

Fontbonne University

GriffinShare

All Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone Projects

Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone Projects

2013

Preserving the Sponsoring Tradition: A Study of Catholic Colleges and Universities Founded by Religious Orders

John Michael Pressimone
Benedictine University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://griffinshare.fontbonne.edu/all-etds>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Pressimone, John Michael, "Preserving the Sponsoring Tradition: A Study of Catholic Colleges and Universities Founded by Religious Orders" (2013). *All Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone Projects*. 156.
<https://griffinshare.fontbonne.edu/all-etds/156>

BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY

PRESERVING THE SPONSORING TRADITION: A STUDY OF CATHOLIC
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOUNDED BY RELIGIOUS ORDERS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

IN

HIGHER EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

BY

JOHN MICHAEL PRESSIMONE

LISLE, ILLINOIS

SEPTEMBER 2013

Copyright by J. Michael Pressimone, 2013

All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been blessed to have been educated by, formed by and befriended by men and women who have committed their lives to the service of God as members of religious orders. I have been privileged to work for and with them in their roles as sponsors of Catholic colleges and universities. Their witness of selfless sacrifice has been a source of inspiration for me and my family. I acknowledge them in a special way and commit myself, as a lay person, to helping them continue their work which is life changing for countless young people who enter these institutions.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to members of my committee who have ably assisted me on this final leg of my journey. Also I wish to thank the many faculty who shared this experience with me and enriched me along the way. I want to acknowledge my professional colleagues at Alvernia University who supported and encouraged me throughout this process. I owe a debt of gratitude to my colleagues at the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities for helping me identify colleges in my study group, for the use of their library and for some lively discussion.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Cathy, and my children:

Cassy, Joanna, Jonathan, Allison, Clare, Rebecca, Abby, Stephanie, Grace, David,

Dominic and Madeline.

Without your loving support and sacrifice,
this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Historical Beginnings.....	1
A Changing Demographic.....	5
The Problem.....	6
This Study.....	10
Purpose.....	11
Research Questions.....	12
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
History and Foundations.....	16
Academic Integrity and Economic Issues.....	18
Governance and Leadership.....	23
Church Authority.....	27
Issues of Catholic Identity.....	31
Symbolism and Iconography.....	38
Sponsorship.....	41
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN.....	53
Validity.....	58
Research Questions.....	58
Limitations.....	61
Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND BEST PRACTICES.....	63
Question One.....	64
Question Two.....	73
Questions Three and Seven.....	92
Questions Four, Five and Six.....	128
Question Eight.....	143
Question Nine.....	146
Question Ten.....	152
Question Eleven.....	161
Assessment of Presence of Sponsor Identity.....	167
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	175

Introduction.....	175
Summary.....	175
Major Findings.....	180
Findings from the Readings.....	188
Surprises.....	188
Conclusion.....	189
Recommendations for Further Research.....	195
Concluding Remarks.....	196
REFERENCES.....	198
APPENDIX A: ORDER AFFILIATION BY PERCENTAGE.....	205
APPENDIX B: ACCU INSTITUTION PRESIDENTS 1990 TO 2010.....	206
APPENDIX C: INSTITUTION CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE LETTER.....	213
APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER.....	214

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	A summary of Catholic colleges by sponsor identity.....	41
Table 2:	Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity in the campus physical environment.....	170
Table 3:	Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity in campus publications (magazine, view book).....	172
Table 4:	Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity on the campus web site.....	172
Table 5:	List of programs expressive of sponsor and Catholic identity.....	173

ABSTRACT

Preserving the Sponsoring Tradition

J. Michael Pressimone

Benedictine University

The majority of private higher educational institutions in America can trace their origins to Protestant Church denominations beginning with the founding of Harvard University in 1636. Catholics in the United States began planting colleges and universities beginning in 1789 with the founding of Georgetown University. Most Catholic institutions of higher learning were founded by religious orders of priests, brothers or sisters which are referred to as sponsors in today's parlance. The identity of each of these institutions was formed by the sponsoring order which established them. The institutions were dependent on the sponsor for leadership, faculty, staff, financial resources and religious identity through the middle of the 20th century. The tremendous growth in college and university enrollments after World War II, combined with the post Vatican II decline of priests, brothers and sisters in the late 1960s, has weakened the sponsor identity on Catholic college and university campuses.

This mixed methods exploratory study examines a purposeful sample of three Catholic colleges and universities, each founded by a religious community of priests, brothers or sisters, to identify best practices in preserving sponsor identity. These best practices were identified through interviews with key campus personnel and leadership. The researcher examined campus programs, symbols, artifacts and icons for evidence of

sponsor identity. The study demonstrates that sponsor identity animates the mission and ethos of each institution in a way that creates meaningful identity and market distinction. The study provides examples for other institutions to emulate as each seeks to proclaim its identity and secure a place in an ever increasingly competitive higher education marketplace.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Historical Beginnings

Higher education in the United States was founded within the framework of Christian denominations, their beliefs and customs. Wechsler, Goodchild and Eisenmann (2007) and Rudolph (1990), discuss the role of the church and organized religion in conjunction with the state or local government in the vast majority of the history of higher education as we think of it today. This is particularly true prior to the Land Grant movement sparked by the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. However, the growth of the public university system did not signal the end of the founding of church-related colleges and universities. In fact, more than half (149) of the Catholic colleges and universities that currently hold membership in the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) were founded after the establishment of the Morrill Land Grant Act. The antebellum and post-bellum periods witnessed rapid growth in the number of private colleges and universities (Burtchaell, 1998).

Denominational relationships gave the institutions their identity. The majority of those who served as presidents and faculty in early universities were selected from denominational ranks and reflected denominational beliefs. These early Christian founders of institutions of higher education were explorers making their way and creating society in a new land having escaped the persecution and oppression they experienced in

Europe. Many of these Christian colleges were closely aligned with denominational administration and governance.

The American colonies were predominantly established by protestant immigrants, and their institutions were closely linked to their denominations. Catholics began to arrive in America in great numbers in the mid to late 1700s and into the 1800s.

Congregations of sisters, priests and brothers came to America to serve these immigrants. Compared to earlier protestant immigrants, Catholics were relatively late in establishing institutions of higher education with Georgetown being the first, established in 1789.

This was over 150 years after Congregationalists established Harvard in 1636. Despite entering the higher education game relatively late, Catholics went on to sponsor and establish the “largest array of colleges and universities in the country” (Burtchaell, 1998, p. 557).

Contrary to more recently held beliefs, Catholic colleges and universities were largely founded independent of the local diocese or the Roman curia. “Catholic colleges and universities have always been more independent from church authorities in their governance, finance, and intellectual initiative than any of the other traditions” (Burtchaell, 1998, p. 562). In fact, only about five percent of the Catholic colleges and universities in the United States today are under the direction of a parish, diocese or the Holy See in Rome. However, the relationship between the sponsoring Catholic religious orders or congregations and the colleges and universities they founded, remained very strong up until the latter half of the 20th century. The official relationship with the Roman Catholic Church and these institutions was seen in the relationship between the order or congregation and either the local bishop or higher authority in Rome. These

orders and congregations have come to be known as sponsors of these institutions in today's parlance. Through the first half of the 20th century there was little doubt about the relationship between the sponsor and the institution. In 1947, Alcuin Tasch O.S.B. reported that "...over 90% of Catholic colleges and universities are under the direct control of some 50 religious orders of men and women" (as cited in Golden, 2006).

Each Catholic institution of higher education in America started out as a unique institution formed by a founding community, congregation and early sponsors and shaped by the people it served in a particular geographic locale. The identity of Catholic colleges and universities was very much based in the identity, ethos, charism and mission of the men and women who founded the institution. These men and women, often immigrants themselves, came to the U.S. to further the work that had been established in monasteries, mother houses and abbeys throughout Europe. There are a number of examples to illustrate this point.

When Fr. Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B. arrived with 18 of his confreres in LaTrobe, Pennsylvania, in the middle of the 19th century, he came to establish a Benedictine presence in the U.S. According to Oetgen (2012) "It was Boniface Wimmer's aim to transplant the ancient Benedictine Order from Europe to the New World" (St. Vincent Archabbey web site). The Benedictines had established abbeys and schools throughout Europe and other parts of the world since the seventh century. These Benedictines, who arrived in rural western Pennsylvania, were a dramatic departure from the clergy who had individually been appointed by the Bishop of Philadelphia, and later the Bishop of Pittsburgh, to serve the Catholic faithful of that part of Pennsylvania. In this time when diocesan authority seemed distant, people looked to the Benedictines for pastoral care,

sacramental preparation and education. Even Bishops looked to the Benedictines and their newly established minor seminary as a place to form other young men for the priesthood. St. Vincent College was a natural outgrowth of the missionary zeal of this group of Benedictines. These men were recognized as Benedictine and their many ministries were steeped in Benedictine spirituality.

Another example involves Spalding University (formerly Nazareth College) which was established by the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth in 1920. The educational roots of this order pre-date the founding of the college and go back to 1814 (Spalding University web site, 2012). Unlike immigrant orders of men and women religious, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth were established in the U.S. in Kentucky to meet the needs of Catholic families who relocated from Maryland after the Revolutionary War. Their first superior, Catherine Spalding, and the other women who responded to the call to serve, established social service, health care and educational ministries throughout Kentucky and the south. These women were readily recognizable as Sisters of Charity and greatly appreciated for their tireless acts of service to the underserved, needy and sick. Nazareth College was established to train young women to serve as the Sisters had done. The college was later renamed Spalding University to honor its foundress and heritage (Sisters of Charity of Nazareth web site, 2012; Spalding University web site, 2012).

There are numerous other examples of congregational identity at the heart of institutional identity. Congregational identity as seen in the powerful presence of faithful men and women from congregations like Catherine Spalding and Boniface Wimmer was

the dominant identity of the institutions they established through the middle of the 20th century.

A Changing Demographic

The dramatic growth in college attendance after World War II far exceeded the expectations and predictions of institutions of higher education. Over 2,200,000 veterans enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities from 1945 to 1949 (Freeland, 1992). Campuses needed to rapidly expand and build facilities to meet this demand, and they needed new faculty to teach the emerging masses. Anyone who attended college in the 1960s into perhaps as late as the 1980s remember the Quonset hut and barracks type buildings that were hastily erected as classrooms, laboratories, dormitories and offices. Over time and in some cases with the help of federal funds, permanent buildings replaced these temporary structures though, on church-related campuses, without hallmarks of religious identity. At Catholic colleges and universities, the percentage of faculty who were members of sponsoring congregations declined as newly hired lay men and women swelled the faculty ranks.

The Catholic Church went through a dramatic period of self-assessment during the Second Vatican Council from 1962 to 1965. This event, combined with other external factors like increases in federal funding and regional and program accreditation requirements, caused a dramatic shift in the control and governance of Catholic colleges and universities. Beginning in the 1960s, there were dramatic drops in the number of priests and sisters throughout the United States and across all sponsored ministries (Dolan as cited in Gallin, 1996). It was not a problem unique to higher education. It is a problem that persists to this very day. Before Vatican II there was very little doubt that

these Catholic institutions were indeed Catholic. Their identity was firmly built upon and supported by the members of the congregation who founded them. It was evidenced by the number of members of the sponsoring religious orders who held faculty and administrative positions (Morey and Piderit, 2006; Steinfels, 2003). There was a kind of ‘ministry of presence.’ The older buildings on these campuses were former mother houses and friaries with chapels and religious symbolism integrated into the architecture, but by the 1960s these facilities were singular historical remnants in a sea of new academic buildings and residence halls.

The Problem

As the number of vowed religious on Catholic college and university campuses declines or disappears and lay men and women take up their work, there is a risk that institutional identity expressive of the sponsoring tradition of the institution will diminish, dissipate or disappear altogether.

“The last decade of the 20th century will have seen more profound and radical changes in Catholic institutional ministries than at any other time in their history” (Grant & Vandenberg, 1998, p. 109). There are two factors that drive this. The first is the decline in the membership of the orders as discussed above. There are simply fewer members and those who remain are aging. The second is a shift in ministerial focus away from institutional ministry. Those priests, brothers and sister who remained in the order left the schools, colleges, hospitals, etc. to serve in more individualized ministries focused on social services and missionary outreach (Grant and Vandenberg, 1998). As this demographic shift continues and fewer members of the sponsoring orders remain active in higher education ministry, two challenges emerge. The first revolves around the

legal relationship between the institution and the Church. If the sponsoring order disappears altogether, what will replace them to establish an acceptable link to the Church? The second, and for the purposes of this study the more important challenge, is how to keep the sponsoring identity and traditions alive and vibrant in the face of the decline.

The clock is ticking. Perhaps within the next generation, many of our Catholic and sponsored institutions of higher education will have no representatives from the sponsoring congregation on campus or perhaps even alive. It is vitally important that the lay men and women who now lead, govern, teach and work at these institutions embrace and understand the founding tradition so that they may transmit that ethos to new generations.

The dialogue about the Catholic identity of colleges and universities in the U.S. is active and sometimes contentious. Pope John Paul II's siren call to these institutions, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (from the heart of the Church) promulgated in 1990, and the subsequent *Application of Ex Corde Ecclesiae for the United States* promulgated in 2000 and its recent ten year review conducted in dioceses throughout the U.S., have challenged college and university presidents, board members and faculty to consider questions of identity. Pope Benedict XVI addressed Catholic college and university presidents in 2008 and called on all present for a renewal of commitment to Catholic identity.

In individual instances throughout the U.S., there have been rifts between local bishops and Catholic colleges and universities in their dioceses. These contentious issues often involve campus speakers or dramatic and artistic presentations that challenge or question Church doctrine. A most notable and public example was the furor that arose

when President Obama spoke at the University of Notre Dame commencement in 2009. There are many critics of Catholic colleges and universities who question issues of identity. One example is the Cardinal Newman Society and its *Newman Guide to Choosing a Catholic College*. The Cardinal Newman Society, founded in 1993, uses *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* as a kind of litmus test of Catholic identity and fidelity. Since the promulgation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, there have been a host of books and articles decrying the loss of Catholic identity at colleges and universities like Burtchaell's *The Dying of the Light: the Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from their Christian Churches* (1998) and Morey and Piderit's *Catholic Higher Education: a Culture in Crisis* (2006) or more generally Peter Steinfels *A People Adrift: the Crisis of the Roman Catholic Church in America* (2003) to name a few.

Rather than focus on the criticism and what is not working, this study examines what is working. It unearths and holds up for others to emulate best practices in preserving, animating and making more relevant sponsor identity. This is a significant departure from other literature which looks at identity first through the Catholic lens rather than the sponsor lens.

Since the time of Jesus Christ and the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church, groups of men and women, hearing the Word of God, sought to give voice to their understanding of Jesus and the Gospels. Each order of men and women derive their charism from the teaching of Jesus Christ as found in the New Testament. There are five primary sources of information about Jesus: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul. Each writer wrote for a specific population in context; Matthew for the Jews, Mark for people in the Diaspora, etc. Each order animates some part of those teachings in their history

and founding principles. For example, Franciscanism is steeped in Francis's understanding of Jesus and how Jesus served the marginalized. Francis pursued this work in his way in his time. His preoccupation with the nativity experience, God becoming man and entering the world as an infant, lies at the root of Francis' humility. Were it not for the influence of some of Francis's followers like Anthony of Padua and Bonaventure, the Franciscan influence on education may have been less or nonexistent. Similarly, other traditions looked to the gospels and the writings of Paul and animated them in their own way in their own time.

In the 2000 years since Jesus' death and resurrection, individuals have studied His teachings as read in the New Testament, and men and women have adapted them to meet particular challenges. Chaminade (Society of Mary/Marianists) and Adele (Daughters of Mary Immaculate) looked to the teachings of Jesus to try to reconstruct the life of the Church in revolutionary France and to save men and women from lives of despair and poverty. Adele rescued prostitutes and built a vibrant community of religious women. As these orders of men and women grew, they began to plant new ministries in other parts of the world and, for some, education was a natural outgrowth of this movement. For example, the Marianists in the U.S. Established the University of Dayton (OH), Chaminade University (HI) and St. Mary's University (TX).

All members of religious orders lived their lives in ways they felt were consistent with the life of Jesus because they believed that this was the path to salvation. In the U.S., these orders established myriad ministries that included social service, health care and education. The charism of the order was the underpinning of these ministries. Their ideals, guiding principles and core values permeated the institutions they established

How is this significant in the world of private, Catholic higher education in the U.S? Catholic institutions of higher education serve a higher purpose than simply the education of students. They are communities gathered around a common set of beliefs and principles built on the teachings and life of Jesus as seen through the lens of the particular founding charism and made manifest in the contemporary context. Examining Catholic identity alone ignores this rich history.

There are a number of recent studies that examine aspects of Catholic identity. Estanek, James and Norton (2006) conducted a study looking at Catholic identity in mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities. Gambescia and Paolucci (2011) examined Catholic identity as found and represented in college and university web sites. Introcaso (1996) conducted a study that looked at the Catholic identity of four colleges and a university established by congregations of women religious. Her study did examine institutional culture but looked at the issue of Catholic identity relative to *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. Wilcox and King (2000) edited a volume of essays under the title *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Campuses* which, for the most part focused on Catholic identity rather than sponsor identity.

This Study

There are exemplary programs at some Catholic colleges and universities that demonstrate this continuum of thought from Jesus to the founding order to their institutional identities. This study examines three such institutions and presents them as models for other institutions to emulate. Sponsor identity may be manifest in a number and variety of ways. It may be embedded in mission and vision statements, marketing materials, programs for students, leadership development, faculty institutes, areas of

study, art, architecture, ministry, etc. The researcher visited each campus and interviewed key campus and sponsor personnel to inquire how sponsor identity is animated and communicated throughout the campus community. The researcher developed a taxonomy of sponsor identity for each institution. Following the interviews, the researcher toured each campus and examined print and electronic material for visible evidence of sponsor identity. This latter step looked for correlation between the institution's stated intentions relative to sponsor identity and visual and programmatic evidence of sponsor identity. The researcher analyzed these programs and looked for best practices which were then summarized as a set of recommendations. This study is relevant for the nearly 200 Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S. founded by orders of men and women in that it seeks to emphasize sponsor identity as a key identifier and market differentiator for each institution. There may also be applicability to colleges and universities sponsored by other religious denominations as they examine their relationships with their sponsors.

Purpose

As the presence of vowed religious men and women decline on Catholic college and university campuses, lay men and women are called to lead in greater numbers. Hellwig (2001) speaks of this transition and states "Where the religious congregations are diminishing, a new generation of lay leadership has come to the helm with considerable energy, good will and sense of purpose and direction" (p. 24). This dissertation examined the importance of preserving the sponsoring tradition as it passes from the professed members of the sponsoring community to a new generation of leadership made up largely if not entirely of lay men and women. Catholic colleges and

universities continue to thrive in large numbers in no small part due to their identity as Catholic. Their Catholic identity is surely a distinguishing characteristic, but sponsor identity animates and defines the identity and ideals of the institution and gives each a unique presence in the higher education marketplace. Catholic colleges and universities need to distinguish themselves, and the sponsoring tradition provides an important distinguishing characteristic. Morey and Piderit (2006) tell us that “in order for a Catholic university to be distinguishable, there have to be some visible differences” (p. 231). Catholic colleges founded by religious orders preserve sponsoring tradition by elevating icons and symbols of their identity in publications and on their campuses and by incorporating programs (co-curricular and curricular) that animate the sponsoring identity. These institutions, experiencing the decline in members of the religious community on campus, have been intentional in finding ways to make the sponsor identity more present and vibrant as the decline occurred. This study assessed the presence of such symbols, icons and programs as the presence of members of the sponsoring order continues to diminish.

