

The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition

DISCUSSION GUIDE



SPONSORED BY JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY & THE CARDINAL SUENENS CENTER AT JCU
PRODUCED BY THE FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY MEDIA CENTER

This Discussion Guide was prepared by

Doris Donnelly
Margaret Finucane
Howard Gray, SJ
David LaGuardia
Edward J. Peck
Helen Rombalski
Patrick Rombalski

at

John Carroll University

Introduction

“And so he left for Paris, alone and on foot, and he arrived in Paris for the month of February more or less.” With characteristic simplicity in his “personal writings,” Saint Ignatius of Loyola records the beginnings of a journey, early in the sixteenth century, to the city where he would meet two companions, Saint Francis Xavier and Blessed Peter Favre. The three would form a bond of historical dimension. Theirs was a convergence of spirit, of intellect, and of heart. Their coming together would change the lives of multitudes.

As happens in such simple beginnings, they could not have guessed the import of their coming together. The significance of events like theirs grows over time.

And so, on the occasion of the 450th anniversary of the death of Ignatius in 1556, came another pilgrimage. On the 11th of June, 2006, from across the Atlantic, one-hundred-twenty-three faculty, administrators and staff from the Jesuit universities in the United States convened in Paris to celebrate and to consider the implications of that simple meeting long ago. For persons so intricately involved in the mission fostered by these “first companions,” it was appropriate to return to the place of beginnings.

The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition was first nourished in the summer of 2004 and the winter of 2005 at John Carroll University. A steering committee was assembled consisting of representatives from various Jesuit universities: Boston College, Georgetown, Marquette, Santa Clara and John Carroll. Inspiration, talent and unselfish energy gravitated to the blossoming idea. We soon had a place in Paris at which to convene, foundations eager to help in funding, persons to prepare leaflets for morning prayer and Eucharist, a person to staff the conference, musicians.

And, of course, from the rich tradition that began 478 years ago, we had scholars. From Boston College, we invited Father Michael Himes to serve as convener and moderator. Father Himes selected the image of a string of pearls as a controlling metaphor for the wisdom inherent in the conference. With inimitable wit and delicacy, he fashioned an approach to the connecting power of our outstanding presenters: Parker Palmer, John O'Malley, S.J., Jane McAuliffe, Howard Gray, S.J., June Ellis, and Jesús Escobar.

All agree that this was a significant and moving event. From beginning to end, it became a working conference where people brought focus and concentration to common themes. There was in the speakers and their presentations an arc of inclusion expansive enough to embrace all participants. The presentation of Parker Palmer, himself a Quaker, might have seemed distant from the Jesuit legacy, but in fact it folded naturally into the Jesuit tradition.

Through the use of the accompanying DVDs, the organizers of *The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition* extend to those who did not attend the conference a taste of the enthusiasm enjoyed by all who were there. The speakers, their talks, the questions and answers, and something of the ambiance of the event are all included. The discs are adaptable to creative use in First Year Seminars, academic courses, for alumni presentations, for Boards of Directors, for new faculty/staff orientations. Suggestions for discussion are provided, and these may be altered and adapted for specific use. Perhaps like the original journey centuries ago, through these DVDs the significance of this pilgrimage can grow with the passage of time.

Parker J. Palmer
AM Presentation, Monday, June 12, 2006
Title: Teaching and True Self

Introduction. Parker Palmer opened the conference on “The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition” with two propositions: 1) Good teaching can never be reduced to technique and 2) Good teaching flows from the integrity and identity of the teacher. Dr. Palmer suggested that effective teachers naturally bring their selfhood into their teaching. Other themes in his morning talk included:

1. **The Myth of Objectivism** is a hierarchical model of teaching often apparent in higher education. In this model, the subject matter is presented in a sterile way by teachers (experts) to students (amateurs). The myth inherent in this model is that there is something to be gained by having a teacher who is removed or at arm’s length from both the topic and the students. Dr. Palmer describes this model as morally deforming and misguided because it does a disservice to the learner.
2. **The “Community of Truth”** is an alternative epistemology that brings a more realistic picture to how knowing happens. In this model, knowers (students *and* teachers) gather around subjects. These knowers enter into relationship with the subject to advance knowledge and learning that deepen over time. The teacher, the students, and the subject create connections and intersections that would not be possible without all three participating together in the learning and knowing process.
3. **Deeper Learning** occurs when a teacher develops a pedagogy that appropriately responds to the brain’s strongest function, the many forms of intelligence, the emotions tied to cognition, the vivid, lively, and morally compelling realities of learning communities, and the communal process that cultivate habits of mind and heart.

