

OCT 28 1967

FATHERS RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

A JESUIT AT SAINT PAUL'S

A UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

SELECTION PROCEDURES IN JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

Volume 30, Number 2

October 1967

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER FRANCIS X. MOAN, S.J., teaches Latin and Greek at Saint Joseph's Preparatory School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

FATHER PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J., is the Vice-President for Student Affairs at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. His article is divided into four parts; the second part appears in this issue of the JEQ. The two remaining parts will be published in subsequent issues.

FATHER ROBERT R. NEWTON, S.J., is a fourth-year theologian doing graduate work in theology at the Yale Divinity School.

BROTHER JAMES M. KENNY, S.J., is the Vice-President for Planning and Physical Facilities at Fordham University in New York City.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, S.J., is the President of Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, Missouri. He is also President of the Jesuit Educational Association.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 30, Number 2

October 1967

CONTENTS

A JESUIT AT SAINT PAUL'S

Francis X. Moan, S.J. 67

THE VISION OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

Part II—A Unique Educational Mission

Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J. 76

SELECTION PROCEDURES IN JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS:

TIME FOR RE-EXAMINATION

Robert R. Newton, S.J. 90

DEVELOPING THE ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN

James M. Kenny, S.J. 105

FIRST MEETING OF A BOARD

Paul C. Reinert, S.J. 112

NEWS FROM THE FIELD 118

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

A. WILLIAM CRANDELL, S.J.

Managing Editor

PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.

ADVISORY BOARD

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

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
E. JOSEPH GOUGH, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

COPYRIGHT, 1967

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

A Jesuit at Saint Paul's

FRANCIS X. MOAN, S.J.

Since I have recently returned from the novel experiment of being a Jesuit priest on the faculty of a Protestant Episcopalian boarding school, it has been suggested that readers of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* may be interested in some of my observations on that experience.

To begin at the beginning. When my Province Prefect of Studies offered me a sabbatical leave from my regular post as teacher of Latin and Greek at St. Joseph's Prep in Philadelphia, I jumped at the chance. But in giving consideration to how I would spend that year, I came to the conclusion that in preference to a year of study or a year of travel abroad I would like to see another school system at work. When I made this suggestion to my Provincial, his reply was, "If you can get a job, you may do it." So here I was, after some 20 years in the security of the Society, out pounding the streets for a job.

But I only pounded them as far as the local public library. There I took down the *National Association of Independent Schools* catalogue. For I had decided that, since I was engaged in private education in a rather good academic school, I wanted to see how Jesuit methods of education and the aims of Jesuit schools compared with one of the better private Prep schools. Also, if possible, I wanted—in this ecumenical era—to see what effect such an era was having at the grass roots of a church-related school. Finally, I wanted to be accepted on my academic qualifications and therefore I had to find a school that was still strong in the classics. So I paged through the catalogue jotting down the addresses of schools which offered Greek. This I did on the presupposition that although Greek might be minimal in such a school, there still would be enough Latin taught to provide a place for me.

I picked out 19 such schools, mostly church-related, mostly in New England. In January, 1966, I wrote to the Headmasters of all these schools telling them of my hopes for the school year '66-'67. I am happy to report that I had replies from all 19 Headmasters. All were enthusiastic about the project. Not all, however, could take me for the particular school year of '66-'67,

nor did all have an opening in my field. One Headmaster on the West Coast wrote in some dismay to say that he had just hired a classics teacher in the previous week but promised that he would be on the long distance phone to get me should any problem develop in that contract.

Eventually, four varying offers were made. St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., was most spontaneous and generous in its response. I was invited to fly up at their expense for an interview. I did so. There I was graciously entertained overnight. I was interviewed by the Head of the Classics Department as well as by another member of that department, by the Dean of Studies and by the Rector. In these conversations, it was suggested that I also become involved in the Sacred Studies Department by teaching one course in it. I consented to do so. A definite offer was made. I returned to Philadelphia, made known the situation to my superiors, received the permission of the local Bishop to enter his diocese, and had everything settled within a month after my interview. I had the rest of the school year and the summer to enjoy the anticipation of this experiment.

Two practical points aided my appointment as a full-time member of the faculty of St. Paul's. One was the ecumenical movement. I feel quite sure that five years ago such an idea on my part would never have received attention within the Society. And I think it fair to say that five years ago neither St. Paul's nor other denominational schools would have considered the possibility. Therefore, I am grateful to the memory of Pope John XXIII for inaugurating such a spirit within the Christian churches.

Secondly, the reputation of the Society in the field of American education considerably helped to open doors. Though I had offered to send my academic records along with supporting letters of recommendation, this was unnecessary. The fact that I was a Jesuit, had received a Jesuit training, was engaged in Jesuit schooling seemed sufficient credentials. And the year indicated that the men with whom I worked have a high regard for Jesuits and Jesuit schools. Being so enclosed in our own ghetto, I think we tend to forget this, and forget the valuable work our schools are doing.

Here, then, are some of my reflections about my year at St. Paul's.

First of all, St. Paul's school has everything that money can buy. No Jesuit school can hope to compete with it financially.

The school has a larger endowment than even any Catholic college in the United States. And it has this money not only because it has catered to a wealthy class but also because it works at raising money and has done so consistently throughout its existence. St. Joseph's Prep is older, by a few years, than St. Paul's. And though it may be true that we have not been dealing with the same financial class of people, it is nevertheless difficult to explain why our vision of our goal and the means to effect that goal did not include a persistent endeavor, from our beginning, to seek to endow our school. Even after more than 100 years, we are still living a day-to-day existence.

Jesuits are prone to think the Society is too tradition-bound. But some traditions are very fine things. St. Paul's is a place of tradition and preserves many fine customs, a notable one being its regard for its alumni. My own experience in Jesuit schools has been that we have to a great extent remained independent of and indifferent to the opinions of our alumni. Such independence is valuable. But it has been won at the cost of continued alumni support. St. Paul's alumni have a feeling that they are a part of the school. There are plaques all around in memory of them and their deeds. They are prayed for frequently in the chapel. They are wined and dined on their visits. Their alumni organization is solid, is run in a very business-like manner, and operates as an independent corporation. At times, it is true, the school, in order to keep pace with the times, or to experiment educationally, must sever relations with a generous but disapproving alumnus or benefactor. But its over-all relationship with its alumni makes this possible without serious harm.

Academically the school is run in a far more professional manner than is any Jesuit school within my experience. But this in no way implies that it runs like a cold machine. Members of the faculty are very humane, cultured, educated and personally involved. Of course every administrator has his own secretary and it is thus easy for him to communicate to the faculty through a memo. But there continued to be, nevertheless, a constant re-appraisal of media of communication in order to improve the situation.

Part of the necessary nuisance of running a school professionally is the demand for meetings. These were held in abundance—perhaps more than necessary—but still held for the good of the school. Faculty meetings were held every week, departmental

meetings were held every week, heads of departments met fortnightly as did heads of houses (dormitories). In addition there was a dispatch-of-business committee (to settle the agenda for the weekly faculty meeting), a committee to investigate Independent Study Programs, an athletic committee, a discipline committee, *et al.* Though I could not categorically approve of all these meetings, I still think we are lagging far behind in this continual professional reevaluation of our work.

The faculty at St. Paul's was good academically but not of that superior quality which I expected. This is due, I think, to the remoteness of the school from a large urban area, to the demands made upon teachers in too many diversified ways in this day of specialization, and more importantly, to the lack of faculty stability caused by the absence of anything like tenure or a more democratic influence on the part of the faculty in the voice of the school.

I suspect that the school will encounter more and more acute faculty problems in the years ahead. Though the school provides comfortable living quarters for all faculty members and their families and though it pays well, the enticement to withdraw into the medieval community of the school's location and to have minimal contact with even the neighboring town is not very great for young teachers. The contact with outsiders is curtailed because classes are held on six days a week with even Sunday making demands on the faculty. It is almost impossible to get away once school is in session.

Though school vacations at Christmas and in the spring are lengthy, the three terms are terribly demanding on a faculty member. He will be teaching four courses (frequently four preparations), coaching a sport in two of the three terms, being master in a dormitory, moderating one or more extra-curricular societies and serving on a faculty committee or two. All this a teacher must do while raising his own family, trying to get involved in the local PTA at the school his young children attend and keeping an eye out for summer study if he does not yet have an M.A. or for summer employment if he does. My over-all impression was that the teachers there work much harder than our own men. (This summer, after 28 years of dormitory duty, the Vice-Rector is finally moving into a cottage on the campus.)

In these days of increasing specialization fewer and fewer men will be found to sacrifice their devotion to 'their field' to this demanding sort of life. As a consequence, the school has been

forced, it seems to me, on some occasions to hire, and retain, men competent to the task but not the superior educators one would expect in a place like St. Paul's. Yet their poorest teachers were not as poor, it seemed to me, as some teachers we have tolerated in our schools. I was impressed by the number of men who have given many years of their lives to St. Paul's as I was also awed by the few really outstanding teachers on its faculty.

What I would presume to be the most compelling faculty problem is the lack of anything like tenure. Though I am sure there are some elders on the faculty who feel quite sure there is little chance for their dismissal, still contracts are on a year-to-year basis, as are salary increments. This has its advantages. But I am suspicious that the men with more experience could and would contribute more to the total life of the school if they felt a little more secure in their positions. Surely in a private school a great deal depends on the Board of Trustees in the realm of financial security, and overseeing of the business of the corporation. But the basic operation of the school—its academic pursuit—should benefit from the wealth of experience of its senior faculty. A number of these men did and do contribute. But a faculty senate would be a far more worthwhile channel of these contributions.

A final word on the faculty. What impressed me greatly was the culture of so many of the faculty and their families, a quality so lacking in our Jesuit communities and even in a number of our lay faculty who are products of our system. For one thing, the living accommodations of the school are gracious—not lavish, but gracious. And art in many forms was the everyday sight and sound in many a master's home. Frequently enough these displays of artistic talent were the creations of the masters themselves—not always professionally done, but nevertheless a thing of beauty by one's own hands. Other masters were gifted in music, played in the school band, or for local groups, or even in the New Hampshire Symphony at a tremendous cost of time and energy. Though the school has an excellent art department, I am convinced that the art courses alone will never communicate culture. One needs a cultured faculty to make the boys cultured. Our schools are barracks compared to St. Paul's and our schools are barracks because our communities are barracks, a place to eat, sleep, work and pray—with never a thought for the beauties of nature and art. This, I think, has begun to be corrected within the last ten years as superiors have begun to send some of our

young men to study the fine arts. But the formation of our men throughout the course of studies is still woefully deficient in this matter. You can't cultivate the refinement of the human spirit by daily life in our barren institutional novitiates and seminaries.

The curriculum at St. Paul's is solid, rather standard, and permits of little freedom in comparison with some of its sister schools but allows more freedom than the Jesuit schools within my experience. Classes are small. (The largest I had contained 14, the smallest 8.) An excellent library is at hand (over 38,000 volumes) and is available late in the evening. Except for a brief required study period in the evening, boys are generally on their own and expected to prepare their assignments when they can. No course had the number of class hours a similar course would demand in one of our schools. Discipline was hardly a problem. The minuscule discipline so often exaggerated in our schools was handled by the sixth formers (seniors). More serious breaches of discipline were handled sternly and at once, and it was expected that no further action would be taken against the offenders beyond that meted out by the administration. Such penalties were immediately communicated publicly to the boys.

Athletics were required daily of all. Non-athletic extra-curriculars were held in the evenings. The number of such organizations was large, but the number of boys in each organization small. In this way, college applications of the boys can often show an impressive listing of athletic and non-athletic activities, a strong issue with many colleges.

My general impression is that St. Paul's offers a few boys a superb education whereas St. Joseph's Prep imposes a good education on a larger number. Both points of view have their merits. Comparing our facilities, our faculty, our enrollment and our financial situation, I think we should be very proud of the job we are doing.

This brings me to the point of college admissions. It cannot be denied that St. Paul's is very successful in getting its students placed in "the" colleges. Already I am frequently asked how many 'Paulies' go to the Ivy League schools. This pinpoints the situation at once. We have not had the tradition of sending our students to the Ivy League schools so we have no background with their admissions departments. For over 100 years St. Paul's has been sending its graduates to Harvard, Princeton and Yale. Up to 20 years ago, St. Paul's could send over 90% of its graduates

to those three schools. A large number still go there. But St. Paul's has a tradition at these places and the colleges respect that tradition, though less so each year now. This respect manifests itself in ways such as the free access the college guidance officer at St. Paul's will have to the admissions offices in a number of fine colleges. The college guidance officer there also seemed to me to be quite realistic in counseling the seniors on where they should apply.

I found the departmental meetings each week a new academic experience. First of all, the department plays a far greater role within the school; assigns students to classes, develops curricula, acts as an academic go-between for administration and faculty, interviews new teachers, settles on textbooks, develops uniform patterns in teaching, handles its own budget, etc. We have a long way to go in this area. An interesting asset for each department was the invitation to 'Dickey Fellows'. The school has a certain amount of money in trust so that each year each department can invite someone—usually a distinguished university professor—to stimulate the members of the department in its particular field.