Research Questions

1. In the last generation (since 1990), how has the presence of members of the sponsoring religious community diminished and by how much?
2. How has the leadership of the institution transitioned or changed in character, if at all, during that period?

These questions affirmed the assertion that the actual presence of the sponsoring community had indeed diminished and provided a quantitative backdrop for the study. In addition, some institutions sought to keep a member of the sponsoring tradition in the

president's office even when the overall presence of members of the community had diminished. Presence and leadership are important elements of the sponsor relationship.

3. Over that same period, how have these colleges and universities preserved the presence of the sponsoring identity?
4. What symbols and icons are present which signify the founding relationship? (This question, along with question seven, led to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
5. How has the presence of such symbols and icons succeeded in keeping the relationship with and identity of the sponsoring community alive and vibrant?
6. How are these symbols and icons displayed on campus and in publications?

Symbolism plays a vitally important role in organizational culture. In Schein's (2010) description of the three levels of culture, he describes artifacts as the visible products of the group, such as the architecture of its physical environment; its language; its technology and products; its artistic creations; its style, as embodied in clothing, manners of address, and emotional displays; its myths and stories told about the organization; its published lists of values; and its observable rituals and ceremonies.

(p. 23)

Icons, symbols, programs and mission statements are all examples of Schein's artifacts. While his theories are largely based in corporate culture, they are transferable to higher education as well. Much of his work deals with cultural change and managing such change. Managing the cultural shift in Catholic higher education in the United States is at the heart of this dissertation.

7. What programs exist which animate the sponsoring identity? For students? For faculty/staff? (This question, along with question four, led to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
8. How does the institutional mission statement reflect the sponsor identity/relationship?
9. Who has primary responsibility for preserving and lifting up sponsor identity in the campus community?
10. How does the symbolic and programmatic presence of the sponsoring identity add value to the institution?

An additional question emerged during introductory conversations with the participating presidents. This question was incorporated into the semi-structured interviews with each institution and its representatives:

11. If in the next generation or so there are no members of the sponsoring order serving the institution in leadership, on the board or as an employee, how confident are you that the sponsoring charism can be preserved?

Religious orders of men and women hold particular views and traditions which can be expressed programmatically. An order of Franciscan sisters or friars may have a particular focus on environmental issues based on their heritage. The presence of programs or organizations that involve students and faculty in environmental issues would be evidence of a programmatic link to the sponsoring tradition. Virtually all institutions of higher education have mission statements. This study looked for explicit and implicit expressions of sponsoring identity in the statement. Finally the study asked the ‘so what’ question. Why should an institution expend energy and resources in upholding the identity of a sponsoring order that is in decline? It is the outcome of this

question that is probably the most vital and it examines Morey and Piderit's (2006) challenge to Catholic colleges and universities to be distinct.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

History and Foundations

As discussed in the introduction, higher education in America and later in the United States was begun by communities that shared a strong denominational identity. During the first 150 years which began with the establishment of Harvard in 1636, these institutions were founded by Protestant denominations. Early colleges of colonial America were examples of the close relationship between the state and the church. These early communities were parts of each and shared early denominational identity (Cunningham, 1994, p. 25).

Georgetown, the first Catholic college in the U.S., was founded in 1789. Over the following two centuries, Catholics established a diverse array of institutions across the country. “(T)hese institutions were founded with an eye to meeting the needs of local communities and the emerging Catholic Church” (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 247). According to Steinfeld (2003), American Catholics had an instinct for “institution building” (p. 104). These American Catholics were not missionaries sent individually by His Holiness the Pope to plant seeds of Catholicism in America. Rather, they were orders of men and women who shared a particular spirituality rooted most often in the person of an inspirational figure like St. Benedict, St. Francis, St. Augustine, St. Ursuline, St. Ignatius Loyola and Catherine McAuley to name a few. They often shared an ethnic identity and they came to America to serve those immigrants who also shared that ethnic

identity. Most Catholics would be familiar with at least some of the myriad religious orders that Steinfels (2003) describes as those that “cross diocesan and parish lines” (p. 107). He credits them with being the Church’s “entrepreneurs” in America as the Church was growing (Steinfels, 2003, p. 108). Currie (2010) remarks that these women and men of great faith and against all odds built the foundation of Catholic higher education that exists in the U.S. today. Each institution has its own great story to tell. Catholic colleges and universities are a part of the nation’s largest private educational system (Steinfels, 2003).

The system of public colleges and universities so prevalent today did not come into existence until nearly 100 years after the founding of Georgetown. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 paved the way for this system, but they would not become the large ‘land grant’ universities we think of today until well into the 20th century (Rudolph, 1962). Even as the public university system grew, Catholic colleges and universities presented an alternative to public education. As public higher education grew, Catholic higher education could compete by offering something “distinctive” like smaller, more personal experiences and the continuing presence of religious symbols and practices (Langan 2000).

Before Vatican II, Catholic congregations of women were visibly (habits), spiritually and intellectually present on campuses “making the Catholic tradition institutionally vibrant” (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 246). “For many years there was never a question of identity since these institutions served mostly Catholics and were staffed by Catholics, particularly men and women in religious orders” (Steinfels, 2003, p. 110). In 1947, over 90% of Catholic colleges and universities were “under direct control

of religious orders” (Gallin, 1996, p. 18). Even in those years when governance was dominated by the order, many colleges had both civil and canonical identity in much the same way as their Protestant predecessors.

After World War II and with the creation of the G.I. Bill, there was a tremendous amount of growth throughout U.S. higher education (Freeland, 1992). Dramatic declines in the representation of the sponsoring order as a percentage of the faculty resulted from this growth. For example, at Boston College (BC) the percentage Jesuits on the faculty decreased from 43% just after World War II to 21% in 1964-1965. In the post-World War II years, 96% of the lay faculty were Roman Catholic. In 1964-1965, the percentage of Roman Catholic lay faculty could not be determined since BC no longer monitored the statistic (Burtchaell, 1998). There was a dramatic decline in the number of representatives of the sponsoring congregation present in these colleges and universities as well which became most dramatic in and beyond the 1960s (this decline will be detailed in a later section). However, with that dramatic decline in numbers as a backdrop, Burtchaell (1998) claims that the 1960s brought near collapse to Catholic colleges and universities as the orders could no longer provide “leadership and scholarship” (p. 563). A survival instinct drove the institutions in Burtchaell’s (1998) study to abandon or move away from their founding traditions.

There were other forces at work as well. Catholic colleges and universities were not respected as places of academic endeavor as we will see below.

Academic Integrity and Economic Issues

The challenges faced by Catholic higher education in America were not new in the later part of the 20th century. Catholic institutions had begun dealing with the need to

modernize as early as the latter part of the 19th century. This struggle continued in the early part of the 20th century. In part this was caused by the tremendous growth of public education at both secondary and higher education levels and through the introduction of the above mentioned Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. “Catholic colleges had to...bring themselves into line with contemporary norms in respect to institutional structure, curricular organization, and articulation between secondary, collegiate, and graduate levels of education” (Gleason, 1995, p. 21). Gleason (1995) goes on to state that this modernization happened “unevenly over a span of several decades” (p. 21).

During that same time there were increased calls for Catholic higher education to become more relevant. Gleason recalls Maurice Francis Egan who challenged Catholic colleges to “broaden their scope” if they did not wish to remain “small and isolated eddies apart from the main stream” (Gleason, 1995, p. 22). University of Chicago president Robert Maynard Hutchins, who served from 1929-1951, challenged the purpose of Catholic higher education which, he said, was “tainted by...athleticism, collegiatism, vocationalism, and anti-intellectualism” (in Gleason, 1995, p. 246). Hutchins challenged Catholics “to be true to their heritage and thereby demonstrate to the rest of the world that the intellectual tradition can again be made the heart of higher education.” Gleason (1995) recalled writings of noted Catholic scholar and historian John Tracy Ellis that “clearly establish(ed) that Catholics were shockingly under-represented in standard indices of achievement, and that their schools fell far below national norms in respect to sending their graduates to graduate school and to careers in scholarship” (p. 288).

Boston College, a subject of the Burtchaell (1998) study, provides a great example of the struggles of Catholic colleges and universities as they tried to adjust to

internal and external forces in the 1960s. Boston College was denied entry into Phi Beta Kappa in part because of the College's preponderance of the Philosophy requirement. As a result, in 1963 and 1964 Boston College greatly revamped its curriculum, lowering requirements for Philosophy and Theology (Burtchaell, 1998). As Catholic colleges and universities struggled to be taken seriously academically, Boston College made the decision to "master" the American educational model rather than retrench in a way described by Robert Harvanek S. J. Harvanek argued that the Jesuit colleges and universities had grown too big and complex to continue offering "a characteristically Jesuit education" (Burtchaell, 1998, p. 580). Father Walsh, then president of Boston College, thought that Harvanek was incorrect in his assertion that Jesuit institutions are "more Jesuit simply by having more Jesuits" (Burtchaell, 1998). Some Jesuits argued that lay colleagues, properly educated and formed, could preserve the Jesuit identity; others disagreed with this position.

Maturing academically did not necessarily imply or require the stripping of theology and philosophy from the curriculum. On the contrary, Hutchins believed in the transcendent mode of higher education in a metaphysical sense. Marsden (1994) reminds us of Hutchins and Adler's (both from University of Chicago) admonition that education is at its best when in the end it seeks ultimate truth through metaphysics. Hutchins substitutes this for theology. The professoriate was "fragmented" in their approach to learning which prevented them from addressing questions of ultimate truth according to Adler (pp. 377-381). "Religion deals with "the meaning of the whole" so that attempting to find meaning to life in anything less than the divine amounts to the idolatry

of promoting a partial interest or perspective as ultimate” (Marsden, 1994, p. 397 reflecting on Niebuhr).

Up until the 1960s Catholic colleges and universities had an “internalist” point of view which was seen as a weakness of the enterprise (Gleason 1995). There were significant voices who spoke out and called on Catholic colleges and universities to view their enterprise more objectively from an external point of view. Such voices included Ellis and University of Notre Dame president Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C. and those who gathered with Hesburgh at the famous “Land O’Lakes” gathering in 1967. The outcome of that gathering was the *Land O’Lakes Statement: The nature of the Contemporary Catholic University*. The statement begins, “The Catholic University today must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence” (as cited in Gallin, 1992, p. 7). Its opening section concludes “Distinctively, then, the Catholic university must be an institution, a community of learners or a community of scholars, in which Catholicism is perceptibly present and effectively operative” (as cited in Gallin, 1992, p. 7). These two expressions address the challenge of integrating academic excellence and the exploration of faith. “Integration as an educational goal (in Catholic higher education) therefore implied helping students to realize their fullest potential spiritually, as well as intellectually, and giving them an understanding of where they fit into the overall order of creation” (Gleason, 1995, p. 251).

Hellwig (2000) says that “at the minimum a Catholic university should be a true university in the accepted sense, and it should maintain a lively familiarity with the treasure of the tradition and the way of proceeding in the tradition” (as cited in Cernera

and Morgan, 2000, p. 10). Catholic universities in America are best positioned to promote and preserve the Catholic intellectual tradition because they are now recognized as first rate academic institutions and because they have the rich history of the tradition to draw from.

In addition to the challenges of building and maintaining academic integrity, Catholic higher education also had to compete for funding in order to remain healthy and vibrant. As colleges and universities entered the 1960s, the second most prevalent concern of Catholic college presidents was the role of religious orders¹. The first concern was the finance of higher education. This was closely related to the second issue at that time - the decline in contributed salaries and direct subsidy from the sponsoring order (Gallin, 1996). Those committed to the Protestant heritage of the liberal community saw the Catholics as a threat. One of the vestiges of this was the effort to keep Catholic education from receiving public funding (Marsden, 1994, pp. 400-402).

In the case of the College of New Rochelle in New York, a Catholic college founded by the Ursuline Sisters, external pressures included the conflict between the Bundy Committee which provided for funding for private colleges in the state of New York and the restrictive Blaine Amendment which forbade funding of institutions under the control of a denomination or in which a denominational tenet is taught (Burtchaell, 1998, pp. 646-652). At the same time there was an increased nervousness about the potential loss of federal funds for religious institutions (Gleason, 1995). In their applications for grants from the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, three Catholic colleges were found too sectarian to receive funding (Golden, 2006). This event added to

1. 1964-1965 Ford-Roy survey of Catholic College as quoted in Gallin 1996.

an overall sense of anxiety and triggered a massive move among Catholic colleges and universities to reshape their governance structures in a way that created distance between themselves and their Catholic identity.

Governance and Leadership

According to Golden (2006), “changes in the governance of Catholic colleges and universities were inevitable” (p. 91). External forces related to funding, accreditation and the pressure to be independent of sectarian control necessitated the change. According to Gallin (1996), there is a perception that “secularization” is negative and indicated institutions have become “devoid of religious meaning.” The 1960s saw a major shift in the makeup of institutional boards. Prior to this decade, the boards were largely populated with members of the sponsoring congregation. The board makeup changed to boards consisting of a predominance of lay men and women. Gallin (1996) draws a distinct difference between “secularization” and “laicization” with the latter more accurately describing this change in governance (p. xi). As stated by Gleason (1995), this move to include lay members on boards was very much in the spirit of Vatican II. Some saw this as a way of being more Catholic since it is more like life which involves a sharing of responsibility (Gleason, 1995).

By the late 1960s and in the wake of Vatican II, the change was well under way. In 1977, Martin Stamm conducted an analysis of board governance at 134 Catholic colleges and universities all of which had moved to one of several emerging systems of governance (as cited in Golden, 2006). In 2000, 172 Catholic colleges and universities responded to a survey that indicated that 45% operate with a unicameral structure (a single board with governance authority) and 51% operate with a bicameral structure (a

two level board usually with the college or university board responsible for routine governance and a board that represents the interests of the sponsoring community which may hold reserve powers) (Morey and Holtschneider, as cited in Golden, 2006).

Interestingly, in 1971, a Connecticut court found that four Catholic institutions of higher education were not too secular to receive funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act. The transformation in governance had accomplished this end at least.

Early trustees in these new governance models were very committed to maintaining and preserving the particular sponsor identity of the college or university and the Catholic identity. This was done with great deference to ‘sister’ or to ‘father,’ out of respect and admiration (Gallin, 1996). Fr. Paul Reinert, S.J. stated in 1967, that “it is clear that dominance by religious will be replaced, not typically by total turn-over to lay control, but by shared responsibility by religious and the laity” (in Gallin, 1996, pp. 2-3).

At the 2012 gathering of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU), Bishop Joseph P. McFadden of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and the chair of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Committee on Catholic Education called for trustees who value the unique mission of Catholic higher education. Tom Longin of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) joined McFadden in calling for trustees of Catholic colleges and universities to be “liaisons to the broader Catholic community.” Longin (2012) also enumerated best practices for Catholic college and university boards in light of McFadden’s call. They include: Review, Approve, Support College’s Mission; Endorse Vision Statement; and to answer the questions Who are we? What do we believe? Whom do we serve? What programs and services do we offer? In what form and

where do we offer them? How do we know our service is effective? (ACCU Conference address).

The *Application of Ex Corde Ecclesiae for the United States* lists responsibilities of boards of trustees at Catholic colleges and universities. These include:

- Be committed to the strategic implications of the college's Catholic identity as set forth in its mission statement
- Be Catholics committed to the Church ...to the extent possible
- Develop effective ways of relating to and collaborating with the local bishop on matters of mutual concern
- Be knowledgeable about ecclesiastical documents on higher education and consider ways of implementing their principles
- Periodically undertake an internal review of the alignment of the college's mission statement, courses of instruction, research program, and service activity

(The Application of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* for the U.S., Part II, Art. 4)

As the governing boards were changing and as the number of lay men and women members increased, there also began a shift in leadership at these institutions. There were fewer men and women from the sponsoring congregations who were prepared or skilled to lead what had become more complex institutions of higher education. In the 20 years since the promulgation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in 1990, the number of presidents called from the founding order decreased from 108 of 183 (60%) to 65 of 183 (36%) (Appendix B).

A respondent to Morey and Piderit's (2006) interview suggested that lay leaders are not adequately formed and theologically less literate than the sponsors. Another

implied that institutions had no plan to fill the congregational void (Morey and Piderit, 2006). So, do we fill the void with ‘Catholic’ or ‘Catholic formed by the sponsoring tradition?’ “No organizational culture can survive or flourish without a visible witness group” (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 272). Morey and Piderit then assert that no group of lay men or women could ever have the same significant preparation and formation that members of the founding congregations of men and women who preceded them had. If the leaders (administration and board) are not committed to the Catholic identity and preserving sponsoring tradition, then certainly faculty, staff and administrators will likewise not be committed. Another issue that develops is the lack of faculty and staff who are adequately formed in the Catholic tradition. This is in part a result of the decline in the members of the sponsoring tradition (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 94). This dissertation challenges that assumption and presents vibrant examples stating the opposite.

Institutions committed to upholding the sponsoring tradition can put practices in place to support this commitment. An example is hiring for mission. There are plusses and minuses to the concept of hiring for mission. How is mission defined? Mission statements and tag lines are inadequate. Commitment to the continuing education of faculty and staff in Catholic identity is as important as the hiring process. It is also important to carefully develop and identify leadership in the face of declining numbers of religious – leaders who bring a commitment to mission and to upholding Catholic identity (Steinfels 2003).

“Every college president today understands that the refashioning of Catholic identity in a way that will be effective in a new social and demographic context is an essential part of his or her work” (Langan, 2000, p. 1).

Dillon (2002) conducted a survey of Catholic educators to determine their attitudes about Catholic identity. She randomly selected 40 Catholic colleges and universities and surveyed 181 administrators and 472 faculty at those institutions. Of the many findings in the survey, a few stand out for attention. For example, administrators attached great importance to preserving specific expressions of the Catholic intellectual tradition (on a scale: a lot, some, none): social justice teaching – 89% a lot; communal ethics – 78% a lot; coupling of faith and reason – 74% a lot. “Faculty respondents were significantly more likely than the administrators to say that they attach “some” rather than “a lot” of importance to aspects of the tradition” (as cited in Cernera and Morgan, p. 45). This is an indication of the necessity to form leaders in the tradition so that leaders can articulate tradition and form others.

Church Authority

Historically, Catholic colleges have been more independent from Church authority than their protestant counterparts. Ties to religious orders were strong and there was no patronage from the local ordinary or diocese. Dioceses were often established well after a college or university was founded. Benedictine monks from Pennsylvania accepted a gift of land to establish a seminary and lay college in North Carolina which later became Belmont Abbey College founded in 1876. Leo Haid O.S.B. was sent from the Archabbey in Pennsylvania to lead this new community and begin a college. Over the course of his years there he served as Abbot and was appointed Vicar Apostolic of

North Carolina and ordained a bishop in 1888. Throughout all, he continued to direct the Abbey and the College. The Benedictine identity of the church and the college were very much entwined.

Gallin (1992) observes that the Church was attempting to exert control over American Catholic colleges and universities at the same time that institutions were moving toward increased lay control and independence. These factors served the dual purpose of responding to Vatican II's call for a more engaged laity and the need to secure federal and state dollars which had been largely reserved for public and secular colleges and universities (pp. 63-64). Since the 1960s however, this relationship has become strained as the gulf between institutions and the Church have widened.