Throughout his presentation, Dr. Palmer returned often to themes of connection, heart- filled teaching, and personal story, encouraging us all to find our own stories of learning (and vocation). The lynchpin holding learning together is the heart of the teacher or the teacher's self-investment.

Suggestions for Discussion:

1. Why is the Myth of Objectivism alive and well in higher education? What benefits are there for the teacher who prefers this model? How is this model supported and/or challenged on our campus? Is there anything specific to the Jesuit tradition of teaching that challenges or supports this model? Have we who are teachers made attempts to distance ourselves in teaching or research from our students or the subject we teach? What are the dangers for students who draw no personal connections to their subject matter? What are the dangers for the teachers?
2. In relation to our students and our subject matter, what are some specific challenges connecting both student and subject? What are our unique ways for drawing students into the subject matter? How do we see our own students holding knowledge that is discovered and shared in the classroom?
3. What is our own pedagogy? How do we think students learn best? What evidence do we have in our own teaching that tells us our theory is correct? How have Dr. Palmer's basic propositions challenged and/or supported our way of thinking about teaching and learning?

Parker J. Palmer
PM Presentation, Monday, June 12, 2006
Title: Vocation and True Self

Introduction.

Parker Palmer's afternoon session focused in two areas. First, he revealed strands of his own life journey. He reviewed specific movements and themes that brought meaning and deepened his own learning. One example was being "moved by beauty." Dr. Palmer recalled beauty in music, symbols, language, and stories that formed his early life. The symbol of Christ's cross and words such as "the Word became flesh" are still deeply engrained in his selfhood and serve as significant themes of learning. The main point is that each person needs to look back on his or her life in order to identify threads of vocation. (Other themes for Palmer included: touched by incarnation, captured by concepts, challenged by silence, wrapped in darkness, lost in the dark, and broken toward wholeness.)

The second part of Dr. Palmer's presentation focused on his definition of a *Christian who teaches*. For Dr. Palmer, Christianity is not merely a perspective. It is his identity and his truth. It is his way of proceeding and his way of being in the world. Parker defined eight characteristics of a Christian who teaches. All of these characteristics draw from his morning presentation of a person (teacher) seeking connection of self to subject to student. He furthered this explanation by saying that a Christian who teaches also recognizes vulnerabilities and fears of students, deals effectively with student failure in the classroom, gathers students in a community that facilitates habits of mind and heart, and invites students to respect the mystery at the heart of all great things. It means to offer students incarnate, embodied versions of the great things that are being studied and to be in community with colleagues who help make a generous, hospitable dialogue about teaching and learning possible.

Suggestions for Discussion:

1. Dr. Palmer's focus on vocation is deeply personal and introspective. As you listened to the strands of his life, did it help you to reflect on significant movements in your life? If so, in what ways have these strands informed and formed your teaching and research today? In Dr. Palmer's words: Is there a truth that has been pursuing you? If so, what is it? How does it relate to your vocation as a teacher?
2. In the modern day academy with so many different expectations placed on you by family, community, and work, how do you balance your many vocations and callings? How do these impact your availability?
3. Whether or not you are Christian, how did you respond to Dr. Palmer's discussion on the characteristics of a Christian who teaches? Do you find these open and inviting or limiting and exclusive? Why do you think Dr. Palmer discussed this with a group of faculty members?
4. Should a Jesuit university have any role in assisting students to explore their vocation? How might this happen? What role do faculty members play in this exploration? What role would staff have?

John W. O'Malley, S.J.

