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Study Questions and Case Study

Please be prepared to discuss these questions and case study during the workshop.

LMU’s Mission Statement

1. The Mission Statement says LMU’s intellectual tradition “encourages an integration of knowledge in which ‘faith and reason bear witness to the unity of all truth.’” How would you explain this statement to an applicant for a faculty position?

2. Describe any factors that differentiate your department’s mission from that of a similar department at a secular private university.

3. Place a check beside each of the following cultural/intellectual traditions that define a Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount university; leave blank those cultural/intellectual traditions that do not define a Catholic University.

   - Views the world as sacramental and seeks to find God in all things.
   - Refutes the notion that there is a significance and historical difference in the educational opportunities available to traditionally privileged and students of color.
   - Takes philosophical and theological thinking seriously.
   - Esteems both intellect and imagination.
   - Eschews the supposition that there can be value-free facts.
   - Respects the integrity of the individual but also pursues common goals.
   - Seeks an integration of knowledge in which “faith and reason bear harmonious witness to the unity of all truth.”

4. Identify your mental associations and viewpoints regarding LMU:

5. What are the essential attributes associated with an LMU education?

6. What is the most important message that LMU communicates to the public?
Distinctively Catholic: Keeping Faith in Higher Education

1. After reading Heft’s article, what are your thoughts about whether/why the Catholic, as well as catholic, identity of LMU is important?

2. How would you explain Heft’s statement that “it is a false choice to think one must hire either for mission or for diversity”?

3. What does Heft mean when he writes that “no sharp distinction should be drawn between [the intellectual and the religious missions]” of a Catholic university?

Ethnic Diversity and Religious Identity in U.S. Catholic Higher Education

Explain Why These Statements Are True or False

1. Intellectual Solidarity requires “both listening and speaking in genuine conversation across the boundaries that have traditionally divided the world.” (Hollenbach, 2003).

2. A basic commitment to diversity on the part of the Catholic University is an expression of religious identity.

3. Explain the dual goals of inclusivity and particularity. How might they come into play in a faculty search? What could be some ways of keeping them in creative tension?

Benefits of a Diverse Faculty: A Review of the Literature

1. Check the benefit(s) that American universities receive by way of a diverse faculty. Be prepared to explain your reasons for selecting each benefit.

   A) Helps the university fulfill the mission of American Higher Education
   B) Enhances the university’s reputation
   C) Increases the university’s endowment
   D) Helps the university achieve its mission of excellence in teaching, research and service
   E) Helps the university identify members of the Board of Trustees

2. Check the statement(s) that describes the impact that a diverse faculty and student population have on Learning Outcomes. Be prepared to explain your reasons for selecting each statement.
A) Helps students develop active thinking processes that reflect a more complex and less automatic mode of thought
B) Increases critical thinking skills
C) Increases students’ intellectual self-confidence
D) Increases students’ motivation to achieve
E) Increases students’ satisfaction and involvement with their institution

Case Study: Dr. Robbie Lee Briscoe

Based on your analysis of the article, Benefits of a Diverse Faculty: A Review of the Literature, read the following case study and identify the impact that Dr. Briscoe’s leaving may have had on:

- Whitmore University
- Educational Anthropology
- Educational Anthropology Curriculum
- Student Learning and Outcomes
- Department European American
- Majors and Minors African American
- Majors and Minors. Latino Majors and Minors
- Asian/Pacific Islander Majors and Minors

Dr. Robbie Lee Briscoe was hired at Whitmore University in 1995. Even though he earned a Ph.D. at Harvard University in Educational Anthropology, some faculty wondered whether he was “qualified,” and they questioned his ability to earn tenure at Whitmore. Dr. Briscoe, who grew up in the inner city in Jackson, Mississippi, was ten years older than the other junior faculty in the department; he spoke with a strong Southern accent, and his research agenda focused on the impact of teacher ethnicity on children of color who attend inner city schools.

Week One

The faculty took Dr. Briscoe to lunch to welcome him to the Anthropology Department. When he returned to the Department, he waited for the Chair to assign a mentor to him. After all, he knew that mentoring had the potential to impact his ability to succeed at Whitmore.

Week Three

Six of the eight male faculty in the Department took their bi-weekly trip to the local golf course, a ritual they had enjoyed for many years. They did not invite Dr. Briscoe.
Week Fourteen

Three female faculty offered advice and shared information with Dr. Briscoe on a sporadic basis, but the Department Chair had not assigned a faculty mentor to him.

Second Year

Dr. Briscoe decided that he was going to survive regardless of the obstacles. He read books on the *Art of Teaching in Colleges and Universities*, and applied much of the newly acquired knowledge to the development and delivery of his courses. Students responded with very high evaluations of his courses. African American students were particularly drawn to Dr. Briscoe, and he assumed the role of mentor to most of those who were Educational Anthropology majors. A colleague advised him to delete the section in his Faculty Service Report that described his work with African American majors because “Whitmore places a higher value on research and teaching than it does on service.”

Fourth Year

Dr. Briscoe called Dr. Mary Anne Riley, an Anthropologist of color at another university, and described the climate he was experiencing in his Department. He said “I’ve decided to walk away from Whitmore, and I don’t think I’ll ever get another teaching job.”
Dr. Riley said many Departments would welcome an Anthropologist of his caliber, and encouraged him to apply for positions at other institutions. She also offered to act as a reference for Dr. Briscoe.

Six Months Later

Dr. Briscoe was the successful candidate for a tenure-track position at Broadbent University, another of the nation’s top research institutions.

First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Years

Dr. Briscoe met with his assigned mentor, and they mapped out a strategy which could lead to tenure and promotion. Dr. Briscoe also remained in close contact with Dr. Riley, who agreed to act as a content mentor until he earned tenure. With support from his Departmental mentor and Professor Riley, Dr. Briscoe focused on research and scholarship, while at the same time he strived to be an outstanding teacher.

While he continued to mentor some African American Anthropology majors, Dr. Briscoe discovered that he had more time to focus on research and scholarship at Broadbent University because his European American colleagues made a concerted effort to mentor all majors, regardless of the students’ ethnicity or gender.

He delivered conference papers, wrote a monograph that was published by the American Anthropological Association, published several articles in *The Journal of Educational Anthropology*, and a group of external colleagues invited him to submit a Book Chapter. He used the material gathered for the articles and chapter to develop a book proposal, which was accepted by McGraw Hill.

Sixth Year

Dr. Briscoe was tenured and promoted to Associate Professor.

Hiring for Mission: An Inclusive Term

1. Define “hiring for mission.” What are primary opportunities for articulating the Jesuit education dimensions?
Jesuit and Marymount Catholic Identity

As a Catholic university, Loyola Marymount University shares in a rich intellectual heritage dating from the earliest centuries of Christianity. This intellectual tradition sees a mutually fertile relationship between faith and reason and thus seeks to promote dialogue between culture and religion.

The Catholic character of Loyola Marymount is further specified by the educational heritage of its sponsoring religious orders—the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary (Marymount Sisters), the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange—and by many dedicated lay men and women. The members of the religious orders, together with their faculty, staff, and administrative colleagues, share a common dedication to academic excellence, spiritual growth, and social justice as hallmarks of a contemporary Catholic University.

Religious Communities at LMU
- Society of Jesus: Jesuit Community
- Marymount Sisters: RSHM Community
- Sisters of St. Joseph: SCJ Community

Offices and Institutes
- Academy of Catholic Thought and Imagination
- Campus Ministry
- Center for Catholic Education
- Center for Ignatian Spirituality
- Center for Religion and Spirituality
- CSJ Center for Reconciliation and Justice
- Marymount Institute for Faith, Culture, and the Arts
LMU History

The names “Loyola” and “Marymount” have long been associated with Catholic higher education in countries around the globe. Saint Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus, sanctioned the foundation of his order’s first school in 1548. The Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary have conducted educational institutions since their establishment in France in 1849 by Father Jean Gailhac. These two traditions of education have come together in Los Angeles as Loyola Marymount University.

The present University is the successor to the pioneer Catholic college and first institution of higher learning in Southern California. In 1865, the Vincentian Fathers inaugurated St. Vincent’s College for boys in Los Angeles. When this school closed in 1911, members of the Society of Jesus opened the high school division of their newly founded Los Angeles College.

The collegiate division opened a few years later. Rapid growth prompted the Jesuits to seek a new campus in 1917 and incorporated as Loyola College of Los Angeles in 1918. Relocating to the present Westchester campus in 1929, the school achieved university status one year later. Graduate instruction began in 1920 with the foundation of a separate law school. The formation of a distinct graduate division occurred in June 1950.

In separate, though parallel developments, the Religious of Sacred Heart of Mary began teaching local young women in 1923. In 1933 they opened Marymount Junior College in Westwood, which by 1948 had grown to a four-year college granting the baccalaureate degree. The school later transferred classes to a new campus on the Palos Verdes Peninsula in 1960.

Eight years later, Marymount College moved again, this time to the Westchester campus of Loyola University as an autonomous institution. At this juncture, the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Orange joined the Marymount Sisters as partners.

*In 1968, Rev. Charles Casassa, S.J., and Sr. Raymunde McKay, RSHM, jointly announced the affiliation between Loyola University and Marymount College, bringing women and men students together on the Westchester campus for the first time.*
After five years of sharing faculties and facilities, Loyola University and Marymount College merged and formed Loyola Marymount University in 1973.

During the intervening decades, and under successive administrations, the University has grown in size and stature. Conscious of its history and heritage and ever-growing stature, LMU looks to its future as one of the nation’s distinguished Catholic universities.
LMU Mission Statement

Introduction

*Loyola Marymount University* offers rigorous undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs to academically ambitious students committed to lives of meaning and purpose. We benefit from our location in Los Angeles, a dynamic city that brings into sharp focus the issues of our time and provides an ideal context for study, research, creative work, and active engagement. By intention and philosophy, we invite men and women diverse in talents, interests, and cultural backgrounds to enrich our educational community and advance our mission:

- The encouragement of learning
- The education of the whole person
- The service of faith and the promotion of justice

The University is institutionally committed to Roman Catholicism and takes its fundamental inspiration from the combined heritage of the Jesuits, the Marymount Sisters, and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange. This Catholic identity and religious heritage distinguish LMU from other universities and provide touchstones for understanding our threefold mission.
The Encouragement of Learning

At LMU, the encouragement of learning takes place in the context of an intellectual tradition that:

- Insists on critical thinking and the development of imagination and artistic expression
- Takes philosophical and theological disciplines seriously
- Engages in ethical discourse and embraces the search for values
- Respects the integrity of the individual while at the same time pursuing the common good
- Views the world as sacramental and seeks to find God in all things
- Encourages an integration of knowledge in which “faith and reason bear witness to the unity of all truth” (Ex Corde Ecclesiae, 1990, #17)

As a foundation for inquiry and learning we strive to create an intercultural community and to promote ecumenical and inter-religious dialogue. This means that at LMU the encouragement of learning is a radical commitment to free and honest inquiry—but always with reverence before the mystery of the universe and openness to transcendent reality.