Beginning in the late 1960s and continuing still today, the representatives of the Church and leaders and scholars from Catholic higher education around the world have engaged in a dialogue about the changing nature of higher education, its leadership, its relationship to the Holy See and issues of academic freedom. This conversation takes place in a number of ways. There have been international gatherings of delegates in Rome and other places around the world. These have led to official letters stating positions that have been drafted, commented upon, and redrafted. Some of these meetings and letters have led to statements of official Church doctrine like *Sapientia Christiana* (Christian Wisdom) which was issued by Pope John Paul II in 1979 and dealt with ecclesiastical institutions and faculties. Most Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S. are not "canonically erected" nor do they have "ecclesiastical faculties." There are a handful of Catholic colleges that were established by Dioceses with one, The Catholic University of America, established by the Holy See. Ecclesiastical faculties

normally refer to those engaged in the teaching of sacred theology, canon law and other closely related disciplines in the Church. As *Sapientia Christiana* was being developed, a communication from the Vatican to all Catholic colleges and universities raised concern among the higher education community. It seemed to signal to them that the Church was beginning to assert a level of control over them. This dialogue eventually led to the creation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (*from the Heart of the Church*) issued in 1990, which ultimately defined the relationship between all of Catholic higher education and the Church. Ten years later, the American Bishops completed their document, *The Application of Ex Corde Ecclesiae for the United States*.

The debate over the application of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in the United States continued well after the document was released in 1990. “Cardinal Francis George (in 1999) ...declared that “no ecclesiastical institution is completely autonomous, and no one is Catholic simply on his or her own terms,” but that “a Catholic university finds its identity... in a network of ecclesial communion...in the heart of the church...which is a threat only to those who understand freedom as complete autonomy and for whom relationships jeopardize control”” (George, 1999, p. 621 in Janosik, 1999, pp. 19-20).

One of the issues that persists is whether the Church’s authority extends to the institution or to the individual. In reference to teaching sacred theology, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* calls on the teacher of theology to seek a mandate (mandatum) from competent ecclesial authority, usually the local bishop. It does not require the institution to seek this mandate on behalf of the instructor. Conservative translators of this requirement insist that the institution is in fact required or should, at least, encourage theology faculty to seek the mandatum. A case at the University of Dayton speaks to the evolving

relationship to the magisterium as “individual” and not institutional. (Gleason, 1995). A faculty member at Dayton was accused by colleagues of teaching heresy. This complaint was made directly to the local ordinary (bishop). After one in- house and one external review, the case was resolved, but the most important determination was that expressed above; that everyone was obliged to respect the bishop’s teaching authority, but that the obligation rested upon the individual and not the university.

Documents such as these are codified through the application of *norms* and the code of canon (Church) law. These norms and laws by nature sound and appear very legalistic. The Pontiff, Vatican representatives and local Bishops, are tasked with translation, application and enforcement. For the most part, these representatives attempt to be pastoral in such application. Pope Benedict XVI, in his address to Catholic college and university presidents in April 2008 said, “First and foremost, every Catholic educational institution is a place to encounter the living God who in Jesus Christ reveals his transforming love and truth” (ACCU web site, 2012).

In that same address, Benedict made an appeal appropriate to include here to congregations of religious men and women.

Here I wish to make a special appeal to Religious Brothers, Sisters and Priests: do not abandon the school apostolate; indeed, renew your commitment to schools especially those in poorer areas. In places where there are many hollow promises which lure young people away from the path of truth and genuine freedom, the consecrated person's witness to the evangelical counsels is an irreplaceable gift. I encourage the Religious present to bring renewed enthusiasm to the promotion of vocations. Know that your witness to the ideal of consecration and mission among

the young is a source of great inspiration in faith for them and their families.

(Benedict XVI, 2008, ACCU web site)

Issues of Catholic Identity

In order to understand Catholic or sponsor identity, it is necessary to understand the concept of 'identity' itself. "(I)identity has been considered as a loosely coupled set of ideas and concepts, a framework or a point of view" (Erickson, 1980, in Janosik, 1999, p. 20). "A primary meaning of the term identity in most formulations is a classification of the self that identifies the individual as recognizably different from others and similar to members of the same class" (Erickson, 1980, p. 109, in Janosik, 1999, p. 20).

Identity is defined by both internal and external forces and it has "both external and internal dimensions" (Janosik, 1999, p. 21). Comparisons with other institutions define external distinctiveness. A university has a "singular identity" when it can be recognized as different from other institutions that perform the same function. Identity can also be determined by how the various aspects of the college or university interact with one another.

Analysis of these external and internal dimensions suggests that institutions which have a distinctive identity exhibit three overarching characteristics: (a) commitment to a unifying theme which is authentically demonstrated through articulation of institutional vision and organizational values, (b) operative decision making strategies which consistently emphasize and support vision and values, and (c) dedication to achieving excellence in the context of the specified institutional vision. (Townsend, Newell, & Wiese, 1992)

Mission and values lie at the heart of the identity of institutions of higher education (or any institution for that matter). What is unique about the Catholic mission and values at institutions founded by orders of men and women is how those values are expressive of both the Catholic and sponsor heritage of the college or university. Public expressions of mission and values help to build institutional identity. All actors within the institution must be aware of mission and vision and embracing of it. This will animate the work of the faculty, staff, leadership and governing body (Janosik 1999). “In the case of a Catholic university, it would seem obvious that it requires a mission that is driven by something over and above the often conflicting ideologies of the varied disciplines at hand” (O’Brien, 2002, p. 195). “More recently Murphy (1991) has focused on the degree to which vision and values, especially as expressed through the tradition of the founding order and the leadership of the institution, influence perceived Catholic identity of institutions” (Janosik, 1999, p. 17). Indifference to mission is a concern – hostility to mission is a greater concern (Morey and Piderit, 2006).

O’Brien (1995) identifies some writers about Catholic identity in higher education as “restorationists” and includes the likes of Gleason and Burtchaell; this researcher would add Morey and Piderit. These writers raise concerns about what they see as the “erosion of Catholic identity.” On the other side of the debate we find the “Americanists” or “pluralists” or “universalists” such as Ellis, Murray, Hesburgh and Gallin to which the researcher would add George O’Brien and Grant and Vandenberg.

Janosik (1999) discusses identity and how it is formed by the institution’s relationship with the Church. Is the proper relationship with the Church similar to the kind of relationship colleges and universities have with external organizations like

accrediting agencies or the government? Is the proper relationship better viewed as though the Church were internal to the institution? Janosik (1999) tells us that the restorationists and pluralists have already “staked out their positions” but that the politically charged climate of the debate makes it difficult to develop “theory and practice concerning operative distinctiveness” (p. 29).

As stated earlier, each Catholic institutions of higher education in America started out as a unique institution formed by its founding community or congregation and early sponsors and shaped by the people it served in a particular geographic locale. External forces like the growth of public education and the need to compete with public and other private institutions or demands of regional accreditors or demands of local, state and federal government drove our institutions toward a level of sameness. The Church has made numerous calls for our Catholic institutions to be unique. Preserving and upholding the sponsor identity provides a way for institutions to be both Catholic and unique within that large group. The 1960s cultural revolution combined with Vatican II made “institutional survival in the midst of ideological collapse” uncertain and left them (Catholic colleges) uncertain of their identity” (Gleason, 1995, p. 305). Steinfels (2003) challenges us with the question “what is Catholic about Catholic higher education” when compared to the public university down the street. This is part of what he defines as “the crisis in Catholic identity” (p. 110).

There was a mass exodus of priests and sisters in the wake of Vatican II, especially among Catholic women’s orders which left their colleges short of sisters to teach and fill administrative roles. From 1966 to 1969, 3,413 men resigned from the priesthood. From 1966 to 1980, the number of sisters declined from 181,421 to 126,517

(Dolan in Gallin, 1996). This dramatic decline led to the “identity crisis” in Catholic higher education, and Gleason (1995) asserts that this identity problem persists not institutionally or organizationally but ideologically (p. 320). The Catholic identity of colleges founded by women religious in particular eroded in the wake of the cultural upheaval of the 1960s (Morey and Piderit, 2006, pp. 251-252).

The identity problem in Catholic higher education “consists in a lack of consensus as to the substantive content of the ensemble of religious beliefs, moral commitments, and academic assumptions that supposedly constitute Catholic identity, and a consequent inability to specify what that identity entails for the practical functioning of Catholic colleges and universities” (Gleason, 1995, p. 320). “(A) distinct good is accomplished when a major moral and religious tradition as exemplified, for instance, in Catholicism or in Methodism or in Judaism, plays a constitutive role in the identity of a university” (Langan, 2000, p. 5). John Henry Newman continues to exert influences over the discussions of what it means to be a university even today (as cited in Turner, 1996). Newman’s writings/discourses are clearly seen in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, in particular when speaking of the relationship between the Holy See and the university in Discourse 1. According to Newman, as read in his famous discourses on *The Idea of a University* written in the 19th century, “theology is crucial to the integrity of the university” (Gleason 1995). Gleason (1995) said that caution against secularization dated back to the Catholic Revival movement in the 1930s. They rallied against the separation of religion from education (Gleason 1995). Steinfels (2003) contends that “Catholic identity must be centered in the Catholic universities and intellectual life” (p. 150). He looks to the “how” of teaching as a key to upholding Catholic identity across the curriculum. This “how” is

rooted in the charism of the sponsoring order and can be interpreted, in the opinion of the researcher, through both Catholic and congregational lenses.

Hellwig asserts that there are many external forces and influences that “tend to erode both the integration of higher education and the identity of religiously sponsored institutions.” She gives these institutions a sort of benefit of the doubt in that while this erosion is not a conscious move on the part of the college or university, reclaiming identity requires a conscious action on the part of the institution (as cited in Cernera and Morgan, 2000, pp. 2-3).

Some of these qualities find a voice in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* and/or the *Application of Ex Corde Ecclesiae for the United States* i.e. “The university president should be a Catholic” (USCCB, 2000, Art. 4.3.a).

Cunninggim (1994) argues that conservative critics of church-related college, including Catholic colleges, will only be satisfied if the institution “affirms its religious affiliation in the new old-fashioned way that such (critics) desire” (pp. 68-69). He goes on to say that such critics fail to take into account a number of factors outside of college or university control that may affect perception of institutional identity “a. it takes little account of differences in rootage (founding) itself; b. it ignores the possibility – the actuality – of growth and change in the churches’ own positions through the years; and c. perhaps most important, it does not recognize the large, demonstrable, maturing change in the relationship of the colleges and universities to their ecclesiastical sponsors during the century” (pp. 68-69). Cuninggim (1994) makes two additional valuable points regarding the ethos of church related higher education. He says “Identity is not the same as identically, and a college is not the same as a church” (pp. 69-70).

Cuninggim (1994) takes on Burtchaell (1998) in his recounting of Vanderbilt University's separation from the Methodist church. Essentially he argues that Burtchaell's recounting was flawed by a tainted point of view and a misreading of the facts. The "villainy" reported by Burtchaell was, according to Cuninggim (1994) not as dramatic as he claimed. Burtchaell (1998) claimed that the Methodist churchmen were solidly against the separation but in reality the "vote...was by the close margin of 150 to 140" not the overwhelming majority Burtchaell claimed. In such retellings, the point of view of the author of the study can have a significant effect on the interpretation of data.

According to Imbrelli (2002), it is not simply the academic that is suffering from an identity crisis rather "the Catholic mind or intellectual tradition is in a state of acute crisis today, I would suggest that a key dimension of that crisis is the loss of a robust Christic center" (Imbrelli, 2002, p. 5). Imbrelli (2002) derides what he refers to as "misguided ecumenism that seeks not to cause offense" and the "invocation of a 'generic brands' deity that only exists in an abstract realm" (p. 5).

Institutions are interested in enhancing their Catholic culture which has been eroded by external forces. They insist that the culture needs "enriching" so that it will become a more "favorable brew" (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 36). Morey and Piderit (2006) establish what they refer to as "boundary points" for Catholic identity. At one end you find institutions that are "too Catholic to be a university" and at the other end you find institutions that are "too secular to be Catholic" (p. 35). Colleges and universities choose to position themselves within the boundary points based on many community factors. This leaves institutions open to criticism (p. 36). Cuninggim (1994) gives an apt and more complete list of identifying qualifications of church-relatedness, many of which

are still relevant or which at least have become the fodder of criticism in Catholic higher Education. These include:

1. Founding and historic association – the sponsor identity.
2. Structure and governance – ownership, control, leadership, board presence, “final authority.”
3. Support – money, personnel, moral support.
4. The credentials of the college leaders – expectations for leadership; “the church expects the college president to be X (Roman Catholic?)” What percentage of the board should be Catholic? Faculty?
5. The students – how many are expected from the faith tradition?
6. The course of study – courses reflective of the tradition.
7. Campus life – expectations of behavior.
8. Religious affairs and provisions – “worship, study, service or whatever the denomination insists on.
9. Ethos – proclamation of identity. How is it like the sponsoring church (pp. 44-45)?

O’Brien (2002) issues a call for Catholic colleges to promote vocation. Not necessarily just religious vocation, but in all of life’s endeavors. Imbrelli (2002) calls on higher education and keepers of the Catholic intellectual tradition to be more Christ-centered. Only then “we shall discover anew that *ex corde ecclesiae* is ever *ex corde Christi*” (p. 8). Gleason (1995) asserts that “Catholic colleges and universities” must become “a distinctive element in American higher education (p. 322). It is imperative that we do this now while memories and members of the founding order are still present and/or remembered on Catholic college and university campuses.

Symbolism and Iconography

Like any organization, Catholic colleges and universities have a corporate culture. Corporate culture has a number of important hallmarks including artifacts, norms, values and basic assumptions (Cummings and Worley, 2009). A particular interest of this study is the role of artifacts when trying to relate or demonstrate sponsor identity. Cummings and Worley (2009) define artifacts as “visible symbols of the deeper levels of culture” (p. 520). They may include many things like dress and behavior, language, organizational structure, décor, art displays, symbols, banners, etc. (Cummings and Worley, 2009). “By themselves, artifacts can provide a great deal of information about the real culture of the organization because they often represent the deeper assumptions” (Cummings and Worley, 2009, p. 521). Schein (2010) defines three levels of culture beginning with artifacts and including espoused beliefs and values and basic underlying assumptions. These include “all the phenomena that you would see, hear and feel when you encounter a new group” (Schein, 2010, p. 23). Schein (2010) also includes “climate” among his artifacts. This is very important in how institutions animate their ethos, especially in a Catholic context. When a prospective student and family visit campus, will they notice a perceptible difference between your campus and the campus they visited earlier in the day or yesterday? There should be a distinct difference that resonates with the values of the institution that is palpable. This distinction could simply be that one institution is Catholic and one is public, but students make decisions about institutional attendance based on more defining aspects of culture. “Somehow it just felt different. It felt like I belonged there.”

Artifacts can be objectively observed and measured as they were in a study of Catholic college and university web sites. Gambescia and Paolucci (2011) conducted a study of Catholic identity as institutions present it on their web sites. They categorize seven markers which include:

1. Explicit mentions of Catholic identity.
2. Mention of sponsor identity or relationship to a sponsoring identity or heritage.
3. A lead intellectual statement that includes a reference to the Catholic intellectual tradition or some similar reference.
4. Specific references on the human resources page of the web site regarding hiring preferences sensitive to Catholic heritage.
5. References to Catholic worship.
6. References to Catholic social service.
7. Visible references to heritage through symbols, photos, etc.

The most prolific presentation of identity on Catholic college and university web sites was related to the sponsor heritage or identity. This may be an indication that Catholic institutions are more comfortable discussing sponsor identity rather than make specific references to their relationships to the Catholic Church.

As noted in the introduction, Estanek, James and Norton (2006) studied mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities. This study looked for ‘artifacts’ of Catholic and sponsor identity like references to service or the Catholic intellectual tradition among others that may identify the institution as Catholic. Ninety-four point five percent of their sample made direct references to their Catholic identity and 76% of

the sample made reference to the sponsor identity or heritage. The mission statement is an important marker of Catholic and sponsor identity.

We live in a world that is rich with symbolism and artifacts of our culture. Higher education enrollment professionals know full well that the average 18 year old perspective student will only give your material, electronic or otherwise, a brief look for such symbols which capture the eye and their interest. Our culture is rich with such symbolism. Moore (2010) has written an entire volume about the emergence of the “ribbon culture” since the appearance of the “yellow ribbon” during the Iran hostage crisis of the late 1970s. We now see a preponderance of “awareness ribbons” that immediately identifies the wearer as promoting breast cancer research or autism awareness. Our electronic culture has heightened the role of symbols and artifacts as well. Web sites are filled with flash images that entice us to delve further into the subject at hand.

For many years, Sisters, priests and brothers were a “witness community of role models” (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 254). They were highly visible representatives of their culture and belief. The culture they created on campus was rich. “Content and symbols support the goals of a vibrant culture” (Morey and Piderit, 2006, p. 265). If a Catholic college or university is going to support a vibrant sponsor culture, it must be rich with artifacts of Catholic and denominational identity. For example, most observers would expect to see crosses and crucifixes on Catholic college campuses. But there is a difference between the Benedictine cross found on the medal of St. Benedict which is rich with Latin acronyms and invocations of prayer and the iconographic cross of San Damiano originally found in the church where Francis of Assisi heard the voice of God.

Catholic symbols and artifacts can be expressive of sponsor identity and sponsor symbols can help define Catholic identity. All are important markers that make institutions distinct from one another.

Sponsorship

There are 193 Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) member institutions in the U.S. (Appendix A). This number does not include seminaries which are also members, but it does represent the vast majority of Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S. ACCU member institutions were founded by myriad congregations of men and women and some dioceses. Twenty major religious orders have two or more colleges and universities, though there is great diversity in charism; 28 religious orders have one college or university; ten are diocesan. The breakdown by affiliation is as follows:

Table 1

A summary of Catholic colleges by sponsor identity

Institutional Affiliation (top 10)	
Jesuit	27
Franciscan	21
Mercy	17
Dominican	16
Benedictine	13
Diocesan	10
Holy Cross	8
Sisters of Charity	8
Sisters of St. Joseph	8
LaSallian	6

Almost all of these founding orders can trace their heritage to a dominant person who either founded or inspired the order. Our Christian heritage has great exemplars noted by

Hellwig such as Benedict and Scholastica, and Francis and Clare. There is an undeniable influence of the Catholic intellectual tradition on western civilization. Each of these figures can be traced to a particular community of believers i.e. Benedictine, Franciscan. Each institutional founding order, from its very beginning, was seeking a way to relate to and spread the Gospel of Jesus. Each did so in a unique way based on time, place, personalities of founding members and world events. This centuries long period of influence should be highlighted when describing institutional identity. This helps keep the Catholic intellectual tradition alive and vibrant.

As noted earlier, prior to 1962 and the beginning of the Second Vatican Council, there remained a significant presence of members of the sponsoring order on campus as faculty, teachers, administrators and students. Many of the college and university presidents were selected from the sponsoring order. Morey and Piderit (2006) in their discussion of religious women, tell us “these women led lives committed to making the Catholic tradition institutionally vibrant and personally transferrable within their institutions” (p. 246). In the late 1950s and early 1960s there began a cultural shift at Catholic colleges and universities, particularly those founded by religious women. In light of the broader cultural upheavals in the United States in the 1960s, there were also upheavals among the vowed religious. A generation of more highly educated women religious who had been the symbolic presence of the Church and the order on college campuses began to leave campuses in pursuit of life as laywomen or to follow interests other than education such as service to the poor or social justice (Morey & Piderit, 2006, p. 250-251). There were similar dramatic declines in the numbers of men in religious life and they too left the academy to pursue other interests.