AM Presentation, Tuesday, June 13, 2006

Title: Five Missions: The Framework of the Jesuit Enterprise

Introduction: Using the most sacrosanct of Jesuit documents, the Five Chapters, along with the social history of the Jesuits, Father John O'Malley identified the five missions that he proposed shape the framework of the Jesuit enterprise. Arguing that the social history is important because it reveals additional information about what the Jesuits did rather than only what was articulated in their formal documents, John O'Malley identified the five orientations or missions that have shaped the Jesuit educational enterprise. The first three come directly from the formal documents; the last two emerge from studying the social history of the Society of Jesus. The five missions are:

- 1. Pastoral/spiritual:** work for the progress of souls in Christian life and Christian doctrine; teaching people about the basic truths to be lived and practiced
- 2. Ecclesiastical:** a world-wide vision of service to souls; the faithful and the infidel; seeing the world as the vineyard of the Lord
- 3. Social:** commitment to the primacy of place for the Jesuits; working for the common good within the communities in which they are located. Suggests an explicit commitment to the world and its betterment
- 4. Cultural:** foundation of Jesuit education is in humanities; a created course of studies not as preparatory for theology but for ordinary laypersons who would need to make their way in the world, to help others, and to live lives that would be a benefit to the community
- 5. Civic/urban:** commitment to the cities in which Jesuit institutions were located; provided cultural opportunities to the cities before they were publicly available such as libraries, entertainment

Father O'Malley suggested that these five missions have shaped the complex and rich tradition of the Jesuits. He argues that the official documents of the Society of Jesus cannot and do not express the full reality of the Jesuit tradition, and in some cases, may even truncate it.

Suggestions for Discussion:

1. Father O'Malley said these five missions are integral to the Jesuit "thing." They "validate for us an expansive vision of what we are doing and what we hope to do." The changes in the Five Chapters over the 11 years from the first version in 1539 to the final version in 1550 represent, according to John O'Malley, the fact that the society was an ongoing enterprise that had not assumed its full identity. He speaks to the "enlargement of purpose and mission that was, at best, only a potential at the beginning;" of moving education out of the ivory tower and into the world. How do we take these values of Ignatian pedagogy and transform our classrooms?
2. John O'Malley proposed that early Jesuit spirituality and charism had a civic and cultural mode that was implicit rather than explicit, manifested in deeds rather than words, in what we can infer from studying history rather than what we can verify. Does this understanding connect with our own experience?
3. Father O'Malley argued that the emphasis on teaching Latin and Greek classics in early Jesuit education gave shape to the very identity of the Society and to the core identity of the institutions the Society sponsored. He does not suggest that we return to mandatory study of these classics but that we recognize these realities as part of the very fabric of the Jesuit soul. O'Malley argued we need to be expansive in our quest to locate and understand these missions of the Society of Jesus because they correlate well with the mission of our schools today. How do we, especially as lay faculty, continue to appropriate and adapt these missions to our Jesuit institutions?

John W. O'Malley, S.J.

PM Presentation, Tuesday, June 13, 2006

**Title: The Schools and the Teachers in the Early Jesuit Tradition:
What? Why? How? So What?**

Introduction:

John O'Malley, speaking on the afternoon of the second day of the conference, presented the two approaches to education that shaped the Jesuits educational philosophy, the scholastic (13th century) and the humanist (15th century).

Scholastic: emphasis on subject matter, not moral or emotional well-being of the student. Scholastics' focus on a scientific, objective approach to education. Harvard's motto, VERITAS (truth) captures a good part of this tradition.

Humanist: student-centered institution with emphasis on developing the emotional, oral, and physical well-being of the student. The early Jesuits believed they contributed to the common good by creating upright citizens who could assume positions of responsibility in society and government. Cicero's statement, "We are not born for ourselves alone" exemplifies the humanists' approach to education.