The Education of the Whole Person

With roots in the spiritual humanism of the earliest Jesuit colleges, LMU’s pedagogical tradition has an abiding concern for the education of the whole person.

Today we understand this as a simultaneous process of information, formation, and transformation. The education of the whole person thus includes these points:
• It encourages personal integration of the student’s thinking, feeling, choosing, evolving self. It does this by fostering not only academic and professional development but also physical, social, psychological, moral, cultural, and religious/spiritual growth.

• It promotes formation of character and values, meaning and purpose. As students learn to “read” what is going on in their own lives and in the larger world, they are encouraged to grow in the skills of personal and social literacy needed for responsible citizenship.

• It seeks to develop men and women for others. LMU encourages students, faculty, and staff to identify with those living on the margins of society so that the intellectual inquiry and moral reflection endemic to university life will lead to meaningful work for transformative social change.

The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice

We take seriously both parts of this phrase. The service of faith encompasses all those ways in which the University engages its Catholic intellectual, cultural, and religious heritage. These ways include specific courses and academic programs as well as opportunities for worship, faith formation, and spiritual development.

The service of faith also honors the reality of religious pluralism on our campus and embraces inter-faith dialogue in formal and informal contexts. The desired outcome of such encounters moves us beyond tolerance to mutual respect and understanding, deepens appreciation of one’s own faith, and creates opportunities for engaging others who share a longing for meaningful lives.

Finally, at LMU we insist that the service of faith is incomplete without the promotion of justice. Together with the University’s sponsoring religious orders and the post-Vatican II Church, we believe that participating in the struggle for justice in ways appropriate to our academic community is a requirement—not simply an option—of biblical faith. In this struggle LMU makes common cause with all who share a commitment to local and global justice, whether they are motivated by faith or other noble ideals.
Distinctively Catholic: Keeping the Faith in Higher Education

James L. Heft

In the twenty years since Pope John Paul II issued *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (“From the Heart of the Church”), his apostolic constitution on Catholic universities, progress has been made in articulating and reinvigorating the Catholic identity of the more than two hundred and thirty Catholic universities and colleges in the United States. Still, significant work remains to be done, especially in clarifying the distinctive intellectual foundations on which any university that calls itself Catholic must rest.

Once it was commonplace to assume that secularization and scientific and economic progress would eventually stamp out religion along with other “superstitions.” Yet the death of religion, to paraphrase Mark Twain, has been greatly exaggerated. Both here and across the globe, religion continues to influence nearly every aspect of society. To be sure, modernity has purified religion of some of its pretensions. In the West, the church now recognizes the autonomy of science, defends the separation of church and state, and affirms religious freedom. At the same time, the church has demonstrated great resilience. Religion evidently is here to stay.

Yet for the most part, the secular academy remains indifferent, if not openly hostile, to traditional religion. While there has been a renewed interest in the study of religion in the history and sociology departments of some campuses, most secular universities are dismissive of the study of religion and especially theology. There are several reasons for this, one of which is the prevalence of “postmodernism.” Found mainly in the humanities and the social sciences, postmodernism comes in two forms: hard and soft. Hard postmodernism proclaims the end of metaphysics, the end of all “totalizing” narratives (itself a totalizing narrative), and the reduction of all knowledge claims to various forms of power. Obviously, hard postmodernism is deadly for Christianity; it attacks Christian truths as ideologies of control and oppression. On the other hand, Catholic scholars should welcome soft
postmodernism, for this way of thinking recognizes that a purely objective and totally accurate expression of reality is impossible, that the realities of power, gender, and coercion cannot be ignored, that all concepts have a history, and that all truths need to be put in their historical and cultural context. Rightly understood, a soft postmodernism helps us avoid both the pretensions of absolutism and a paralyzing relativism.

The academy’s reluctance to study religion has gone hand-in-hand with the professionalization of the disciplines. Over a hundred years ago, American academics, inspired by their German counterparts, began to organize themselves into separate departments, which established their own journals and professional societies. The professionalization of the academy took place when the influence of science was at its peak. No doubt professionalization has increased methodological rigor and promoted more original research, but professionalization has also had negative consequences, one of which is called “physics envy”: many academics think that unless their research is empirically verifiable, it will be dismissed as mere opinion. The best scholars know better, because they understand the limits of their methods. But because most religions claims are not, strictly speaking, empirically verifiable, few professors in the modern academy take the study of religion seriously. Most major secular universities have no room for theologians; those that do tend to isolate them in schools of divinity, where they are often seen not as producers of new knowledge but as trainers of students entering the ministry.

In the face of these powerful cultural forces, what can Catholic intellectuals bring to the modern academy? First and most obviously, our tradition values tradition. If Catholics were to rely primarily—or only—on the study of biblical texts, they would bypass centuries of philosophy and theology to say nothing of art, music, literature, and architecture. An emphasis on tradition underscores the importance of human reason, the recognition of which
Catholic intellectual tradition is rooted in specific religious beliefs and practices—most fundamentally, the Incarnation, the Trinity, and the Eucharist. Even before the Word became flesh, the Jewish tradition affirmed that all creation is good because it is from God. Jews, Christians, and Muslims together affirm that human beings are created in the image and likeness of God. Christians believe that the dignity of that image is made most clear in the person of Jesus Christ, the human face of God. But Jesus is not all there is of God: Christians also affirm the existence of the Trinity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—which means that Christians understand God as a community of persons. Catholic Christians build their own community of persons through the sacraments, primarily through the celebration of the Eucharist. Catholic beliefs and practices ground a university education in a common search for the truth and a dedication to the common good. Scholarship inspired by Catholicism bears on real-life issues, not just for the benefit of that very small percentage of humanity fortunate enough to be professors or students, but for everyone, and especially the poor. A Catholic intellectual community does not lead students to decide who they want to be; it helps them discover who they have been called to be. The key concern is not personal identity but dedication to God and to others.

Moreover, because reason and faith are intimately related in the Catholic tradition, every part of a Catholic school’s curriculum should be informed in some way by philosophical, ethical, and theological perspectives. In professional education, such as medicine, the Christian vision of the human person will fundamentally shape the care given the sick, the poor, and especially the dying. In the study of history, the presence, forms, and vitality of various religions are studied as an integral part of the human story. The teaching of philosophy will not ignore the vital relationship that has existed for centuries between philosophy and theology (even if much of modern philosophy severs that relationship). In other words, at a Catholic university, Catholic intellectual traditions will affect all aspects of the curriculum, and even determine some of the majors that are offered.

Most important, the Catholic intellectual tradition seeks to integrate knowledge. There ought to be connections between all the subjects studied because everything that is studied has its source, ultimately, in God. This is a daunting task given the enormous expansion of knowledge in the past hundred years. Today, courses are taught by professors who may know nothing about what their colleagues in other departments—and sometimes even in their own—are teaching. Still, Catholic universities must resist the fragmentation of knowledge typical of secular universities. Scholars who rely exclusively on already established methodologies within their disciplines will prematurely dismiss important questions they don’t yet know how to answer. In the words of
Denys Turner, they “reverse the traffic between questions and answers so as to permit only such questions to be asked as we already possess predetermined methodologies for answering, cutting the agenda of questions down to the shape and size of our given routines for answering them.” This approach spells the death not only of the liberal arts, but of all our disciplines—and certainly the death of Catholic universities, which ask unanswerable questions even of God.

Fostering the distinctive characteristics of Catholic intellectual life also faces administrative and economic challenges. The commercialization of American culture tends to reduce human activity to exchange; it restricts the idea of value to a single, narrow measure—that of economic power. A friend of mine describes the United States as an economy with a culture loosely attached. Commercialization affects everyone in the academy: administrators, faculty, and students.

Administrators, including members of boards of trustees, become agents of commercialization when they rely entirely on models borrowed from the business world—models that maximize revenue, bureaucratize all transactions, and speak of faculty as “employees” and students as “customers.” Development and public-relations staff become agents of commercialization when they focus on “branding,” especially when this means reducing the mission of the university only to what is popular and sells. Some accrediting agencies expect faculty to quantify all the important outcomes of what they do. Of course, any university that does not balance its budget will eventually cease to exist: “No margin, no mission.” But the mission of a Catholic university is about much more than a good margin. In Einstein’s words, “Everything that counts cannot necessarily be counted.”

The faculty is commercialized when professors are more concerned with increasing their salaries than with their responsibility to teach and do research that contributes to the common good. Similarly, students can become so focused on acquiring marketable skills and landing good (that is, well-paying) jobs that they see no value in the liberal arts—no value in exploring the theological and philosophical questions inseparable from a life of genuine reflection. Catholic colleges and universities should help students see beyond what they want (or think they want) to what they most need: an integrated education rooted in a distinctive religious tradition that will sustain them in whatever professions they choose.

Faculty who are skeptical about the intellectual relevance of a Catholic university’s religious mission pose another problem. They may not see how the Catholic intellectual tradition relates to their discipline and research. Or they may assume that the university’s religious mission is only pastoral and should be outsourced to campus ministry and the theology department. They may think that being teachers at a Catholic university means simply being fair and kind to their students—which is, of course, a good thing. Or they may think that research that draws on Catholic intellectual traditions cannot be challenging or worthwhile.

Hiring faculty who are sympathetic to the mission of a Catholic university is thus critical. It is a false choice to think one must hire either for mission or for diversity. Hiring a diverse group of people who embrace a single mission is the answer. In order to “hire for mission,” search committees must understand the religious mission of their university in intellectual terms.
Every search committee has a mission in mind when it hires. It is not illegal to ask faculty candidates how their research might contribute to the institution’s mission. Faculty from other faiths, and even no faith, can and do make valuable contributions to the mission of Catholic universities. (Disaffected Catholic professors, especially when they are tenured, often pose the greatest obstacle to strengthening the Catholic identity of a university.) Nor does “hiring for mission” inevitably lead to an inner and outer circle among faculty. It all depends on how faculty and administrators go about it.