Such a shift in how religious women and men manifested their vocations was not unique to higher education. A similar shift was happening in Catholic health care as well.

Religious communities, faithful to the mandates of Vatican II, recognized multiple ways of responding to God's call -- some of which were not directly tied to the specifics of a ministry. At the same time, a majority of the communities experienced a loss of members and a diminishment in size. The decrease in numbers of religious within institutions led to increased concern about the control (and later, the influence) the founding communities exercised within the institutions. Concerns sparked dialogue about how the ministries would remain ministries, and how they could be recognized as faithful to their mission, to the intent of the founders, and to the church. The term *sponsorship* came into use as a way of recognizing the important role that founding communities must continue to play within the ministry. An awareness of a growing separation between the roles of governance and that of sponsorship also grew. (Catholic Health Association of the United States, 2007)

The "founding role" mentioned above is not the only role of the sponsor. Both Canon Law and the Pope John Paul II's 1990 encyclical *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* reference the important role of the sponsor in Catholic higher education. Canon 808 states "Even if it is in fact Catholic, no university is to bear the title or name of Catholic university without the consent of competent ecclesiastical authority" (In Holland, 2011, p. 2). The college or university itself is not competent ecclesiastical authority. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* states "Every Catholic university, without ceasing to be a university, has a relationship to the

church that is essential to its institutional identity” (in Gallin, 1992, p. 421). That relationship requires an agent, advocate or sponsor. Again Holland (2011) tells us ““that in order to use the title Catholic, the university must either be in the hands of an entity which by its very definition works in “the name of the Church” (a diocese, religious institute, society of apostolic life, or an “apostolic” public juridic person) or it must have the written consent of ecclesiastical authority”” (p. 2). Essentially the Church is protecting its ‘brand.’ An institution may say it is Catholic, but the Church makes the final determination as to whether the institution fulfills all of the requirements to make such a claim. Because of this, Holland (2011) would argue that the Church itself has taken on the role as the “ultimate sponsor of a college or university bearing the name Catholic” (p. 2).

Catholic health care organizations have already had to deal with this issue. In order to create a canonically acceptable link to the Church, canon law allows for the creation of the public juridic person. “A public juridic person in canon law is a sort of canonical mirror of the civil not-for-profit corporation. Canonical juridic personality could be granted to the college or university, coincident with its civil corporation, so that it then has legal standing with the resultant obligations and rights, in both spheres: civil and canonical” (Holland, 2011, p. 4). Founding or supporting congregations of men and women are who we refer to today as “sponsor.” Sponsor comes from the Latin word meaning pledge or promise. A sponsor is one who gives assurance. This can be best understood in the context of baptism or confirmation. The sponsor assures that the initiate will be properly instructed.

So what exactly does it mean to sponsor a Catholic institution of higher education? The word itself has no canonical or civil definition so its meaning is subject to numerous interpretations both in practice and in theory (Golden, 2006; Holland, 2011). Still there is a great deal written about it, there are many experts in the field, and it occupies the minds of college administrators and members of boards of trustees at Catholic colleges and universities across the country. Though the word has no meaning, Catholic institutions have both civil and canonical identity. Catholic colleges and universities do not enter into a contract per se with the Church. Some in recent years have formalized their relationship through ‘oaths of fidelity’ taken by the president or by insisting that theology faculty have received the “mandatum” described above. However, on the civil side, each institution has a charter and/or by-laws and/or articles of incorporation on file with their local or state government depending on local custom. In fact, college and universities enter into all sorts of legal civil contracts in the course of business. The relationship with the Church is not so orderly. Canon lawyers (those who deal with Church law) and civil lawyers (those who deal with local, state and federal law) have been engaged in conversations about the nature of canonical and civil relationships since the end of the 1960s (Smith, Brown and Reynolds, 2006). Prior to 1970 the word that best described the legal relationship with the Church was *Dominium* – control over goods and property and issue regarding their disposition (Golden, 2006). *Dominium* has been replaced with sponsor. “Sponsorship of an apostolate or ministry is a formal relationship between a recognized Catholic organization and a legally formed entity, entered into for the sake of promoting and sustaining the Church’s mission in the world” (Smith, Brown and Reynolds, 2006).

A number of useful and interesting models have emerged that describe the relationship between the Church and the institution typically through their governing board and sponsors. The first issue that had to be settled was how the newly created and mostly lay governance board would relate to the sponsoring organization. Some of this is covered above under *Governance and Leadership* but it bears repeating and refining here. Most institutional governing boards (96% as of the year 2000) have either a unicameral or bicameral structure. A unicameral board is a single entity empowered to carry out the work of the institution. These boards may have representatives of the sponsoring organization on them, but, unless mandated by the by-laws, those members do not enjoy any special rights or privileges. The sponsoring congregation has no authority over the board or the institution. A bicameral board has two parts. The institutional governing board has legal authority to carry out the work of the college or university. However, there is a higher power, usually a group made up of members of the sponsoring community and who may hold certain powers in reserve. These typically involve approving the hiring of a president, transactions concerning real estate since some orders still own the land under colleges and universities and the ultimate disposition of the assets of the college or university. When those reserve powers are well defined there is very little conflict between the two boards, but having two boards certainly increases the risk of conflict (Morey and Holtschneider, 2000 as cited in Golden, 2006).

As concepts continue to develop and dialogue continues a number of emerging models have been suggested. These include:

- Sponsorship Boards or Councils – Group (including both lay and religious) appointed by congregational leadership hold reserve powers on behalf of congregation.

- Contractual Agreement – Congregation enters into contract with self-perpetuating board and has influence and responsibility for mission.
- Public Juridic Person – Example from Catholic health care; create a public juridic person to act as sponsoring agent.
- Association of the Faithful – Seeking recognition from a diocese to form an “association of the faithful” that would have canonical status and come under the proper ecclesiastical authority.

It is increasingly clear however that no matter how the relationship is defined: independent public juridic persons, wholly owned subsidiaries of some public juridic person, private juridic persons, public or private associations, or even de facto associations, each is subject to canon law in some way (Beal, 2006). “all the faithful, regardless of their status or condition, are bound “to maintain communion with the Church,” whether they act as individuals or in association with others” (Beal, 2006)

This was not always the case, however. After Vatican II, Msgr. John McGrath, a civil and canon lawyer, undertook the task of determining the legal nature of Catholic institutions as their boards became dominated by lay men and women. He essentially said that, once a Catholic institution was organized as a civil entity or legal corporation it ceased being “ecclesiastical goods” and “therefore canonical permission was not necessary for restructuring” (as cited in Golden, 2006, p. 92). This canonical divergence with historical practice did not stand. There were a number of critics but perhaps none more influential than Adam Maida, a canon lawyer from the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Archdiocese (who later became Cardinal). Maida wrote a number of critiques of the “McGrath Thesis” and, in 1974, it was repudiated by the Church in a letter sent by

Gabriel-Marie Cardinal Garrone, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, a prominent figure in the debates and documents regarding Catholic identity. McGrath and Maida made reference to the term ‘sponsor’ in their debates and arguments. Their high profile discourse actually had the effect of heightening the meaning and power of the term (DiPietro, 2006).

While the canonical and civil implications of this discourse are important, there are other implications that need to be explored. First, there is the issue of the decline in the presence of members of the sponsoring order on our campuses.

The declining numbers of active religious and priests in the United States has entailed their shrinking presence in Catholic institutional apostolates. Second, those who remain associated with the institutions are either increasingly disengaged from their day-to-day life or relegated, and perhaps marginalized, to specialized areas dealing with “religious stuff.” (Beal, 2006)

Janosik (1999) states “the degree to which the founder or founders maintain corporate influence through the governing board and the president’s cabinet, maintain viable presence in the day-to-day academic and administrative life of the institution, and otherwise contribute directly or indirectly through committed laity to the fundamental religious and spiritual values of the institution is critical to role preservation and corporate influence” (p. 25).

If members of the religious community are not present then who will represent them and animate and uphold their identity and charism? As organizations continue the shift from complete sponsorship by the religious order to shared sponsorship with lay colleagues and finally toward a time when lay women and men alone will be entrusted

with their institutions, it is important that this final transition happen in a careful, deliberate and trusting way. Grant and Vandenberg (2004) describe this journey as one “of accompaniment, of journeying with, companioning, in which the road is travelled together. David J. O’Brien argues “Catholic colleges should continue to seek a renewal of their historic effort to integrate faith and learning, not by reclaiming the institution, but by persuading colleagues and the public that this is a worthwhile thing to do” (as cited in Grant and Vandenberg, 2004, pp. 105-106). “Catholic colleges and universities will demonstrate their Catholic identity in an institutional ethos where teachers, administrators, staff members, trustees and sponsors collaborate with each other and with their local communities to teach our students to “act justly, to love tenderly, and to walk humbly with God”” (Sanders and Ashe, 2004, p. 118).

As noted earlier the demographic shifts in these institutions are not simply among the vowed religious members of the community. More and more non-Catholic students study at these colleges and universities. Many faculty came from large, secular, public universities and did not necessarily share the faith tradition of the institution. Again, this in some ways make Catholic colleges and universities more Catholic. Hellwig (2000) states that our Catholic colleges must necessarily be open to faculty and students from all faith traditions and that their presence makes for a more lively dialogue of faith. She goes on to say that it is clear that “a critical mass of faculty, administration and staff really committed to the Catholic mission of the institution is essential if the character of the institution is to survive” (as cited in Cernera and Morgan, p. 17). There must be a balance if identity is to be preserved.

So lacking a canon lawyer, how does an institution wrestle with the concept of sponsorship? Grant and Vandenberg (1998) describe three steps in the transition of sponsorships from a model dominated by the order to one heavily dependent on lay men and women. Steps included:

1. Permission – the sponsor acknowledges that the paradigm has shifted.
2. Preparation – the intentional formation of those who follow.
3. Praxis – “the union of action and reflection,” “rigorous effort to be faithful,” “focus on creative fidelity” and “emphasis on workplace spirituality and accountability for mission integration” (pp. 118-120).

Underpinning all of this is what Grant and Vandenberg (1998) refer to as “a theology of sponsorship” which acknowledges each individual’s “call to holiness.” Through our baptism, we are all called to ministry. Sponsorship calls us to serve in a way that is “bound together by Gospel spirituality, a deep sense of personal and mutual accountability and commitment to the continuity of the ministry and to fidelity to the mission” (pp. 121-122).

There are many examples of thriving sponsorship relationship in Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S. Gallin (2000) gives many examples of how Catholic colleges and universities in the 1990s began to program around Catholic and sponsor identity. In particular she mentioned a University of Dayton program which provided resources to faculty to explore “ethical dimensions of many different professions” or the Georgetown program in “Centered Pluralism” which “focused on the Jesuit and Catholic identity of Georgetown.” She also points to the creation of “institutes” that explore “issues from the

perspective of Catholic tradition” (p. 181). This dissertation explored a number of examples like those described by Gallin but in today’s context.

Cuninggim (1994) gives a more hopeful interpretation of the emerging model of church-related higher education. These institutions are both “free and committed.” They act independently and make their own way academically and programmatically “and they cherish their tie to the community of faith that founded them.” The researcher argues that this is best animated not only by the tie to the Catholic Church, but, more specifically, to the founding congregation.

Rev. Charles Currie, in his 2010 address upon the occasion of his receiving the Hesburgh Award, speaks of the synthesis of a bishop’s understanding, friendship and support and an inspirational sharing of sponsoring charism and lay leadership up to the challenge.

Closing Thoughts

Ultimately, there is in fact no panacea, no silver bullet, no once-and-for-all solution to insure Catholic identity... [N]o one thing will do it, but rather constant alertness to opportunities, initiatives on many fronts, with some successes, some failures, no quitting. None of this can be accomplished without leadership. That means presidents of Catholic colleges and universities who don’t make Catholic identity an afterthought but rank it with the top concerns (primarily financial) that daily occupy their attention. That also means second-tier and middle-level staff in administration and faculties who do not view fostering their school’s Catholic identity as a burden – or as someone else’s task – but as a challenge to be creative and reflective. (Steinfels, 2003, p. 160)

Steinfels (2003) frames a challenge for institutions of higher education as it relates to sponsor and Catholic identity. It is not enough to simply proclaim affiliation. It must be incorporated into practice, mission, programs, and daily life and visibly present in icons, symbols and artifacts that express institutional identity. This study provides a means to test the extent to which institutions respond to Steinfels' (2003) challenge. In a time when the presence of members of the sponsoring order are declining depriving students, faculty and staff and the community of daily visible reminders of sponsor identity, are these institutions committed to preserving sponsor identity? Do they proclaim it? Is the vernacular of sponsor identity present in institutional dialogue and publications? If so, are there other visual symbols that reinforce sponsor identity? This study began from the point of view that sponsor identity is important and that it distinguishes these institutions in a competitive higher education market place. It examined institutions that have made a commitment to achieving a level of distinction by holding up and animating sponsor identity, which could, in turn, stand as examples for others to emulate.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Mixed Methods Exploratory Design: Taxonomy Development Model

This study used a mixed methods exploratory design: taxonomy development model. The study proceeded in two phases – qualitative (QUAL) followed by quantitative (quan). The qualitative phase of the study consisted of interviews with key personnel at the colleges and/or universities in the study group. A key component of the interview was to determine which symbols, icons and programmatic initiatives are expressive of sponsor identity. The responses to these questions formed a taxonomy or a classification of symbols, icons and programs that are by nature particular to each institution depending on sponsor identity. For example, symbols of Franciscan identity are distinct from symbols of Benedictine or Augustinian identity. Additional interview questions assessed the relative importance of sponsor identity to the particular institution as interpreted by or seen through the eyes of campus leadership. Post interview, the researcher examined campus environment, structures and publications to assess the presence of symbols, icons and programs to see if stated emphasis on sponsor identity as expressed by interview subjects aligned with visible, stated and printed representations of sponsor identity. Greater emphasis was placed on the qualitative assessment. The quantitative assessment helped to measure institutional commitment to sponsor identity. Such a mixed methods approach takes the study beyond the realm of opinions or feelings

about sponsor identity to a more factual assessment of sponsor identity (Creswell, 2008; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Pannozzo (2008) addresses the advantages of the mixed methods approach as “(1) the ability to provide more a [sic] thorough understanding of a research problem because of the opportunity to examine multiple forms of data that are more comprehensive than data that might be collected via either quantitative or qualitative methods alone; and (2) the ability to answer complex research questions that cannot be addressed through the use of quantitative or qualitative methods alone” (in McMillan, pp. 310-311).

The study group was selected using purposeful sampling. The intent of the study was to identify best practices in preserving and presenting sponsor identity. In consultation with the professional staff at the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) in Washington, DC, the researcher identified a pool of ten colleges and/or universities that trace their roots and founding to Catholic congregations of religious men and women. These consultations took place over several months with the President and CEO and Vice President of the organization via email, telephone and in person in their Washington, DC office. The geographic areas were limited to the middle-Atlantic and New England states. Such a limitation did not diminish the sample as 43% of all Catholic colleges and universities sponsored by congregations of men and women are found in that region of the country. In addition, they represent the diversity of size, scope and Carnegie classification that would be found in the entire group. From this initial group, three Catholic colleges or universities that were reputed to have vibrant sponsorship identity as suggested by the ACCU representatives were selected. The larger, initial group made allowances for colleges and universities which did not respond

or that chose not to participate. It was noted in Introcaso's (1996) study that one member of the original sample never responded to multiple requests.

The first part of the study examined the change in the presence of members of the sponsoring group from 1990 to 2011. Initial research had already determined if the leadership has moved from religious to lay or vice versa during that period. Decline in other sponsor members was determined during interviews with the president and other institutional representatives who were asked to provide this information.

An initial introductory telephone was placed to each of the three selected institution's presidents. Each of the three accepted the invitation to participate. Each of the three presidents then provided a letter (Appendix C) to the researcher indicating their willingness to participate and demonstrating that each understood the parameters of the research study and what was expected of each of them individually and of their institutions. Following the receipt of these three letters, application was made to the Benedictine University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Following a period of review, IRB approval was granted and research proceeded. The key campus personnel identified to be interviewed included a member of the sponsoring community, the President, a member of the governing Board and the Vice President or Director for Mission. Working with staff members in each president's office, those to be invited to participate in the study were identified and contacted by the researcher directly. Again, all willingly participated.

In order to assure anonymity, each college and interviewee was assigned an alias. In addition, each research site is referred to as college even though two of the three have

made a transition to university status. Each is identified as follows, and lettering was determined by the order in which the campus visits took place:

- College A – President A, Trustee A, Mission A
- College B – President B, Trustee B, Mission B
- College C – President C, Trustee C, Mission C

The three colleges in the study may generally be described as follows:

- College A – founded by a religious order of women as one of a number of institutions founded by the same order. Suburban location. Over 100 years old. Total headcount is approximately 2,300.
- College B – founded by a religious order of men as one of a number of institutions founded by the same order. Urban location. Over 140 years old. Total headcount is approximately 3,100.
- College C – founded by a religious order of women and is the only institution of higher education sponsored by the order. Over 50 years old. Total headcount is approximately 3,300.

After initial conversations with each president, it became evident to the researcher that each institution had a particular way of carrying out the work of mission and trusteeship. Here is the make-up of each set of interview participants:

- College A: President – also a member of the sponsoring order. Trustee – a duly appointed lay person who serves as a trustee/sponsor representative for college A and 15 other institutions of higher education sponsored by the same order. Mission – a Mission Advisory Council made up of lay members of the campus community.

- College B: President – a lay person and first lay president of the college. Trustee – a lay person and an alumnus of the college. Mission – the Vice President of Mission and Ministry and a member of the sponsor community.
- College C: President – a lay person and the second lay president of the college. Trustee – two members of the sponsoring order one of whom also serves as a “Member” of the corporation (described in chapter four). Mission – a Mission Advisory Council made up of a member of the faculty, a member of staff and a senior administrator, all lay people.

The researcher scheduled visits to each campus to conduct face to face interviews.

All interviews were conducted on the participating campuses with the following exceptions:

- The trustee/sponsor representative for college A was interviewed in her office in a remote location on a different date. It should also be noted that this particular interviewee serves as a trustee/sponsor representative for each of the 16 institutions sponsored by this order.
- The trustee representative for college B was interviewed at his office on a different date.
- One of the two trustee/sponsor representatives for college C participated in the interview by phone while the other interviewee was present in person. The participant by phone did provide informed consent and the call was recorded and transcribed as were all of the interviews.

Each interviewee was asked to sign an informed consent letter that outlined procedures for protecting interviewee identity and how data from transcriptions were to be stored and

safeguarded. A model of the letter is included as Appendix D. All interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and later transcribed by the researcher.

Transcriptions did not contain any identifying information about the college or the interviewee. All identifying information was removed and the aliases listed above were used to identify participants. All recordings were stored in a secure location in the home of the researcher and were backed up on the personal computer of the researcher. The personal computer is password protected to prevent anyone other than the researcher from gaining access to files.