The school also has the benefit of other foundations by which it can bring in distinguished Americans for a weekend. These visitors give public lectures to faculty and students but there is always a time set aside in which the students can visit and talk to them informally. In the year '66-'67 the Conroy Fellows were Archibald Cox, Solicitor-General under Kennedy, Aaron Copland, the composer, and Dr. Mary Calderone, a leading advocate of sex education in the schools. Other guest lecturers were brought in for one night stands. The school attempted to promote a greater appreciation of the arts through concerts by the Philadelphia String Quartet, the New Hampshire Symphony and a celebrated Brass Ensemble.

St. Paul's is a church-related school, by tradition and emphasis a Protestant Episcopal school, though its legal connection with the Episcopal Church is tenuous. Until this past year, chapel was required of all—faculty and students—every day and twice on Sunday. Only in this past year did this schedule change when one Sunday service was dropped as well as Saturday morning chapel. I tried to imagine getting the faculty, especially the Jesuit faculty, in one of our schools to attend compulsory chapel so frequently.

In addition to such services, the religious aspects of the school are manifest in two chapels on campus, the presence of six Episcopal clergymen (including the present Rector) and the academic requirement of two years of Sacred Studies, one in first year high school and one in third. I was involved in the third year course (though half of my students were seniors). Basically the course was a history of Christianity from a study of primitive religion to the new morality. In the particular section I taught, all the students had had classical Greek so that when we reached that part of the course dealing with the life of Christ, we read the whole of St. Mark in Greek, did an exegesis of the text and then moved on to parts of *Acts* and *Romans*. This was one of the most satisfying phases of my stay at St. Paul's and my students thought the Greek section of the course was probably the most valuable part.

Yet boys are boys anywhere and the boys at St. Paul's with whom I discussed the matter reacted strongly to compulsory chapel. I detected, though, that they respected the academic caliber of the Sacred Studies courses. The Sacred Studies department itself will be the first to admit that there is a great divide between the classroom and the chapel. Though attempts are being made to breach the gap, the religious upheaval of our times makes this extremely difficult.

The year at St. Paul's was of great value to me personally. Having been entirely educated in Catholic schools, and having lived for the last 20 years in a predominantly Catholic-institutional form of life, I was now for the first time living a quite independent life in a Protestant environment. I was most cordially received at St. Paul's and most cordially treated throughout my stay. This does not mean that either faculty or students refrained from expecting me to be pretty much of a spokesman for the Catholic Church. I trust that one fruit of my stay there was to dissuade them of the notion that every Roman Catholic priest is nothing but a funnel through which the 'official line' of the Church is channeled.

I lived in a bachelor apartment on campus. This experience has led me to question the wholesomeness of the type of community life we live. I am now inclined to think that we live too close to one another. During the past year I was happy to receive and read the decrees of the last General Congregation. Among them was the notion that perhaps we should live away

from the place of our apostolate. Perhaps our lives become too narrow and confined and our human frictions too exaggerated when we live, eat, work and recreate within an exclusive group.

Somewhat along the same line was the observation that grew within me during the year that despite their dedication to their professional work and its demands upon their time, faculty members at St. Paul's make more of an effort than our man to contribute to the good of the civil community in which they live. We have been brought up on that 'separation-of-Church-and-State' notion which bars clergymen from any but Church affairs. But a clergyman is still a citizen and often, because of his talents and opportunities, a very responsible citizen. Yet we have not been educated to this role nor have we been noteworthy for our contributions to the public good of the communities in which we live.

A year of teaching and living at St. Paul's proved to be an extremely valuable sabbatical. But after such a refreshing change, I am delighted to be at work again in one of our own schools.

The Vision of Christ and Christian Freedom

PART II—A UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J.

New voices are being heard on the Catholic campus today and older voices heeded. Almost a century ago Newman wrote of a need for fostering "elbowroom for the mind" in the Catholic Church. Where should that elbowroom be found if not on the Catholic university campus? Father Michael P. Walsh, President of Boston College, urges that,

The Catholic university should be, and must be in the future much more than it has been in the recent past, the place where the Church does its thinking.¹

Father John Courtney Murray, speaking at a special honors day convocation at Fordham University last spring defined the function of a Catholic university.

. . . . to live on the borderline where the Church meets the world and the world meets the Church to interpret the Church to the world and the world to the Church. The borderline is ever shifting. Our first task is to find it.²

Such observations reveal a rethinking and a realigning of basic values in the Catholic university's educational mission. The evolving concept is already affecting the relationship of the Catholic university to its students. Students on Catholic campuses are anticipating and in some cases are forcing changes which are not altogether incompatible with the emerging concept. In particular, students are impatient that the Catholic university assume the mien of a true university.

A. DUAL COMMITMENT

It is best to think of the emerging Catholic university as having not one but two commitments. First, the Catholic university must commit itself to the educational ideal of a true university. Second-

¹ Walsh, Michael P., S.J., "Where Church and World Meet," *Catholic Mind*, December, 1966.

² Murray, John Courtney, S.J., "The Vatican Declaration on Religious Freedom: An Aspect of its Significance," *The University in the American Experience*, Fordham University, 1966.

ly, at the same time it must also retain its commitment to the Catholic faith. Whether or not these two commitments can be reconciled is a matter for later discussion. It is important first to consider the nature of the two commitments.

The first commitment of the Catholic university, its commitment to the educational ideal of a true university, is that which distinguishes the Catholic university from other Catholic societies. The mission of a true university is frequently expressed as "the pursuit of truth" or "the preservation, transmission and enrichment of our cultural heritage." Since the university would consider a cultural heritage of value only for the truth it enshrines, the primary and basic concern of the university remains truth, its achievement, its preservation and its communication. If the Catholic university, therefore, is to fulfill its commitment to the ideal of a true university its primary and basic concern must be truth. The expression, "pursuit of truth," however, provides problems which are not just semantic. The "pursuit of truth" cannot be presumed to include truth's preservation and communication where it is denied that objective truth can ever really be achieved. In view of these difficulties "the pursuit of new truth" provides a more suitable expression of the Catholic university ideal. "The pursuit of new truth" presumes that there are truths already known which are to be preserved and communicated. It expressly states, moreover, that there is to be a quest for new truth both through a deeper understanding of truth already known and its application to new problems. Any expression which involves the achievement of new truth as the university goal is particularly apt for the emerging Catholic university. Catholic educational emphasis on all levels has too often been placed in the past almost exclusively on protecting and defending truth already known.

While the basic goal of the university community must be conceived as the pursuit of new truth, the true university assumes a complementary goal particularly with respect to students. The university must involve its students in the community's quest for new truth. In other words, in the true university students are actively incorporated into the community enterprise of seeking new truth. While the advanced function of the true university is not instruction but enquiry, instruction has an important place in the true university especially for the lower classes. The university has a serious responsibility to communicate its patrimony, its truth already known, not just for its own sake but that students

may be guided to the frontiers of knowledge where truly relevant and meaningful enquiry begins. But even within the frontiers instruction at a true university labors to present truths, accepted by the university community, in a manner which enables students to embrace these truths through personal assent as each student truly discovers them for himself in his own, personal university experience. The Catholic university community cannot, therefore, if it is to be a true university, catechize or spoon feed to students its own accepted truths. The Catholic university is unique in its presentation, in full and proper context, of those truths which are considered to be known and established by the Catholic university community. To these truths the Catholic university must seek to have its students give their own "personal assent" grounded on rational understanding.³ In addition the Catholic university must seek to lead its students to the frontiers of these accepted truths where, aided by all secular and religious branches of knowledge, students are incorporated into truly meaningful and relevant enquiry. It is the educational mission of the Catholic university to teach students "to wonder, to understand, to contemplate, to make personal judgments and to develop a religious, moral and social sense."⁴

The second commitment of the Catholic university is to the Catholic faith. It is very important that the religious commitment of the Catholic university be understood as a commitment not of individual members of the university, or of a particular (religious) group within the university community, but as a commitment of the university precisely as a total community. Not every individual member of the university need, therefore, personally share the Catholic commitment. Non-Catholic members do not in any way weaken the commitment as long as all members acknowledge and respect the fact that the university as a community holds the Catholic commitment. The social, community nature of the Catholic university commitment is of significant consequence in determining the precise responsibility which the Catholic university has for the religious and moral development of students.

The religious and moral development of students cannot be regarded as the primary end, or *raison d'être*, of Catholic university education. Neither can it be considered something extra,

³ Abbott, *The Documents of Vatican II*, "Declaration on Religious Freedom," #3.

⁴ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," #59.

something that the Catholic university tries to accomplish on the side, as it were, while elsewhere it pursues its main purpose, its quest for new truth. The religious and moral development of students must be regarded as a means by which students are effectively incorporated into the unique character of the Catholic university's pursuit of new truth. Students can be assimilated into the full quest for new truth on the Catholic university campus precisely to the degree that they are knowledgeable of the religious patrimony of the community and have committed themselves by personal assent to its fullest realization in their own lives and in the academic mission of the university. The Catholic university cannot, therefore, be indifferent to the spiritual and moral welfare of its students if it is to fulfill its responsibilities as a true university of incorporating students into its primary educational mission, its quest for new truth.

B. FAITH, A SOURCE OF TRUTH

In addition to its first commitment, to seek new truth according to the ideal of a true university, the Catholic university community must respect its second commitment, that which it holds to the Catholic faith. Can these two commitments be reconciled? Everybody is familiar with George Bernard Shaw's contention that a Catholic university is "a contradiction." Dr. Rosemary Lauer invoked the position in the recent St. John's University turmoil. It is common enough for activist students on Catholic campuses to hold that Catholic universities can have only a Catholic "emphasis," not a commitment. A university commitment of any kind, it is argued, prejudices or makes impossible an objective search for truth. A university with a commitment, it is claimed, cannot allow freedom either to search for truth wherever it may be found or to follow truth wherever it may lead.

However strongly such arguments may be urged, the actual difficulty faced by Catholic universities in modern academe is paradoxically quite different. The Catholic university today is not disturbed by the permissiveness allowed in academe in its search for truth but rather by the arbitrary limitations which are imposed upon the search by the secular-humanistic influences which so dominate modern education. Secular humanism, in the tradition of Jeffersonian rationalism, insists quite dogmatically that the search for truth be limited to only such truths as can be achieved by reason and empirical science. The Catholic university

claims freedom from any such limitation. Specifically, the Catholic university insists that religious faith be regarded as a valid and respected source of intellectual truth; the secular humanist is reluctant to accept religious faith as a source of intellectual truth. Secular humanism limits the search for truth to the natural order; the Catholic university extends the quest for truth to include both the natural and the supernatural orders.

On different planes we are, you and we, oriented toward the truth—yours, the truth of the natural order, and ours, the truth of the natural and the supernatural.⁵

The position of the Catholic university is best explained by pointing out that its special commitment is to a religious faith, not to some special philosophy or world-view. Religious faith, the Catholic university community insists, must be accepted and respected in academe as a valid source of intellectual truth. If religious faith is not a source of intellectual truth the Catholic university is, quite obviously, "a contradiction." If, on the contrary, religious faith is a valid source of intellectual truth the Catholic university is not a contradiction and quite properly insists that religious faith be given appropriate and respected consideration in the university society. The complexities of religious faith may be difficult to comprehend. However, a rudimentary understanding of faith as a source of intellectual truth, beginning on the purely natural level, is not difficult to explain. In a lecture at Xavier University (December 5, 1966) Father Anthony T. Padovano cited the example of a young man telling a young girl over and over that he loves her. The problem faced by the young man is that he is unable to prove his love in an empirical manner. Yet his love, he well knows, is a fact—and a very objective fact, it might be added. He might attempt to assert or "prove" this fact by outlandish feats of chivalry, thereby giving witness or testimony of his love, but his exceptional efforts only further demonstrate the impossibility of his actually proving his love empirically. The young man protesting his love over and over is asking, in final analysis, to be believed. The response is faith, and can only be faith. (One can deceive another about his love, Father Padovano noted.) For love to be known it must be believed. When it is accepted and believed, and especially when it is returned, faith becomes a means of knowing an objective fact.

⁵ Pope Paul VI, Address to delegates to the Italian Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology, October 29, 1966, *Catholic Mind*, March, 1967, p. 59.

It is an instrument by which the human mind achieves an intellectual truth. It is both academic and scholarly to accept faith resulting from such communication—ultimately self-communication—as a legitimate, albeit limited, source of intellectual truth. Similar arguments are currently being made for intuition and insight and even for feeling and sensing as valid sources of intellectual truth. It can only be regarded as quite arbitrary to restrict truth to that which can be proved empirically.

Religious faith is essentially no different. Religious faith too can be academically respected. Religious faith results from man's confrontation with God. God speaks to man and in His very speaking attests His love. Man replies. Love is communicated and through love intellectual truth.

[Religious language] tells of what countless men have felt. It is frequently our way of saying that life is meaningful and has some intelligent direction even if we do not perceive the whole system. Religious language is often our way of saying that there is mystery about the human person and his destiny. It speaks to that within us which finds a measure of happiness here but which senses that we are pilgrims in search of another homeland. Something about our being here is unsettled and unfinished. It remains so in spite of all we say or do. This is what religious language is talking about. It seeks to speak what the heart of man so vaguely but hauntingly feels. Religious language never says all perfectly and clearly but what it does say rings true enough to man's heart and intelligence for him to say there is something valid about it. And he admits this, century after century.⁶

The Catholic university, therefore, regards religious faith as a valid source of intellectual truth—not the source of *all* truth and not the *only* source of truth. The Catholic university regards religious faith as a source of limited truth, truth which must be brought to oneness with other truths learned from other, natural, sources.