One way to deal with legitimate concerns raised by policies to strengthen Catholic identity is to spend time—lots of time—talking with chairs of departments and faculty search committees about why it’s important to hire for mission, and even how not to go about it. However many years they have spent at a Catholic university, faculty need regular opportunities to learn or to reconsider what it means to teach and do research at a Catholic institution. Book discussions, cross-disciplinary faculty seminars, and carefully designed scribe missions only in terms of the charisms of the religious general-education programs are all good ways to promote the university’s mission. This is especially true for untenured faculty, who are likely to be the most receptive to opportunities to learn about how Catholic intellectual traditions can enrich work across all disciplines.

All candidates for faculty positions—whether Catholic or not—should be able to contribute to the intellectual mission of the institution. I did not write “the intellectual and the religious missions” of the university. This point is fundamental: no sharp distinction should be drawn
between these two closely related aspects of the Catholic university’s mission. Seeking the truth of things, whether in science or the humanities, is a religious act. Faculty must be dedicated to that search for truth.

Depending on their academic disciplines, some faculty will be more able than others to incorporate intellectual themes related explicitly to Catholic intellectual traditions. Diversity needs to be sought and respected, but it is more important that all diversity enrich the mission of the university as a Catholic university—that all diversity be within, not parallel or indifferent to, that mission.

Another important issue facing Catholic universities concerns the meaning of academic freedom. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is dedicated to protecting the rights of individual professors against the actions of arbitrary administrators, board members, politicians, and anyone else outside the academy. The AAUP stands for some very good things. For example, it insists on rigorous peer review and due process. Catholic universities have learned a great deal from the AAUP about the rights and responsibilities of individual professors. But the secular understanding of academic freedom has consequences when it is adopted without qualification by Catholic universities, where a specific intellectual tradition should be privileged, and where philosophy and theology occupy a special place in the curriculum. Catholic universities need to be able to insist that all faculty show respect for a theologically grounded ethics and a
willingness to engage with the church’s intellectual resources. The secular notion of academic freedom gives no importance to strengthening Catholic distinctiveness. This is ironic, since secular liberal organizations say they support pluralism; and Catholic universities, if they can be substantively distinct, will contribute to the needed pluralism of American higher education.

The public perception of a school’s Catholic identity presents yet another problem. Since the Enlightenment, cultural elites have criticized the Catholic Church as the major opponent to intellectual progress, while negative media images of the contemporary Catholic Church make rehabilitating the word “Catholic” problematic for many. It needs to be acknowledged that some Catholic leaders have contributed to that perception. But it is a mistake to respond to such criticisms by limiting a distinctively Catholic mission to the pastoral care of students. Nor is it sufficient to describe mission only in terms of the charisms of the religious orders that have founded Catholic colleges and universities.

Some orders have richer intellectual and spiritual traditions than others; none, however, has the depth and variety of intellectual and spiritual traditions of Catholicism as a whole. It makes sense, therefore, to emphasize Catholic intellectual and spiritual traditions first, before moving on to the particular embodiment of those traditions that individual religious orders provide.

This brings us to the tendency of some people in the academy to privilege the so-called small-“c” over so-called capital-“C” of Catholicism. Advocates of small-“c” Catholicism focus on ideas that many non-Catholics, and not only a few Catholics, find acceptable. They affirm a both/and approach, promoting a capacious understanding of natural law, human rights, and the humanity that everyone shares. These are important truths, to be sure, but left out are what many consider the less attractive truths of Catholicism—namely, the magisterium, dogmas, and certain moral teachings that seem increasingly hard to defend. Instead of speaking of Jesus and the church, small “c” advocates speak of the Christian heritage. Uncomfortable with the concrete details of the gospel (Jesus and his community of believers), some schools speak instead of the “values” of Jesus and the “heritage” of the Christian community.

Sometimes there are legitimate reasons for emphasizing the small “c.” Yet the situation for Catholic universities today calls for something bolder. If one omits the big “C”—the distinctive theological dimensions of Catholicism—the small “c” soon morphs into Christian “values,” and from there it often collapses into a bland humanism. Eventually, what is truly distinctive of Catholic Christianity will disappear altogether. Catholic scholars need to understand that they can be more inclusive precisely because of the big-“C” elements of Catholicism. Catholics are committed to ecumenical and interreligious dialogue and research because of, not in spite of, their Catholic faith. Rightly understood, the big “C” broadens the intellectual horizon. That some Catholics will then push some nondogmatic teachings as though they were dogmatic, that some members of the hierarchy will seek to close off thinking that is critical but still faithful, that some members of the laity will continue to describe a legitimate diversity of positions among Catholic scholars as heresy—none of these predictable difficulties should lead Catholic universities to retreat from the particulars of the church’s tradition.
Finally, Catholic scholars should be aware not only of what they can offer the church, but also of what the larger church can offer them. Professors and administrators note with sadness the distrust many bishops have of Catholic colleges and universities. That unfortunate distrust, however, should not keep academics from acknowledging what Catholic colleges and universities might learn from the larger church. The Catholic intellectual tradition, which presupposes the interplay of faith and reason, can never be reduced to fundamentalism, be it biblical or papal. Tradition is a socially embodied and historically extended debate, not only about interpretations of Scripture, but also about the interpretation of the constant but still-evolving and historically conditioned teachings of the magisterium. An international church with real teaching authority helps local colleges and universities avoid the pitfalls of nationalism and other kinds of idolatry. Absent a vibrant Catholic intellectual tradition, the forces of the market economy may well overwhelm our colleges and universities, reducing them to training grounds that produce students who fit seamlessly into seriously flawed corporate or government institutions. If leaders and scholars draw freely and deeply on Catholic tradition, universities can offer a distinctive nonsecularized form of higher education, one that will make a major contribution to the life of the whole church as well as the secular world.

James L. Heft, SM, is the Alton Brooks Professor of Religion at the University of Southern California and President of the Institute for Advanced Catholic Studies. This article is adapted from lecture presented last fall in Rome at the General Assembly of the International Federation of Catholic universities.
Ethnic Diversity and Religious Identity in U.S. Catholic Higher Education

Robert V. Caro, S.J.

A 2006 *New York Times* report highlights the “murky” and “contentious” environment that has followed in the wake of two affirmative action decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in 2003. Both decisions involve the University of Michigan. In one case, the court upheld the use of race in law-school admission decisions, finding that a “highly individualized holistic review of each applicant’s race” justified consideration of an applicant’s race. In the other case, involving undergraduate admissions, the court struck down the practice of awarding points based on race.¹

One might say the court took away with one hand what it gave with the other. Opponents of affirmative action seized on the uncertain state of the law as well as the changing composition of the court to raise legal challenges that call into question “hundreds of thousands of dollars in fellowships, scholarships, and other programs previously created for minority students.”² Many universities, facing threats of litigation and other pressures, are opening funds to white students that they had previously dedicated to ethnic minorities.

According to the newspaper report, “Officials at conservative groups that are pushing for changes see the shift as a sign of success in eliminating race as a factor in decision making in higher education.”³ Roger Clegg, president and general counsel for the conservative Center for Equal Opportunity is quoted as saying, “Our concern is that the law be followed and that nobody be denied participation in a program on account of skin color or what country their ancestors came from.”⁴

This view, which fails to recognize the significance of historical differences in educational opportunity for privileged white students on the one hand and minority students on the other, is countered by Theodore M. Shaw, president of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.: “How is it that they [Clegg and others] conclude the great evil in this country is discrimination against white people? Can I put that question any more pointedly? I struggle to find the words to do so because it’s so stunning.”⁵

---

² Ibid.  
³ Ibid.  
⁴ Ibid.  
⁵ Ibid.  

Anyone who believes in the benefits of a diverse college campus will be troubled by the liberal-conservative polarity reflected in this news account. Besides calling into question whether and to what extent proactive programs for minorities are consistent with legal principles, the split serves as a chilling reminder that the underlying goals of educational equity for traditionally underrepresented groups are still subject to the shifting winds of politics. The point is underscored by declining minority enrollments for fall 2006 at UCLA and several other University of California campuses, where Proposition 209, a 1996 voter-approved initiative, banned consideration in public institutions of race and gender in admissions and hiring.6

Whatever the outcome of current legal challenges in the wake of the Michigan case or of efforts in California’s public universities to work around the restrictions of Proposition 209, I believe that for United States Catholic universities, numerous passages of the decrees of the Second Vatican Council (1962–65) and other ecclesial documents of recent decades provide a much broader context in which to situate a firm commitment to ethnic diversity. This context encompasses, but goes beyond, American racial/ethnic politics and makes clear that for Catholic universities a commitment to ethnic diversity is not an option but needs to be a key feature of their identity. These universities should be inclusive not because of legal or political exigency but precisely because they are Catholic and therefore see every human being as a child of God, embrace a commitment to the common good, and share the church’s post-Vatican II concern for the cultural progress of all people, especially the poor and afflicted.

After reviewing conciliar and other church documents in the first part of this paper, I will suggest, in the second part, that a university whose commitment to ethnic diversity is grounded in Catholic identity will not be satisfied with mere tolerance of minority members. Rather, it will urge everyone to make educational capital of the opportunity to engage the other in genuine dialogue, with social and intellectual solidarity the desired result.

Finally, having made the case that a commitment to ethnic diversity is central to contemporary Catholic identity, I will go on to caution that the two are not coextensive. Catholic identity is a broader complex of cultural and religious values and provides the unifying structure that supports a commitment to diversity. I will conclude by suggesting that the particularity of Catholic identity and the inclusivity a university espouses through its commitment to ethnic diversity need to be held in creative tension.

Conciliars and Other Ecclesial Documents

Any overview of the documents of the Second Vatican Council needs to begin with Lumen Gentium, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. This first and foundational decree of the council, approved November 21, 1964, is less concerned with the institutional organization of the church than with the basic reality of the church’s relationship with Christ. The document moves toward a view of the church as the primary sacrament of encounter with Christ and as

the instrument for achieving, in Christ, the unity of the human race. This understanding corresponds with the image of the church as community, or people of God, and gives rise to the idea that the mission of the church encompasses not only the ministries of word and sacrament but also the pursuit of justice and concern for the transformation of the world. “The church is called to not only preach the word and celebrate the sacraments,” said Ann Ida Gannon, B.V.M., in a reflection on Lumen Gentium, “but also to serve human needs in society and culture; social, political, economic, [and] scientific areas are also proper areas for her influence.”