Key points of convergence in shaping the Jesuit educational philosophy:

1. Character formation: inspire the students to live ethical lives that would be in service to their neighbors
2. Performance is not enough; students need to demonstrate inner conviction
3. The teacher plays a crucial role and should be a source of inspiration for students; our lives are our best sermon

Suggestions for Discussion:

- 1.** Father O'Malley said St. Ignatius valued both of the educational traditions of the 13th century, scholastic and humanist. In his statement, Rules for Thinking about the Church, Rule 11, St. Ignatius clearly articulated the strengths of each tradition: the humanists for their ability to rouse affection so that we are moved to love and serve God our Lord, and the scholastics because they define and more clearly state the truths needed for salvation and the errors concerning them. Are both traditions alive and well for us? Ought they be?
- 2.** John O'Malley addresses the "so what?" question toward the conclusion of his presentation. In presenting the five key ideas, O'Malley argues that we need to appreciate the tradition within which we are faculty. How important is it for faculty to understand the heritage of Jesuit education? How do we best share that heritage with new faculty?
- 3.** He speaks of the anthropology we share, that service to others is a common goal among our colleagues, even those who are not Jesuit. What sets us apart is the soul of the university. God's preferential option for the poor is something that teachers in the Jesuit tradition should radiate by their very person. How do we reflect this in our roles as teachers?
- 4.** Father O'Malley argued we should not worry about the distinctiveness of Jesuit education as we pursue our vocations. He said the earliest Jesuits didn't spend time looking over their shoulders to see what others were doing; they assumed they were doing more or less the same thing. How do you respond to this statement?

Jane D. McAuliffe
AM Presentation, Wednesday, June 14, 2006
Appropriating the Ignatian Tradition and the Parameters of Pluralism

Introduction. Professor Jane McAuliffe's presentation provides a framework for pluralism within the Ignatian and Catholic tradition. Dr. McAuliffe divided her presentation into three sections and used three approaches to answer historical, theoretical and practical questions:

1. Why should a Catholic and Jesuit college or university foster interfaith understanding?

For Dr. McAuliffe, interfaith understanding is part of the Ignatian and Catholic tradition. The international perspectives of both early Jesuits (Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Matteo Ricci and Roberto di Nobili) and contemporary Jesuits (Francis Clooney, Gerhard Böwering and Peter Hans Kolvenbach) are offered as touchstones. Key theological statements, including *Nostra Aetate* and *Our Mission and Interreligious Dialogue* from the Jesuits' 34th General Congregation underscore the importance of interreligious dialogue.

2. What is the contemporary context within which our interfaith efforts operate?

Increasing demographic diversity in the United States and expanding global interconnections make interreligious dialogue imperative. Other changes which affect the context of current dialogue include the waning of the 'secularization theory,' an upsurge in faith-based interest and activity, and an enriched awareness of the value of dialogue. Dr. McAuliffe highlights several modes of dialogue (action, religious experience and theological exchange) from the Vatican document *Dialogue and Proclamation* as ways to proceed.

3. How do we help our students and faculty learn and engage inter-religiously?

Dr. McAuliffe encourages building research connections for faculty, using a university's convening power and creating local partnerships, supporting student efforts, and making interreligious dialogue part of the curriculum.

Suggestions for Discussion.

1. Historical and theoretical knowledge is the basis for Dr. McAuliffe's framework for interreligious dialogue. Does faculty have this knowledge? Who provides the education if knowledge is lacking?
2. How do we engage students, faculty and staff in an interreligious dialogue with off campus organizations? How does this work intersect in the classroom? In co-curricular activities?
3. Are people of all faith perspectives welcome at our institution? How do we maintain the Catholic Jesuit nature of our institution and include others?
4. Genuine dialogue with believers of other religions requires that we deepen our own Christian faith commitment. What is our school doing to achieve this for faculty, students and staff? How do we instill in members of our campus community a basic understanding of and respect for the faith vision of members of the diverse local religious community?
5. Does our university community engage in dialogues of life, action, religious experience and theological exchange? How? If not, how can the dialogue be enlarged? Who on our campus is responsible for this?

Juniper (June) Ellis
Presentation for Wednesday, June 14, 2006
Ignatian Justice in Higher Education

Introduction.