Here, I suggest, is a task for the university which bears the name Catholic. It is to be the bearer of the new movement that will transcend the present dichotomy of sacral and secular, and it is to be the artisan of their new unity. The

⁶ Padovano, Anthony T., "American Unbelief and the Death of God," Xavier University Forum Series lecture, December 5, 1966.

task is manifold, complicated, and most delicate. . . . The Council (Vatican II) has dissolved an older problematic—the differentiation of the sacral and the secular. Thereby it has installed a new problematic—the unity of these two orders of human life, achieved under full respect for the integrity of each.⁷

C. FREEDOM AND CHRISTIAN WISDOM

If it is to be allowed that religious faith is a valid and respected source of intellectual truth in the academic society, a further and much more difficult problem seems immediately to arise for the Catholic university. Can a scholar in a Catholic university seek truth wherever it may be found and follow it wherever it may lead? Theoretically the Catholic university has no problem with the Jeffersonian concepts. The Second Vatican Council repeats a religious tradition that long antedates Jefferson even though in the modern educational context it might appear to echo his voice.

. . . .—that all men should be at once impelled by nature and also bound by a moral obligation to seek the truth, especially religious truth. They are also bound to adhere to the truth, once it is known, and to order their whole lives in accord with the demands of truth.⁸

It is an essential part of the religious faith of the Catholic university to believe that all truth, natural and supernatural, comes from God and, rightly understood, leads to God. The Catholic university would betray its religious commitment if it did not encourage all scholars to seek and follow truth without reservation. "Faith and reason give harmonious witness to the unity of all truth."⁹

In the practical order, however, the problem of freedom in the Catholic university cannot be dismissed so lightly. The Catholic faith is taught by the *magisterium* of the Church, and this same *magisterium* is quite definitely, by divine constitution, unified in the Church's hierarchy and the Bishop of Rome. Moreover, the teaching of the Church's *magisterium* is reinforced by a juridical order, independent of the Catholic university, which protects the Church's teaching and regulates its observance. Can an acceptance of the Church's *magisterium* with its own external jurid-

⁷ Murray, John Courtney, S.J., *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁸ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Declaration on Religious Freedom," #2.

⁹ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Declaration on Christian Education," #10.

ical enforcement be reconciled with freedom as it must exist if the Catholic university is to be a true university? Philip Gleason puts the problem well.

Faith does indeed mean a commitment; it does assume that there is such a thing as revelation; and it does claim that there is a sort of knowledge that is valid although it is not publicly verifiable through empirical tests. Moreover, Roman Catholicism does involve the acceptance of authoritative interpretations of the revealed Word. How all of this—and more—is to be reconciled with the principles of free inquiry is by no means clear.¹⁰

Miss Jacqueline Grennan, President of Webster College, is currently presiding over the secularization of Webster. Her problem has perhaps been minimized.

It is my personal conviction that the very nature of higher education is opposed to juridical control by the Church.¹¹

Miss Grennan's problem does not appear as basic as that pointed out by Gleason since the Church's juridical control could accommodate itself to the educational ideal of a true university. Moreover the decrees of the recent Council indicate very clearly that the Church recognizes the importance of such an accommodation. There are indications in these same decrees that the *magisterium* of the Church will more completely integrate its own search for truth with that of the Catholic university.

In its Declaration on Christian Education the Council lists as a specific purpose of the Church's involvement in the field of education,

to create for the school community an atmosphere enlivened by the gospel spirit of freedom and charity.¹²

With explicit reference to Catholic colleges and universities this same declaration teaches that,

individual branches of knowledge [should be] studied according to their own proper principles and methods, and with due freedom of scientific investigation.¹³

¹⁰ Gleason, Philip, "Academic Freedom," *America*, July 16, 1966, p. 63.

¹¹ *Time*, January 20, 1967, p. 66.

¹² Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Declaration on Christian Education," #8.

¹³ *Ibid.*, #10.

In the *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, where principles for the necessary and rightful independence and autonomy of secular societies are outlined, the Council strongly affirms the legitimate autonomy of human culture and especially of the sciences. . . . Within the limits of morality and the general welfare, a man [must be] free to search for the truth, voice his mind, and publicize it.¹⁴

Elsewhere, in the same constitution, one reads,

Now, many of our contemporaries seem to fear that a closer bond between human activity and religion will work against the independence of men, of societies, or of the sciences.

If by the autonomy of earthly affairs we mean that created things and societies themselves enjoy their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated by men, then it is entirely right to demand that autonomy. Such is not merely required by modern man, but harmonizes also with the will of the Creator.¹⁵

In spite of the fact that the quotations taken from the *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* deal directly with secular societies, nevertheless in the context of the entire Vatican II proclamation they have an obvious relevance to the Catholic university. There is the repeated reference to "freedom" and "autonomy" for the sciences. "Scientific investigation" is the everyday business of the Catholic university. The only restrictions which the Council sees for men seeking truth are "the limits of morality and the general welfare." The Council directs the search for truth particularly to the Church itself. "All men are bound to seek the truth, especially what concerns God and His Church, and to embrace the truth they come to know, and to hold it fast." In view of such statements Father John Courtney Murray explains that theology is not to return "to its pre-conciliar state, in which the theologian had been forced to abdicate his high function and to become simply a commentator on the latest magisterial utterance."¹⁶ Father Pedro Arrupe applies the Conciliar spirit even more directly to the Catholic university explaining that its perennial task is "to insure the awareness, the talent, and the instruments whereby the body corporate of Christianity is to do its thinking, bring its faith to self-reflective understanding, and devise appropri-

¹⁴ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," #59.

¹⁵ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," #36.

¹⁶ Murray, John Courtney, S.J., *op. cit.*, p. 1.

ate lines of action in and upon both the Church and the world." He considers the Catholic university the Church's "most appropriate organ . . . of self-study and self-reflection."¹⁷

If Fathers Murray and Arrupe correctly interpret the mind of Vatican II, the Council obviously provides for a more complete integration of the Catholic university into the work of the *magisterium* itself. The function of the Catholic university is not to be confined to preserving and communicating truth as predetermined by the *magisterium*. It is to participate in the *magisterium's* own quest for new truth by reflecting the thinking of "the body corporate of Christianity." Because of its close relationship to the Church's *magisterium* the Catholic university shares the responsibilities of the Church, particularly of its *magisterium*. Within the Church it must be allowed to "enjoy [its] own laws and values which must gradually be deciphered." Only under such conditions can it function as a true university and properly serve the *magisterium*.

The limited freedom of the Catholic university appears as but another contradiction to the secular humanist who insists that absolute freedom is the only acceptable ideal in the true university. To the secular humanist the university must be the most free of all societies and the scholar the most free of all men. Only the man who is absolutely free can seek truth wherever it may be found and follow it wherever it may lead. Any limitation of freedom is unreasonable for the academic mission. The Catholic university can only ask in reply: Is there such a thing as absolute freedom in academe? Is absolute freedom compatible with the university mission, let alone its ideal? Does integrity limit freedom? Do responsibilities limit freedom? Does truth itself once it is perceived limit freedom? Is not absolute freedom in academe a myth?

It is interesting to consider some of the concepts of freedom more commonly discussed on campuses and to speculate to what extent they provide for absolute freedom in the academic context. Freedom conceived as "the absence of external restraint" proves most inadequate. A man of strong prejudice, uncontrolled ambition or violent emotion, although not limited by external restraint, is academically not free. He is incapable of seeking and following truth. Freedom in the academic sense demands a great

¹⁷ Arrupe, Rev. Pedro, S.J., *The University in the American Experience*, Fordham University, 1966, p. 26.

deal more than an absence of external restraint. It is sometimes proposed in the campus argument that the university society can allow but a single limitation to absolute freedom. Men must always respect the rights of other men. Measuring allowable limitations to freedom by the rights of others, however, provides its own strange contradiction. Freedom diminishes, it appears, as men become more aware of the dignity and rights of others. Ironically, it is the educational mission to awaken this awareness—and so diminish freedom. Freedom must be made of better stuff. These are “Robinson Crusoe,” “isolationist” concepts of freedom which exaggerate individualism. They have been appropriated from civil liberties proposals which are inadequate today even for civil society. A concept of freedom appropriate to the academic community certainly demands a great deal more.

Any concept of freedom which appears suitable and appropriate for the academic society necessarily involves some limitations of absolute freedom. These limitations, paradoxically, actually promote academic freedom rather than limit it. The individual scholar, for instance, must have a style or character which frees him from disorders that limit intellectual understanding and honest judgment. In other words, to be academically free the scholar must be humble, receptive to the ideas of other men, always seeking to correct and clarify his own thinking by searching for some new truth in each new idea. He cannot be selfish, a man who “fights truth” because he is unwilling to assume its responsibilities. The academic community itself, if it is to foster a spirit of freedom appropriate for a university, must have its own internal style and character. Communication, so essential to the academic society, must be such as leads to mutually creative self-fulfillment. There is no place in the academic community for communication which frustrates a creative cooperation in the search for truth.

When the paradoxical “limiting” qualifications for the scholar and the academic community are examined it appears not only that absolute freedom is a myth but that seeking truth in an academic community presupposes that a great deal of wisdom or truth is already known. In many ways the academic community must already know and be living truth before it can be free creatively to seek new truth. And precisely here the faith commitment of the Catholic university can prove an advantage. The intellectual truth acquired through religious faith, understandingly applied to the university mission, can yield a wisdom which is

peculiarly apt for seeking further truth. If the "laws and values which must gradually be deciphered" for the emerging Catholic university reflect true Christian wisdom they can provide a freedom in which individualism will be neither lost nor exaggerated, a freedom in which the academic community will be regarded as an asset to the quest for new truth rather than a liability hindering the search. There is a peculiar academic propriety in the Vatican Council's associating freedom with charity. Jesus, who so stressed the love we must have for one another, said that *His truth* would make us free. Love, truth and freedom, therefore, are interdependent in Christian thinking.

The ideals of freedom proposed for the academic society by secular humanism provide an interesting contrast with those evolving in the contemporary Catholic university. Neither solution, as presently understood, offers a complete answer to all the problems of freedom encountered in the university society. Both lead to difficulties which cannot, with academic honesty, be overlooked. The secular-humanist concept can break down all too easily into academic anarchy. The Catholic concept is all too prone to paternalism and authoritarianism. The secular-humanist ideal of freedom for academe tends towards individualism. The Catholic ideal is likely to favor the society at the expense of the individual. Both have a great deal to learn from the other.

The situation of the Catholic university at the present time is well expressed by Gleason. First he offers two non-answers. The Catholic university cannot simply insist that things remain as they always have been, that freedom in the academic society be made "to fit into the interstices of a paternalistic and authoritarian Catholicism." Nor can the Catholic university accept "the most doctrinaire, ideological sort of freedom," presently proposed by secular humanism, as "the only true variety" for the academic society. If the Catholic university cannot accept either of these alternatives it must work out its own really creative third possibility. This, Gleason points out, will be "infinitely more laborious" than accepting either of the two non-answers he outlines, "but it will be infinitely more rewarding."¹⁸

D. A MESSAGE TO MEN OF THOUGHT AND SCIENCE

It is impossible to understand student unrest on the Catholic

¹⁸ Gleason, Philip, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

university campus today except in terms of the dichotomy presented by Gleason. Students are disturbed by the efforts of Catholic university administrators to fit the freedom which a true search for new truth requires "into the interstices of a paternalistic and authoritarian Catholicism." They all too frequently see the secular-humanist concept of freedom as the only alternative, "the only true variety" of freedom possible for the true university. They but vaguely understand the possibility of an emerging Catholic university offering "an infinitely more rewarding" third possibility. However, new laws and values are already gradually being deciphered which provide for the Catholic university a function within the Church with full respect for the academic mission of a true university. The Second Vatican Council provides a spirit for such new laws and values by identifying itself with true scholars.

In a remarkable document, issued in the name of the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council on December 8, 1965, at the close of the ceremonies marking the end of the Council, eight Messages were addressed to various groups. One of these Messages is addressed "to Men of Thought and Science." Another is addressed "to Youth." The former especially is of importance to the concept of the emerging Catholic university. In their Message "to Men of Thought and Science" the Council Fathers first explain their "special greeting," "Because all of us here, bishops and Fathers of the Council, are on the lookout for truth." They point out that the work of the Council for four long years has been "a more attentive search for and deepening of the message of truth entrusted to the Church and an effort at more perfect docility to the spirit of truth." "Your road is ours," the Council Fathers exclaim, identifying themselves with other searchers for truth as "friends," "companions," "admirers," and at times "consolers." The Council offers encouragement to all of academe.

Continue your search without tiring and without ever despairing of the truth. Recall the words of one of your great friends, St. Augustine: 'Let us seek with the desire to find, and find with the desire to seek still more.' Happy are those who, while possessing truth, search more earnestly for it in order to renew it, deepen it, and transmit it to others. Happy also are those who, not having found it, are working toward it with a sincere heart. May they seek the light of

tomorrow with the light of today until they reach the fullness of light.¹⁹

The Message concludes with words, addressed to all academe, which have a special relevance "to Men of Thought and Science" who search for truth in Catholic university communities. "Without troubling your efforts, without dazzling brilliance," the Council Fathers offer to assist men who search for truth with "the light of our mysterious lamp which is faith."