Validity

Interrater reliability was established by having the researcher and another person separately analyze the data for themes based on the data. The person assisting the researcher in providing validity is a professor of theology at a sponsored, Catholic college, though not one in the study group or with the same sponsor as any of those in the study group. In addition to working at a sponsored institution, this person was formerly a member of a sponsored community. In addition, he served as executive director of a group of sponsored institutions for a sponsor group other than those in the study group. The researcher identified 18 themes, and the vast majority of the themes identified by the expert, though worded differently, correlated well to the researchers themes. The findings were the same 94% of the time.

Research Questions

The interviews were semi-structured and used research questions listed in the introduction and below. In addition to gaining a qualitative understanding of the institution's relationship with the sponsor, this part of the study helped the researcher

determine how consistent the college or university was in both understanding and manifesting its identity.

1. In the last generation (since 1990), how has the presence of members of the sponsoring religious community diminished and by how much?
2. How has the leadership of the institution transitioned or changed in character, if at all, during that period?
3. Over that same period, how have these colleges and universities preserved the presence of the sponsoring identity?
4. What symbols and icons are present which signify the founding relationship? (This question, along with question seven, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
5. How has the presence of such symbols and icons succeeded in keeping the relationship with and identity the sponsoring community alive and vibrant?
6. How are these symbols and icons displayed on campus and in publications?
7. What programs exist which animate the sponsoring identity? For students? For faculty/staff? (This question, along with question four, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
8. How does the institutional mission statement reflect the sponsor identity/relationship?
9. Who has primary responsibility for preserving and lifting up sponsor identity in the campus community?
10. How does the symbolic and programmatic presence of the sponsoring identity add value to the institution?

An additional question emerged during introductory conversations with the participating presidents. This question was incorporated into the semi-structured interviews with each institution and its representatives:

11. If in the next generation or so there are no members of the sponsoring order serving the institution in leadership, on the board or as an employee, how confident are you that the sponsoring charism can be preserved?

The final step involved a quantitative assessment of the presence of symbols, icons and other artifacts of institutional culture related to the sponsor identity that were identified during the interviews and contributed to the sponsorship/identity taxonomy. Current campus publications (magazine, view book and web site) were examined to discover the presence of symbols, artifacts and programs that are expressive of the sponsor identity. In addition, the researcher conducted a physical examination of each campus to assess the presence of sponsor related artifacts and symbols. This was done to great effect in the Introcaso (1996) study. The purpose was to look for items from each institution's taxonomy and to evaluate or assess how often they appeared and how obvious these symbols may be to the campus visitor, students or faculty/staff members. A hard count of symbols and artifacts was made across various media platforms and on campus. The presence of their visual symbols and artifacts were rated using a Likert scale as follows:

3 – Highly Visible – The artifact is readily seen in five or more locations around campus and/or it is prominently placed so that the casual observer would easily happen upon it during a campus tour or visit.

2 – Moderately Visible – The artifact is visible in two to four locations though not centrally located in such a way that the casual observer would easily happen upon it.

1 – Barely Visible – The artifact is seen in a single location and is not centrally located in any way. The casual observer may or may not see the artifact.

0 – Not Visible – The artifact is not visible on campus.

Interviews were transcribed and major themes were pulled out that tell the story of sponsor identity. Interview transcripts and narrative descriptions of each program along with the researcher's analysis are presented in chapter four of this dissertation. The researcher made final qualitative analysis of the effectiveness of upholding sponsor identity based on an assessment of qualitative and quantitative data in chapter five. The researcher presented examples where there are consistent and strong links between sponsor identity and how that identity is used to uniquely identify each institution. The researcher examined areas where there may be a disconnect between stated emphasis of sponsor identity as determined in the interviews, and the actual presence of programs, artifacts and symbols, that are expressive of sponsor identity.

Limitations

A limitation of the study is the relatively small number of institutions in the sample (three out of a potential 183). In addition there is the potential for bias on the part of the interviewee and the interviewer. Since each person interviewed in the study was involved in leadership at his or her respective institutions, it is possible that the interviewee could become defensive or choose to present the institution in the best light possible. The interviewer sought to address this by reaching a comfortable rapport with each subject so that an easy and comfortable repartee could be established.

Conclusion

This study builds upon the growing body of literature that examines sponsorship from both the legal (canonical and civil) and cultural perspectives. The study aims to support the idea that preserving sponsoring identity is good for the institution because it aids in supporting the canonical relationship and makes the institution distinct in the marketplace. It serves to elevate the importance of preserving sponsoring traditions at Catholic colleges and universities in the 21st century. Catholic college and university administrators, board members, and faculty and staff make up the primary audience for the study, but its implications and results could also have significance for other sponsored ministries of the Catholic Church and for other church-related institutions as well, including colleges and universities sponsored by other denominations.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

In this study a narrative discussion approach is used to analyze the data that was collected from nine semi-structured face to face interviews at each of three campus sites and two off-campus sites. Codes were developed throughout the interview, transcription and analysis stages of the study. The codes fell into two categories: *literal* using the words of the interviewees and *analytical* that rely on the “researcher’s insights for drawing out interpretation” (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011, p. 311). These codes were then categorized into major themes that provide the basis for analysis.

The data is organized by research questions. After transcription was completed, the researcher organized each relevant response under a particular research question. This was a time consuming task. Although each interview followed the same pattern in the order of questions asked, responses to one question led the interviewee to answer a subsequent or yet unasked question. In addition, the interviewees would often circle back to later include information relevant to the earlier question. During transcription and initial analysis some research questions were grouped together. The researcher’s analysis follows each question or group of questions. There were three levels of coding for each question or group of questions. Codes were noted by the researcher during the initial live interviews. Additional codes were identified during the transcription process and further coding was completed through intense reading as the transcription was organized by

research question. Codes were then grouped into themes and a thorough discussion of each follows the research question.

It should be noted that all of the parties interviewed as part of this study are well-versed, experienced and, in many cases, expert in the field of sponsored higher education. Their responses are presented below organized as described above. It is a rich narrative that could largely stand on its own. Chernail (1995, in Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011, p. 338) states “I believe that the data, that have been painfully collected, should ‘be the star’ in the relationship. By this, I mean the main focus in qualitative research is the data itself.” To that end, the researcher has included much of the transcription as a rich source of data from a well-informed group.

Question One: In the last generation (since 1990), how has the presence of members of the sponsoring religious community diminished and by how much?

In order to more fully understand the responses to this particular research question, the reader needs to develop a more complex understanding of the work “presence.” Presence can be thought of in two ways. The first is the actual count or the physical presence of the members of the sponsoring order present and how it changed over the period of time. The second, and perhaps more significant or important meaning, has to do with the perceived presence. Do members of the sponsoring order occupy critical roles on campus? Are they visible at campus functions? Are they vibrant members of the community?

There were 19 codes identified from the data collected for question one. These codes were then captured under four thematic expressions that could be further organized under two main themes.

- 1. There is an overall sense of decline and aging within the sponsoring order and this is more broadly seen as part of a larger phenomenon in the Church.**
- 2. There is a change in the nature of presence by members of the sponsoring orders on campus and higher education is no longer a destination for members of the sponsoring community.**

There is an overall sense of decline and aging within the sponsoring order and this is more broadly seen as part of a larger phenomenon in the Church. It is clear from the data collected that there is a perception that the numbers of members of the sponsoring orders on these campuses have declined. This is seen in several ways. First there is a decline in the number of members of the sponsoring order who reside on campus. This was particularly dramatic at college A where the residential population went from 23 to eight in a short period of time. “Two years ago we had about 23 members who were on campus affiliated and living in residence here, and now we are at eight members that are still in residence so the number has dropped” (College A – Mission).

The perception of decline must also be seen through the lens of the interviewee. When the particular interviewee arrived on campus impacts the perception of decline. In college B for example, the vice president for mission has a long history with the college and the sponsor community. He remembers a time when there were 69 members of the sponsoring order living on campus but this was prior to the time frame of this study.

There were 69 members of the sponsoring order at one time. They overflowed this building into the top of that building right next door. That goes back probably to the 60s and maybe into the 70s. I don't know exactly when the decline started, but probably 15 years ago. (College B – Mission)

Similarly, the trustee from college B has a history that spans more than six decades and his perception is influenced by earlier recollections. “I knew that the numbers of members of the sponsoring order was much, much larger when I was a student and that the number is much smaller now” (College B – Trustee). The trustee's most active period of engagement has been in the last two decades as a regent and a trustee and later co-chair of the presidential search committee that hired the first lay leader of the college. Even at institutions like college C where the sponsors have never had large numbers present or residing on campus, there is a perception of decline as the institution has grown in size.

This college is very unique. It wasn't founded until the 1950s. To my knowledge, we never really had a great number of sisters on the college campus. We (the sponsors) were never a dominant presence on campus, but we were more prominent in the beginning because the college was very small. The sisters knew all the girls since most were boarding on campus. Everyone knew everyone. (College C – Trustee)

This perception of decline as a percentage of the whole is consistent with the experiences of many Catholic colleges and universities after World War II as discussed in chapter two.

In addition to the actual evidence of decline, there is data that indicates that the population is aging and, as a result, less engaged.

We have a number of department chairs who are members of the sponsoring order, but they are, I would say they're all in their 70s. There's a handful of us that aren't in their 70s. I am 64, there's a couple of others in their 50s, and that's it. (College B – Mission)

...it's become a little bit of a retirement home, I suppose, for many.

Because they're an aging population, they're not as present as they used to be years ago. I mean, that's clearly the problem that we have. So, of the 25 or so that we have in residence, and of the nine very active, you know, employed by the university, I would say today that's there's maybe two or three of them that are very visible on campus on a regular basis. And that is a challenge. It's a real problem. They're old, they're frail, they're tired. And getting them to participate, even though it's a small campus, as you can see, it's not like they have to go far. It's a challenge. (College B – President)

A member of the Mission Advisory Council and the president at college A who arrived in the last decade also had a sense of the aging population. "When I first got here there were a few sisters in a modified habit and then they were very elderly, however, and they have either retired or have passed" (College A – Mission). "People have retired, people have died. That's going to happen, and there aren't huge numbers to take their places" (College A – President). The student experience two or more decades ago would more likely include active and engaged members of the sponsor community serving as

faculty or in key administrative roles on campus. Today the experience is more one of witnessing the kindly old sister, father or brother traversing campus.

This decline can be seen in the broader context of the Catholic Church. If you were to ask the average Catholic about the population of priests in his or her parish or diocese, they would no doubt mention a sharp decline. It is widely discussed in the press, in diocesan newspapers and other Catholic periodicals. Even middle-aged Catholics (like the researcher) can remember a time when every parish had more than one priest in residence. There is considerable statistical data to document the decline. The trustee at college B, a lifelong and active member of the Catholic Church, recognizes this and it puts the decline of sponsor members at his alma mater into a broader context. “I was aware of the diminishing number of members of the sponsoring order just as there were parish priests in diminishing numbers and the laity was taking on more and more responsibility” (College B – Trustee).

The campus leaders interviewed for this study are also plugged into the larger picture of sponsor identity and the challenges faced by each order of men and women. There is a greater understanding of the overall decline in the numbers of men and women entering the sponsor communities.

I would say that I think what really jarred us to kind of wake up to that, and I remember this to this day, I think I was the faculty leader at the time, and the then provincial came to visit and he did a presentation and laid it out, showing the numbers of members of the sponsoring order and those coming through the funnel, and where we would be over time. And when you looked at that curve, I

think everybody was shocked. So, that was an eye opener to us and to the board of trustees that something had to happen. (College B – President)

The head of mission at college B continues to seek to grow and make more vibrant the sponsor community and its active presence on campus. He faces challenges that go beyond the mere availability of members of the sponsoring order; there are other external forces that impact this as well.

You know, it's about sponsor presence, whether it's philosophical or ideological or it's actual boots on the ground. So I've worked hard to try to recruit some people with mixed success. And the complication is right now that, as with a lot of schools, we have a hiring freeze on, and it's been that way for a while. So even though a couple of possible candidates have come across my desk and the rector's desk, we can't afford, the college can't afford to hire them. We have no way to pay them. (College B – Mission)

It is clear upon examination of the data that there is both an actual decline in the numbers of members of the sponsoring orders on these campuses, that they are perceived as an aging and less engaged population and the decline is similar to that which is occurring in the Catholic Church in general.

There is a change in the nature of presence by members of the sponsoring orders on campus and higher education is no longer a destination for members of the sponsoring community. At one time education was a primary ministry of orders of religious men and women. In the earliest days of Catholic colleges and universities sponsored by orders of men and women, the majority of positions were filled by members of the sponsoring order. As noted above, this changed as the colleges and

universities grew and sharpened their educational focus on quality. There were a number of symbolic occurrences on the campuses in the study that describe the changing nature of the relationship between the sponsor and the college. At college B for instance, the members of the sponsoring order, at one time 69 in total, lived in a building in the center of campus. This building also housed the campus chapel. Their presence was central to the college experience. As the number of sponsor members residing on campus began to decline dramatically in the 1990s, it was determined that the college should buy the building from the order and that the members of the sponsoring order would buy apartments in a building adjacent to campus and not central to it. The vice president for mission at college B relates this occurrence.

The rector and the provincial decided that this building was too big and that the college should take over this building for a nominal sum and then would help us finance buying some apartments over there and renovating them. And that's what happened. At one point we were at least 69, maybe a few more, give or take, now we have 27. (College B – Mission)

So for college B the data shows that there was a change in the nature of presence from central to adjacent.

In addition to geographic changes, there were operational changes as well. Leadership changes occurred and this will be discussed under question two. Where sisters and priests were once active members of the faculty and engaged in the daily life of students, the number involved on a daily basis has diminished.

On one hand I can count faculty members from the sponsor, so most of the (sisters) are serving in other capacities besides faculty. Some are more present,

more identifiable to students and have more interaction with the campus community than others... And people have started here and, who knows why, have left here, not to retire from ministry or active duty, but to go do something different. (College A – Mission)

The second part of that quote gets at another important aspect of this theme. The number of members from the sponsoring order who work in higher education or who felt called to work in higher education has diminished. Where once education generally and higher education more specifically were central to the mission of many religious orders, these men and women have now established myriad ministries and ministry sites here in the U.S. and abroad. There is a much greater emphasis on social services and working with the poor. Those who join sponsoring orders today tend to go into these mission related areas and not higher education. This is seen dramatically in the sponsoring order for college A that happens to be one of the largest orders of women in the U.S.

Interestingly it was mentioned that there are 30 sisters in training around the country. The congregational leader was very clear that she did not see any of them going into higher education because the charism of the order isn't attracting women who want to be educators any longer. (College A – Mission)

In the early days of sponsored and Catholic higher education, members of the sponsoring order often came directly from undergraduate programs and began teaching at the sponsored institution with the expectation that an advanced degree would be earned over time. Criticism and other external forces placed a much greater emphasis on the quality of the higher education experience and the level of competence in the faculty. The terminal degree became the standard by which quality was measured by accreditors and

competition. Members of the sponsoring order represented in this study have seen a decline in the interest in pursuing such higher study. "We don't have as many women that are doctorally qualified to come and teach at a university anymore" (College A – President).

The 'tone' set by members of the sponsoring order on campus appears to be important. At college C there was a perceived change in the quality of their presence on campus. Some of this had to do with a change from sponsor to lay leadership that will be addressed with the second research question. The sponsors seemed to set the tone on campus according to this member of the Mission Advisory Council who has served college C for more than two decades.

The president was a member of the sponsoring order and there were more sisters on campus. We had sisters working in the registrar's office and the business office. A sister was teaching and a member of the history department. The college's foundress was retired but working on campus and a daily presence. They were generally more present 20 years ago. The last president who was a member of the sponsoring order had a particular way of dealing with the campus community. She would deliver pep talks to the departments at the beginning of each semester and it was a nice practice which has continued. We always called them 'sister's pep talks.' Now it has been replaced by the 'state of the college' address. It was just a more visible presence and that has changed certainly.

(College C – Mission)

For some constituents like alumni, the presence of the sponsor is an important link to the past.

It is a bit of a challenge, because, for so many alums in particular, the collar is the symbol of our religious character, and they haven't made in their minds yet the transition that you can still remain sponsored and Catholic without having a member of the sponsoring order as president or members of the sponsoring orders all over the institution. (College B – President)

It is clear from the data that the nature of the relationship between the sponsor and the college has changed due to both the decline in presence in key roles or as faculty at the colleges and that the ministerial focus of members of the sponsoring orders has shifted away from higher education. There is decline in sponsor numbers and presence. Members of sponsoring communities doing vital work and playing active roles on campus are diminishing. The community of sponsors, whether in residence or employed or both is seen as aging. There is ample evidence as seen in the comments from the provincial of the order at college A, that even as new members join the order, there are few or none who seem to be interested in following a path to a career in higher education.

Question Two: How has the leadership of the institution transitioned or changed in character, if at all, during that period?

The status of presidential leadership at the three institutions in this study represents well the current state of transition that continues to play out as it has done since the 1960s and, in particular, since 1990, the period observed for this study. College A has a president who is a member of the sponsoring order. That institution has never had a lay president but the current president and the board member interviewed were convinced that the next president would likely be a lay person. This particular trustee

serves as a representative of the sponsor on all of its higher education institution boards, so she brings a broader perspective of leadership transitions.

In my five years, I think we are two members of the sponsoring order less in our presidents' numbers. We started with five of the then 16 members (institutions); we're now down to three, and we're fairly certain that those three won't be replaced by members of the sponsoring order when their term of service is up. So we're very aware of the fact that we have a movement towards all lay presidents.

(College A – Trustee)

The president at college B was elected in 2007. He follows 21 previous presidents all of whom were members of the sponsoring order. College C elected its first lay president in 1992 and the current and second lay president began serving in 2008 and recently completed her service. A search for new leadership is underway.

Leadership in private, church-related institutions of higher education in the U.S. is not limited to the office of the president, though, symbolically, there may be no more important figure on the college or university campus. In Catholic higher education in the U.S., leadership is shared among a number of individuals or bodies. These include the president, the board of trustees, other boards like the board of regents referenced by the trustee at college B below, the sponsors, and other senior administrators and faculty at the institutions. The majority of the responses to this interview question centered on the president and the board.

An analysis of the data yielded 46 codes. Upon further review and analysis, four dominant themes emerged and are discussed below:

1. **Since 1990 there has been a dramatic decline in the number of sponsor members serving as presidents, board chairs and trustees and a similar increase in lay leadership.**
2. **The complicated business of higher education is beyond the scope of abilities of members of the sponsoring orders.**
3. **Preserving sponsor identity is an intentional part of leadership transitions from the sponsoring order to lay men and women.**
4. **In times of transition and decline, sponsors have to be strategic about what roles they serve in preserving sponsor identity.**

Since 1990 there has been a dramatic decline in the number of sponsor members serving as presidents, board chairs and trustees and a similar increase in lay leadership. As noted above, the colleges that are part of the same sponsor group as college A, are expected to move completely to lay leadership by the end of the next set of leadership transitions at the three schools that currently have a sponsor member as president. As noted in the table in Appendix B, the percentage of presidents who are members of the sponsoring order has declined from 60% to 36% from 1990 to 2010. In addition to presidential leadership, there has also been a sharp decline in the presence of members of the sponsoring community on the boards of trustees at the three colleges in the study. At college B for example, the lay trustee interviewed as part of the study remembered when the board of trustees was made up entirely of sponsor members.