Professor June Ellis focussed her discussion around three topics: Ignatian spirituality, justice, and higher education. Remarking that Father Peter Hans Kolvenbach, S.J. placed the vocation of the faculty at the heart of our universities, she wondered what faculty need in order to fulfill a vocation essential to themselves and to their students. Unpacking the significance of Hopkins' phrase "the just man justifies," Dr. Ellis was interested in the distinguishing ways within Jesuit universities that the just teacher, tirelessly seeking truth in dialogue with students, is called to do justice. This issue brought her to the corollary questions guiding her talk: How does a specifically Ignatian justice strengthen the practice of a teacher's vocation? What does doing justice mean in the context of our work in Jesuit higher education?

Proceeding from the Jesuit tradition of free inquiry, faculty at Jesuit universities strive to create in their students an "educated solidarity," an enriched awareness of the relationship of knowledge to self and of self to world. Lay faculty benefit from an awareness of how the tradition of Ignatian Spirituality underlies and informs their work. Ignatian justice asks faculty to become co-discoverers with their students of ways to serve the brokenness of our world, to bring them to ask: Who am I? What should I be doing? Commitment to justice complements academic excellence and enables faculty simultaneously to fulfill themselves, to strengthen their disciplines, and to render ever more vital the work that they do.

Suggestions for Discussion.

1. Faculty with appointments at state or secular private universities are also involved in guiding students toward knowledge and truth. Are the differences between their “vocations” essentially different from those with appointments at Jesuit universities? Does the specific discipline from which a faculty member works make any difference to Ellis’ assumptions?
2. How does commitment to Ignatian spirituality and Ignatian justice impact faculty at Jesuit universities who are not Catholic, or Christian, or who profess no faith? What impetus should there be to encourage disinterested faculty toward “Ignatian” awareness?
3. What are the implications of June Ellis’ discussion to the core curricula within Jesuit universities?
4. Dr. Ellis speaks to the “sense of urgency” in sharing the Ignatian tradition with laywomen and men. How should we interpret or apply this “urgency”? Within university faculties, whose “urgency” should it be?

Howard Gray, S.J.
Thursday, June 15, 2006
Catholic and Jesuit Identity: Appropriation and Mission

Introduction.

Father Howard Gray's presentation was the last formal talk of the Symposium on "The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition." His task was to focus the final session on the Ignatian charism and teaching as the integration of professional competence with a commitment to apostolic and spiritual values. Father Gray divided his presentation into three sections as follows:

1. **Ignatian Discovery** which proposes that the Ignatian interpretation of teaching relies on the teacher's participation in an act of revelation.
2. **Ignatian Process** which proposes that this act of discovery can be codified as a process of attention, reverence, and devotion.
3. **Ignatian Teaching Vocation** which proposes that this process evolves into a vocation, a way of being, involving sound learning, the ability to communicate this learning to others, and the personal example of honoring and even loving what one teaches.

Throughout his presentation Father Gray attempted to found his reflections on specific Ignatian teaching moments. These teaching moments centered on Ignatius as a student under divine tutelage, on Ignatius as a student in some of the universities of his day, and on Ignatius as the spiritual teacher and leader within the newly founded Company of Jesus. Finally, throughout the presentation Father Gray related these Ignatian teaching moments to the contemporary challenges of the Ignatian teaching vocation.

Suggestions for Discussion:

1. Does one have to found explicitly his or her own teaching on the models proposed by Father Gray to become an “Ignatian” teacher? In other words, does Father Gray present an essential paradigm or simply some possibilities? If these are only possibilities, what are other models of Ignatian pedagogy that could suggest to us alternative ways of being an Ignatian teacher?
2. How many of these models from the life of Ignatius are apropos for faculty who are not Roman Catholic or who come from another spiritual tradition, e.g., Dominican, Franciscan, or Benedictine?
3. Does this presentation rely so intimately on religious experience that it precludes faculty who do not espouse any religious affiliation but who are committed and highly competent teachers within our schools? Isn't there need for another process of translating what Father Gray offers into more ecumenical and/or secular terms?
4. Are there implications from this presentation that Jesuit colleges and universities ought to have well-organized programs to help new faculty assimilate the Ignatian pedagogical tradition? Isn't this all the more crucial as Jesuits themselves diminish numerically within these institutions and the care for this educational tradition passes into the hands of lay leadership?
5. Do the characteristics outlined by Father Gray challenge our criteria for hiring, promotion, and tenure? Do our Boards of Directors understand the essentials that Father Gray provides as part of their oversight of the identity and mission of Jesuit universities?