Never perhaps, thank God, has there been so clear a possibility as today of a deep understanding between real science and real faith, mutual servants of one another in the one truth. Do not stand in the way of this important meeting. Have confidence in faith, this great friend of intelligence. Enlighten yourselves with its light in order to take hold of truth, the whole truth. This is the wish, the encouragement, and the hope, which, before disbanding, is expressed to you by the Fathers of the entire world assembled at Rome in Council.²⁰

In this brief Message the Council Fathers provide a general outline of the new norms and values which are to characterize the emerging Catholic university. The Message indicates the special assistance the Church seeks to provide for, and receive from, all scholars in the quest for truth. Members of Catholic university communities, as men and women of thought and science, may take special guidance from the Message. They are to seek truth everywhere, in both the sacral and secular spheres. They are to unite their efforts as "friends" and "companions" with all men who "with a sincere heart" are also searching for truth. They are to seek especially a unity in truth. Truth is their special mission. They are "to renew it, deepen it, and transmit it to others." They are to have a "confidence in faith" as a "great friend of intelligence." In "the light of the mysterious lamp which is faith," a light which will provide a vision of Christ and Christian wisdom, they are to search for truth with a Christian sense of dignity and freedom.

¹⁹ Abbott, *op. cit.*, "Closing Messages—To Men of Thought and Science," p. 731.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 731.

Selection Procedures in Jesuit High Schools: Time for Re-examination

ROBERT R. NEWTON, S.J.

When Fr. Lorenzo K. Reed remarked to an institute of Jesuit high school administrators, "for the first time in the history of the American Assistency, the Jesuit educational apostolate must be justified to the younger men,"¹ he was referring to a variety of dissatisfactions that have recently found growing support among those interested in the high school apostolate. One of the many questions hidden in Fr. Reed's statement involves the type of student who attends the Jesuit high school; it asks: are Jesuits devoting their time and resources to the group of students among whom they can be most effective? Put in Fr. Reed's terms the question becomes: can a Jesuit be confident that working with the type of student who attends the Jesuit high school is really selling his religious life for the highest price, both spiritually and intellectually? A small number would answer no; a larger number would feel that the question warrants serious consideration.²

In the background of any discussion of this area must be an awareness of the extent of secondary education in the United States. In both public and nonpublic high schools there are 13,300,000 students, approximately 3,500,000 of whom are Catholics. Thirty-one percent or about 1,100,000 of this number are enrolled in Catholic schools; the Jesuit high school apostolate touches 35,000 students. This means that Jesuit schools directly encounter about 3.5 percent of those in Catholic secondary schools, about one percent of the Catholics of secondary school age, and slightly less than 0.3 percent of the total high school population of the United States. Although the population will continue its gradual expansion, it is doubtful that the numbers attending Jesuit high schools will be significantly enlarged; thus the percentage of students reached by Jesuit schools will continue to decline.

All schools, and especially private schools, want students who

¹ Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., "JEA Institute for High School Administrators," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXVII, p. 108.

² This problem is at the root of the North Aurora Questions at the Los Angeles Workshop on Christian Formation. See both the Position Paper and the Minority Report, *The Christian School—A New View* (Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Educational Association, 1966), pp. 63ff.

have a strong desire and the personal capacity to take advantage of what the individual school has to offer. Just as each student has particular needs and abilities, so each school has individual characteristics which suit it to excellence in training and drawing the best out of certain types of students. Jesuit high schools are no exception to this rule. Even more obviously than in the past the success of Jesuit education—whatever Jesuit schools have to contribute to secondary education in the United States—will depend on the extent to which it is maximally effective with the relatively few who are directly encountered. And this effectiveness will be proportional to the degree that these schools can successfully identify the caliber of student whose talents, character and interests are suited to the type of training traditionally associated with Jesuit education. Careful selection thus becomes essential to the goals of the Jesuit secondary school apostolate.

The process is not one-sided; the student and his family must decide what type of school best suits his personal needs and abilities. The number of students who enter Jesuit high schools but for various reasons are not able to continue should be a serious concern for Jesuit administrators since admission to the Jesuit school frequently means exclusion from other Catholic schools. Comparing the number of freshmen in Jesuit high schools in 1962-63 (9,463) with the number who were seniors in 1965-66 (7,611), we find that approximately 20 percent (1,852) or one of five of those who were originally selected never graduated.³ Likewise, account must be taken of the significant number of students whose ability is sufficient for the course of studies but whose personal adjustment to the school has left them seriously dissatisfied.⁴ Such considerations point to the need for a more clearly defined evaluation by both school and student.

At this point a number of questions suggest themselves. What type of student is the Jesuit school set up to work with and how concretely do the schools describe this student? What are current selection procedures and how effective are they in identifying potential students? How do these methods compare with the procedures followed by other private schools with similar goals? Finally, what additional factors and techniques could be brought

³ See Eugene F. Mangold, S.J., "Enrollment Statistics," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXV, pp. 160-176, and "Enrollment Statistics," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXVIII, pp. 157-173.

⁴ Joseph H. Fichter, *Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge Center for Social Studies, 1966), pp. 190-210.

into use and how could Jesuit schools explore their effectiveness? In the following pages tentative answers to these questions will be attempted.

I SELECTION PROCEDURES IN JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

The Jesuit High School Student

The *Ratio Studiorum of 1599*, the first blueprint of Jesuit education, had advised the Prefect of the Lower School to examine those who sought admission and to admit only those whom he knew to be "well instructed and of good character and disposition." More recently, the International Conference on the Apostolate of the Secondary Schools, held in Rome in 1963, pointed to the need to select those who showed promise of becoming distinguished Catholics and who gave hope that they would exercise influence in their communities. In an attempt to discover in the concrete what individual schools envisioned as the norm for their schools, letters were sent to seventeen Jesuit high schools in the United States requesting descriptions of the type of student they felt their school was intended for. Nine replies (53 percent) were received from schools in various sections of the United States. The following summary is presented as generally representative of Jesuit high schools.

Eight of the nine schools stated explicitly in their literature that their course of studies was geared to the academically talented student, many noting the exclusively college preparatory nature of their schools. Five mentioned strong character in describing the type of student they desired. Only one school gave a further delineation of this quality, describing concern about "effort in studies and general perseverance, dependability, emotional stability, cooperation at school, and ambition to succeed." One school indicated that the prospective student should be above average not only in ability but also in ambition, while another noted an earnest desire to attend the school as essential. Promise of service to the community was a concern indicated in the literature of two schools. Leadership potential was mentioned by two schools in descriptions of admission policies, though this notion was practically universal in the stated objectives of each school.

Two generalizations are possible on the basis of this evidence: (1) the schools are geared to the academically talented, college-bound student, and (2) ideally the prospective student pos-

sesses more than mere scholastic ability. With one exception, a certain vagueness surrounded precisely what other qualities were desired, the most frequent generalization being "strong character."

Admission Procedures in Jesuit High Schools

The second part of the request sent to these schools consisted in a questionnaire on the admissions procedure they employed, and in particular the part played by testing, grammar school record, interviewing, recommendations and character evaluation in the decision to admit or reject an applicant. The findings indicated that each school required applicants to take an entrance examination. Seven of the nine respondents made use of standardized examinations or participated in a program that was controlled outside the school, e.g., diocesan entrance examination. Eight of the nine schools surveyed replied that the result of the examination was the major determinant in their admissions process. Six of the nine schools took note of grammar school records in formulating their decision, though only two indicated that this factor had more than a minor role in their overall procedure. One school insisted on an interview with each student; three others responded that interviewing was occasionally employed for special cases. Three schools used recommendations from grammar school teachers, two of the three placing some weight on this factor. In answer to the question: do your procedures attempt to evaluate the character or personality of the prospective student?, one school reported an extensive program of home visits, consultations with pastors and grammar schools during a period extending from October to April. This same school noted that ninety percent of its decision to admit a student depended on these interviews. Two other schools noted some effort at character evaluation: one employing it only in negative cases, another relying somewhat on a self-report by the applicant.

Summarizing briefly: eight of the nine schools relied heavily on an entrance examination; six of the nine placed some weight on grammar school records; one school made extensive efforts at character evaluation primarily through interviewing.

Independent NonCatholic Schools

As part of the survey of Jesuit high schools reported above, identical requests and questionnaires were sent to seven independent nonCatholic schools. Seven replies (100 percent) were received. Since these schools bear some similarity to Jesuit high

schools, particularly in their aims and selective student bodies, it was hoped that a survey of their admission procedures would provide additional information as well as a point of comparison.

Catalogs from the seven schools gave generally full descriptions of the type of student sought by the school. With the exception of one school sound character was explicitly noted. This quality was expanded in various ways to include seriousness of purpose, range of interests, potential for personal contribution and future promise. In all cases it was assumed that the applicant would possess the intellectual capacity to meet the rigorous standards of the school.

Admission procedures at these schools followed a regular pattern. Testing (in six of seven cases the Secondary School Admission Test) and grammar school record were used to determine academic qualifications. Emphasis was then shifted to investigation of the student's character and potential for contribution to the school and society. The interview was considered an important instrument for determining this factor and in all cases an interview was required. If travel to the school was impossible, an interview with an alumnus was arranged in the applicant's locale. Stress was also placed on recommendations received from former teachers and occasionally from persons outside the school experience of the applicant. Three of the schools required a personal statement from the applicant. The information gleaned from these sources was used to form a general impression of the student on which the decision to accept or reject was based.

Summary and Comparison

It is unrealistic, of course, to expect uniformity among a system of fifty-three Jesuit schools which are geographically so disparate; of necessity local conditions dictate specific operational procedures. Nevertheless, it seems logical to expect that the similar orientation and identical goals of the men who operate Jesuit schools should result in certain common objectives. The sampling of Jesuit schools on the type of student desired seemed to bear out this conclusion and the general statement was offered that the schools surveyed wanted students of above average ability, of good character, with some potential for future leadership.

Investigation of the admission procedures used by Jesuit schools indicated that testing was universally employed to judge the applicant's aptitude; in some cases grammar school achievement

was added to this consideration. With one or possibly two exceptions, however, little or no effort was made to assess the personal qualities or character of applicants. A comparison with the seven independent schools in the survey showed similar norms for selection of students—insistence on aptitude and sound character. In contrast to Jesuit schools, the independent schools regarded character evaluation, accomplished through personal interviewing, recommendations and sometimes the applicant's personal statement, of either equal or more importance than scholastic aptitude. The independent schools' procedure is obviously more exhaustive and revealing; it likewise involves considerably more time and energy.

Dangers in the Exclusive Use of Intellectual Criteria

When account is taken of the aims of the Jesuit high school apostolate, the exclusive use of intellectual criteria for selection of students appears to hold certain dangers. The first and most obvious disadvantage is that only one aspect of the student is considered or evaluated. The student's personal traits as well as his special interests and talents remain uninvestigated and consequently are not considered in the admissions decision. The student subsequently enters the school with the faculty knowing little more about him other than his name and examination score. Such a one-sided analysis seems to run counter to a more complete understanding of the process of education and certainly counter to the traditional Jesuit concern for "the whole man." The exclusive emphasis on intellectual ability seems built on the assumption, at least implicit, that the student has little more to offer and the school no reason for evaluating anything other than this capacity.

One of the advantages of any school is that it draws together a group of people who learn as much from one another as from those who are assigned to teach them. The school that can gather a student body from a wide variety of backgrounds and with a wide range of talents can obviously create a situation where this mutual sharing becomes an integral and important part of the educative process. Exclusive reliance on aptitude as a means of selection runs the risk of excessive and perhaps stultifying homogeneity within the student body. The Fichter Report⁵ on Jesuit high school formation indicates that whereas 48 percent of

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20f.

American males between 45 and 54 years of age earn under five thousand dollars a year, only 7 percent of the students in Jesuit schools come from families whose annual income is under this figure. Sixty percent of the student body comes from families whose income ranges between five and fifteen thousand dollars. Though it is obvious that this phenomenon is due in great measure to the necessary tuition rates of Jesuit high schools, a not improbable case could also be formulated to show that the aptitude or intelligence test is unavoidably geared to a middle class background.⁶ It is now well known that intelligence tests are measures of general intellectual achievement, a combination of ability and experience, rather than some innate culture-free quality. Children from depressed educational, social or cultural backgrounds on the average score significantly lower than children from middle class backgrounds. The gap widens as the children grow older in school. It thus becomes generally impossible to identify the high ability student from a deprived background by using the normal interpretation of aptitude scores. This phenomenon is obviously true of students from radically disadvantaged backgrounds; but it seems quite likely that it is true of students whose development has been hindered though perhaps not as dramatically by low socio-economic status. In this context the question must also be raised whether the concern to communicate a spirit of Christian social justice can ever be successful if efforts take place in a context where the disadvantaged student plays no part, where the Negro, for example, remains to the impressionable high school student someone to be tutored.