If Lumen Gentium is the foundational document of Vatican II, subsequent documents spell out its implications for a church that no longer sees itself in a defensive posture toward the world but rather in dialogue with it, e.g., Unitatis Redintegratio (Decree on Ecumenism), Dignitatis Humanae (Declaration on Religious Liberty), and Nostra Aetate (Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non Christian Religions). Most especially, however, Gaudium et Spes, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, is recognized as the lens through which we should read Lumen Gentium. If Lumen Gentium, as a dogmatic constitution, speaks at times in language that appeals mainly to believers, Gaudium et Spes, as a pastoral constitution, addresses all of humanity:

Now that the Second Vatican Council has studied the mystery of the church more deeply [in Lumen Gentium], it addresses not only the daughters and sons of the church and all who call upon the name of Christ, but the whole of humanity as well, and it wishes to set down how it understands the presence and function of the church in the world today. If Lumen Gentium, as a dogmatic constitution, speaks at times in language that appeals mainly to believers, Gaudium et Spes, as a pastoral constitution, addresses all of humanity:

Situating itself in solidarity with the entire human race, Gaudium et Spes embraces the church’s mission of service and expresses its desire to shed the light of scripture on “the joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the people of our time, especially those who are poor or afflicted.” In other passages it will be clear that the outreach is not one way; rather, the council wishes a genuine dialogue in which the church not only shares the wisdom of Christian faith but also learns from the world.

9 “Gaudium et Spes,” 1.
10 “Gaudium et Spes,” 33: “The church is guardian of the deposit of God’s word and draws religious and moral principles from it, but it does not always have a ready answer to every question. Still, it is eager to associate the light of revelation with the experience of humanity in trying to clarify the course upon which it has recently entered.” See also Gaudium et Spes sections: 40, 44, 92.
Undergirding the document’s concern for “the people of our time” is its strong emphasis on the humanity of Jesus and its corresponding emphasis on the dignity of every human being as reflected in the reality of the incarnation: Jesus became who we are. This theological anthropology is apparent in the following passage:

Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed in [Christ], has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare. For, by his incarnation, he, the Son of God, has in a certain way united himself with each individual. He worked with human hands, he thought with a human mind. He acted with a human will, and with a human heart he loved. . . . Conformed to the image of the Son who is the firstborn of many brothers and sisters, Christians receive the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom 8:23) by which they are able to fulfill the new law of love. . . . All this holds true not only for Christians but also for all people of good will in whose hearts grace is active invisibly. For since Christ died for everyone, . . . we must hold that the Holy spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partners, in a way known to God, in the paschal mystery.11

By emphasizing the humanity of Jesus, Gaudium et Spes helps us to appreciate a telling parallel between the concern of Jesus for the people of his time and the council’s concern for “the people of our time”—not just the Christian faithful, but all people. Not only are the preaching and parables of Jesus “placed in the context of the social” political, and economic realities of the period in which [the gospels] were written,”12 but also, within that context, they frequently show us Jesus reaching out to strangers (non-Jews), to women, and to all kinds of marginalized

11 “Gaudium et Spes,” 22.
people—tax collectors, public sinners, lepers, etc. The ministry of Jesus was truly inclusive. It is exemplary in its openness to the other.

As many commentators have pointed out, at Vatican II, the Roman Catholic Church began to emerge for the first time as a truly global church, not simply a Western church, and for that reason the other who makes a claim on us in the name of our common humanity is as likely to be found across the world as on the other side of town. Concern for the common good, which is axiomatic in Catholic social thought, may begin at home but is not, in the view of the council, limited by local or national borders:

Because of the increasingly close interdependence that is gradually extending to the entire world, we are today witnessing an extension of the role of the common good, which is the sum total of the social conditions that allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and easily. The resulting rights and obligations are consequently the concern of the entire human race. Every group must take into account the needs and legitimate aspirations of every other group, and even those of the human family as a whole.

Whether at home, on our campuses, in local communities, or in the larger world, the social interdependence—the human solidarity—envisioned by Gaudium et Spes requires individuals to have a sense of personal responsibility for “their obligations in conscience toward themselves and various groups to which they belong.” The document recognizes, moreover, that a developed

14 “Gaudium et Spes,” 26.
15 “Gadium et Spes,” 31.
sense of personal responsibility for the common good is scarcely possible without education. “Above all,” it says, “we must undertake the training of youth from all social backgrounds if we are to produce the kind of men and women so urgently needed today, men and women who not only are highly cultured but are generous in spirit as well.”16 In a similar vein, a subsequent passage of Gaudium et Spes speaks of a “duty” to “ensure the recognition and implementation everywhere of everyone’s right to human and civil culture in harmony with personal dignity, without distinction of race, sex, nation, religion, or social circumstances.”17 In carrying out this duty,

Every effort should be made to provide for those who are capable of it the opportunity to pursue higher studies so that as far as possible they may engage in the functions and services, and play the role in society most in keeping with their talents and the skills they acquire. In this way all the individuals and social groups of a particular people will be able to attain a full development of their cultural life in harmony with their capabilities and traditions.18

Similarly, Gravissimum Educationis, the council’s Declaration on Christian Education, underscores the idea that “all people of whatever race, condition, or age, in virtue of their dignity as human persons, have an inalienable right to education.”19 Mindful of this right, the council asks universities to facilitate entrance “for students of great promise but of modest resources.”20

16 “Gaudium et Spes,” 31 (Emphasis added).
17 Ibid., 60 (Emphasis added).
18 Ibid.
20 “Gravissimum Educationis,” 10.
Taken together, all these passages make the conciliar case for a Catholic university’s commitment to ethnic diversity. We can summarize them by saying that since the time of the council, the church no longer assumes a defensive posture but wants to be in dialogue with the world. The church’s mission includes, in addition to the ministries of word and sacrament, a concern for justice and the development of people, especially those living on the margins of society. Every woman and man is a child of God and has been raised to a new dignity through the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Against this background, the council documents urge the importance of education for the local and global common good and point to the responsibility of educational institutions to promote social interdependence and welcome students "without distinction of race, sex, nation, religion or social circumstances."\(^{20b}\)

In the decades following Vatican II, key documents continued to echo the council’s faith-inspired call for economic development, social justice, and human solidarity in promotion of the common good. Two of these documents are Pope Paul VI’s 1967 encyclical, Populorum Progressio, and Pope John Paul II’s 1987 encyclical, Sollicitudo Rei Socialis. Both documents descend directly from *Gaudium et Spes* and join a long tradition of social encyclicals going back to 1891. And both are referenced in John Paul’s 1990 apostolic constitution on Catholic higher education, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, in the paragraph where the pope touches on a Catholic university’s diversity commitment as part of its responsibility “to contribute concretely to the society within which it works.”\(^{21}\) The entire paragraph is worth quoting as a reprise of the conciliar documents reviewed above:

> The Christian spirit of service to others for the promotion of social justice is of particular importance for each Catholic university; to be shared by its teachers and developed in its students. The church is firmly committed to the integral growth of all men and women (cf. Sollicitudo Rei Socialis #27–34). The Gospel, interpreted in the social teachings of the church, is an urgent call to promote “the development of those people who are striving to escape from hunger, misery, endemic diseases and ignorance; of those who are looking for a wider share in the benefits of civilization, and a more active improvement of their human qualities; of those who are aiming purposefully at their complete fulfillment” (Populorum Progressio #1). Every Catholic university feels responsible to contribute concretely to the society within which it works: for example, [by making] university education accessible to all those who are able to benefit from it, especially the poor or members of minority groups who customarily have been deprived, of it. A Catholic university also has the responsibility, to the degree that it is able, to help to promote the development of the emerging nations.\(^{22}\)

Like the documents of the council, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* sees a university’s commitment to ethnic minorities, the poor, and other underrepresented groups as an act of social justice— as a necessary expression of the church’s gospel-based concern for the common good and the development of peoples. Such a commitment is to be realized primarily in the context of the university’s home country. Yet it is not surprising that the church’s concern is global and that in the postcolonial era, Catholic universities are encouraged to cultivate in their faculty and students an awareness of the needs of emerging nations.

---

20b "Gaudium et Spes," 60.
22 Ibid., 34 (Emphasis added).
In their 1980 statement *Catholic Higher Education* and the *Pastoral Mission of the Church*, the U.S. bishops offered universities similar encouragement for an international perspective, even while emphasizing a strong diversity commitment as required by the social reality of the United States. For the bishops, such a commitment extends not only to student recruitment and financial aid but also to faculty hiring and the presence of minorities on boards of trustees. This is what the bishops wrote:

> As new minority groups seek educational opportunities, Catholic institutions should strive to respond to their legitimate needs, providing student aid and an education that respects their culture while offering the benefits of the Christian heritage. We have in mind Blacks, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and other minorities, but, especially, Hispanic Americans, whose own Catholic culture is so rich and whose numbers are so great... We ask that attention be given to the need for the presence of minority persons on boards of trustees and faculties of these institutions. [Moreover,] because the unity of all people under God is a fundamental principle of Catholic theology, an international point of view should be evident on the Catholic campus.

As is clear from the bishops’ statement, from papal documents, and from key passages of Vatican II, contemporary Catholic universities have a responsibility to share in the church’s postconciliar concern for the development of individuals and societies. It is ultimately a concern for—a belief in—human dignity, social justice, and the common good. It provides the broad context in which the documents we have reviewed situate a Catholic university’s commitment to ethnic diversity and provide the motivation for it. I turn now to a consideration of how such a commitment can be furthered when diverse groups and individuals attend to the church’s post Vatican II emphasis on dialogue.

