately appreciated by many administrators. Nevertheless, it haunts the business officer and his associates if they are aware of their responsibility to be enlightened clients of their architects. For enlightened clients should conduct continuous reviews of the architect’s work during the development of both preliminary plans and working drawings. The first of these reviews should be undertaken by the faculty or staff members who will actually use the facility or be responsible for its function. This is particularly true in the case of science buildings and similar highly specialized units.

The second kind of constant review must be provided by the physical plant staff who are the best judges of designs that avoid or create difficult maintenance problems. For example, there has been a period in contemporary architecture in which vast areas were wholly enclosed by glass. Such designs may be architecturally exciting, but they are also fantastically frustrating to maintenance crews, who are expected to keep 20- and 30-foot expanses of glass free from the ravages of rain and dirt.

The accessibility and character of the utilities and related services are of real concern to the director of a physical plant. Adequate provision for receiving and storing supplies and equipment may be of little interest to anyone except the physical plant personnel, but for them and ultimately those they serve, such matters are vital. The problems of maintaining dining room areas and kitchen areas in food service buildings are fundamental considerations in all architectural plans for such space.

The responsibility of determining the adequacy of what is being planned for their use does rest with the clients and must not be left entirely to the discretion of an architect, regardless of his competence. If a college gets a bad building in which the tenants are unhappy (and many such buildings have been built during the past five years), it is usually the institution itself whose officers are solely to blame.

A working schedule of regular reviews of the architect’s drawings should be made a part of the process of every building program. Most large institutions with multimillion-dollar building programs have found it economically advantageous and more satisfactory to employ an experienced, properly qualified person to devote his full time to this responsibility. Even under such circumstances, the review by all other officers and staff concerned must be done.
When the architect has completed his drawings for a building project, it is most desirable for an institution to obtain on its own behalf an estimate of the likely cost for the project before it is released to bidders. This may be done by professional estimators. For a small fee, they are able to calculate such an estimate from the architect's drawings. Many architectural firms have their own estimators. Whether a school accepts the architect's judgment or depends upon an independent estimate is a matter of policy. Many times, friendly contractors are skillful in providing such a service, if they are willing to do so. They do have the unique advantage of knowing what they might expect such a project to cost if they were bidding on it. It can be a bad mistake to release a project for bid if one is not reasonably assured of the cost range within which such bids are likely to be made. The cost to redesign and re-bid a project will usually exceed a small margin of error in bidding. This is the reason why most budgets for building projects include a bidding contingency.

A popular practice by architects of including alternate deductions or additions in their bidding documents can prove to be both advantageous and disadvantageous. For instance, including a high-priced add-on alternate can change the awarding of a contract from one company to another company which offers a very low figure for the alternate so that the total price is in their favor. The ethics of this practice may be open to question. It is a device which has been used in many instances to control the selection of contractors.

After these first five factors have been given their just due, the next major area of concern is the awarding of the building contract to an honest and capable contractor. Institutions using federal loan or grant funds in support of any part of their construction projects are required by law to engage in open bidding. The disadvantages from this procedure can be controlled to some extent by specifying minimum requirements or standards for bidders before their bids are acceptable. One essential requirement should be that the contractor is a bona fide builder with his own staff and employees and not a broker who must depend upon assembling a group of subcontractors if he succeeds in getting the bid. Institutions have a right to expect a contractor to demonstrate financial responsibility and integrity by way of assurance that he can complete the construction reasonably on schedule. If possible, the names of approved bidders whose credentials have been verified should be listed by the school.
Regardless of the restrictions under which schools may be forced to work, there is no obligation to award the contract to builders who can be depended upon to do an adequate job.

Institutions which are building projects financed wholly by private funds usually have the advantage of selecting a contractor on a negotiated basis. It has been the general experience of colleges and universities that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages of having the contracts for electrical work, plumbing, heating and ventilation, and air-conditioning independently bid by contractors specializing in these areas of work rather than having the total project under one general contractor who in turn subcontracts for these services.

The procedures and routines for preparing bidding documents and receiving bids are all very formal and require a thorough knowledge by the business officer who must follow them in detail. College presidents should be equally familiar with most of these procedures so that they understand what is happening during this critical phase in the program for any new project.

Once a contract has been awarded and construction has been started by the successful bidder, another phase of the college business officer’s responsibility begins. This is the seventh factor so essential to the success of a building project.

A college should have one full-time experienced person on its staff assigned as a clerk-of-the-works. This individual will devote his full time daily to observing every aspect of the actual construction to determine that the contractors are honestly and correctly following the plans of the architect. Such a person is particularly concerned with observing that the contractor is not economizing at the expense of the college on the materials and workmanship going into the building.

The weekly or periodic inspections of the project by the architect, which is part of his on-going responsibility, will not substitute for the daily supervision by the clerk-of-the-works.

Every invoice from the contractor to the institution for work completed to date should be approved in the first instance by the clerk-of-the-works before it is sent to the architect and before it is processed through the business officer and his accounting department.

Change orders are a necessary evil, but they must be held to an absolute minimum if severe dislocations in the construction budget are not to occur. All change orders should certainly be held within the limits of the construction contingency fund.
As a project is nearing completion, there is another important responsibility which rests upon the business officer and his clerk-of-the-works. This is commonly called the check-list procedure. For this the business officer should rely upon the professional competence of his clerk-of-the-works and his physical plant staff who must examine every aspect of the building to determine that it is complete according to the original design and specifications. This procedure will also be done independently by the architect. The final check-list should likewise have the advantage of review by the departments who will be assigned the new space as their own.