A final consideration involves the question: to what extent does the traditional aptitude test indicate the student with creative potential? In a study on creative and academic performance among talented students, Holland⁷ found that creative performance was generally unrelated to scholastic achievement and scholastic aptitude. He concluded that the traditional predictors of academic achievement were of little or no value in identifying the creative student. In previous studies in the same area Holland had attempted to discover the personal characteristics of students with superior high school ranking⁸ as well as the traits of stu-

⁶ John M. Duggan, "Evaluating the Disadvantaged Student," *Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal*, 1966, pp. 14-17.

⁷ John L. Holland, "Creative and Academic Performance Among Talented Adolescents," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LII, pp. 136-147.

⁸ "The Prediction of College Grades from Personality and Aptitude Variables," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LI, pp. 245-254.

dents who received good college grades.⁹ In both cases the socialized individual who was unlikely to express very much of his own individuality was the one most likely to be successful. Holland's findings are not presented as conclusive; but such research does pose an interesting question for schools whose criteria for selection center around aptitude testing and previous school record.

II TOWARDS A MORE COMPREHENSIVE SELECTION PROCEDURE

One of the results of the International Conference on the Apostolate of the Secondary Schools¹⁰ was an outline of criteria for the selection of Jesuit high school students. The Conference Report pointed out that intellectual qualifications could be assessed by the use of standardized and well validated tests. An evaluation of the religious and moral character of the student, it was felt, could not be as easily or accurately determined. A convergence of probabilities would be required. Three methods were offered as suited to this task: reports from previous teachers, investigation of the family and home, and an interview with the applicant himself. In the pages that follow each of these techniques will be briefly explored and both possibilities and reservations noted. The supposition will be that the selection procedure best suited to Jesuit schools is a combination of the various methods to produce a maximum amount of information for decision.

Aptitude Tests

The college preparatory nature of Jesuit high schools demands some accurate assessment of the student's ability. As noted above, standard aptitude tests were in fact being used by all of the Jesuit high schools investigated. Because of the large number and variety of scholastic aptitude tests available for evaluation of 7-9 grade students, careful inspection of individual tests is necessary to determine their usefulness for the selection process in a Jesuit high school. The technical data supplied with each test must be analyzed to insure reliability and validity as well as the suit-

9 "The Prediction of College Grades from the California Psychological Inventory and the Scholastic Aptitude Test," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L, pp. 135-142.

10 "International Conference on the Apostolate of the Secondary Schools," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXVII, pp. 48-75.

ability of the test for the group under consideration.¹¹ A test which may give valid results when used with a group representative of the population in general may be virtually useless when employed with applicants who have already undergone some type of screening process. Likewise, a test which proves valuable in the original selection process might be invalid or unreliable when its results are used to determine the placement of students. The aptitude test published by the Scholastic Testing Service and in use in some of the schools surveyed, for example, is criticized both for its failure to provide sufficient validity data and for the incompleteness of statistical information necessary to interpret scores.¹²

With any aptitude test it is important to realize that test scores should not be regarded as an absolute measurement of the student's ability. A large number of factors connected with the construction and standardization of the test introduce elements of relativity into the meaning of the test score. No test, for example, is a completely consistent measure of aptitude. The degree to which the entire test or its various subdivisions are consistent measures is expressed by means of a reliability coefficient. The standard error of measurement based on this coefficient provides the range in which the obtained score of the individual should be interpreted. The Scholastic Aptitude Test (Verbal Section), for example, one of the most accurate measures available, has a standard error of measurement of 30 points.¹³ A score of 500 on the SAT-V, therefore, is not to be interpreted absolutely but should be taken as an indication that the student's true score will fall between 470 and 530 two-thirds of the time. The use of a cutoff point with an aptitude test thus appears unrealistic to the degree that it treats the score as an absolute rather than as a range.

The question of validity likewise introduces a note of relativity into the use of a test. The extent to which test results can be said to correlate with future learning success, for example, is a variable which is expressed in a correlation coefficient for predic-

11 See Oscar K. Buros, *Tests in Print: A Comprehensive Bibliography of Tests for Use in Education, Psychology, and Industry* (Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1961), and *The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook* (Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965). This second work provides critical evaluations or references to evaluations of virtually all tests available for use.

12 Oscar K. Buros, *The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook*, pp. 93-96.

13 *College Board Score Reports: A Guide for Counselors and Admissions Officers 1965-66* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), pp. 19-20, 45-47.

tive validity. Though a high degree of accuracy can be expected from a good test, once again the test scores should not be used as though they were infallible guides.

By way of summary, it can be said that tests of scholastic aptitude have generally proved to be reliable and valid instruments for measuring ability and predicting classroom success. But the danger also exists that the aptitude may be misused by expecting it to measure or predict with a degree of accuracy which is both unclaimed and unrealistic.

Grammar School Record and Rank

The previous grammar school performance of the student is regarded by many as an important element in the selection process. The consistent achievement of an applicant through eight years of schooling quite logically can be expected to be a more reliable predictor of future scholastic performance than an hour-long aptitude test. The use of grades and class ranking, however, does give rise to certain difficulties when it involves a variety of schools which are either not comparable or use different grading standards. Recently methods have been proposed to enable colleges to adjust for differences between high schools and consequently increase the predictive value of school marks.¹⁴ Kinkead, for example, describes how Yale University has over the years built up its own system, a special cooperative relationship with certain secondary schools on whose reports it can rely for predicting a student's success at Yale.¹⁵ A high school that draws its student body from a limited number of grammar schools could develop similar norms to take full advantage of previous school record as a prediction factor.

An obvious difficulty inherent in the use of school grades has been mentioned previously—the tendency of teachers to reward with good marks the students who are more willing to conform to the patterns they set.¹⁶ The possibility exists, therefore, that the imaginative, nonconforming student will not be easily identified by this norm. In spite of this, grammar school record

¹⁴ Benjamin S. Bloom and Frank R. Peters, *The Use of Academic Prediction Scales for Counseling and Selecting College Entrants* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961).

¹⁵ Katharine T. Kinkead, *How an Ivy League College Decides on Admissions* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1961), pp. 29-39.

¹⁶ See John L. Holland, "The Prediction of College Grades from Personality and Aptitude Variables," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LI, pp. 245-254, and Robert F. Peck with Robert J. Havighurst, *The Psychology of Character Development* (New York: Wiley, 1960), p. 151.

should be regarded as an important and valuable instrument in the selection process.

Assessment of Personality Factors: Recent Research

Within recent years the large number of intellectually qualified students who have failed to complete college as well as the increased number of highly talented applicants to certain selective colleges have stirred investigation of non-intellectual factors as predictors of college success. Harvard College, for example, finds that the number of intellectually qualified students has so increased that the group refused admission is quite similar in aptitude to the group actually admitted to the College.¹⁷ As a consequence, the decisions of the Harvard Admissions Committee have gradually shifted over the past decade to place more and more emphasis on personal qualities. With the increased interest in personal characteristics as a factor in college admission, various methods have been developed to assess these personal qualities. In this section an attempt will be made to summarize and comment briefly on the more psychological approaches to this task; in the following section, use of the interview and recommendations in personal assessment will be described.

A recent College Entrance Examination Board publication¹⁸ has attempted to review the psychological literature pertaining to evaluation of personality in admissions and summarize the research in this area between 1950-60. It was found that the existing research could be organized under four different approaches: the pilot experience, the social or demographic approach, the psychological approach, and the transactional model.

The "pilot experience" is an approach which uses the student's personal adjustment to his previous schooling as a predictor of his future performance in a similar situation. Though this adjustment is measured through the symbols of school marks and rank in class, the focus here is not the intellectual ability of the student but the personal characteristics which are essential to success in the type of experience which the school presents. Though this approach yields excellent results as a predictor of adjustment, the danger exists, as has been previously noted, that it will fail to identify the talented student who finds it difficult

¹⁷ Fred L. Glimp and Dean K. Whitla, "Admission and Performance in the College: An Examination of Current Policy," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, January 11, 1964.

¹⁸ Morris I. Stein, *Personality Measures in Admissions* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963).

to conform to the more routine demands of school life. The technique is also concerned not so much with a deeper understanding of the student as with accurately predicting how he will react.

The demographic or social approach investigates the characteristics of the environment of the individual, factors over which he has no control. A generalization can be made on the basis of past experience, e.g., with applicants from a certain ethnic or socio-economic group, about the probability of success in a particular situation. The demographic approach has proved to possess a certain validity as a predictor but runs the obvious risk of contributing to the continuation of stereotypes. The method aims at highlighting the attributes of the environment rather than the characteristics of the individual student; consequently it provides little understanding of the student and can neglect to take account of the applicant's unique adaptation to his environment.

The more strictly psychological approach involves research with both projective and objective tests. Psychological testing is the area of personality assessment which has been the subject of much popular criticism in recent years. This has been true especially with regard to its widespread use in industrial hiring and promotion.¹⁹ Proponents of the use of psychological tests in education maintain that such testing can reveal important factors about individuals which will provide new understanding of their educational potential, limitations and needs. Though it seems difficult to quarrel with this aim, there do seem to be serious reasons to doubt whether psychological tests can presently accomplish this purpose. Anastasi summarizes her lengthy evaluation of personality tests: "The field of personality testing is still in a formative stage. Few if any available instruments have as yet proved their value empirically to the same extent as have aptitude or achievement tests. Consequently, the tester must proceed warily—at his own risk."²⁰ Other critics hold that psychological testing involves serious ethical problems, especially the violation of the individual's right to privacy. Though psychological tests may provide useful understanding at some future date, the current status of this technique would argue against their use in the selection process at the present time.

¹⁹ See, for example, Martin L. Gross, *The Brain Watchers* (New York: Random House, 1962) or William H. Whyte, Jr., "The Testing of Organization Man," in *The Organization Man* (New York: Doubleday, 1956).

²⁰ Anne Anastasi, *Psychological Testing* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), p. 633.

The final approach analyzed by Stein, the transactional, is based on the assumption that success in a school situation is a function of transactions between the individual and his environment. The transactional method proposes to understand both the individual and his environment by bypassing the criterion used in the other predictors, school grades, and substituting in their place the psychological make-up an individual will need if he is to be successful in the environment of a particular school. Essential to this approach is the construction of a model delineating the psychological characteristics that an individual school will demand of the student. The success of this approach would depend on the skill and willingness of the school to analyze the psychological demands of the situation and discover methods of evaluating prospective students in terms of these demands.

By way of summary, it might be concluded that each of the methods discussed possesses some merit in evaluating students for admission to school situations. The pilot experience and demographic approach permit good prediction but, as was seen, little understanding. The psychological approach holds the possibility of valuable information but currently needs serious development. The transactional aims at fuller understanding of the student and school but demands a painstaking, though perhaps rewarding, study of both.

Interviews and Recommendations

Personal interviews with the candidate and recommendations from his teachers are probably the most widely used methods for evaluating personal qualities in the admission process. The brief survey of independent schools' admission procedures presented earlier in this paper shows that heavy emphasis was placed on these two techniques in the evaluation of the student's character. Admission policies of some of the more selective colleges²¹ indicate the extensive use of alumni and staff interviews as well as recommendations from teachers and principals to form a total picture of the candidate. The rationale behind this procedure is obviously the conviction that the soundest evaluations of a student's character will come from those who know him best—his teachers, counselors, and principal. Likewise the stress on the

²¹ See Glimp and Whitla, *art. cit.*, and Kinkead, *op. cit.*

personal interview is founded on the supposition that the skilled interviewer with a clear idea of the personal demands of his school (similar to the transactional model discussed above) will be able to evaluate the applicant with reasonable accuracy. The information derived from these sources is compiled to present a rather thorough description of the applicant's personal qualities. Misrepresentation or misinterpretation are obviously possible; it is improbable, however, that such difficulties would survive the convergence of evidence from various sources. Careful use of recommendations and interview data thus seems the most effective method of evaluation currently available. The increasing use of these measures points to their wide acceptance as useful instruments for selection purposes.

III SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This paper has touched upon a number of areas. Initially selection of students in Jesuit high schools was isolated from the variety of concerns which make up the unrest current in Jesuit thinking on the educational apostolate. The importance of this area was briefly indicated and an analysis of the type of student desired by Jesuit schools was presented. A sampling of admission procedures currently in use in the Society's schools was followed by a comparison of these procedures with the methods employed by independent schools which profess similar aims. The disadvantages involved in the use of purely intellectual criteria were suggested and brief descriptions and evaluations of available selection procedures—aptitude testing, previous school record, psychological testing, interview and recommendation—were presented.

A definite theme has constantly been in the background of these discussions. It is the conviction that selection of the student body in Jesuit high schools is one of the keys to the success of the Society's educational apostolate and as such is worth serious time and effort. It seems obvious that the goals of the Jesuit system require more than intellectual ability in its students. It follows logically, therefore, that whatever means are necessary should be employed to identify boys who possess the interest and personal capacity to take full advantage of what a Jesuit high school has to offer. A professional attitude should dictate a constant search for better evaluative criteria; increasingly accurate

decisions should be possible on the basis of carefully observed successes and failures.²²

The importance of the selection process to the effectiveness of Jesuit high schools as well as a sense of obligation to those who are accepted do not permit an unwarranted and unquestioning confidence in a single criterion to the neglect of other valid and useful methods. As a result of the rapid upgrading and expansion of both public and private school education, the luxury of a more passive approach to the selection of students is fast becoming less and less possible. The fact that the Jesuit school no longer stands as everyone's first choice argues for a more carefully planned and aggressive admission policy. The problems which face Jesuit schools at large in this area could easily be the subject of a national research effort, an effort which would take advantage of the experience and resources of the extensive Jesuit high school system. But whether this problem is confronted on the national level or studied locally, the general improvement within Jesuit secondary education indicates that it is time for a re-examination of the selection procedures in Jesuit high schools.