**Beyond Tolerance: Embracing Dialogue**

At first glance it might appear that the success of a university’s commitment to ethnic diversity could be measured in terms of minority student enrollment, faculty ethnicity, retention rates, and so on. But are such indices enough? Or, to ask the question another way, does a commitment to diversity imply more than providing educational access to previously under-represented groups? For those whose epistemology valorizes the context in which learning
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takes place, the answer to this latter question is a resounding “yes.” They see the embrace of diversity as offering positive educational benefits for the entire campus community. They see that for students, as well as faculty and staff, a diverse community promotes openness to intellectual, ethical, and spiritual dimensions of truth previously unseen. As a benefit specifically for students, this enhanced understanding is aptly described in the amicus brief filed by the University of Chicago and other institutions in the affirmative-action case brought against the University of Michigan:

Students are both recipients and providers of the learning that takes place at universities, and [universities] have a vital interest in what students bring to the task of educating each other. . . . Diversity helps students confront perspectives other than their own and thus to think more vigorously and imaginatively; it helps students learn to relate to persons from different backgrounds; it helps students become better citizens. The educational benefits of student diversity include the discovery that there is a broad range of viewpoints and experience within any given minority community—as well as learning that certain imagined differences at times turn out to be only skin deep.25

Chicago’s website goes on to point out that when meaningful diversity is absent, “homogeneity perpetuates unchallenged assumptions—the very antithesis of what a university stands for.” On the other hand, when there is a critical mass of diverse faculty, staff, and students, as Fairfield University President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., has remarked, “interaction, understanding, enlightenment, and conversion” occur.26 Informal and informal settings, dialogue happens, and diversity’s value-added educational benefits click in.

So a full-fledged commitment to ethnic diversity means more than opening the doors to minority groups. It has implications as well for members of the majority community. It is not enough that they support an official policy of nondiscrimination, or remain free of bias or prejudice, or proclaim tolerance for ethnic groups other than their own. A full-fledged commitment to diversity, teleologically grounded in Catholic beliefs in human dignity, social justice, and the common good, will mean more than tolerance. It will mean outreach to the other. And it will mean, on a Catholic campus, embracing the spirit of dialogue bequeathed to the church by Vatican II.

We have already noted the emphasis that *Gaudium et Spes* places on dialogue with the world. The actual word ‘dialogue’ (dialogus) appears four times in that document and even more often in the decree on ecumenism (five times) and the decree on the church’s missionary activity (six times). It is also used in the decree on religious liberty; and throughout the documents the related word ‘discussion’ (colloquium) is used even more widely. But the council did more than talk about discussion and dialogue. Vatican II also practiced what it preached, and, according to Joseph Komonchak, continues to serve as a model for dialogue. The council, he writes, “provided ample room for discussion [and] debate, for disagreement, and, as often as not, these were dealt with by conciliation and compromise for the sake of as broad a consensus as possible.”

Dialogue—in the sense of a willingness to engage with others on sensitive topics like religion, politics, or culture—is rarely easy and not always successful. Yet, in the spirit of Vatican II, it belongs at the heart of a Catholic university’s commitment to ethnic diversity. As Bradford Hintze suggests in the following description, taken from his study of practices of dialogue in the Catholic Church since Vatican II, dialogue does not guarantee moving beyond tolerance, yet it holds great promise for doing just that—for breaking down barriers and building community:

The distinctive, dynamic feature of dialogue . . . is the back-and-forth movement in communication between individuals in which people are acting both as speakers and listeners and there is an exchange of messages that provide the condition for possible common understandings, judgments, decisions, and actions. Through this exchange people can gain insight into their personal and communal identity and into the world; horizons expand, minds and hearts change, conversions occur. Such a dynamic supplies the necessary ingredients in the formation of bonds of relationship, bonds that may withstand varieties of hostility, or elicit uneasy tolerance, but that also provide the condition for the possibility of the deepest forms of sociality, friendship, and love.

In an article addressing the mission of Catholic higher education in a divided world, David Hollenbach, S.J., is similarly optimistic about the possibilities of dialogue for breaking down barriers that have traditionally divided local and global communities. He is specifically concerned with a renewed dedication in Catholic universities to the common good, which of course includes harmonious relationships among ethnic groups. In developing his argument he makes

28 Ibid., 126.
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Hollenbach believes that the common good, a central theme in Catholic tradition long before Vatican II (it has roots in Aristotle and was discussed by Aquinas) is in serious trouble today from both American and global pluralism. He points out that many thinkers (e.g., John Rawls) claim that we cannot be expected to agree on the good we share in common. Without such agreement, groups that are fundamentally divergent in their culture, religious tradition, or way of life appear as threats to one another. “The most they can hope for is tolerance, and for many middle-class Americans, this is the highest good.”

Hollenbach argues that Catholic universities are well situated to counter this predilection for individual goods over the common good. Catholic universities, he writes,

... have a particular capacity and special responsibility to bring reflection on the common good to bear on the [racial, ethnic, and class] divisions of our metropolitan areas and on the cultural and religious conflicts that divide our globalizing world. ... The teaching and research of Catholic universities ought to be making notable contributions to understanding how metropolitan and global interdependence can embody commitment to the common good. This can be called the university’s mission of solidarity.

According to Hollenbach, this mission of solidarity in pursuit of the local and global common good can take two forms: social and intellectual solidarity. Both presuppose dialogue.

Social solidarity reflects the idea, prominent in Catholic social thought, that the dignity of human persons comes to fruition in community. Social solidarity therefore rejects all forms of personal interaction “that reinforce inequality and existing patterns of exclusion, whether these be economic, political, or cultural.”

It is equivalent to what Aristotle called “civic friendship” and is a prerequisite for justice. Indeed, the ultimate injustice—the negation of social solidarity—happens when “a person or group [is] treated actively or abandoned passively as if they were non-members of the human race.”

Unjust exclusion can take many forms, whether on a college campus or in the wider community, and people who promote it—or simply tolerate it when they could do otherwise—fail in their responsibility to the common good. It is the duty of Catholic higher education to

---
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sensitize students to the responsibilities of social solidarity or civic friendship and help them envision ways to live it out, ways that involve talking and interacting—dialogue—with individuals from groups other than their own.

Intellectual solidarity, which implies a more structured academic context than social solidarity, calls for honest, respectful dialogue that is hopeful of convergence and open to the possibility of growth. According to Hollenbach, intellectual solidarity requires “more than a tolerance that simply leaves others who are different alone...it requires both listening and speaking in a genuine conversation across the boundaries that have traditionally divided the world.” He adds this particularly apposite observation:

Overall the Catholic intellectual tradition [has] a conviction that cultures holding different visions of the good life can get somewhere if they are willing to risk serious engagement with one another. This conviction should above all shape the Catholic university today, marking [its members] with a readiness to listen to those with different views...while being unafraid to speak [their own] convictions with true humility.

Like Hollenbach, William M. Shea finds a strong impetus within the Catholic intellectual tradition, spurred on by Vatican II, for active dialogue with—rather than passive tolerance of—those from other backgrounds or traditions. In an article entitled “Beyond Tolerance: Pluralism and Catholic Higher Education,” Shea focuses on religious pluralism, but his general analysis of tolerance and its shortcomings is equally relevant when applied to ethnic pluralism. He cites a dictionary definition of tolerance—“to suffer to be or to be done without prohibition, hindrance, or contradiction”—and notes (as did Hollenbach) that although tolerance in this sense is a useful political virtue, it is “essentially negative,” namely, “the willingness and the ability to put up with something the elimination of which might be more difficult or dangerous.”

Shea then differentiates three types of tolerance. He calls the first type the tolerance of the Enlightenment. It is characterized by a concealed classicism and “takes its own truth for granted, along with the falsity or inauthenticity of the tolerated.” For Shea, this type of tolerance “leads nowhere,” least of all to understanding. It can be the tolerance of a bigot. Shea’s second type—relativist tolerance—is characteristic of what he calls the “muddle headed liberal.” Far from being a bigot, the liberal relativist may profess openness but “will not engage in serious critical conversation about beliefs and values because, in the final analysis, no belief or value is incorrect or wrong.” Shea’s critique of these first two types of tolerance is devastating:

The tolerance of the Enlightenment and the tolerance of liberalism are no longer adequate for dealing with the realities of American political, academic, and ecclesial life. They either permit us to avoid and ignore the other or they permit us to talk with the other without taking the conversation seriously. They militate against the very task of education: they may allow the other, whether student or faculty member, to “construct their world of meaning” but they do not aid in it or lead to it. Neither of these versions of
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tolerance befits the teacher or the administrator who cares about the integrity of education….39

But there is a third type of tolerance, which Shea calls “active tolerance” and which closely resembles Hollenbach’s social and intellectual solidarity. Neither arrogant (like the tolerance of the Enlightenment) nor condescending (like relativist tolerance), active tolerance “is based on humility and on respect for the minds and hearts and history of others. . . . When it is practiced with full heart, it is the sort of tolerance that seeks the truth in the life and words of another and assumes that there is a truth there to be found.”40 For Shea, this type of tolerance—he says perhaps it should be called by another name—is a “crucial” virtue in academic life.41 It is the tolerance of genuine dialogue—it requires careful listening as well as speaking—and happens only when participants from different racial, ethnic, or religious groups (or from both sides of a disputed question) take responsibility for their convictions and express what is most meaningful to them with clarity, courage and a willingness to grow in mutual understanding.

Shea makes a convincing case that the first two types of tolerance are not up to the task of fruitful academic discourse, leaving us free to conclude that something more is required if faculty, staff, and students are going to embrace (rather than give hesitating or indifferent approval to) a commitment to ethnic diversity. That “something more” is the kind of dialogue that, as Shea acknowledges, moves beyond tolerance to a genuine willingness to engage the other.

As we saw in the first part of this paper, a basic commitment to ethnic diversity on the part of a Catholic university is not simply a political statement but is also, and more fundamentally, an expression of religious identity. Similarly, the embrace of diversity as offering positive educational benefits to an entire campus community takes on added urgency at Catholic universities because it is an opportunity to put into practice the spirit of dialogue bequeathed to the church by Vatican II. In their overlapping emphases on dialogue and social/intellectual solidarity, Shea and Hollenbach take us beyond tolerance and help us to see that a Catholic university’s commitment to ethnic diversity cannot be simply a matter of nondiscrimination in providing access for

39 Ibid., 39.
40 Ibid.
historically under-represented minority groups. It is indeed that, but it is also an opportunity for majority as well as minority members of a university community to engage one another in their pursuit of knowledge and, in that enterprise, to open themselves to new possibilities of friendship and love. “To risk serious engagement,” in Hollenbach’s phrase, is to embrace the kind of dialogue that moves away from a person’s comfort zone and ordinary frames of reference (thus it is a risk) in order to create an epistemological world where new knowledge can be born and where human dignity will be respected, social justice promoted, and the common good advanced. In a university setting there are many occasions, both formal and informal, intellectual and social, for such dialogue. In a Catholic university, embracing them is an opportunity—and also a responsibility—to break down barriers of fear, to expand horizons, and to grow in human solidarity.