Originally the Board of Trustees was all members of the sponsoring congregation. The Board of Regents was entirely lay people and was advisory. Subsequently as the number of members of the sponsoring order diminished, more and more lay

people were invited to serve as trustees. Today, of 35 total trustees, five are members of the sponsoring order. The Board of Regents continues to serve as an advisory board to the Board of Trustees. There is a regent on every trustee committee and the regents have their own initiatives like mentoring and an entrepreneurial program. The regents continue to do good things on their own in addition to their being advisors to the president, the board of trustees and to advancement. (College B – Trustee)

This passage provides an additional insight into the changing relationship between sponsors and their institutions. Note that the regents were all lay and advisory. Regents had no role in governance. Governance was carried out entirely by members of the sponsoring order in their roles as trustees and as the president of the college.

For many years both the president and the board chair/board president were members of the sponsoring order. This change at college B took place before the transition in the presidency.

There were two transitions. One was the board of trustees which happened before I got involved, and the other is the president who is no longer a member of the sponsoring order. There was already a lay president of the board of trustees prior to my service as a regent. (College B – Trustee)

Sponsors now occupy a very small percentage of seats on the boards at the sponsored institutions in the study as seen at college A.

It's written into our bylaws that we have 15% sponsor representation (on the board). But I think eventually we'll have to change that to say up to 15%.

Everybody's slightly different. There was a time, when I first got here I think the

percentage was 30, but you can't do that, I mean you can't run a place well. First of all, there aren't enough sisters to put on a board. There just aren't. Very hard to find, especially with some interest in higher education and/or having served on a board before and having an idea of how that's supposed to go. (College A – President)

That president's comments are indicative of forces that are driving this decline. There are simply not enough members of the sponsoring community who are qualified of who have the skills and abilities to serve these institutions of higher education and that leads to the second theme.

The complicated business of higher education is beyond the scope of abilities of members of the sponsoring orders. All respondents in this study made reference to the increasing complexity of higher education in the U.S. today. The skills and abilities required to be a college or university president in the 21st century are different than they were at the height of sponsor presence on campus in the post-World War II period into the mid-1960s. The business of higher education has become more complex and the president must possess a broad understanding of the enterprise if he or she is to be successful and the institution is to thrive. Coming up through the faculty ranks was the traditional path for ascending to a presidency for most of the history of higher education in the U.S. across all forms: private, private church-related, public. Many sponsoring orders have not been able to nurture this kind of leadership from within their membership. The Mission Advisory Council at college A observed it in this way,

As I think about this across, not just our sponsor institutions but any institution, if people aren't choosing to go into the professoriate, they're not going to be

developed into leadership, so we're going to see, as we are seeing, that even as we get to that generation from here where there may not be a presence, the leadership is going to change quickly because we haven't been grooming and educating and growing educational leaders in our higher education system since 1970. (College A – Mission)

Many religious orders established education institutions across all grade levels. The skills and abilities required to serve as principal or administrator at an elementary or secondary school are not necessarily transferable to the work of higher education. Some sisters were reluctant to make such a change as noted by the trustees at college C.

The other thing may have been, too, that we had some sisters who were functioning as administration in some of our schools, and I don't know if some of them would have opted to move into higher education. I think many of them preferred elementary schools and high schools. (College C – Trustee)

Institutions and boards recognize that the business of higher education has become more complex. Presidents are emerging who may or may not have not come up through the faculty ranks, but it is clear that search committees at colleges and universities are looking for breadth of professional experience in higher education that would include finance, management, human resources, technology, academic affairs, student life and fund raising to name a few that were mentioned by interviewees. A search profile for another Catholic college distributed in 2012 requested “a candidate who was expert in all fields of higher education.” This is a high bar but it indicates how complex higher education has become.

I think boards know that they (presidents) have to be savvy. I think there's a concern now that you have a member of the sponsoring order who may not have had the same background that they're looking for in terms of fundraising, in terms of business management and operations, where in years past, they were happy to have a representative of the order who bore the charisma who they thought would get on board with everything else she needed to be in time to come. I don't think they feel that they have that luxury today. So, yes, I think that sometimes - and I've been on a search where I know that a person who has been a member of the sponsoring order has been perceived perhaps as a lesser qualified candidate.

(College A – Trustee)

Over the years we transitioned from the presidents being a sister to the president being a lay-woman. I wasn't on the board at that time, but I would suspect that they wanted to transition into laity. My guess would be that the board was just looking at all options of potential presidents. It was probably even a sense of if – because everything's become so much more complicated, if you will, with all of the regulations that are there and accrediting requirements and this and that. My sense is that we just felt that we really didn't have someone who was as prepared to take on this role. I think if we had, if we did have a sister, maybe she would have been put in the pot with all the people to interview. (College C – Trustee)

That (the appointment of the first lay president) happened just before I got here (2007). Sometimes members of the sponsoring order think that we can do everything, and the presidents that preceded the current president were good in

their own ways, but all had glaring weaknesses. The current president's predecessor really didn't care for fundraising at all. He just kind of wanted to ignore it, get on with the academic stuff. We only really started serious fundraising one or two (years) before that. The current president came up through the ranks, and that's good, I think that's the kind of thing you need for a first lay president because he knew the people, they sort of knew him. On the other hand, they were used to doing things in a less systematic, lackadaisical way with the preceding members of the sponsoring order serving as presidents. You know, it was more like a mom and pop operation in their minds. The current president wants to systematize it. He brought in CFOs and others who tried to get a handle on things. It was, and still is, a bit of a nightmare for him because things just weren't done systematically. (College B – Mission)

You're going to need to bring in a business model, not a kind of mom and pop family (business). Our sisters were not trained to be higher educational leaders; that was not part of their ministry and preparation. (College C – President)

It's interesting that respondents at two different institutions, one a member of the sponsor community and one a lay president both use the expression "mom and pop" organization when referring to sponsor leadership. To be fair, there are and have been many wonderful and highly qualified leaders of colleges and universities who are members of sponsoring orders, but there is a perception, captured in the comments above, that prior to making the switch to lay leadership, the college or university was like a family business controlled by the order. The perception during those times was that any

member of the sponsoring order could run the college, and it was more important to have a sister, brother or priest at the helm than a qualified lay person. Here is an amusing anecdote from college C about presidential transitions from members of the sponsor community to lay leadership that helps to tell the ‘mom and pop’ story.

I can remember the first lay president calling over to the library to have the librarians look in the archives to see how the previous presidents had been installed and what the installation ceremony was like. We had to call the president’s office back and say that the last sponsor president was simply handed the papers by the prior sponsor president. There was maybe a reception, but there was nothing. So that was eye opening. The previous transitions had just been very quiet, not marked by much celebration here on campus. (College C – Mission)

Those transitions from sponsor to sponsor were often handled with little or no fanfare while transitions from one lay president to another are often marked by much pomp and circumstance.

Boards of trustee have very serious responsibilities with a strong emphasis on fiduciary care of the institution. In much the same way that the presidency has become more complex, board service and leadership has followed a similar transition. Boards are expected to provide advice and perform in ways similar to corporate boards. In addition, they are expected to play a prominent philanthropic role at the institution. Typically, trustees today are successful business men and women who have a particular relationship with the college perhaps as alumni, parents, community leaders or members of the local

business community. The trustee from college B discusses the importance of this kind of leadership.

Never having witnessed a member of the sponsoring order as head of the board of trustees, I know that the three people who have chaired the board of trustees during my being invited to these meetings, lend something to the running of the university beyond what any member of the sponsoring order could give. The current board chair runs the board of trustees like the board of a public company. Everyone knows their assignments. Everybody knows what's expected of them. The president was evaluated this year based on the goals the president provided last year. And the executive committee, which I am privileged to be a member of, takes into consideration how he met those goals. That's a level of business acumen that I'm not sure that the average member of the sponsoring order possesses. (College B – Trustee)

Church-related, Catholic higher education, however, is not just a business to be run like any other. It is a mission rich environment founded by men and women gathered around a common set of beliefs. This leads to the third major theme.

Preserving sponsor identity is an intentional part of leadership transitions from the sponsoring order to lay men and women. It is a challenge for sponsored institutions to find qualified leaders who can do the job of president and who can understand and reflect the founding charism. Such a commitment to preserving sponsor identity needs to be incorporated from the very beginning of the search process. This was clearly discussed as college B took up the task of searching for a new president. That particular transition tells well the story of the tension that exists when institutions make

the change from sponsored to lay leadership. Those who serve the institutions and who play active roles in the search process bring bias and preferences. The trustee at college B captured that sense.

My initial involvement with the search committee came with a statement from me that I don't want to be a part of a committee that selects the first non-sponsor president of a school that's 130 years old. I was brainwashed in high school that I was going to go to a college or university sponsored by the same order. When I heard the students (at college B) say they wanted a member of the sponsoring order I agreed. (College B – Trustee)

The change to the president of the university to a lay person was met with some concerted effort to retain the sponsor identity. The search for the president included a committee that had three former college presidents on it, faculty, a student, a regent, trustee representation and representatives from other institutions associated with the sponsoring order and from the region. It was very interesting. The student representatives wanted a member of the sponsoring order to replace the president who had died suddenly. Faculty wanted someone with terminal degrees who could make the proper decisions about tenure, etc., and the alumni, for the most part, wanted a fund raiser. So it was trying to serve three different masters to some extent. The person who was selected as the current president, the only concern was about fund raising. I was with the president elect when he was informed, and there was a discussion right then and there that afternoon, about preserving the sponsor identity. The efforts since then, particularly as led by the vice president for mission – a member of the sponsoring order – have been

outstanding. It's hard to say it, but the college might be more identified with the sponsoring order under lay leadership than it had under sponsor leadership. The efforts of mission and ministry and campus ministry are very, very strong.

(College B – Trustee)

Boards and search committees can help preserve sponsor identity by clearly stating their intentions in writing through position profiles and by clearly challenging candidates to respond to questions about understanding of sponsor identity and commitment to mission. The president at college C reflected on this below.

I think it was made clear to me, any candidates, in the materials, that they were looking for someone who would be a supporter of the Catholic identity and the mission of the institution, so that was kind of the expectation. So there was a decision made, and I thought articulated well in the materials. I only, I did become aware of it in the search process because some of the other faction was still on the board, so they were questioning me in terms of my propensity for kind of going back to the argumentative or the confrontational stage. I made it clear to the trustees that if you're looking for a president that's either going to be charged with separating this institution from its founding order or pulling back in its Catholic identity, you do not want me. (College C – President)

Once the selection is made, presidents can signal commitment to or resonance with the sponsor identity or move away from it. Intentionality about preserving the sponsor identity from both the president and the board is very important. Lay presidents, especially those serving as the first lay president, have the added burden of proving to the sponsoring order that they both understand the founding charism and are committed to

preserving it. In the selection of lay presidents at colleges B and C, the candidates clearly understood the importance of making statements and acting in ways consistent with each institution's sponsor and Catholic identity. The president at college B made some immediate decisions about leadership and tone that would demonstrate his understanding of and commitment to mission and charism.

So the first thing that I decided to do, and the board agreed, was that we appoint a vice president for mission and ministry who was a member of the sponsoring order. You know, to kind of reassure the troops, if you will, that there's a lay president, there's still at the very highest level, there is still going to be a member of the sponsoring order present and engaging in cabinet meetings and discussions, etc. That was really important. I had to spend a lot of time reassuring the alumni base that we're not going to somehow now become a secular institution because there's a lay president. And so we spent a lot of time meeting the alumni, reassuring them, you know, sharing my thoughts and visions about the institutions, sharing my background so that they would know that I'm sponsor-trained myself, you know, so it took a lot of reassurance. On the internal side, it was a little less of a challenge, I think. I had been here a long time, people knew me. I was provost and designated also chief operating officer for maybe four or five years before I became president, so my predecessor was really not much involved in on-campus activities, mostly external stuff. So, I was the face of administration here at the university for four or five years, so they were kind of reassured already on that score. They knew where I was coming from; he and I were in sync with things. (College B – President)

The president has depended on me a bit, I think, to help him understand interaction with the community and, historically, the way sponsors have related to the college. The interaction with the community; you know, a lot of the members of the sponsoring community are kind of opinion leaders within the faculty and others, so he relies on me and the rector to help understand what these guys want, what they're looking for. (College B – Mission)

This kind of collaboration and shared responsibility for mission is important in preserving sponsoring traditions and charism. While, as mentioned earlier, the president may be the single most important person in signaling commitment to mission and the founding order, it does not have to be a burden carried alone. Another key responsibility of the president is to create a team to assist in carrying out the work of the college or university. If the president is committed to creating a mission rich environment, he or she should be intentional in finding partners who embrace the same philosophy and commitment to mission and charism. In addition to building a team and making statements about this commitment, the president may also take advantage of various public events, gatherings and ceremonies where a strong statement can be made about this important issue. The president at college B related the following:

This may be a little bit off, but I wanted to mention that I think it was really important for a lay president of a Catholic and sponsored institution to also be incorporated in some way into the worship practices of the institution, so one of the things that I do, at the Mass of the Holy Spirit, and then also at the Baccalaureate Mass, I have a role in the Mass, and it is to read a blessing of the students. I think that connects me in a very tangible, visible way. I don't pretend

to be a priest, but lay people can give blessings, and I do. I frequently invoke the Lord and Jesus and the founder of the order in my public talks because I think it's important, not just to do it for symbolic reasons, but because I really feel it. And I think it surprised a lot of my colleagues, you know, the language that I chose to use along the way, as prior to being president, I didn't have too much opportunity to do lots of public speeches where I could do that, but now as president I can and I do. And I think that helps as president to say 'Look, lay people can be people of strong faith devoted to our mission and sustaining our identity and the world is not going to fall apart.' (College B – President)

It is also interesting to note in that search that there were two finalists – a member of the sponsoring order and the lay person who was selected.

The two finalists were a member of the sponsoring order and a lay person, and I feel very comfortable that we made the right decision in selecting a lay leader.

The president along with the vice president for mission and ministry (a member of the sponsoring order) have an incredible level of understanding of what it means to be a sponsor related and Catholic institution of higher education. (College B – Trustee)

When the initial transition to lay leadership occurred at college C there were no qualified candidates from among the ranks of sponsor members, so the sponsoring community sought candidates who appeared to understand and manifest sponsor charism and identity.

There was not sister candidate when the first lay president was appointed. We felt, at the time, that she would be very much in the spirit, and many of her formal

talks called upon her immigrant roots. I don't remember which sisters were on the search committee at that time, but I do remember them talking about the importance of lay collaborators. (College C – Mission)

That first lay president at college C served for 16 years, but there was some concern about waning interest in sponsor identity as her tenure came to an end. There is ample evidence in the data that indicate that preserving sponsoring identity can be difficult and commitment to mission and sponsor identity can erode over time as seen at college C.

The second lay president had some mending to do with the sponsors when she came in. It was not a healthy relationship at the end of the first lay president's tenure. There was a lot of acrimony. The second lay president did a very good job of mending the relationship with the sponsors. If we talk about the revival of this relationship, the president spent a lot of time making sure that that happened and that was very clearly important to her, and then the connection to how we are actually living out the mission in the curriculum was important. There has been so much attention to the *Justice Matters* curriculum during the second lay president's years, but most of that was in place before she got here. She named it *Justice Matters* or got to say that she named it anyway and she has been very supportive of it and talks a lot about it. But clearly that attracted her in in her inaugural address she said so. (College C – Mission)

When the first lay president was interviewed as a candidate for the presidency, she was asked the question what's your relationship to – do you pray to the order's foundress. She responded 'yes, in Italian.' If you fast forward 16 years when she left, if you check *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, she was

among the five highest paid presidents in the country. It was a very strange time of a person who could espouse and talk about her own immigrant and sponsor-related roots but yet in action, not so much. (College C – Mission)

This last point is an interesting reflection of culture in church-related higher education. Many of those who work in those institutions do so out of a sense of calling or vocation. There is generally an understanding or expectation that those who work there often do so for less money than they would in the corporate world or in larger public universities or secular private institutions. Issues of presidential compensation (data that is publically available and reported annually in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*) are often contentious. How can you be committed to mission and highly paid? As the work of the president has become more complex and expectations placed on presidents in terms of their public personae have increased, compensation has risen dramatically. The situation described by the Mission Advisory Committee above actually involved a large lump sum distribution of deferred compensation that pushed the presidential compensation into the very highest bracket of compensation. That incident and the ill will it created put a very dark punctuation mark on a troubled end of an administration. The new president had that as a backdrop at the beginning of her administration. Her response was to make very strong and deliberate statements about commitment to mission as described below.

I felt that I had to really ramp up focus on mission and own it as the incoming president, and let people know that this was not delegated to a person, to an office, that this was an institutional mandate that I'm a steward on behalf of the trustees. (College C – President)

The work of preserving sponsor identity is shared among all those involved in leadership and this leads to the final theme.

In times of transition and decline, sponsors have to be strategic about what roles they serve in preserving sponsor identity. It has been established that there are simply not enough qualified members of the sponsoring order to serve these colleges as leaders and board members. During this time of transition they still hold the key to sponsor identity and have found ways, both formal and informal, to pass it on. One such way is to look at governance structures and how the sponsoring order interfaces with the sponsored ministry. The trustees interviewed at college C, both members of the sponsoring order, do a very nice job of defining this interface. They made a particular reference to the distinction between the ‘members’ and the trustees. The term ‘member’ may generally refer to any person who belongs to the sponsoring order or more specifically it may refer to a ‘Member’ of the sponsoring order who also serves as an officer of the corporate body of the sponsor. For the purpose of this analysis, the researcher will use an upper case M when referring to this latter Member. The legal relationship that exists between the sponsor and their institutions is typically defined in a set of by-laws that contain certain ‘reserved powers’ that are carried out by the Members. These powers often include but are not limited to the final say over the hiring of the president or appointment of trustees or the sale or encumbrance of property. The trustees from college C draw a very nice distinction between the responsibility of the trustees and the Members even if they are one in the same.

I think that the distinction to be made is this: when the sisters serve as trustees, they serve as trustees individually. They’re not just representing the community;

they are taking on the responsibilities of trustees. Membership is different than trusteeship. It just so happens that board member A is a Member, but board member A does not have to be. The Members are the ones who really, in a sense, have to safeguard the philosophy and the charism by electing trustees and making sure that the trustees are supporting that, and by being involved in the selection of the president of the college and then also to the whole set of mission guidelines and asking if those are being fulfilled. It's a dual level type of thing and sometimes there's a little confusion thinking that the trustees have to, in other words, that they're really carrying the whole burden of carrying on the philosophy and everything else, but it's really the responsibility of the Members. The sisters on the board can certainly support that, maybe wave a flag if they see something that is really going downhill. Basically, it's the responsibility of the Members. That's why you have the two-tiered structure. (College C – Trustee)

At the moment we have a Membership corporation in which the provincial (sponsor's leader) and council canonically serve as Members and then we have certain reserve powers, and it's governed basically on an operational level by the board of trustees. We do have two Members of the sponsoring order that are *ex officio*, and the provincial is *ex-officio* on the board and she has a vote, so there are three total. (College C – Trustee)

It is a major responsibility of the trustees culled from the ranks of the sponsors to uphold and infuse the charism into the life, decisions and deliberations of the board.