²² Admittedly the considerations presented do not speak directly to the problem of the school forced into a diocesan entrance examination; the ideas offered, however, may both suggest reasons why it is important to explore new possibilities and indicate some of the ways in which selection of students can become a more active process.

Developing the Academic Master Plan

JAMES M. KENNY, S.J.

The techniques of planning long range physical plant expansion have become highly developed during the past ten years. The primary thrust in this development came from the Federal Loan Programs designed to enable colleges to provide residence halls and food services buildings on a self-financing basis. Without this help, the institutions could not have accepted the increases in their enrollments over the past decade.

These expanded enrollments, however, meant added burdens on academic facilities and that, in turn, prompted self analysis of a kind previously foreign to academic institutions. This analysis is the now familiar space-utilization study which seeks to discover how the increased numbers for whom housing and food services have been provided can be accommodated in the existing educational facilities.

No one was greatly surprised when these studies demonstrated two points. First, they showed that there were not more than eight hours in the day when classes could be scheduled conveniently. Secondly, and more significantly, it appeared that even during these eight hours college classrooms and laboratories were utilized, on the average, only from 30 to 50 percent of the time.

Whether from design following upon these studies, or necessity following upon the rising enrollments, it is a fact that the utilization of facilities on all campuses has increased rapidly. Indeed, it has risen and remains as high as 90% for many schools. The Higher Education Facilities Act did a great deal to encourage the making of those space-utilization studies as well as the reporting of new techniques and developments in the planning and construction of academic facilities. The Act, in fact, freely supported experimentation in all areas of plant expansion. Nevertheless, despite these efforts toward more efficient utilization of existing academic facilities, it is still not uncommon to find many institutions planning new dormitories and food services without making sure at the same time that they will be able to provide these additional students with the necessary classroom, laboratory and library space.

Circumstances of this sort nourished a more sophisticated understanding of the complexities of academic planning, and with that, institutions entered upon a second phase of physical plant expansion.

This new phase was marked by the appearance on many campuses of a senior officer designated as the Director or Vice-President for Development. It is his job to coordinate the institution's efforts to obtain funds for capital purposes from friends, alumni, foundations, and any other likely benefactors. Many of these officers in the older privately-supported institutions had been highly successful in this art long before the present crisis. Their techniques provided good patterns which were followed successfully by the newcomers. Professional fund-raising companies had a field day, many with surprising success. All such efforts are, of course, still being valiantly made but the results are increasingly disappointing. Some of the large foundations have given substantial financial support to higher education. But one would scarcely need to be a prophet to see that the greater the number of institutions that are actively seeking aid from these foundations, the smaller the amounts available to any one institution.

When it became obvious that the academic facilities immediately and urgently needed could not be provided by private funds, the Higher Education Facilities Act was proposed and passed by Congress in 1963. The programs provided in this Act are designed as complements to the earlier Acts which make low interest loans available for housing and food services. At the same time, governmental help means that students shoulder some of the costs of academic expansion. Their tuition and fees are inevitably raised so that the institutions might carry the debts incurred through federal partial grants and loans.

Heretofore, supporting the debt service on academic facilities from tuition and fees has been considered ill-advised. Tuition and fees were traditionally regarded as the principal source of income dedicated to faculty salaries and instructional expense. If this income is now also to be dedicated to debt service, any on-going increases in faculty salaries and educational expense can be met only by additional endowments or further increases in tuition and fees. But there is a ceiling on this sort of escalation and it comes into view very quickly in any budget projection. Once that ceiling has been recognized, the college or university officials must once again begin the search for other sources of

additional income on a continuing basis. In the absence of large endowments or a very well established program of alumni annual giving, many non-public institutions may finally be reduced to looking for a public legislative body which will take the school over and provide it with tax dollars for its support as a public institution.

But even in cases which do not call for so extreme a solution, the very borrowing of federal funds to build academic buildings may actually lead some non-public schools into real difficulties. They may find, for instance, that their enrollments cease to expand and the new buildings become harder to carry. Such a drop in enrollments will not be due, of course, to any decrease in the number of college-age youth actually going to college. It will be due to their enrolling in ever greater percentages in public institutions. The public sector of higher education is itself constantly growing and each year sees the appearance of new municipal or community colleges supported by both State and local legislative bodies. At the same time, State Universities continue to spread their networks of community level extension centers. These centers most frequently offer a full range of courses leading to standard degrees. All such schools, of course, charge a low tuition with which privately supported schools cannot compete.

For all these and other reasons, two major privately financed institutions in Pennsylvania have in recent years given themselves to the State. In exchange for State appropriations for capital purposes and for annual subsidies of the deficit in their operating budgets, they have lowered their tuition to the level of other heavily subsidized State public colleges. In one case, that amounted to a reduction from \$1,400 per year to \$450. Neighboring private institutions cannot escape the impact on their own commuting students of developments of this sort.

What conclusions, then, might we expect the managers of the higher educational enterprise to draw from the current state of affairs? It seems to me that they would surely conclude that academic planning ought to be guided by a master idea and a set of techniques just as much as is the planning for the expansion of the physical plant. Yet in only a few institutions is this the case. In too many institutions master planning of the academic program has been neglected or has resulted only in repeating the existing curricular and instructional patterns on the assumption

that to do so is the only way to preserve their basic aims and objectives. This notion is open to serious question. For example, in a once small college in which senior faculty taught four or five classes with fifteen or twenty students in each course, the same professor may now be lecturing two or three times weekly to one large lecture section with 125 or more students who then are turned over to graduate students or younger faculty men for quiz sections, or the whole process may be conducted on closed circuit T.V.

The traditional approach to the older style of academic planning began with a carefully worded statement of the aims and objectives of the institution's program. Departments were then expected to develop their curricula to serve these broad all-inclusive purposes. During the past two decades one of two things has happened: either the stated institutional aims came to have very little correlation with the individual objectives of departments, or the stated aims became so generalized that they lent themselves to any interpretation a department wishes to accept in support of its own purposes. The end result is that administrators today have come to recognize that academic planning must be predicated on a new base. In discussing the impact on institutions of the rapid changes in subject content and curricula, the editors of the report entitled *To Keep Pace with America* stated: "Actually, some colleges and universities are now discarding the whole idea of statements of purpose, regarding their main task as one of remaining open-ended to accommodate the rapid changes."

The editors go on to say that there are many who disagree with this view. Whether you do agree or do not, the obvious implication is that traditional approaches to academic planning no longer serve their purpose. Attention must be given to examining some of the techniques which have been developed by colleges and universities as complementary to their long range expansion plans. The academic master planner must ask himself whether or not such planning is to be governed, even in a general way, by certain overall institutional objectives and, if it is, precisely what these objectives are and how the planning is to minister to their attainment.

Contemporary approaches to academic planning have identified some positive factors which must be regarded as basic to establish-

ing a master plan. These fall into two groups. The first are fixed factors and include the following:

1. The capacity of the academic facilities is measured by the number of student stations available for teaching in classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and all special purpose teaching areas. It is self-evident that the total number of individual rooms available during any given number of hours selected to be utilized for classroom activities automatically determines the total number of sections which can be taught in the physical plant.
2. A subordinate collateral calculation is the number of student stations available for each section which determines the maximum enrollment that can be considered under any circumstances. This measure has no correlation whatever with the number of dormitory beds, but the latter cannot be greater than the former. Obviously, no institution would dare accept enrollments equal to its actual maximum capacity without being faced with intolerable scheduling problems.
3. The ratio of each type of laboratory and its capacity to the general purpose classrooms and their capacity automatically sets the framework within which the number of science courses will be offered in balance with the humanities and the fine arts. This is not the same problem for the professional school as it is for the multipurpose institution or college.
4. All academic areas assigned to research or similar proprietary uses are excluded from any measure of capacity for teaching sections.
5. Numbers of faculty required to serve the programs (ignoring for the moment their distribution by discipline) is determined by dividing the total teaching hours to be offered by the average teaching-hour-load assigned each faculty member.

All these are relatively simple items to measure and serve only to set certain limits within which the major determinants of academic master planning make their distinctive contribution. These major determinants are the educational policies of the institution. Whether these policies are identified as overall aims or objectives of the institution, or whether they are the sum total of the aims or purposes of the individual schools, divisions, or departments, the master plan must pre-determine the balance

which will exist among these variable factors, as we may call them. There can be only one logical sequence to this aspect of academic planning:

1. First is a determination of what shall be the minimum distribution among the several disciplines of the basic requirements for all students who seek a baccalaureate degree. This determines the distribution among the departments (or schools) of the available sections to be offered by each.
2. Within each department or curriculum, a determination must then be made of how many of the sections available to it will be offered at each year level. These in turn will be assigned as prerequisite required or elective courses on the basis of established curricula criteria.
3. As new courses are planned, they should be added only at the expense of existing offerings or upon acquisition of additional classroom or laboratory space or hours of use and with additional students to avoid fractionating sections and doubling the cost for instruction. These inescapable requirements for sound academic master planning have been recognized and are reflected in the increasing practice of dividing the great multiversities into small components established around a well-defined curricular structure. The pattern for this principle was established very early by professional schools on university campuses where schools of law, engineering, medicine, and religion are virtually self-contained, particularly at the graduate level.
4. Academic master planning at the department or discipline level is the responsibility of the faculty of that unit. In addition to conforming their curricula and general course content to the standards set by their own professional groups, they should revise content and devise substitute courses to keep abreast of the expanding boundaries of knowledge in their subject matter.

Thus academic master planning at this point is a three-fold responsibility: (1) The administration must set the policy which will ultimately greatly influence the distribution of the number of classes to be taught in many of the disciplines. (2) The department heads must determine the distribution among the four years of the sections available as their share of the total to be taught

in any one semester. (3) The faculty in discipline groups must determine the identification of the courses offered by their departments. They must also determine the appropriateness and quality of course content and be constantly alert to its modification in keeping with the rapidly expanding knowledge in their subject matter.

If these three groups can arrive at an understanding of their mutual relationships and interdependence, academic master planning can achieve its purpose and serve its responsibility regardless of the present or changing character of any institution of higher learning.

Master academic planning should be the basis for all physical plant expansion planning. The time has come to reverse the prevailing practice in too many institutions of beginning with enrollment projections and working backward from those numbers to residence halls, food services and then academic facilities, numbers of faculty, supporting personnel, and finally to the academic matter with which these numbers are to be stuffed or spoon fed.

First Meeting of a Board

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

Last year, at this time, the Board of Trustees of Saint Louis University consisted of thirteen Jesuits who were deans or administrative officers of the University. On a Saturday morning last June, a newly-constituted board, consisting of Jesuits and laymen, met for the first time.

That occasion, and the transitional period that preceded it, constitute one of the most significant chapters in the 149-year history of Saint Louis University; and, conceivably, in Catholic higher education in the United States.

The meeting that began on the morning of June 23 officially opened the University's Fordyce House, a center for retreats and educational conferences built on a bluff overlooking the Mississippi River in a secluded area about 15 miles from downtown St. Louis. It also opened a new era for the University.

The twenty-five men who sat down around a U-shaped table in the main meeting room constituted a microcosm of the diverse world of St. Louis University. There were five Jesuit administrators—the president and four vice-presidents, who had been chosen by the thirteen Jesuits who formed the board in 1966; five outstanding Jesuit scholars and administrators from Cambridge, Spokane, Detroit, New York City and Ontario, Canada; thirteen business and civic leaders, including four alumni, from the St. Louis area, and two men from outside St. Louis, Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino, Director of the Medical Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Of the twenty-eight trustees¹ who were invited to the first meeting, only three were unable to attend—Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, whose daughter was married that day; Jack Steele Parker, vice-president of General Electric Co., who was in Europe, and Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who was hosting underprivileged children at an annual summer camp on her estate.

When Daniel L. Schlafly, chairman of the board, called the meeting to order, the work and hopes of many months were

realized. The first full meeting of the Board of Trustees under a lay chairman and with a majority of lay members was under way.

The decision to reconstitute the board to include eighteen laymen and ten Jesuits was made last year by the thirteen Jesuit trustees who then constituted the board.

They decided that the educational goals of the University could best be served by:

1. Placing legal responsibility in a board composed of leaders from various fields of American society, so that it will truly represent the various interests and needs of the University's many constituencies, including, besides the Catholic Church and Jesuit Order, the University's alumni, the business and professional community and the general public;
2. Giving laymen a clear-cut opportunity to participate in university life at the policy-making level, in line with the general movement within the Catholic Church, as expressed by Vatican II, to place laymen in highly responsible positions on all levels throughout the church;
3. Separating the general, overall policy-making function from the internal administration of the University in keeping with modern university practice, thus eliminating the inconsistencies in a system of governance under which the men who made the policies also carried them out and audited them;
4. Enabling the University to strengthen and broaden its influence and support.

Henceforth, the chairman of the board will be a layman; the president will be a Jesuit.