**Particularity and Inclusivity: A Creative Tension**

As crucial as ethnic diversity may be for the identity of today’s Catholic university, it is nonetheless only a part of that identity. We saw above that the documents of Vatican II (especially *Gaudium et Spes*), as well as subsequent ecclesial statements, help us situate a Catholic commitment to ethnic diversity in the church’s concern for human dignity, social justice, and the common good. Yet in developing such themes and in its desire to honor diversity—Catholicity with a small “c”—the council “drew upon the wider intellectual heritage of Catholicism, the broader theological framework within which the social fits.” This “wider intellectual heritage”—which in fact is not exclusively theological, which includes an imaginative as well as an intellectual dimension, and which is perhaps more aptly called the “Catholic cultural tradition”—is the birthright and defining characteristic of Catholic universities. It differentiates them from their

42 Loyola Marymount University Brochure. *Interculturalism: Definition, Vision, and Goals*. October 2005. The kinds of dialogue I have been emphasizing as incumbent upon a Catholic university in the spirit of Vatican II overlap with the pro-active approach to ethnic diversity known as interculturalism. At Loyola Marymount University, for example, interculturalism is defined as “sharing and learning across cultures with the aim of promoting understanding, equity, harmony, and justice in a diverse society.” The interculturalism vision statement elaborates: “Grounded in the Catholic intellectual tradition, Loyola Marymount University affirms human dignity and promotes justice. Different cultures are unique expressions of these common aspirations. All cultures can contribute to the search for knowledge and the building of communities based on the common humanity of all people. At LMU interculturalism is an essential source of academic excellence and a defining characteristic of our campus community. We draw upon interculturalism to create a university of excellence, to serve as a model Catholic institution, and to be a catalyst for the creation of a more just society built on respect and a sense of shared destiny.”


secular counterparts and, in some respects, from other church-related colleges and universities. To the extent that it is alive and well, it keeps these universities—at the heart of their academic life as well as in their institutional ethos—true to their identity and ensures that they remain not only inclusive but also Catholic in a particular sense, Catholic with a large “C.” Such universities, even as they grow in academic distinction, aspire to be recognized as centers of Catholic life and culture; indeed, as places where the church does its thinking.

An increasing volume of literature has appeared in recent years on the Catholic cultural/intellectual tradition and on the nature of Catholic higher education, much of it motivated by a concern that Catholic universities not go the way of many originally Protestant institutions that threw off their religious identity during the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth.45 It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a comprehensive overview of this literature, so let it suffice for present purposes to note that the cultural/intellectual tradition that belongs at the heart of a Catholic university includes characteristics such as these46:

1. It views the world as sacramental and seeks to find God in all things. Whereas classic Protestantism stresses the otherness of God, Catholicism, with its strong focus on the incarnation, refuses to lose sight of the immanence of God. In the words of Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins, “The world is charged with the grandeur of God.” On this view, the world is filled with signs that speak to us of hidden realities, as do the church’s seven sacraments—outward signs of graced experience. Especially in the Eucharist, believers encounter Christ and, in communion with him, grow in community with one another.

---

45 Associated Press, “Church Ties Loosened by Many Universities,” Los Angeles Times, August 22, 1992, B4-B5. An iconic example was the dramatic decision of Presbyterian-founded Occidental College in Los Angeles to remove the cross from its campus chapel as the college strove to project a pluralistic image. According to President John Slaughter, “Part of the problem here was that the college was perceived to be continuing to behave as though it were a Christian college. This created some difficulties with students and faculty members.” (B5).


2. It takes philosophical and theological thinking seriously. Catholics are not fundamentalists nor do they hold to the principle of sola scriptura. They view theology as faith seeking understanding, and from the beginning they have sought to give an accounting of what they believe. Early on they began to see their faith through the lens of Greek thought and thus brought into the church a tradition of philosophical reflection. It flourished in the first universities, founded by the church in the middle ages, and continues to the present day. In contrast to the dominant secular view, Catholic tradition stresses the ability of the human mind to arrive at reasonably argued conclusions and, ultimately, to know objective truth.47

3. It esteems both intellect and imagination. In Catholic tradition, the speculative mind of Thomas Aquinas is no less esteemed than the poetic imagination of Dante Alighieri. While extremists among the Reformers were smashing statues and destroying stained glass in their zeal to purify religion, Catholic devotion was fostering the use of imagination in prayer and promoting a baroque sensual exuberance in art and architecture. Although not without its own strain of Puritanism, Catholic tradition, in esteeming works of imagination as well as intellect, honors both sides of the flesh-spirit duality. Given the tradition’s emphasis on incarnation, it could do no less.

4. It eschews the supposition that there can be value-free facts. Was the dropping of an atomic bomb on Hiroshima merely a fact or also a moral evil? For Catholic thinkers, it was, of course, both. In Catholic tradition facts are rarely simple, autonomous realities but have implicit teleologies and value implications. As Margaret O’Brien Steinfels has observed, “The notion that education can be a value-neutral process in which teachers simply convey facts and students simply receive them, in which behavior is neither right nor wrong but a matter of personal choice, in which judgments are neither better or worse, but simply someone’s opinion, is nonsense.”48

5. It respects the integrity of the individual but also pursues the common good. The American ethos, as influenced by classic Protestantism, exalts the autonomy of the individual and is thus not entirely comfortable with the idea of the common good. Catholicism, on the other hand, takes seriously the demands of biblical justice and social solidarity. Even while it has learned from Protestantism a deepened respect for individual integrity, it “elevates to an unusual degree the embeddedness of the individual within a collective identity.”49 As we have already seen, this concern for the common good is reflected in the documents of Vatican II and other ecclesial writings. In a specifically American context, Robert Bellah views Catholics as having a special responsibility to promote the common

47 For a position quite at odds with the Catholic intellectual tradition, cf. media commentator Tim Rutten’s description and criticism of “a strong new current in American life—the culture of assertion, which increasingly pushes logical argument out of our public conversation. According to this schema, things are true because I believe they are true and you have to respect that, because it’s what I believe.” Rutten adds that the culture of assertion “makes things like creationism an issue in our schools and the demands of biblical literalism a force in our politics.” (Los Angeles Times [May 20, 2006], E13). Tim Rutten. “Concoct a Word War? It Won’t Crack This Code,” Los Angeles Times, May 20, 2006, E1, E13.


49 Roche, The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University, 11.
good as a counter-balance to the dominant individualism of our culture.\textsuperscript{50}

6. It seeks an integration of knowledge in which “faith and reason bear harmonious witness to the unity of all truth.”\textsuperscript{51} All learning, all intellectual disciplines shed light on the created world and point beyond to the Source of truth. In Catholic tradition, this is why faith and reason are not antagonistic or ultimately contradictory and why there is optimism about the ability of the mind to know objective truth. It is also why contemporary Catholicism encourages dialogue with culture and other faith traditions; why it looks, as toward a horizon never quite attained, for the integration of knowledge, not its compartmentalization.\textsuperscript{52} The search for the unity of truth and integration of knowledge is reflected in the propensity of Catholic universities to raise ethical/moral questions across the disciplines, to place equal emphasis on teaching and research, and to link the liberal arts with professional training.

In its emphasis on ethical values and dialogue and in its concern for social justice, solidarity, and the common good, this list of characteristics reinforces the grounding for a Catholic university’s commitment to ethnic diversity that we reviewed more extensively in earlier sections of this paper. At the same time, even this brief glimpse at the Catholic intellectual/cultural tradition suggests that a university claiming Catholic identity will need to live out this claim in ways that can leave no doubt as to its distinctive and unifying religious ethos. It will indeed welcome to the campus community and actively engage non-Catholics, ethnic minorities, and members of other previously under-represented groups. More fundamentally, however, it will ensure that it nurtures and makes available to successive generations of students the full riches of the Catholic intellectual tradition. It will therefore promote, in the words of \textit{Ex Corde Ecclesiae}, “a continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute by its own research”\textsuperscript{53}—research that “necessarily includes (a) the

\textsuperscript{50}This is the theme of Bellah’s article cited above. Interestingly, he remarks, page 13, a strong correlation between the common good and the Catholic emphasis on the sacraments, especially the Eucharist: “The sacraments pull us into an embodied world of relationships and connections . . . rather than a world in which individuals attempt to escape from society.” The tension between individuals and society is already implicit in an earlier work, Bellah et al., \textit{Habits of the Heart} (Berkeley: UC Press, 1985). Robert Putnam’s evocatively titled \textit{Bowling Alone} (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) also addresses this tension.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Ex Corde Ecclesiae}, 17.
\textsuperscript{52} Roche, \textit{The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University}, 29–30, finds a grounding for academic freedom in the Catholic approach to discovering truth: “The defense of academic freedom need not arise only from the Protestant elevation of the autonomy of the individual; it can equally derive from the Catholic elevation of truth as that which is best discovered by our having listened carefully to all possible positions.”
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Ex Corde Ecclesiae}, #13.
search for an integration of knowledge, (b) a dialogue between faith and reason, (c) an ethical concern, and (d) a theological perspective.” 54

In sum, a truly Catholic university will be known for its inclusivity but even more for its dedication to the intellectual/cultural tradition that is its birthright—and that undergirds its commitment to diversity more profoundly than any consideration of legal or political exigency might do.

No one claims it is easy to achieve the dual goals of particularity and inclusivity—of a strong Catholic identity and simultaneous commitment to ethnic diversity. As noted above, engagement across cultural divides can be a risky business. And, to cite an example from the volatile realm of faculty hiring, Thomas Monahan, Dean of Commerce and Finance at Villanova University, believes that “the goal of diversity implies a potential conflict with the goals of preserving our Augustinian Catholic identity.” 55 Other potential conflicts or turf battles—in student recruitment, core curriculum emphases, allocation of resources, etc.—are not hard to imagine. Yet such conflicts need not be either/or situations. Catholicism is no stranger to the reconciling of tensions. As the church’s intellectual-cultural tradition suggests, a whole range of polarities is endemic to Catholic life. We have already noted those between transcendence and immanence, faith and reason, grace and nature, fact and value, individual and community; and still others could be added, for example, between obedience and freedom, or between prayer and work. 56 In each of these polarities, as long as both sides remain in creative tension, with neither side trumping the other, balance is achieved and the vibrancy of the tradition is assured.