Rev. Michael Himes
Thursday, June 15, 2006
Irritating Questions and an Orientation to the Future

Introduction. Father Michael Himes was the moderator of the conference on “The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition.” At the end of each day’s presentation participants were asked to reflect and submit responses to the following questions to be collated, synthesized, and presented by Father Himes at the concluding session titled *Irritating Questions and an Orientation to the Future*:

The most important thing I learned today was...
The question raised for me was...

Father Himes divided his closing presentation into three sections:

- I. A report/synthesis of the participants’ responses
- II. His observations as moderator of the conference
- III. An open conversation with participants

I Report/Synthesis & Questions that Emerged:

A. Personal Questions

1. What about the notion of conflicting vocations? How is it possible to be fully present to and with our students, our colleagues on the faculty, our colleagues in our field of research, and our family? How do we put all those things together in a single life experience?
2. What is the Jesuit tradition of scholarship that might accompany the Jesuit tradition of teaching?

B. Pedagogical Questions

1. How do we create safe learning spaces – i.e., spaces in which our students feel free to explore openly with us and with one another questions that may be threatening, frightening or self-revelatory? How do we create those spaces so that our faculty can actually talk to one another?
2. How do we foster Jesuit pedagogy in professional education? For example, the Jesuit tradition of teaching in business schools, in nursing, in education?
3. The shift to *outcomes* as a way of evaluating education seems to work precisely against the kind of teaching advocated by Parker Palmer and much of what Father Gray talked about. How do we respond to this?

C. Institutional/Structural Questions

1. Should Jesuit colleges and universities consciously strive to be communities that provide an alternative experience to the success, wealth, fame oriented culture of our time? What would need to be in our place for this to happen, if it is not already clearly in place?
2. Do some widely accepted academic norms and structures militate against the Ignatian tradition in teaching? For example, “publish or perish,” a widely accepted canon in American higher education, is precisely counter to what we have been talking about this week. How do we respond?
3. How can we emphasize to the faculties at large that other subjects besides theology convey the Ignatian and Catholic tradition?

4. How do we acknowledge and celebrate the Ignatian Vocation of non-Jesuit, non-Catholic, non-Christian faculty members? How do we recognize their Ignatian vocation to teach? How do we celebrate that fact?

5. What do non-Catholic and non-Christian faculty and staff contribute to the Jesuit and/or the Catholic conversation? During in-house discussions for Catholic faculty, do non-Catholics simply watch or are they fully participants in that conversation and, if so, how? What might we look for; what might we ask them for as participants in this discussion?

6. How do we and how can we represent a more dialogic understanding of Catholicism to parents and students for whom the *Catholic* character of our institutions may be the key attractive feature? For parents, as well as for the students, how can we make the term *Catholic* more inclusive?

D. General Question

This question appeared on more than 50 percent of the responses. Father Himes calls it the 'pendant' question for our string of pearls:

How do I communicate this conference to my colleagues who are not here? What am I going to do with this when I go home? How can the issues raised here be continued on our campuses?

II Moderator's Comments: Personal Observations

The questions that have been brought to the surface are *irritating* precisely because they are questions that are somewhat nagging. They are questions that don't easily admit an easy answer or simple solution.

What is the definition of a college or university? What is the definition of a Jesuit

college or university? How do we define a college as being in the Catholic tradition? How do we incorporate the fields of physics, chemistry, biology – the culture of the sciences – into our conversation? How can this conference be shared with the people in the sciences?

III Open Discussion/Questions from conference participants:

A. The multi-cultured reality was never addressed during the conference. What is the relationship between Diversity and Mission & Identity at our Jesuit schools?

B. How do we build the material of these presentations into our curriculum?

C. What is happening at other Jesuit campuses? What are the best practices in terms of Ignatian pedagogy: courses, curricula, and pedagogies relevant to the Ignatian Tradition? How do we share these ideas, resources, conversations?

E. With the numbers of Jesuits on our campuses diminishing, what will be the role of the “Society of Jesus” in our colleges? What happens when there are no more Jesuits in our “Jesuit” schools?