By-laws were formulated which safeguard the permanence of the University's traditions. They specify that: "a) The University will be publicly identified as a Catholic university and as a Jesuit university, b) The University will be motivated by the moral, spiritual and religious inspiration and values of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, c) The University will be guided by the spiritual and intellectual ideals of the Society of Jesus, and d) the University, through the fulfillment of its corporate purposes, by teaching, research and community service, is, and will be, dedicated to the education of man, to the greater glory of God, and to the temporal and eternal well being of all men."

Any change in these by-laws will require a two-thirds vote. So, in order to change the basic character of the University, a combination of nineteen Jesuits and laymen will have to cast an affirmative vote.

In conjunction with the restructuring of the Board of Trustees, the University created a separate corporation embodying the Jesuit Community. The corporation is legally distinct from the University, with no legal rights or responsibilities in relationship to the University corporation. The physical assets of the Jesuit Community corporation consist of their residence, its facilities, and other necessary material needs. The members of the Community corporation, including the Jesuit administrators and faculty members of the University, will contract with the University corporation for their services. Surplus funds will be returned to the University corporation in the form of an annual gift. The executive officer of this corporation is the rector of the Jesuit Community. In June, the Rev. William V. Stauder, S.J., professor of geophysics and geophysical engineering, was appointed to this position by Father General, effective September 1.

The thirteen Jesuits who voted for this separation felt that it would not only emphasize the autonomy of the Board of Trustees, but also would alleviate problems associated with the frequently unclear relationships between the Community and the University.

I feel that the pattern of governance we have adopted at the University is a pioneering one for church-related institutions. It establishes a middle position between the traditional arrangement in which all or almost all of the legal trustees are members of the religious order responsible for the institution, and, on the other hand, the pattern common to private non-denominational institutions whose boards of trustees are composed totally of laymen. The change in no way means a move towards secularization or alienation from the Society of Jesus.

In giving his approval Father General pointed out that the change was in line with a decree on education which was adopted in October, 1966, by the 31st General Congregation of the Jesuit Order, meeting in Rome.

The move involved no change in the charter of the University, which was enacted in 1832. Some of us were surprised to learn that the charter made no stipulation that University trustees be Jesuits. Thus, we were not forming a new board, but simply reconstituting the present one.

With the approval of the change, our next task was to find a layman able and willing to take on the many challenges and responsibilities inherent in this revolutionary role, someone who would have the approbation and respect, not only of his fellow trustees, but of all our publics. We found such a man in Mr. Schlafly, an outstanding Catholic layman, a highly respected businessman, a three-term president of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, recipient in 1960 of the coveted St. Louis Award "for effective service in the public interest as a member of the St. Louis Board of Education; for his conscientious efforts to improve the quality of education in the City of St. Louis, and for the image of civic service he has projected." Before accepting, Mr. Schlafly wanted assurance that the reorganized board would have real responsibility for the University. I assured him that the board would have total control of the properties and policies of St. Louis University.

On Saturday morning, January 21, the reorganization of the board and the appointment of Mr. Schlafly as first chairman were announced at a press conference on the campus.

Mr. Schlafly stated:

"My acceptance was based upon my belief that a board of this type is the best way to achieve the fundamental objectives of the University. This is not in any way a step toward changing those objectives, but a better way of achieving them.

"While the board will not and should not be involved with the day-to-day administration of the University, it will nevertheless have the final authority over the University's long-range policy."

The news that the University had become the first major American institution operated by a Catholic religious order to vest legal authority and control in a board composed of both laymen and clergy received wide national attention. Reaction to the move was universally favorable.

Leading citizens expressed their satisfaction to me and to Mr. Schlafly. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, in an editorial, called the move "a progressive and revolutionary step." In letters from alumni and in meetings with them, I found them keenly interested and in favor of the move. Letters from other institutions, seeking more information about our board, began arriving at the office.

Naturally, we had to explain several misconceptions, including one that had appeared in a story in *TIME* Magazine. The article suggested that we had made the move because we feared

that the Maryland Supreme Court decision prohibiting state funds for church-related institutions would mean elimination of federal funds for a university such as ours unless we transferred control to laymen. The idea has no foundation and certainly had nothing to do with our move.

In choosing the remaining laymen for the board, Mr. Schlafly and I went first to a group of twelve local business leaders who had formed our Lay Board of Trustees, a body that was strictly advisory in function. With our reorganization in governance, this board had been phased out.

Of the twelve invited, eight accepted membership on the board. One of them expressed the sentiments of all. In his service on the Lay Board of Trustees, he had missed most of the meetings. "But this is something else," he said. On the morning of our second day at Fordyce House, another trustee asked him how he had slept the night before. "Sleep?" he said. "I spent most of the night reading background information on the University."

The total membership of the board was announced on April 27. Of the eighteen laymen, four are alumni and nine are Catholic.

An executive committee, consisting of four laymen and three Jesuits, including myself, was formed and this group began monthly meetings.

The first quarterly meeting of the full board at Fordyce House began with orientation sessions in which officers of the University provided background on such matters as the place of the University in the national, state and local educational picture, its academic goals, its financial status and its development projections. From the beginning, it was obvious that the board had come, not to be led, but to lead. The new trustees interrupted frequently to ask a question or make a point and this exciting interchange of information and ideas continued throughout the two days. At the end of the meeting all of us were exhausted, but thrilled with the meaning that the meeting had for the future of the University. Four committees were appointed—for financial and business administration, academic affairs, development and public relations, and membership. These will meet in advance of our next quarterly meeting, September 23 and 24.

I believe Mr. Schlafly summed up well the aspirations and the work of more than a year when he told the trustees at the end of their first meeting:

“Before we met here, I knew that we had, on paper, one of the finest boards at any college or university in the country. After these two days, I know it’s a reality.”

¹ The members of the Board of Trustees are: Daniel L. Schlaffy, President, Arkansas Beverage Company, Chairman; Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J., Research Associate, Cambridge Center for Social Studies; August A. Busch, Jr., President and Chairman of the Board, Anheuser-Busch, Inc.; Thomas B. Donahue, Vice Chairman of the Board, UMC Industries, Inc.; Rev. John W. Donohue, S.J., Professor of Education, Fordham University; Rev. Edward J. Drummond, S.J., Vice-President for the Medical Center, Saint Louis University; Rev. Paulinus F. Forsthoefel, S.J., Professor of Genetics, University of Detroit; Rev. Robert J. Henle, S.J., Vice-President in charge of Academic Administration, Saint Louis University; Dr. Carroll A. Hochwalt, President, St. Louis Research Council; Very Rev. A. A. Lemieux, S.J., Rector, Mount Saint Michael, Spokane, Washington; Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J., Executive Vice-President, Saint Louis University; Dolor P. Murray, Jr., Financial Vice-President, McDonnell-Douglas Corporation, St. Louis; Edward L. O'Neill, Executive Vice-President, Emerson Electric Company; Rev. Francis J. O'Reilly, S.J., Vice-President for University Relations, Saint Louis University; Jack Steele Parker, Vice-President, General Electric Company, New York; Edmund D. Pellegrino, M.D., Director of the Medical Center, State University of New York at Stony Brook; Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President, Saint Louis University; Joseph F. Ruwitch, President, Renard Linoleum & Rug Company; Eunice Kennedy Shriver, Executive Vice-President, The Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Rev. David M. Stanley, S.J., Dean, Professor of Sacred Scripture, Regis College, Willowdale, Ontario, Canada; Jerome F. Tegeler, President, Dempsey-Tegeler & Co., Inc.; Joseph H. Vatterott, Chairman of the Board, Joseph H. Vatterott Management Co.; Edward J. Walsh, Jr., investments; Clinton L. Whittemore, Jr., President, Levering Investment Co.; Roy Wilkins, Executive Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York; Eugene F. Williams, Jr., President, St. Louis Union Trust Co.; Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, Director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif.; John M. Wolff, Vice-President, Western Printing and Lithographing Company.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

On September 1, FATHER JOSEPH O. SCHELL, S.J., former dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at John Carroll University, succeeded Father Hugh E. Dunn, S.J., as President of the University. During Father Dunn's ten-year tenure as President of the University, student enrollment has increased from 1,600 to 4,600, the number of full-time faculty members has grown from 141 to 225 and faculty salaries have increased almost 100%. In physical growth, the University has added five major buildings, a library, a dormitory, a student activities building, a gymnasium and a science center.

FATHER CHARLES J. DUNN, S.J., formerly Vice-President for Student Affairs at Holy Cross College, has been appointed the first Rector of Bishop Connolly High School at Fall River, Massachusetts. The school, which opened in September 1966, has moved this year into its handsome and modern new plant, generously provided by the Bishop of Fall River. The new facility is designed to accommodate 1,000 students, has living quarters for 40 faculty members and is situated on 70 acres of land.

FATHER JAMES A. REINERT, S.J., has been named Rector of the Jesuit Community located at the St. Louis University Lewis Memorial Residence, the former Coronado Hotel. The community is composed of Jesuit students and faculty members of the University's School of Divinity which was formerly located at St. Mary's College in Kansas. The re-located School will admit laymen and clergy of all faiths and the faculty will be composed of both priests and lay theologians. A number of religious orders will have their quarters in the Lewis Memorial Residence.

DESMET Jesuit High School in Saint Louis is the newest Jesuit High School in the United States. The school opened the doors of its new plant at 233 North New Ballas Road to Freshmen on September 5, 1967. Father Gregory H. Jacobsmeyer, S.J., is Rector and President of the new school; Father Gerald P. Bone, S.J., is the Principal.

An innovation in the administrative structure of a Jesuit High School was announced with the appointment of Father Donald C. Reilly, S.J., as Rector and Father Anthony J. Zeits, S.J., as President of SAINT JOSEPH'S Prep School in Philadelphia. Father Joseph D. Ayd, S.J., remains as Principal of the school.

Other newly appointed Rectors of Jesuit High Schools are the following: Father Thomas J. Bain, S.J., Walsh Jesuit High School in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; Father J. Donald Hayes, S.J., Saint Ignatius High School, Chicago; Father Thomas H. Radloff, S.J., University of Detroit High School; Father John H. Rainaldo, S.J., Creighton Preparatory School; Father William T. Wood, S.J., Xavier High School, New York City.

Father W. Patrick Donnelly, S.J., died on September 2. At the time of his death, Father Donnelly was Rector of Jesuit High School in El Paso, Texas. Prior to his assignment to El Paso, he was Principal at Jesuit High School in New Orleans, President of Spring Hill College in Mobile and President of Loyola University in New Orleans. Throughout his life he was a very active member of the Jesuit Educational Association. Father Richard T. Gaul, S.J., has been appointed Acting Rector in El Paso.

FATHER RAYMOND J. SWORDS, S.J., President of Holy Cross College was presented with an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree by the University of Massachusetts at its Commencement exercises last June. He was one of eight eminent persons honored by the University as it completed its 104th year of operation.

FATHER JOSEPH A. SELLINGER, S.J., President of Loyola College in Baltimore, has been appointed to the Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education by Governor Agnew of Maryland.

FATHER DEXTER L. HANLEY, S.J., Professor of Law and Director of the Institute of Law, Human Rights, and Social Values at the Georgetown University Law Center was appointed

by President Johnson to the U. S. delegation to a major United Nations Council. He served as an adviser to the U. S. Economic and Social Council at the opening of its semi-annual meeting in May. Among the subjects studied by the delegation were transport development of member nations, public administration, and a five-year survey of world economic and social resources. Recommendations for action are submitted by the Council directly to the U. N. General Assembly.

FATHER FRANCIS J. HEYDEN, S.J., Professor of Astronomy and Director of the Astronomical Observatory at Georgetown University and FATHER DANIEL E. POWER, S.J., Director of Public Affairs at the University, have been named 1967 Faith and Freedom Award winners by Religious Heritage of America. They were cited in the radio-television category for the "God, Man and Modern Thought" series and for the Georgetown University Forum. The latter was initiated in 1946 by Father Heyden and a few months later Father Power became program director. Today, it is carried by more than 300 United States radio stations, the Armed Forces radio and television service, and the Voice of America. The Faith and Freedom Awards are given annually to those whose work in the communications field has contributed to religious understanding and brotherhood. The awards were presented to Fathers Heyden and Power at a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel in June.

Two Jesuits have been invited and assigned to work with educational agencies in Washington during the coming year. They are: Father Joseph D. Devlin, S.J., of the New England Province, Research Associate in the National Education Association Center for the Study of Instruction; Father L. W. Friedrich, S.J., of Marquette University, Educational Specialist for Graduate Academic Programs, Bureau of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education.

MR. FRED JACQUES, Executive Secretary of Saint Peter's College Alumni Association and Board of Regents, was elected by the Jesuit Alumni Administrators of the United States to be their official representative at the World Congress of Jesuit Alumni

held in late August in Rome. Delegates from several hundred Jesuit institutions from all parts of the world were in attendance at the Congress. The general topic of the Congress was "The Active Participation and the Responsibility of Jesuit Alumni in a Changing World." The official languages of the Congress were French, English and Spanish. There were simultaneous translations of these languages at all of the meetings.