This paradigm can be a reassuring source of hope for United States Catholic universities as they seek to balance their faith-inspired commitment to ethnic diversity and educational equity for traditionally under-represented groups with fidelity to the unifying religious heritage that supports and enriches that commitment.

Robert V. Caro, S.J., is the Former Vice President for Mission & Ministry, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA.

54 Ex Corde Ecclesiae, #15.
56 William A. Barry, S.J., and Robert G. Doherty, S.J., have explored the tensions characteristic of Jesuit spirituality in a small book entitled Contemplatives in Action: The Jesuit Way (New York: Paulist Press, 2002). Mutatis mutandis, what they say of balancing the tensions in Jesuit spirituality speaks as well to the range of polarities inherent in Catholic life. They write that “Jesuit spirituality functions best when [the] tensions are alive and clearly felt, that is, when Jesuits experience within themselves the pulls of both sides of each polarity” (5).
Benefits of a Diverse Faculty: A Review of the Literature

Abbie Robinson-Armstrong

Colleges and universities with a predominantly white faculty drastically limit the institution’s ability to provide educational experiences that produce “an empowered, informed, and responsible student capable of negotiating the inevitable differences in a diverse society” (University of Arizona 2006, 1). Conversely, an institution with a diverse faculty provides significant benefits for everyone in the campus community. In this paper, we define a diverse faculty as one that is characterized by a “diversity of experience, age, physical ability, religion, ethnicity, gender, and other human attributes” (Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute 2004, 2).

According to the American Psychological Association, many institutions strive to create a diverse faculty to ensure a broad representation of viewpoints, paradigms, and content expertise (APA 1994). Not only can a diverse faculty prepare students to live and work in an increasingly complex global society, a professorate marked by diversity (1) “promotes cognitive, social and emotional growth and development in students, (2) increases and raises the level of intellectual discussion within the faculty, and (3) adds multiple perspectives, theories and approaches to scholarship and the curriculum that students consume” (Milem and Hakuta 2000, 39).

While colleges and universities have experienced steady growth in the ethnic and gender diversity of student populations, they have not experienced similar growth in the faculty (Turner 2002). According to Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, and Richards (2004), many campuses engage in efforts to diversify the faculty—usually fueled by arguments related to the increasingly diverse student population and the need to prepare all students for a diverse society—but the reality is that the least successful of diversity initiatives is in the area of faculty diversity.

Methodology

The primary goal of our research was to conduct an integrative review of the literature. According to Jackson, an integrative review infers “generalizations about substantive issues from a set of studies directly bearing on those issues” (1980, 438). Our intent was to summarize
accumulated knowledge and highlight important issues concerning the benefits of faculty diversity (Cooper 1982). In 2006, we began our search for scholarly literature on the benefits of a diverse faculty by reviewing research that spanned a ten-year period, 1998–2008. The resources collected included journal articles, book chapters, books, and reports.


Keyword searches consisted of the following terms: benefits of faculty diversity, diversifying the faculty, educational benefits of diversity, valuing diversity in faculty, educational value of diversity, and the importance of faculty diversity. What follows is a summary of the literature on the benefits of a diverse faculty. Specifically, we describe the ways in which a diverse faculty impacts colleges and universities, student learning and citizenship outcomes, student retention and persistence, faculty, the curriculum, and campus climate.

**Impact on Colleges and Universities**

**Helps Institutions Fulfill the Mission of Higher Education**

Gurin states that the overarching mission of higher education is “to prepare young people for active participation in our democratic society, which is an increasingly diverse society” (2001,1). The researcher further noted that

institutions of higher education have an obligation, first and foremost, to create the best possible educational environment for the young adults whose lives are likely to be significantly changed during their years on
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campus. Specific objectives may vary from one institution to another, but all efforts must be directed
to ensuring an optimal educational environment for these young people who are at a critical stage of
development that will complete the foundation for how they will conduct their lives. (1)

An analysis of the mission statements of the top twenty-eight liberal arts colleges in the
United States, as ranked by *U.S. News and World Report*, supported Gurin’s philosophical stance
on the mission and purpose of American higher education. The mission statements contained a
range of essential aspirations that surpassed intellectual mastery as a goal (Anon. 2000). More than
half of the institutions included the following values in their mission statements: “(1) developing
self knowledge and growing personally, (2) learning perspectives from diversity, (3) developing
and nurturing a liberated, creative mind, and (4) gaining an increased capacity for tolerance,
respect, and concern for others” (2). The value of learning from diversity was recognized by more
than 60 percent of these colleges. Tolerance and respect for others was an essential element in 57
percent of their mission statements.

Enhances an Institution’s Academic Reputation

The presence of faculty from diverse backgrounds enhances an institution’s academic
reputation among its key constituents, including students, parents, funding agencies, and American
corporations. Today’s sophisticated students and their parents understand the value of emersion
in a diverse college environment. Parents tend to encourage their children to select institutions
that can provide opportunities for them to interact with students and faculty who are different
from themselves. Funding agencies and foundations, such as the Kellogg Foundation and the
Ford Foundation, place a high emphasis on diversity within the institutions they choose to
fund. American corporations increasingly demand that institutions of higher education produce
graduates “who have studied, confronted, and appreciated diverse points of view” (Maher 2002,
1). To meet the demands of these important constituencies, institutions must aggressively recruit
and retain a diverse faculty (APA 1994; Humphreys 1995; Maher 2002; Maimon and Garcia
1997; Milem 2003; Tatum 2003).

Helps an Institution Achieve Its Mission of Excellence in Research and Teaching

In order to prepare students for the new global reality, institutions must fully engage their
communities of scholars in cutting-edge research that incorporates multiple views, theories,
and approaches. “By nurturing a diverse group of scholars, [a] university can participate fully in
current scholarly discussions and activities that sustain and improve the academic reputation”
(Maher 2002, 1). According to Smith and Moses, a diverse university speaks to the core of the
vitality and viability of an institution. Only through a diverse faculty can all of those concerned,
as well as society as a whole, “draw from a full range of perspectives that both challenge and
inform knowledge production and dissemination” (2004, 1).

Helps an Institution Prepare Students for a New Global Reality

A diverse faculty plays a major role in preparing students for a workforce that is undergoing
rapid and unexpected changes. A diverse workforce, from the perspective of the business
community, will lead to a successful enterprise. A diverse faculty draws on the strengths of a variety of sources and enables differing viewpoints to enter into the dialogue to resolve problems. Maimon and Garcia said, “in order to prepare all students for a new global reality, our universities must provide an environment that values the differences that make every individual unique and inspires all students and faculty to reach their full potential” (1997, 4). Turner sums it up nicely, Major companies seem to be discovering that diversity is vital to their success. If higher education intends to continue to educate students for the world of work, it must also embrace the contributions different perspectives can bring. In other words, institutions need to provide arenas in which students can interact and exchange ideas with professors from diverse backgrounds. As the populations of minority groups continue to grow in this country, the viability of U. S. higher education may depend on the ability of colleges and universities to meet this goal. (2000, 1)

**Helps an Institution Demonstrate Support for Fairness and Justice**

According to Tatum, diversity is not simply a good idea. It provides evidence that colleges and universities are fair in their thinking and just in their practices. “Twenty years ago, a lack of diversity within a university faculty was a consequence of unequal opportunity in American society. Today, a lack of diversity within a university faculty suggests unequal opportunity in that university” (2003, 2).

**Impact of a Diverse Faculty on Student Learning and Citizenship Outcomes**

**Increases Student Learning and Citizenship Outcomes**

A diverse faculty impacts student learning and citizenship outcomes in a number of ways (Wilds 2000). According to Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Smith (2003), learning outcomes are impacted by a distinctive use of pedagogical techniques, the introduction of diversity in the curriculum, and experiential opportunities that allow students to utilize in real life the concepts they have learned in the classroom. Moreover, learning outcomes associated with diversity and inclusion impact students’ academic growth, cognitive development, complex thinking skills, intellectual self-confidence, motivation, and institutional satisfaction and involvement (University of Arizona 2006). For example, Wilds cited a study by Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996) that found that students who engage in activities that provide opportunities to formulate positive relationships with other students and faculty from backgrounds different from their own showed measurable gains in their critical thinking skills, reported greater openness to diversity and challenge, and exhibited reduced levels of ethnocentrism.

**Increases Benefits for European American Students**

Research has also shown that a diverse faculty provides more benefits for European American students than for students of color, particularly those coming from homogenous backgrounds who have had little if any previous contact with minorities, and whose interpretations of minorities are primarily influenced by negative media images (Alger 1997). The existence of minorities
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in faculty positions provides students with diverse role models and increases the likelihood for students to interact with them and develop more effective mentoring relationships (Turner 2002). Furthermore, according to Chang (2007) and Austin (1993) (as cited in Diversity Digest 1997), “the more diverse the faculty and student body, the greater the likelihood that the [European American] student will socialize with someone of a different [ethnic] group or discuss [cultural issues].” (3) Cross-cultural interaction has been shown to contribute to the students’ “academic development, college GPA, satisfaction with college, level of cultural awareness . . . commitment to multiculturalism and diversity, intellectual self-confidence, and social self-confidence.” (3) Findings from another study further underscore the long-term educational benefits of cross-cultural interaction for [European American] students. Using post-college graduation survey data, the study found that “interacting with [people] of color during and after college has a positive effect on [European American] males’ post-college sense of social responsibility and participation in community service activities” (Villapando 1996, as cited in Diversity Digest 1997, 3-4).

Increases Student Retention and Persistence

Interaction with a diverse faculty also plays a critical role in student retention and persistence (Alger 1999, Antonio 2003, Hurtado 2001, Millem 2003, Western Association of Schools and Colleges 2001). Research has shown that the single leading predictor of college attrition is insufficient interaction with other members in a college community (Pascarella and Terenzini 1979, as cited in Nagda, Gregerman, Jonides, von Hippel, and Lerner 1998). Sufficient interaction involves sustained, informal contact—students interacting with other students and faculty—and it must occur early in a student’s career in college, a time when he or she has a greater likelihood
of leaving (Levin and Levin 1991, as cited in Nagda et al. 1998). Noel and smith (1996) found that European American, African American, and Mexican American students prefer to disclose information to faculty members of their own cultural background. African American and Mexican American students, however, have a stronger preference, especially concerning topics of a cultural, academic, or sensitive nature, which further strengthens the case for faculty diversity.