F. Is there a distinction between being Ignatian and being Jesuit? How do we ensure that our universities remain Ignatian? How do we ensure that leadership is Ignatian?

G. How do we then look at our hiring practices?

H. How can we utilize on-line education to reach the world of the future – our colleagues in South America, Africa, South Asia, East Asia and Island Asia?

I. The major issue facing our nation, world and universities that has not been touched at all: the war in Iraq. Are we apolitical? Do we not get involved in politics? Is the Ignatian tradition one that tackles social issues of war and peace?

Speakers

Parker J. Palmer, an internationally-known writer, speaker, and activist, holds a PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley. He is a senior advisor to the Fetzer Institute and founder of the Center for Courage & Renewal and previously served as senior associate of the American Association of Higher Education. His seven books include *A Hidden Wholeness*, *Let Your Life Speak*, *The Courage to Teach*, *The Active Life*, *To Know as We Are Known*, and *The Company of Strangers*. He holds eight honorary doctorates, two Distinguished Achievement Awards from the National Education Press Association, and an Award of Excellence from the Associated Church Press. In 1998, the Leadership Project named him one of the 30 “most influential senior leaders” in higher education and one of the ten key “agenda-setters” of the decade.

John W. O’Malley, S. J. is a Jesuit long associated with the Weston School of Theology as professor of church history, but at the time of the presentation was transitioning to Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Father O’Malley earned his doctorate at Harvard University, specializing in the European Renaissance and Reformation. He has written extensively about the history of the Jesuits as well as post-Vatican II theology, including *The First Jesuits* (justly honored with many distinguished awards), *Four Cultures of the West*, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*, and others. Fr. O’Malley is a member of the Detroit Province of the Society of Jesus.

Jane D. McAuliffe, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgetown University, is also a Professor in the Department of History and the Department of Arabic. Prior to her appointment at Georgetown, she held appointments at the University of Toronto and Emory University, where she was an associate dean. She served on the Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with Muslims for ten years and in 2004 was president of the American Academy of Religion. She is an internationally known scholar of Islamic Studies. Her numerous publications have focused on the Qur’an, early Islamic history, and the many relationships between Islam and Christianity.

Juniper (June) Ellis received a Ph.D. from Vanderbilt University and holds the position of associate professor of English at Loyola College in Maryland. She currently serves as chair of the national steering committee on Justice in Jesuit Education. At Loyola she founded and directed the immersion program Encuentra, El Salvador. She also founded the Kolvenbach Awards, a community-based research program, and she founded and chairs the Kolvenbach Fellows program, which supports research in values particular to the Jesuit tradition. Through the Maryland Province Magis program she helps to provide formation in Ignatian spirituality. Dr. Ellis has published scholarly articles in the leading journals in literary studies, including *PMLA*, *Ariel*, and *Arizona Quarterly*. Her scholarship has been supported by Fulbright awards in New Zealand and Germany, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Andrew W. Mellon fellowships.

Howard Gray, S.J. is a Jesuit of the Detroit Province of the Society of Jesus. At the time of his presentation, Father Gray was the rector of the Jesuit Community at John Carroll University where he also served as the Assistant to the President and Consultant for University Identity and Mission and an Adjunct Professor in the Department of Religious Studies. Prior to these assignments at John Carroll, Father Gray was the Director of the Center for Ignatian Spirituality at Boston College, Tertian Director for the Detroit Province, Provincial Superior, and Rector and Dean at the Weston Jesuit School of Theology in Cambridge. Father Gray has written and lectured on Ignatian spirituality, ministry, and narrative theology throughout the USA and Canada, in East Africa, East Asia, India, and Europe.

Michael Himes, a Professor of theology at Boston College, known for an uncommon ability to present the deepest dimensions of the Christian faith in a style that is engaging and challenging. A priest of the Diocese of Brooklyn, New York, he holds a PhD from the University of Chicago and has authored several books including *Fullness of Faith: The Public Significance of Theology* with Kenneth Himes OFM; *Doing the Truth in Love: Conversations about God, Relationships and Service*; *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginnings of Modern Ecclesiology*, *The Mystery of Faith: An Introduction to Catholicism*; *The Catholic Church in the 21st Century* with Daniel J. Harrington, in addition to serving as Associate Editor of *The Harper Encyclopedia of Catholicism* (Harper/Collins, 1995). Teacher, scholar, and author – Father Himes is also a consummate facilitator and moderator.