But all of us as members of the sponsoring order who serve on the board bring the awareness of the founding and the charism, so usually there's always a sister on

the committee for mission and charism. There's also always a sister who's usually on the institutional governance committee that looks for new trustees and some of those things. I think we bring the skillsets that we each have, but we also bring the knowledge of the missions and philosophies to kind of be keeping an eye on that as well. (College C – Trustee)

The data (quantitative and qualitative) and the literature clearly indicate that there have been and will likely continue to be dramatic changes in leadership away from members of the sponsoring order to lay men and women. More presidents will become lay men and women and the presence of members of the sponsoring order on boards of trustees will diminish. This is due to the decreasing size of the orders themselves, and is also due to the fact that fewer men and women from these orders are prepared to or have any interest in serving in leadership positions in higher education. In the colleges studied, there is no formal process to identify leadership from within the membership of the order or to train future leaders that makes the continued decline inevitable.

Question Three: Over that same period, how have these colleges and universities preserved the presence of the sponsoring identity?

Question Seven: What programs exist which animate the sponsoring identity? For students? For faculty/staff? (This question, along with question four, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)

It became evident that the responses to questions three and seven noted above included considerable crossover in concepts and application. Responses to question three included, though not exclusively, initiatives that focused on preserving sponsor identity

during times of transition. Responses to question seven more broadly described initiatives that animate sponsor identity some of which were spurred on by leadership transitions and some of which came out of more broadly based institutional mission and identity initiatives. This section contains a robust set of institutional examples and underscores how seriously each institution takes the tasks of mission integration and preserving sponsor identity. A summary of programs and an assessment of their presence at each of the three colleges can be found in Table 5 (p. 170).

Responses to these two questions comprise approximately one-third of all the narrative data collected through transcripts. Analysis of the data yielded 59 codes from which three major themes emerged. They are:

- 1. Movement from isolated responsibility to shared responsibility.**
- 2. Emphasis, Intentionality and Ubiquity.**
- 3. Connections to broader Catholic concepts and external influences.**

Movement from isolated responsibility to shared responsibility. As discussed below in question nine, there are opinions about who has primary responsibility for preserving and lifting up sponsor identity. Even if the respondent considered the president to be that person on campus, it is not a work that can be carried out alone. The data indicates that the colleges have integrated this responsibility into new or preexisting institutional structures that has proved to be effective. This study indicates that there is not a single structure or methodology for carrying out this work and two of the colleges in the study have changed structures during times of transition in leadership and certainly within the overall time frame of the study beginning in 1990. Such changes are

inevitable as personnel change over time. The president at college C for example inherited an individual charged with upholding mission and made a transition when that person left the institution.

I went on a different path here to continue with the mission officer, or the office of mission. It was a lay person. I didn't, at that point, do away with the position. There were things that that person was really skilled to do, but it wasn't about them being the mission person, so it was really about owning it as an incoming president, then beginning to explain that it's everybody's responsibility, starting with the cabinet. Then I just, with a lot of input, at least six months input from campus constituents, I started to bounce off the idea of a group that could come together and focus on mission. (College C – President)

That group would come to be called the President's Initiative on Mission Integration (PIMI) at college C. It is interesting to note that this president took three years to engage this group and give them a mandate. This signals the importance of taking time to learn institutional culture and how it perceives its relationship to the sponsor prior to launching major new initiatives. It also allows the president to assess personnel in place who have key responsibilities in this area.

I established what I called the President's Initiative on Mission Integration (PIMI). I charged a group to really engage the community in a variety of ways - to dialogue around this (mission) statement and what it means and how we are living it out and educating ourselves. It was a very cross-functional approach to engaging the campus community. It was a two year initiative, at which time I wanted a document, and I have a lovely vision paper, a vision for mission of the

college that was presented to me last fall and with recommendations for moving forward, as well as some key outcomes from that two year initiative, some of which are substantial and kind of already in the culture, and, again, this was the surprise to me, because there was the test of can we keep this going without it being in an office, a department, a person. Well, the recommendation from the group was to establish a standing council for mission to continue in the same path, so I just did that on Founders Day in February. (College C – President)

The proliferation of such initiatives and councils was not something that the researcher expected. However, two of the three colleges in the study have moved to this conciliar format and there is much to be said for the approach based on the responses to interview questions. In general, there arises a strong sense of ownership that becomes organically integrated into the life of the college. College C took up this call as follows:

The charge to the (Mission Advisory) Council was to include one administrator, one faculty member and one cabinet member. The council has only been in existence for six weeks, but it is the stepchild of the President's Initiative for Mission Integration (PIMI) which is two years old. That was a two year initiative, and the council is a permanent body. The council reports directly to the president. Prior to PIMI, we had a vice president for mission integration and institutional effectiveness and that position was abolished after a period of overlap with PIMI. (College C – Mission)

As indicated by the president at college C, there was a call for a document that would become a guiding force to sponsor identity and mission related initiatives. The Council responded as follows: "A charge was to develop a vision paper or a white paper

saying next steps but also describing the mission, and so, what we ended up putting together was seven foundational elements of the mission for us” (College C – Mission).

The president at college A also inherited a structure that had an individual responsible for mission. Initially she called upon a member of the sponsoring order to fill that position.

When I became president, the person I asked to be a member of my team and look at mission integration, was one of our older sisters. She had a long career here as a faculty member, and had served in community leadership as well. She came back to the college, and was interested in mission. When I got here, that position was not as directly responsible to the president. (College A – President)

That structure was seen as commonplace especially at institutions associated with the same sponsoring order as college A. The trustee at college A as mentioned earlier also serves in that role at the other colleges that are part of the sponsor family.

On a very practical level, most of our places have identified a mission officer, and that person serves as a senior member of staff, or as a direct report to the president, and generally then they have the chaplain reporting to them and sometimes some persons in student life. Right now (most of) our mission officers are currently members of the sponsoring order, all but two. Then we have two schools that don’t have an executive mission officer now. And of those two, both of them have a member of the sponsoring order as presidents. So my guess is, when they leave, we might be getting someone in the mission office. (College A – Trustee)

It became clear to the president at college A that presidential commitment to mission and preserving sponsor identity was vitally important to the task, and her later responses to the interview questions bear this out. Still, in her mind the work of mission was too great to be carried out by one person, so college A also moved to a conciliar structure as described by representatives of its Mission Advisory Committee.

The Mission Advisory Committee is an institutional committee where faculty are appointed by the EOFA (Executive Officers of the Faculty Assembly), and staff members and students are appointed by the president and the dean of students, so we have a membership team of about nine in total. Our job is to review Mission of the University, look at where it's occurring, where it's not occurring, influence change in helping to make sure mission stays present and relevant, to support the initiatives that are happening in various ways on campus through either promotion, attendance, participation in some way in fostering or developing it, and occasionally initiating and activity or an event. But often it's us putting support behind other things from around the university. (College A – Mission)

An interesting feature of the college A structure is the formal role faculty play in selecting members. Faculty governance and its intersection with higher education administration can sometimes occupy a contentious space on college and university campuses. Allowing the faculty to elect or appoint members of the council ups the ante for them and their involvement and indicates that they consider the initiative to be important. Similarly, the administration support of this faculty process gives similar signals that they understand and appreciate the vital role that faculty play in carrying out mission and lifting up sponsor identity.

College B has not moved to a conciliar structure for mission and sponsor identity, but there is a sense that responsibility for lifting them up and integrating them into the college is a shared one. For example, trustees at college B engage in an orientation program through service on the mission committee of the board. This effort is led by a trustee who serves as chair of the mission and ministry committee of the board.

My goal as a trustee is to make sure that every member of the board serves some time on the mission and ministry committee of the board. Now, all new trustees will be on the mission and ministry committee, so they will all know that maintaining our sponsor, Catholic identity, is of primary importance to running the university. (College B – Trustee)

This work is shared and expanded by the vice president for mission at college B.

My job description really talks about helping to educate the college in general from board of trustees to faculty to staff, in the basic tenets of sponsored education. So most of my job is, most of the things I want to do have to do with orientation. I have instituted a kind of web based orientation for the trustees that was kind of an experiment. Every new trustee was assigned to the mission and ministry committee and one other, and in that committee, using the web-based materials, we go through the material that takes them into the sponsor understanding, how we understand our role as educators. (College B – Mission)

Even though college B has not moved to a formal representative body that has responsibility for mission and sponsor identity as colleges A and C have done, there is a sense of shared work. It is therefore clear in the data that a shared form is more effective than an isolated form.

Emphasis, intentionality and ubiquity. Sponsor identity cannot be maintained by a single person, holding a single sign, running a single program. The considerable data that follows tells of the breadth of programming each of the colleges has put in place to assure that sponsor identity and mission are at the heart of the institution. This begins with an intentionality about preserving sponsor identity in the hiring processes for presidents, faculty and staff and for board development. There is data that demonstrates the emphasis on maintaining strong ties to the sponsoring order by various constituents within the institution. There may be no better example of this than the gathering of a presidential search committee. These committees are usually highly representative of campus and community culture. The committee will set the tone for the hiring process and will grapple with important decisions about the most important candidate qualifications. The trustee interviewed from college B served as co-chair of the presidential search committee that brought the first lay leader to that college. He relates that following from that experience.

The stated emphasis to retain sponsor identity, shared with the president elect, came out of the search committee which was broadly representative of the campus and broader communities. There was student concern about the potential for diminished sponsor identity, and it was not something the committee was going to ignore. We did comply with the faculty need of having a fully qualified terminal degree holder and the president elect was one of them. The members of the sponsoring order who were on the search committee which included representatives from other institutions sponsored by the order were all of one mind with the committee that this was something important. The alumni couldn't

be sure whether the president elect was going to be a good fund raiser but the recent capital campaign has taken care of all those concerns. Our final edict from the committee was let's hire the lay candidate but make sure the president elect knows that retaining the sponsor identity of the college was key. (College B – Trustee)

This experience clearly indicates an emphasis on hiring for mission that starts at the very top of the institutional tree. Institutions in the study have strengthened sponsor identity by hiring for mission at other levels as well. As evidenced by the responses and comments below, those interviewed believe there is a link between preserving sponsor identity and the hiring process. Institutions that are sponsored and mission centered often attract faculty and staff who philosophically resonate with institutional culture. “On the Academic side, the mission is really foremost in the hiring process, and if you hire for mission and that mission is intimately connected with the sponsoring order, you’re going to maintain that. And that became pretty clear with our conversations” (College A – Mission). “I think that’s beginning to translate more into hiring too – hiring for mission. That way we’re building that into the structure. People are beginning to come to us more because of that” (College C – Mission). Interviewees have recognized this level of intentionality in the hiring process like this faculty member at college A.

I spent the day here with a number of different groups and committees during my interview and it (sponsor identity) was evident in every meeting I had. There were questions related to service, justice, understanding the Catholic identity, understanding the sponsor identity, so they were able to ascertain whether I would fit into this sponsored Catholic place, and I can’t think of one interview I went on

throughout that day that I wasn't asked that, even when I was meeting with students. (College A – Mission)

This is true for leaders, faculty and staff. Recognizing that leadership transitions will take place over time, the sponsors of college B provided a number of programs to educate future leaders about sponsor and Catholic culture.

For us, maintaining our religious character, if you will, has to rely on other aspects and other attributes, and we've known that for a long time. We began here more than 15 years ago preparing for lay leadership, so in that sense, I think that our sponsors were maybe ahead of the curve. The sponsoring order had various training programs, I remember going to one at another sponsored institution, which was an institute which took us through the nitty gritty of how a sponsored institution works and operates. That one was a bit more on the operational side, to groom people who might want to go into administration. [There are] programs to for lay people who want to go into sponsored higher education, and that goes more deeply into the sponsoring order philosophy and mission and the history of the sponsoring order and Church relations and all of that. So that was really the basis to try to get people who, even though you work at a sponsored, Catholic institution, you may not really know enough about the history and the mission and all the various complex aspects of the Church - it's got a lot of parts! And you really need to know that if you're going to be a leader (College B – President)

Similarly, college A and other institutions in that sponsor group have taken a proactive stance relative to the transition.

Rather than mourning that (the decline in numbers of sponsors present and sponsor presidents), how do we then work actively to prepare the laity to have them understand what it means to be a president at Catholic college in the sponsor tradition. How do we prepare boards, the board chair and vice chair, who maybe have never been through Catholic education, maybe are not Catholic themselves, to understand that for us it's just as important for their decision making and in their conversations to address this (sponsor identity). (College A – Trustee)

Once a critical mass of individuals committed to sponsor identity have been identifies and/or hired, institutional culture begins to develop around sponsor and mission themes. It was clear to the faculty and staff involved in the Mission Advisory Council at college A that there was a tremendous commitment to mission in the campus community. It should be noted that the student representative on the Mission Advisory Council was unable to be part of this interview.

It seems like there's a tremendous mission-mindedness here. I think it's in the conversation now in a very real and concrete way. It has kind of spilled into seeing things through in tasks and kind of the momentum. It's absolutely part of every conversation that has to do with planning and student life as well as academics, community outreach, the whole thing. Our president is very vocal about the sponsor charism and the sponsor role in the institution. (College A – Mission)

These colleges have been successful in maintaining sponsor identity because of an ongoing and robust emphasis on nurturing this mission mindedness. There are numerous programs to orient and education students, faculty, staff and trustees. Orientation in the

higher education setting generally refers to activities geared toward new members of the community – students, faculty and staff. The colleges in the study engaged in a number of programs to welcome newcomers.

...when I did orientation there was a meeting that we went to, and faculty and staff went together, we weren't treated separately, and we learned about the history of the foundress of the sponsoring order, and that is built into our freshman experience, and I'm guessing the transfer seminar as well. So that historical piece and the mission of the sponsoring order, I think, we at least educate about it and give people experiences. The core values that are on the sign posts belong to the college. They're not the sponsor's core values, so sometimes I think there's some confusion about that, when students talk about the sponsor's core values, they're thinking sponsor, capital S sponsor rather than sponsor at the college. (College A – Mission)

I was part of that same orientation process when I came here, and when they did the orientation they said "This is our history, these are our values" and so on and so forth. But in my interview process, it was just clear this is who we are. If you want to be part of this you can be part of this. I think they were sizing me up in terms of can I be part of this institution. I think if I had come in with something that clearly said I wasn't able to conform to the mission - and I think the mission is very clear here, you know, the five signs on the roadway, and the sponsor charism of serving women, serving the poor, being of service, those are clear and they're clear to the sisters and they're clear to the faculty. (College A – Mission)

When I first came here there was actually a skit about the sponsor's foundress in habit and showing about how she brought in these women and what she did to help them and how she started the sponsoring order, and that really impressed me. So I do remember that and it was very visual to me and very concrete to me, so it's something that lingers in my memory even today. That really meant a lot to actually see that and even though it was not the foundress, it was still very visual and very meaningful. (College A – Mission)

We do new employee orientation, we do new trustee orientation as well, and at both of those orientations, there is a section where the vice president for mission and ministry talks about what it means to be a sponsored institution, and how the institution tries to sustain that. (College B – President)

Trustees at college A engaged in a more focused activity related to board orientation and formation.

The board has done some interesting things as well. The first of the board retreats we had, in my third or fourth year as president, The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) was partnering with The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) and they were looking to create some power projects, and they were looking for institutions that would try them out. It was really an AGB program with a mission twist. So as a newer president, I thought that'd be really good for our board. So we did it as an overnight retreat, and it really was focused on mission as well as the responsibilities of trusteeship. But we were able to then use the sponsor tradition, our own university mission, as well as the sponsor story. That gave me a foundational group of people to work with who found the

experience a really good experience. Since then, our board has been as engaged and being intentional as I think I have been. (College A – President)

The president at college A provides an insight into the shortcomings of orientation programs that leads to a further discussion about orientation over a longer period of time. We have an orientation program, I'm not sure if that's the answer. People are too new and are like, "This is one more piece of information, along with all of the 300 names I need to figure out who they are when I go into the dining hall. So, how do we create a program that's a little bit more intentional there? I don't believe we've done a terrific job on that, and we could do that. (College A – President)

Orientation therefore appears to be an ongoing process of formation. It is not simply enough to be handed a packet of information about sponsor identity followed up by a keynote address. The institutions in the study have developed programs and practices that address this need. "We always begin every trustee meeting with a prayer. Actually, we begin all of... everything we do here is begun with a prayer" (College A – President).

We run a lecture series throughout the year, we have, obviously, many retreat programs that go on, and those retreats are focused on not just spiritual retreats and general Catholic identity, but also the sponsor charism. In our theology classes, there is a unit on the sponsors, as there is in freshman orientation. They (members of the sponsoring order) go and speak to the freshmen and kind of give them an overview of what it means to be a sponsored institution and a student at a sponsored university (College B – President)

The other practice they (the board) have, in addition to the prayer, is a reflection on one of the sponsor Core Values before the board meeting, before they got into the business of the board meeting. And one or two of the members of the trustees actually prepare the reflection and lead the rest of them in a discussion about “What does that word really mean and how will that affect what we’re really doing? (College A – President)

Another piece we do at most of the trustee meetings, in addition to using our mission and those values at the beginning prayer, at the end of most of our committee meetings, we ask people to reflect on how well we did with regard to the values. Simple practices. (College A – President)

The leadership program I spoke of will be hybrid, will have some online courses, will have regional gatherings, will have one national gathering every other year where we bring everyone together and have some keynote speakers. We have a purposeful set of topics now that we’ve tried, so it isn’t functioning simply as an ad hoc. (College A – Trustee)

None of the programs described above can be maintained without the investment of time by leadership, faculty and staff and a clear commitment to lift up sponsor identity. Each college addresses this in its own way. At college B through the mission committee of the board:

Role of mission committee is to support campus ministry, to bring an awareness to regents, trustees, administrators, anyone who will listen, about what it means to be a sponsor related university. The students get it. I’m incredibly positive about young people. The young men and women of this university are incredibly

responsive to the needs of others in the community or in times of tragedy and they respond in the spirit of the sponsoring order. (College B – Trustee)

At college A it is about intentionality of mission related efforts: “It’s the intentionality. It’s the opportunity for leadership training, for engaging people in mission and the ethos of sponsor and the Catholic traditions. That’s our responsibility” (College A – President). And at college C it is about commitment to core values and how they relate specifically to the example of the foundress of the order:

...our core values are pretty much generic and could be the core values for any institution. So with the development of the staff institute and making that connection that fundamentally they come from the life of the foundress. That is something that people can understand and hold on to. (College C – Mission)

The leaders at colleges A and B speak of being intentional about proclaiming sponsor identity and mission visibly and often. Under question two the president at college B speaks of being present and taking an active role in campus spiritual events. He states that he often and consistently invokes the name of the founder of the order and tenets of the order when he makes public addresses and at other public events. The president at college A was very intentional about sending unambiguous signals about mission and sponsor identity from the very beginning of her administration.