After all of the work on the check-list is completed, the client is expected to retain some small part of the final payment until the building can be cleaned and ready for occupancy.

Finally, with all of this having been successfully accomplished, the college business officer is left with one more major problem. He must staff the new building and plan for its operation and maintenance. This should not be a casual procedure. A specific program must be written in which the responsible supervisors know exactly what is required to guarantee a satisfactory operation of the new unit.

The picture today in college and university construction is such that a president should not recommend to his governing board any new project until it has been given a complete programming in terms of all the considerations which have just been set forth.

There are a few other points which have not been touched upon. No mention has been made in these comments, for instance, of the place of landscaping, roads and walks, and many other equally important aspects of any new building project. These are being taken somewhat for granted.

There is one last point, however, which should not be taken for granted, but rather emphasized. Business officers are learning that fundamental to all successful building programs is a fully developed campus plan. Such a plan includes not only a definition of space requirements for projected enrollments but also the plan for timing and integrating their construction with the conversion or reconstruction of existing units. The danger of overextension of the physical plant can be a real one in view of the somewhat unrealistic enrollment projections accepted by many smaller schools. The popular concept of doubling enrollments between 1965 and 1975 upon which many college expansion programs are predicated is obviously in error. There were approxi-
mately 5,200,000 students enrolled in American colleges for the 1964-65 session. The best estimates available based upon the number of college-age students who will be ready for enrollment in 1975 indicate that the number will be approximately 8,600,000. This number falls far short of doubling today’s enrollment.

College presidents are well-advised to require a restudy and reevaluation of their long-range campus development plans. Even more important is a restudy of the long-range financial projections of the college as these estimates relate to the ability to undertake an increased program of debt service.

Much has been learned by college and university administrators during the past few frantic years. The immediate future presents even greater challenges than in any period in the past. At least there is now some accumulation of valuable experience to serve as a point of departure and as a basis for the new decisions and judgments which must be made.

The business officers of our colleges and universities individually and collectively will have a large share in the responsibility of helping meet the challenge which today confronts American higher education. To the extent that the business officer contributes to meeting this challenge through his imagination, his competence, his technical skill, then to that extent will college business management merit its place at the educational council table.
JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY had material help in their drive for funds with a $1,000,000 gift from James A. Bohannon, a well-known Cleveland philanthropist and retired industrialist. The gift meant that the University could proceed immediately on construction plans for the new $4 million Science Center.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY has been awarded an unrestricted challenge grant of $5,000,000 by the Ford Foundation. Conditions of the grant require that the University must raise $15,000,000 from other private sources in the next three years. The University has already received $1,000,000 as an initial payment on the grant. Twelve universities have received grants under these terms since the inception of this program in 1960. St. Louis University is the second Catholic university to receive such a grant.

ST. LOUIS has also received a grant of over a million dollars from the National Institutes of Health to aid in the construction of a five-story addition to the School of Medicine building. The new addition to be used mainly for research will be so constructed that an additional five floors may be added at a later date. Total construction costs will be close to $2,800,000.

Work is progressing on Fordyce House, a center for student retreats and educational conferences for ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY. The 40 acre property will have private rooms for 60 retreatants but with conference and dining facilities for 120. Construction and remodeling costs will be $597,000.

The UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO reports three munificent gifts to the University in the past several months. Mrs. Pauline Harney, widow of a former member of the USF Board of Regents, has presented a check for $1,200,000 to the University. The gift is the largest cash gift ever received by the school and will be used for construction costs of the Harney Science Center at USF. Mr. and Mrs. Harney had previously contributed to the construction of the Memorial Gymnasium and contributed funds to the marble altar in St. Ignatius Church.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kendrick, who had previously given $1,000,000 towards the construction of the new Law School building, Kendrick Hall, have made an additional gift of $500,000. The added funds will be used to expand the holdings of the Law
School library and also to establish an endowment fund for deserving and qualified law students.

The third recent gift was established under the will of the late Albert Jose Zabala. Mr. Zabala, a descendant of one of Spanish California’s first families, is the father of Father Albert J. Zabala, S.J. who is Chairman of the Theology faculty at USF. The conditions of the will grant an immediate annual income of $45,000 and eventually the entire income from 2,100 acres of Mr. Zabala’s Rancho Arroyo Seco. The Rancho is presently valued at more than $2,000,000. The proceeds of the bequest will be used for the support of theological studies at USF. It was Mr. Zabala’s hope that, through the bequest, USF could become the West’s leading theology center, with resources available to scholars of all major faiths. According to the terms of the bequest the theology library will be strengthened and a chair of theology will be established. Funds will also be available for fellowships to assist laymen engaged in graduate studies in Theology.

LOYOLA ACADEMY won the Prep football crown of the City of Chicago with a 33-13 score over the champion contender of the Public School League. The game, a charity benefit, was played before a crowd of some 80,000 spectators. To reach the Catholic League Championship spot, the Loyola Academy team had to win over three sectional Catholic League teams.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY has been granted a one million dollar fund from the Ford Foundation for an Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure. The Institute will conduct research and demonstration projects in the Washington area. The basic purpose of the new Institute is to encourage community co-operation with the object of initiating reforms to alleviate conditions found detrimental to a sound system for the administration of criminal justice.