Conference participants

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities – Charles L. Currie SJ, Kathleen Snyder

Boston College – Michael Cassidy, Audrey A. Friedman, Erik Goldschmidt, Rev. Michael J. Himes, Richard Keeley, Gilda Morelli, Joseph M. O’Keefe SJ, Dawn Overstreet, David Quigley, Mary Walsh

Canisius College – Rita A. Capezzi, Patricia A. Coward, Michael J. Forest, Christopher R. Lee, Paula M. McNutt

College of the Holy Cross – Jeffrey D. Bloechl, Rosemary P. Carbine, Maurice A. Geracht

Fairfield University – John F. Baldwin SJ, Jesús Escobar, Donald Gibson, Paul Lakeland, Mary Frances Malone, Laurence Miners, Jim Mayzik SJ, Elizabeth Petrino, Norm Solomon, Casey Timmeny, Mark Scalese SJ, Jeffrey P. von Arx SJ

Fordham University – Nancy A. Busch-Rosnagel, Vincent J. Duminuco SJ, Anne M. Mannion, Russell G. Pearce, Patrick J. Ryan SJ, John Tognino, Amy J. Uelmen

Georgetown University – John J. DeGioia, Kevin Doak, Jane McAuliffe, Dennis McAuliffe, Joseph McCartin, Vincent Miller, Anthony Moore, Karen Stohr

Gonzaga University – Cynthia Fitzgerald, Stephen Freedman, Michael Herzog, Patrick McCormick, Anthony Osborne

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkley – Lisa Fullam, Francis X. McAloon SJ

John Carroll University – Mary E. Beadle, Doris Donnelly, Margaret Finucane, Howard J. Gray SJ, David M. La Guardia, Lisa Mencini, Robert L. Niehoff SJ, Helen Rombalski, Patrick Rombalski, Dianna Taylor (Edward J. Peck and Paul Lauritzen did not attend the conference but were members of the planning group at John Carroll University)

Le Moyne College – Donald Maldari SJ, Monica Sylvia

Loyola College in Maryland – Richard Blum, Juniper Ellis, Elliot King, Sharon Nell

Loyola Marymount – Wilkie Au, Robert Caro SJ, Cheryl T. Grills, Paul A. Harris, Robert B. Lawton SJ, Abbie Robinson-Armstrong, Ernest Rose

Loyola New Orleans – Mary Algero, Maria Calzada, Alice Clark, Walter Harris, Kendra Reed, Peter Rogers SJ

Marquette University – Janet W. Krejci, Rev. Bryan N. Massingale, Stephanie J. Russell, David G. Schultenover SJ, Madeline M. Wake

Regis University – Steven D. Berkshire, Mark J. Bruhn, Patricia A. Ladewig, Thomas E. Reynolds

St. Joseph's University – Phyllis Anastasio, Paul F. Aspan, Terrence Furin, Peter Norberg

St. Peter's College – William G. Evans

Santa Clara University – Chris Boscia, Luis F. Calero SJ, Diane Jonte-Pace, Mark A. Ravizza SJ, Kieran Sullivan

University of San Francisco – Margaret M. Higgins

University of Scranton – Hal Baillie, Patricia Harrington, Rick Klonoski, Janice Voltzow

Weston Jesuit School of Theology – John W. O'Malley SJ, Thomas D. Stegman SJ

Wheeling Jesuit – Debra B. Hull, Letha B. Zook

Xavier University – Ed Cueva, Chris Dacey, John Fairfield, Roger A. Fortin, Alison Russell, Janice B. Walker

Special Guests

Bernard Gillibert SJ

Provincial, French Province – Society of Jesus – François-Xavier Dumortier SJ

Centre Sèvres – Michel Fédou SJ

Staff Assistants – Milos Lichner SJ