A chapter of Phi Beta Kappa will be installed at SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY early in 1968. Granting of a charter to the thirteen-member Phi Beta Kappa Faculty Committee was voted recently by the national Phi Beta Kappa Council composed of delegates from chapters throughout the country. The granting of the charter to Saint Louis and Notre Dame, at the same time, now brings the number of Catholic colleges with Phi Beta Kappa Chapters to six. The four others are Saint Catherine's in Saint Paul, Minnesota, Catholic University of America, Fordham and Georgetown. The report which the University made to the various Phi Beta Kappa Chapters prior to the voting showed that 72 percent of the College's full-time faculty holds the Ph.D. degree, that 86 percent of the men graduates and 65 percent of the women graduates from the College of Arts and Sciences enter graduate or professional school, and awards for post-graduate study received by students between 1961 and 1965 included forty-three Woodrow Wilson fellowships, thirty-one NDEA fellowships, seventeen National Science Foundation fellowships and six Fulbright fellowships. It also noted that fifty-six graduates of the College are listed in *Who's Who in America*.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY is the second Jesuit university to include non-Jesuits on its highest-level policy-making board, the Board of Directors. On July 1, Mr. P. C. Lauinger, a Tulsa, Oklahoma, publisher, Mr. Raymond H. Reiss, a New York City manufacturer, Mr. Irving Salomon, a San Diego, California, business executive and Right Reverend Monsignor George C. Higgins, Director of the Social Action Department of the U. S. Catholic Conference, began three-year terms on the Board. The Jesuit members of the Board are the following: Father Paul P. Harbrecht, S.J., Chairman of the Board, Dean of the Law School

at the University of Detroit; Father Felix F. Cardegna, S.J., Rector of Woodstock College; Father Thurston N. Davis, S.J., Editor of *America*; Father Avery R. Dulles, S.J., Professor of Systematic Theology at Woodstock College; Father James J. McGinley, S.J., Buffalo Province Prefect of Studies; Father Edwin A. Quain, S.J., Professor of Classical Languages at Fordham University; Fathers Campbell, Bauer, Bunn, Fitzgerald and McGrath, all of Georgetown University. The members of the Board of Directors are elected by the University's Corporation Board, an all-Jesuit board, in which is vested the ownership of the property of the University.

A recent survey conducted by the Central Office of the JEA reveals that two of our Jesuit institutions of higher learning (Georgetown and St. Louis) have already included non-Jesuits on their highest policy-making boards, 18 indicate that they plan to do so in the near future, eight plan to retain an all-Jesuit board. Three institutions are now in the process of establishing a separate Jesuit Community Corporation, 21 are giving serious thought to the establishment of such a separate corporation and four indicate that they are not inclined to do so at the present time.

All living law alumni who received LL.B. degrees from GEORGETOWN may now obtain a J.D. (Juris Doctor) degree by requesting it from the school. Last June for the first time, the graduates of the basic law program at Georgetown were awarded J.D. degrees at their graduation. The more advanced degrees are entitled LL.M. and S.J.D. With this change, Georgetown is one of 76 ABA-approved law schools which now confer the J.D.; 60 schools still award an LL.B.

Five students graduated "summa cum laude" from the College of Arts and Sciences of GEORGETOWN University last June. All five were graduates of Jesuit High Schools: two from Regis High School in New York and one each from Saint Ignatius High School in Chicago, Saint Joseph's Preparatory School in Philadelphia and Saint Louis University High School.

The million dollar estate of Thomas J. Walsh, former Cincinnati railroad executive, has been received by XAVIER UNIVERSITY for scholarship purposes. Mr. Walsh directed that his estate, after lifetime provisions for two nieces were fulfilled, be used at Xavier University to establish a memorial to his wife "in such form as will perpetuate her memory and serve the cause of religion and education." "It is my wish," he wrote, "that the income from this fund be used for scholarships for worthy students unable to pay entirely for their education."

The Jesuit faculty of CHEVERUS High School in Portland, Maine, dedicated its long-awaited new residence on the feast of Saint Ignatius.

Father Michael P. Walsh, S.J., President of BOSTON COLLEGE, has announced the establishment of a national Catholic Education Research Center. The Center will be located in the School of Education. It will research all levels and aspects of Catholic education in the United States and the public purpose of Catholic education in American society. Father Walsh stated that "In recent years there has been a marked tendency among Catholic educators to raise questions about the goals, methods and effectiveness of Catholic schools. While these discussions have been useful, they have been hampered by the lack of reliable data. For too long we have been forced to take temporary measures and to act on the basis of immediate necessity rather than research-based evidence." The purpose of the Center will be to study the sociological, psychological, political, religious, economic, technological and educational implications of the changing function of Catholic education.

A speakers program to help provide MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY scholarships for low-income Milwaukee Negroes has been started by the Marquette Faculty Association for Interracial Justice. The group was impressed by the fact that many Negro high school students had expressed interest in coming to Marquette but lacked the money for tuition. About 70 members of the Marquette faculty belong to the group which has been actively involved in civil rights activity since the Association was organized in 1963.

Twenty-eight members of the American Catholic Hierarchy participated in a week-long seminar at FORDHAM UNIVERSITY last summer. The seminar was the first of its kind between theologians and episcopal leaders to discuss theological issues arising from the Vatican Council. It stemmed from a purpose outlined by Fordham in recent months that a Catholic university should be a place where the Church does its thinking. The seminar was organized by the Cardinal Bea Institute, founded in 1965 at Fordham under the direction of Father Christopher F. Mooney, S.J., Chairman of Fordham's Theology Department. A letter of endorsement from Cardinal Bea was received at the opening of the meeting. In the letter the Cardinal stated: "The quickening impulse in the contemporary Church toward a close interaction of theology, pastoral care and Christian life, is notable and most encouraging. The role of the Catholic university in this vast enterprise cannot be overestimated and must be of great interest to the Church's leadership." The Bishops assembled daily in the Campus Center ballroom and sat in semicircular fashion to hear a lecturer and two discussants outline a particular subject. Then the meetings were opened for debate. While on campus the Hierarchy stayed in dormitory rooms used by students during the academic year. At the conclusion of the seminar, Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, President of the National Conference of Bishops issued the following statement: "The Episcopal seminar on doctrinal, pastoral and canonical questions is a most welcome development for the leadership of the Catholic Church in America. This has been for many Bishops a reunion with the academic world, a time for thought and frank discussion. The university setting has provided a forum for an exchange of views on current theological issues. Because of their timeliness I am hopeful that there will be more discussions of this kind."

At the conclusion of the last annual Medical Award Dinner for the Stritch School of Medicine at LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, Chicago, His Excellency Bishop Cletus F. O'Donnell, then Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, addressed the assembled guests. The following is a portion of the very significant speech made by Bishop O'Donnell:

"In years to come, as the Church in the United States continues its work of implementing the Vatican Council, our reliance on our great universities can only become more important. For it is a complicated, difficult world in which the Church is

trying to become relevant; and the tools of research and scholarship are now absolutely indispensable for the renewal of our times to be effective.

“Hence the Church will find itself turning constantly to the universities, to seek for the advice of experts, the beginnings of answers to our problems, and even on occasion help in forming the questions we should be asking ourselves. There may have been a time in the history of Catholicism in America when it was possible for the day-to-day administration of the Church to proceed as though all the universities did was to teach school; but just as the government of the United States cannot function without the help of the great national ‘multiversities,’ so the Church needs its own ‘multiversities’ if it is to have academic resources to fall back on in its mission. Universities like Loyola are not luxuries, they are necessities; and I foresee an era beginning in which there will be—to use the popular phrase—an ‘ongoing dialogue’ between the university and the administration of the Church.

“Surely, an archdiocese as large and as important as Chicago must have a great Catholic university at its service. It is, therefore, not at all optional for Loyola to forge ahead in its quest for excellence. Loyola must continue its growth toward academic greatness for many other reasons, of course; but if all the other reasons should disappear, the needs of the Archdiocese of Chicago demand greatness from Loyola.

“It is in this context that I wish to extend the thanks of the Archdiocese to all those who are helping to make Loyola great, to the Jesuit Fathers, to the lay faculty and staff, to the students, and to you good people who are friends and benefactors of Loyola and the Stritch School of Medicine. It is a critically important task on which you are engaged and you must let nothing stand in its way.”

REGIS COLLEGE’S traditional, 90-year-old identity as a men’s college will end next fall. The Regis College Board of Trustees has approved action changing the status of the College to a co-educational institution effective in September, 1968. The change has been under serious consideration at Regis for several months. Final approval by the Trustees was made after discussion with officials of other colleges and universities in Colorado, and, after a favorable vote was received on the matter at a special meeting with elected representatives of Regis.

THE FOLLOWING LETTER OF FATHER GENERAL was written at the request of Monsignor Donald W. Montrose, Superintendent of Schools and Colleges in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, for the Administrators Conference of the Western Catholic Education Association held in Los Angeles on January 19, 20, 1967:

The memories of my visit to the United States in April 1966 are still fresh and green. It only increased my awareness of the vitality and diversity of your Catholic educational system and of the tremendous possibilities of your educational institutions.

Frequently enough, those who are caught up in the day-to-day problems of running schools and who live so close to the educational establishment can lose sight of its achievement and vast potential. Sometimes, it takes a look from afar to comprehend the imagination, heroic effort, courage and sacrifice that have gone into the making of your Catholic high schools.

I am happy, therefore, on the occasion of your meeting at Loyola University in Los Angeles, to share some thoughts with you on the real need for Catholic education at the secondary level.

The importance and relevance of the educational apostolate would be hard to overestimate. In any country education is the key to leadership. In the United States this is true to an eminent degree. Our world is growing in complexity even more rapidly than in numbers. For the intricate scientific, economic, social, human and religious problems of the decades ahead, America will need the finest intellectual training of its most talented people. It will need men and women technically competent, of broad vision, creatively alert, and endowed with inner, personal integrity.

Never in history has education been so closely connected with all phases of national and international life. Education is the mechanism which can move out through individuals to influence and improve government, art, culture, and the morality of society as a whole.

The richness and diversity of secular education in the United States is admirable. It seems to me, however, that America will always need a parallel educational system that can speak out with positive conviction and teach absolute values, a system where morality and virtue can be explicitly and formally cultivated. Religion and theology must always be an integral and irre-

movable part of the full and complete education of our young people.

This is not the time to be contemplating a relaxing of educational efforts. Nothing is more important and more useful to contemporary society than to prepare for it the men and women of proved competence and of solid character and personality, whom that same society now needs so critically.

This is, however, the time to study how to improve our schools and to endeavor to make them more adapted to a world which is taking shape and being put together before our very eyes. There must be room for experimentation and innovation in our educational planning. Our schools must never confine themselves to past patterns. They must be with men in their struggles, helping them to respond creatively to the challenges of history. If our schools are to perform as they should, they will live in a continual tension between the old and the new, the comfortable past and the uneasy present. Our schools must be open to the changes in the Church so that the students can assimilate, in all its vigor, the vitality of a Church in change.

Catholic educators are privileged to have young students during their golden years, the malleable, formative years of personal development when the quality of their religious faith, their citizenship and their professional competence are fixed. It is at this period that their attitudes toward God, their neighbors and themselves are established. The work of the educator is a splendid and special vocation. To assist one's fellowman to come to the fullness of his powers is truly a work of charity of the highest order.

The Catholic school affords the students a real hope of finding a presentation of what is needed for an ordered vision of reality, with the proper focus on human relationships, the pursuit of truth and the true role of philosophy and theology in the moral dimension. Our Catholic schools can open the minds and hearts of young people to a love of truth in all its forms, scientific, humanistic, philosophical, poetic, theological; to some perception of the good of man and of society, and some disposition to work to realize that which we know to be good; to a love of beauty in all its forms; to a passion for justice insofar as we can achieve for others and ourselves that which is right and just; to a compassion for those who may be less fortunate than ourselves, educationally, economically, socially, spiritually, and in the civic order of human rights.

The keystone of the entire system is the good teacher and the

creative-collaborative process, the vital relationship between teacher and student. Our great need, worthy of all our efforts and study, is for truly competent, prepared and dedicated teachers. The good teacher must be developed and, above all, encouraged and made aware of his crucial position in the whole educational process. We need teachers who are possessed of the true Catholic attitude of mind which should be soaring, anti-pedantic, open-minded, and filled with respect for reality. We need what someone has called the evocative teacher who brings out responses that are personal and dynamic, and who knows that human growth is experimental, slow but curious, real only if independent, assisted only if encouraged, successful only after floundering. In the last analysis, the system is dependent on the competence, skill, wisdom, prudence, dedication and holiness of the individual teacher.

Along with my very best wishes for a most fruitful meeting go my assurances of a remembrance in my prayers. The challenge we face in today's world is complex, total and unremitting. We must not only help our students to learn as free men to accept change for themselves, but to shape change for others. We know that the world is partly given to and partly shaped by every generation. This changing world will be shaped by young men and women, now alive, now in our schools. We must help them to infuse a soul into our new world which must not take shape and unity without God and His Church. Our young people must learn not to fear a changing world but to shape it in the freedom of the children of God.

Our Catholic schools bear strong and living witness to the Incarnation of the Son of God. They stand forth as a sign that He really entered our human history, and that in so doing, He sanctified all truth. The Catholic school gives living proof that the Church is concerned with the totality of human living. The school witnesses to the truth: God is alive and loves us.

Pedro Arrupe, S.J.
Superior General
Society of Jesus

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 033 36161 9

397805