Additionally, minority students comment that the presence of a diverse faculty provides a welcoming atmosphere, which increases the likelihood that they will connect with role models who share their same experience and beliefs. Daryl Smith (1989), in her book *The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy?* described the benefits of faculty diversity in higher education, particularly for students of color: faculty diversity (1) provides support for students from diverse backgrounds; (2) serves as a symbol of the institution’s commitment to people of color; (3) creates a more comfortable environment for students, as well as for faculty and staff, of color; (4) broadens the range of what is taught and how it is taught; and (5) creates opportunities for collaboration to occur among minority and majority faculty. Thus, for students of color, “the absence of faculty and staff of color signals that it may be difficult to get the support and mentoring that they need to achieve academic success” (Feagin 2002, 26). Students need to feel that it is possible to achieve the objectives they have for themselves and that there are people who are willing to assist them by serving as advisers and sources of inspiration.

### Impact of a Diverse Faculty on the Curriculum

#### Adds Multiple Perspectives, Theories, and Approaches to Scholarship

Diversity in the faculty has increased the production of new knowledge about sociocultural differences. Women and faculty of color employ a wider range of pedagogical techniques. They are more likely to introduce readings and research that address the contributions of women and minorities in their courses (Milem 2003). Gurin (2001) found that after four years of college, students who were exposed to diversity in the curriculum demonstrated higher intellectual and civic engagement than students who had little to no exposure to diversity in the classroom. Thus, the presence of a diverse faculty not only improves intellectual engagement and academic motivation, but it also diversifies the course offerings, texts, and classroom examples, which improves communication, understanding, and interaction among individuals of diverse backgrounds (Alger 1997; Wilds 2000).

Paul Penfield, professor of electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), wrote that

> Women and minority faculty bring to the department a different perspective on engineering. Whether because of biology or culture, women usually tend to have somewhat different beliefs about what is important, about appropriate uses of technology, and about how human occupations, including engineering, are or should be carried on. These different attitudes and styles should be represented in our teaching and research program. Our students’ education is incomplete without them. (1993, 3)
Contributions from faculty of varied backgrounds incorporate multiple scholarly perspectives, theories, and approaches. They also help faculty learn how to teach in a diverse classroom effectively. John Brooks Slaughter, president emeritus of Occidental College and former director of the National Science Foundation, stated that “through the use of team teaching and interdisciplinary approaches to education as well as syllabi rich with contributions from a multiplicity of sources, the strengths of a diverse faculty can be exercised in a highly effective manner” (2000, 25).

Antonio (2002) found several trends on the impact of faculty diversification on scholarship. Although European American faculty produced more research as measured by traditional means, faculty from diverse backgrounds “were more likely to place a high degree of personal importance on engaging in research activities, to spend more time per week engaged in research and writing, and to feel that the opportunity to pursue research was a very important consideration in choosing a career in academe” (2001, 591). While most if not all faculty believe that colleges should be involved in solving problems and influencing change in society, diverse faculty were more likely to take personal responsibility for participation in social change and more likely to advise students involved in community service. The findings suggest that these are deep and compelling reasons to renew with vigor efforts to diversify the faculty. “Faculty of color bring to the academy a unique combination of values and philosophies from which higher education can benefit” (Antonio 2002, 598).

Reduces Isolation

A diverse faculty may also reduce the isolation experienced by women and people of color, which may lead to increased productivity and a greater likelihood of promotion (Lamont, Kalev, Bowden, and Fosse 2004). According to Antonio, “resistance to diversity in less diverse environments contributes to an inhospitable climate for faculty from diverse backgrounds.”
Diversity among the faculty and the student body also forces institutions to improve their climates for diversity, creates a sense of community, and provides opportunities for role modeling and mentorship.

Alleviates Negative Stereotypes

The benefits of faculty diversity may be even more valuable for faculty than for students, especially as it serves to break down negative stereotypes about the intellectual authority and expertise of women and faculty of color. According to Alger, European American faculty may have the most to gain from interaction with diverse faculty, “because as members of [the] majority [group], they have lived in a culture where most people in positions of authority are also [European American]” (1999, 5). Face-to-face interaction is a critical component of the learning process, and if properly channeled, it can enrich the educational experience for everyone on campus.

Impact on Campus Climate

A diverse faculty also impacts the campus climate. The presence of underrepresented faculty helps attract and retain new underrepresented faculty. This process provides increased opportunities for intergroup interaction, which, in turn, contributes to creating a healthy climate. “A diverse campus with a healthy climate will both promote and reflect the inclusion of all cultures and perspectives in the research, curriculum, and pedagogy across all disciplines” (UC Campus Climate Work Team 2007, 3). As a result, the university’s commitment to diversity is reinforced.
Discussion

The values in the mission statements of the top twenty-eight liberal arts colleges in the nation indicate that some of our most prestigious institutions understand the value of a diverse academy. They also indicate that, in many instances, faculty and administrators now understand the overarching mission of American higher education—to promote critical reflection and to stimulate cognitive, social, and emotional growth and development that prepares students to live in a diverse society. Colleges and universities cannot realize this mission without recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty (Meacham and Barrett 2003; Smith and Moses 2004). Fifty years of empirical evidence leads researchers to conclude that “a diverse faculty provides substantial benefits [and] thus is essential to [a] university’s well-being and advancement” (Maher 2002, 1). In addition, “a diverse faculty represents a broad range of viewpoints, paradigms, and content expertise” (APA 1994, 8) and therefore “helps all students achieve the essential goals of a college education” (Anon. 2000, 2). Research has also shown that “positive benefits accrue from diversity in the classroom and . . . that [European American] students experience no adverse effects from classroom diversity” (Anon. 2000, 2). Given that American colleges and universities share an essential mission to provide a comprehensive educational experience that prepares students to live and work effectively in an ever-changing global society, it is imperative that they produce graduates from diverse backgrounds “who can be agents of change, who can help to identify and reduce social inequality,” and value differences as positive keys to the academic, social, political, and economic stability of this country (Hurtado 2005, 7).

Given this, colleges and universities cannot continue to rely solely on the knowledge, practices, and experiences of the current majority members of their faculties if they expect to produce college graduates who are adequately prepared for the challenges and expectations of
an evolving global society. Instead, higher education institutions must begin to emphasize the necessity of exposing students to diversity, particularly in the faculty. A diverse faculty enhances student learning and citizenship; contributes a variety of experiences, perspectives, and ideas to the curriculum; decreases attrition rates among students, particularly underrepresented students; and provides significant benefits for European American students. In fact, learning and citizenship outcomes of both minority and European American students alike benefit from exposure to a diverse educational environment (Alger 1999). European American students in particular “receive benefits ranging from enhanced intellectual and social self-confidence to growth in academic skills to increased civic engagement.” (Antonio and Hakuta 2003, 2)

A diverse faculty also teaches all students that women and people of color can succeed in academic environments. “Students think of faculty as successful professionals. Therefore, it is important that our faculty include women and people from minority groups to provide role models or ‘existence proofs’” (Penfield 1993, 3). In addition, a diverse faculty helps students learn how to evaluate differing points of view and understand human differences, as it exposes them to multiple scholarly perspectives and inclusive pedagogies, and enhances their learning outcomes, retention, and academic success (Hurtado 2001; Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Smith 2003; Western Association of Schools and Colleges 2001).

There is a growing body of empirical evidence that offers compelling arguments about the benefits that a diverse faculty provides to the faculty in general (Milem 2003). A diverse faculty brings new kinds of scholarship, reduces isolation experienced by women and faculty of color, breaks down stereotypes, and improves the campus climate (Antonio 2002; Milem 2003; Smith 1989). Thus, when colleges and universities continue to seek and value a diverse faculty, the entire academic community benefits.

**Conclusion**

Colleges and universities benefit from recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty in many ways. The presence of a diverse faculty enhances an institution’s academic reputation and provides opportunities for a college or university to achieve its central mission of excellence in teaching and research. American corporations challenged institutions of higher education to graduate students who are prepared to succeed in today’s diverse work environments. A diverse faculty not only helps colleges and universities achieve this goal, it is also a crucial factor in achieving the overarching mission of higher education: student growth and development as scholars and citizens.

*Abbie Robinson-Armstrong* is Vice President for Intercultural Affairs at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, California.
Hiring for Mission: Definition

Presumably all of our efforts to hire not only a competent but a distinguished faculty are mission-driven, motivated by our primary commitment to the encouragement of learning and our corresponding goals of promoting academic excellence in a student-centered university. Yet in a growing body of literature* ‘hiring for mission’ has taken on the specialized meaning of hiring to enhance the religious identity of a church-related college or university.

This is the way the phrase is used in the 1999 discussion document from the trustees entitled “How Is Loyola Marymount University a Catholic University?” So when we speak of ‘hiring for mission’ in this specialized sense, we mean hiring with a view to enhancing our way of being a Catholic university in the spirit of LMU’s Jesuit and Marymount founders.

Note that this does not mean hiring only Catholics. A genuine spirit of ecumenical and interreligious openness (and of openness to non-believers) is an important part of LMU’s Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount identity. On the other hand, the University is not indifferent to the particularities of its religious heritage, both as a lived faith and an intellectual tradition. As we face a time of unprecedented growth, it is important to attract to the faculty significant numbers of men and women who understand and respect the intellectual tradition and religious inspiration that distinguish Loyola Marymount University from its secular counterparts.

LMU’s contemporary way of being a Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount university includes a strong commitment to an ethnically diverse faculty as well as to achieving gender balance. Diversity initiatives and efforts to improve the balance of women and men on the faculty are not only socially just but also pedagogically justified, based as they are on the realization that inquiry and learning are enhanced when a variety of voices is heard.

Hiring for mission at LMU is thus a seamless process, impelling us to be attentive on many fronts. Without in any way gainsaying the need to find and hire academically distinguished faculty, we need to seek out candidates who will contribute to our mission as a Catholic and Jesuit/Marymount University, who will enhance our ethnic diversity, and who will improve our gender balance.
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