One of the things I decided as a new president was that every speech I would give, even if it was two minutes, would include some iteration of our five core values. And within a year, I could hear the echo, because everybody knew. She’s the new president, this is her platform, this is what she’s interested in. Quite frankly, I think it was already here. I was just articulating what was already here

and reminding them that that was the core piece. But it was drill, drill, drill. We ask people to include that (the core values) in plans for their departments, for their classes, for their clubs. How do we incorporate that into development? And it forces people to deal with that. How do we provide opportunities for our colleagues to feel immersed and on fire with that? It's almost experiential. You need experience. We've had some opportunity to work in this Year of Faith a little bit on that, and that's been an intentional opportunity for us. We're having a faculty/staff retreat, and a couple of members of our faculty are putting it together. We've never really done that before. We've had prayer days; we've had special days where we invite people to come and celebrate the sisters, or celebrate our charism, or celebrate this, that, or the other. But not like an away kind of thing for the faculty and staff where they would come together like that. The only other thing we had was this program that was actually created from the mission integration area, was called "Work with a Purpose" and you could self-select to go to it, and there would be about 10 or 12 people, and they would take them by van up to our Motherhouse, and get full immersion, like, here's where the college started, here's a little bit about the sisters, and then you know there was a group of people who would put together a nice spiritual program for people. But very few faculty chose that. Some staff did. This (new retreat program) is much more faculty driven, and I'll be interested to see who raises their hand and say "I'll try that." Again, it's an intentional program. (College A – President)

Others pick up and carry the banner of change and a renewed emphasis on sponsor identity. This is seen in another change in leadership at college A as well.

Sometimes it really is the person who's the administrator, but one of the things I've really noticed is a change in deanship in the school of education and now all of our meetings begin with prayer. This is a person who is strongly rooted into the sponsor core values. She is a graduate of the college, and she has been here a very long time as an instructor. I think it had something to do with her appointment, how rooted she is in the sponsor heritage, so that's a big change just in how our meetings begin, it really kind of grounds everybody. I see that happening in different committees. Not every committee begins in prayer, but that was a big deal for school of education, and I'm not sure if I was the only one who noticed it or not, but for me that was a big change. I think it was because of the individual, not because of "Oh my goodness, I have to step up because there are fewer sisters here. (College A – Mission)

The primary mission of the three colleges in this study and all other institutions of higher education is to educate students. These institutions do not exist merely to animate sponsor identity. Marketing experts tell us that very few students actually choose a college based on its religious identity. These three colleges would agree that the work of formation that occurs with students over their years of study lies at the heart of mission. That work is carried out in a number of ways both intentional and subtle. Some institutions give responsibility for the spiritual formation of student to the office of campus ministry as was seen at college B.

We have always had a very active campus ministry program. I think that when it came to the students, it probably didn't really much impact them during that period. It has been more so in the past five or six years when we've really

redoubled our efforts with students. We had a very kind of traditional, tradition might not be the right word, maybe haphazard, approach to student spiritual development here. Frankly, it wasn't as effective as I think any of us liked. So we began hiring with a real focus on people who would really be kind of kindred spirits with the sponsor mission. We had people who were kind of ok on the Catholic side, but they were lay people. We went more than a decade with no member of the sponsoring order in campus ministry, so that was a problem. We had lots of things about, lots of focus on interfaith, interfaith prayer services. Everything was interfaith which I perfectly agreed with and I think it's a wonderful idea. But I kept saying, 'Well, where's the Catholic and sponsor element here?' And there really wasn't much, so we began to change that. Hence the member of the sponsoring community who is now in charge of Campus Ministry, and a team who is very committed to that. (College B – President)

As noted above, college B has secured the services of a member of the sponsoring order to head up campus ministry. More importantly, the president charged that person with broadening the scope of the work to include lifting up sponsor identity.

[Now] Campus Ministry is the locus of sponsor identity, because we happen to have, we're very fortunate, a very young dynamic director of Campus Ministry, a member of the sponsoring order, who's hired a really super team of lay people to surround him. (College B – President)

Each college in the study tells of a growing level of intentionality in helping the students gain an understanding of sponsor and Catholic identity as discussed by the Mission Advisory Council at college A.

I believe that we are now trying to be more intentional about identifying our Catholic portion. We have been extremely intentional about our sponsor identity. I think that's why, for students, the sponsor identity and the Catholic tend to mesh together. They don't see the separation, because we've been so sponsor directed and, for us, you just can't separate the Catholic and the sponsor identity. But if you're a student who's looking for a Catholic University, there's nothing prior to this year that really drew you to look at this college, not our name, not our location, not anything in our marketing materials that spoke to our Catholic portion of who we were. Now I would say, and I think you will find when you talk to the students, they know the sponsor foundress. Our students come here at the very beginning of the year, they meet orientation leaders, they meet student leaders, they meet peers. All of them are talking about Women in Leadership Development (WILD) and Sponsor Collegiate Society. In those discussions they are talking about how they are going to empower themselves as women as the sponsoring foundress had, and they're always tying it back to the sponsoring foundress. (College A – Mission).

Mission and sponsor identity have now become a more integral part of the student experience at college A rooted in curricular and co-curricular experience, activities and requirements.

We do have the sponsor core values as part of the institutional learning goals that show up on every course outline the degree to which an individual faculty member addresses. All of our students are required to do a minimum number of hours of service learning in order to graduate. The degree to which that is

overseen by a faculty member, it's aligned to whatever course they want to do it in. The degree to which that faculty member draws it back to the sponsor foundress, Catholic, and sponsor is really unique to the instructor, not even to the program. In the school of education we're looking at ways to really measure and quantify this because one of our claims is that we're creating caring educators. How do you measure caring? I'm the little voice in the wilderness saying 'we have to connect it to the sponsor because that's a tool that we have, that's an anchor we have.' It's not part of the conversation yet. I think we are still growing in ways of how to do this, rather just claiming that because we see it happening here it's happening everywhere. (College A – Mission)

College C places an emphasis on sponsor identity from the very beginning in curricular, programmatic and symbolic ways.

In terms of the students, each freshman takes the College Success Seminar and within the last year or two years, as part of that curriculum, if not the first class, one of the first classes is to have a speaker come in and give an overview of the life of the foundress of the order and make a connection with the college's heritage and on core values. When the students walk across the stage at matriculation and then they sign the Charter of Core Values that then hangs in a building on campus for the duration of their four years, they see the core values and they hear about the core values and the life of the foundress and how she lived out those values. They make that connection. Our first year advisors or first year success seminar teachers have that. So the students get that upon coming in within a class. There is also a day and week that is named for and dedicated to

the foundress and that is another punctuation point in the students' annual education. (College C – Mission)

Colleges in the study have been more intentional in creating programs and partnerships that link students to sponsor identity. “Some of this renewed energy around sponsor identity may have occurred because of the emerging institutional relationship with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) as a partner” (College C – Mission).

We have Critical Concerns Week, which comes every year, and one of the concerns of the sponsor organization is the focus of that week, it's typically in November and it's built into the Academic calendar. We bring in speakers from in-house and outside and occasionally it's classes where the students have created projects that they are presenting connected to those critical concerns. Not as well attended as we like. Sometimes they're talking to empty seats. (College A – Mission)

Campus ministry has created a feeding the poor program in the neighborhood surrounding the university. The students do service trips abroad. There are plenty of opportunities for any student at the university to get involved and a tremendous number of students do. The faculty also give of their time in serve but mostly do so quietly. They are very present on campus visibly supporting their students. (College B – Trustee)

Are these programs and initiatives effective in helping students grow in their understanding of sponsor identity and mission? Based on the following comments, it appears that students are developing such an understanding and appreciation of sponsor

identity. “Even though there has been this focus on staff and faculty, clearly the students are feeling it” (College C – Mission).

I have been to - I can't tell you how many - award celebrations or honoraries in the last two weeks. Students begin with prayer. They are referencing the sponsoring foundress. They are referencing the sponsor, they're identifying the fact that they are now called to serve. Our students recognize that service is a critical point and I know community service happens everywhere. I came from another institution that touted that they were the best community service place. It's different here because they're doing it and they're recognizing the foundation of why it's important, and they're tying it back to the sponsor. (College A – Mission)

The trustees at college C observe these efforts from afar. As indicated in the methodology chapter, these two trustees are members of the sponsoring order. However they do not work on or reside near campus. Their comments confirm that the efforts to form students in a way consistent with sponsor identity and the charism of the foundress are successful.

I know that efforts are certainly made to help students understand the identity of the foundress. At orientation, students are told that the name of the foundress is not the name of a city but the name of a person and that this college is dedicated to that particular person and to the sponsor community. I think, because of the whole thrust with *Justice Matters* and immigration and so forth, that some may know the foundress more now. We have symbols around including a statue of the foundress and a prominent mural created by the students called “the wall of

immigrants.” As the students are involved and captivated in some of this and as they have done service with some of the sisters, I would say that there are some students who really have that connection and some that wouldn’t. I know that certainly the effort is made. How much happens is really dependent on the individual. I know that they have a week dedicated to the foundress. If the values are there and the education of the heart and the whole person – it’s important that they know who the foundress is, but it’s even more important that they’re getting the correct education and spiritual development. This whole idea of education of the heart, I think students would know this term, and that is directly related to the foundress. She developed this whole sense of education of the heart and the whole person, and a lot of people would be familiar with that phrase. It is a part of our mission statement. There are definitely pieces which are directly related to the foundress, but I am not sure that everyone could vocalize that connection, but they get the education that develops them as a person. The foundress herself was an educator. She had this great love of education and felt that education was critical in helping students become good citizens. The students get that, but whether they can name it is uncertain. Making sure that students get the education which is reflective of the foundress is more important. (College C – Trustee)

Other than the president, there may be no more important party in the discussion of preserving sponsor identity than the faculty. If the members of the faculty are not on board with the mission of the institution, any efforts to translate that mission to students

are not likely to be successful. This can be seen in the emphasis placed on faculty development as a priority at college C.

People are always asking what are you doing with the students, but we really have to get faculty and staff to understand the mission and identity of the sponsor. I think if you look at the faculty academies and the staff institutes, I think people would be blown away with how much attention and energy people have given to mission. The rush is always to teach this stuff to the students, but we really need to make sure we understand it ourselves so that it is real and authentic. It's not that we've been waiting. We've been moving forward with the curricula continually throughout this. I think students are getting that. (College C – Mission)

One could argue that the interface between mission, sponsor identity and student formation occurs in the classroom, though these efforts are supported by co-curricular activities and administration. The three colleges in this study each enjoy strong buy-in from the faculty. The faculty play an active role in discussions of mission integration and lifting up sponsor identity. They engage in formation programs some of which have already been discussed and described.

Connections to broader Catholic concepts and external influences. These three colleges recognize that they are both sponsored and Catholic. They are also part of a public trust. They are subject to regional accreditation visits and programmatic accreditation. All of these things influence the institutions in specific ways. In particular, respondents reflected on the intersection between Catholic teachings and

sponsor identity. This often involved the intersection between Catholic social teaching and expressions of mission and sponsor identity.

The passages below, some of them lengthy, demonstrate the seriousness with which faculty and others at these colleges take the responsibility of preserving sponsor identity. There was considerable discussion about how Catholic and sponsor identity is manifest.

We have always had a faculty and staff very dedicated to service and justice. It often translated into, from the faculty point of view, teaching about social problems. And I think now we are transitioning to a much more informed curriculum, informed by Catholic social teaching and informed by the college mission. We are at that transitional stage in our faculty development. (College C – Mission)

There was a resurgence to talk about what social justice means. As a new faculty member in 2005, I attended a faculty workshop led by a long tenured faculty member on basically redefining what we mean by social justice. I think a lot of that work was also driven by the partnership with Catholic Relief Services and that helped us to think differently about mission that then led us back to the sisters. There was this bigger theme of what are we doing. We were reworking our core curriculum simultaneously. (College C – Mission)

Justice Matters is very much connected to the sponsor identity and that came from the faculty. It is an interesting faculty here. Every ten to 12 years the core curriculum gets reexamined. The last core curriculum had one service learning course at the junior level. The faculty revised the core curriculum. They

established, beautifully so, learning outcomes, and one component of an outcome is describing this matrix that they have which is referred to as the CLEPs – the characteristics of a liberally educated person. There is a social justice component in that. So they started with that and then they revised the curriculum. That was drafted before I came and that's what attracted me to this opportunity. I saw something that was so Catholic, even though from the faculty perspective it was just the next iteration of what needed to be the college's core curriculum. This infusion of engagement with the common good sequence, beautifully designed from a learning perspective, starting with the individual and expanding in terms of their focus on societal issues, etc., very much Christian humanistic. I come out of another sponsor tradition and a classical approach to liberal education there. We don't have that here, but I saw in what they were doing the perfect blend, in the curriculum, intellectual and social positions of the Church. I got what they were doing from a different, bigger lens. It was just and organic, iterative design of the core curriculum by the faculty who have always known what's true to the sponsor identity. The vision for that transition was to design a transformational education experience for students of the 21st century. In my first year, the program was being piloted. There was a pilot group for that freshman year. I see this as a hallmark, as a niche for the college. I asked the faculty to brand the program so we could refer to it as something and I would then weave it into my inaugural address and that's what happened. It's not my baby. I'm just the cheerleader for it. I'm just the one who describes it and sees the potential and the opportunities it presents for the college. *Justice Matters* became a part of the conversation and

the faculty were so involved in developing and teaching those courses. They were developed the first year and piloted. They learned from the pilot and adjusted. They piloted a second year, learned again and made adjustments. There was so much energy around the faculty in developing the curriculum around this core that staff were interested. They could not get enough of it. Faculty would present to staff and the community became centered around it. Faculty development programs were planned in light of what the faculty were saying. For example, what does it mean for me to be a part of this curriculum because it's interdisciplinary? How can I contribute to it? I don't understand what Catholic social teaching is. I'm not a Catholic or I am a Catholic and I don't know what it means. So the faculty spent an inordinate amount of time in their own professional development addressing it. We got funding for them. This initiative helped them and they have an academy now where they have faculty engaged off campus for three or four days immersed in this but then it continues for a whole year with other experiences and reflections. (College C – President)

More specifically, there were a number of examples of how the faculty integrated mission, sponsor and Catholic identity into curriculum and how the faculty evaluated the effectiveness of these efforts.

It's required that we include the institutional learning goals, and you'll see them on blue posters, kind of banner like posters, numbered lists, and it includes the sponsor core values, and that's supposed to be in everybody's course outline. When we do our assessment loop, we talk about which goals and which objectives - we don't have to do all ten of them - but which of these belong to the work

that's in this course and how do we know it's happening. Again, it really depends on instructor and course and department how definitively we make those claims and talk about that assessment loop. But it's part of the process. (College A – Mission)

We've asked them (the faculty) to include something about the mission of the college and the mission of their department in their syllabi. We are building, rather rapidly, a service-learning program, and that, again, reflects the kind of experiential learning that comes out of the sponsor piece, it comes out of the founder of the order's own experience, and we just translate it into an effective way to get students to dig in and educate themselves. (College B – Mission)

There was also considerable discussion about the relationship between Catholic identity and sponsor identity. Each sponsoring order is inextricably linked to the Catholic Church and draws on the teachings of Jesus Christ in the gospels. This is a complex area of discussion and one that has been contentious on a number of Catholic college campuses. There are allusions to this in some of the comments below.

We have offered various gatherings; I almost wanted to say a retreat, but not a retreat in the old sense of the word. Since I've been here, I think we've had four of them, and we have another one scheduled for the coming year. And we spend about three days framing the larger piece of the Catholic college within the charism of our sponsor. We invite the faculty, and we've encouraged our presidents to send folks who might be a little resistant to this to see if we can have a deeper conversation. And I can tell you that the faculty that I've met, probably up into the hundreds, talking to various faculty members throughout our

campuses, many of them struggle with the Catholic piece, they feel that the norms of *Ex Corde* and the mandate have been an intrusive thing for academic freedom. Some of them are coming from campuses that have had struggles with the bishop. Many of them are Catholics or consider themselves former-Catholics and are upset with the authority of the Church and the way they feel the Church hasn't used that authority well. But they all affirm the sponsor charism, and that's the piece that's a joy for me and a puzzle for me, too. I don't know how you can recognize the sponsoring order, who they are and what they do, without recognizing Jesus at the heart of that. It's almost countercultural now in some groups to take the name of Jesus and use it, but they're very comfortable using the name of the sponsor foundress. So right now, to get the job done, I'm saying 'Let's affirm the sponsor piece, let's make sure we promote it.' And it seems to be in all of our campuses, from what we can identify and judge, and use that as a way to invite people into a deeper understanding of the person of Jesus. And that's what we're working on right now; we're developing a mission and leadership development curriculum. We're almost at the stage of sharing it with our full board, with our presidents, with our sponsors. It's a three year program for leaders on our campuses - for new presidents as well as board members, key faculty - to really help them to understand more about what we hope they would emphasize and know. And to affirm the fact that we haven't had an expectation for them, whether they're Catholic or not, whether they're angry with the Church, whether they don't have any faith that they profess, that there is still a piece they need to be doing on our campuses. (College A – Trustee)

It seems to me that the revival of the relationship has clearly impacted faculty and staff. I am not sure that it has impacted students all that much. I'm not sure that students could clearly articulate the sponsor connection even in the same way they would the Catholic Relief Services connection. We have not talked about it enough and it is such a fault of ours. When sponsor members or representatives come into class the students are so clearly moved by the stories. I think there are so many faculty, who might otherwise be hostile or indifferent to religion who relate to the sponsor stories in a way that they relate to nothing else. They would think of this less as a Catholic college and more as a sponsor college. (College C – Mission)

While the comments above affirm the important role that faculty play in integrating sponsor identity and mission, there are times when others have to take up that work. The faculty on the Mission Advisory Council gave credit to staff for maintaining a link to the sponsoring order during troubled times of transition.

The library staff, during the early part of December, we have for the last 14 years done a little adopt a senior sister program where we go and take pictures of the senior sister and we get her Christmas list and we ask other offices to adopt one and deliver the gifts. It was noted by the senior sisters that the first lay president stopped coming with the death of the sister who was the founding president of the college. The second lay president immediately went down to see the senior sisters. The library staff, single handedly was the group that maintained the closest relations all through the 90s and clearly kept the sisters on the campus radar. (College C – Mission)

Each of the institutions referenced some formal programs of formation and education for faculty and staff. Those programs from college C are described below. It was also interesting to note that faculty and staff approached sponsor identity and the work of lifting it up in different ways. The Mission Advisory Council at college C best captured the essence of those conversations.

As they have developed, faculty have concentrated more on Catholic social teaching and the staff have concentrated more on the foundress and the sponsor. We are now having good conversation about how to bring them together”
(College C – Mission).

The staff institute is a two day experience. The first day is spent on campus and the second day is spent with the sponsors and walking in the footsteps of the foundress. The first day is a time for prayer, learning and reflection, and community and we learn about Catholic social teaching, the life of the foundress, the charism of the sponsor and the institutional partnerships. We have different speakers who come in. On the second day we travel to see what and where our students are going. That makes the *Justice Matters* curriculum more real to the staff people. Then the second day we go the foundress’ shrine and we have a prayer service. We finish with a dinner with the sponsors and we get to meet the women who have given their lives for the mission. (College C – Mission)

The faculty academy is a full year program in three phases. The first phase is three days off campus during which we learn about Catholic social teaching and have powerful discussion of people’s journeys of faith. This is held at CRS headquarters in Baltimore. Then we’ll have things sprinkled through the

year, but then at Christmas time we are going to do an immersion trip to another off campus site for three or four days. At the end of the year, there will be a three or four day retreat in which we discuss mission and implications for our personal lives and our own teaching. Participation in both the staff and faculty programs is encouraged but not required. (College C – Mission)

The work of maintaining sponsor and Catholic identity is complicated and complex. The trustees at college C recognize this complexity and recognize the intersections between the work of leadership, faculty, staff, the sponsoring order and the student experience. Such a collaboration is seen by them as not only important to the college but also to the sponsoring order as well.

The element of service, the element of respect, reaching out, Catholic identity, and, recently, reaching out to and helping faculty and staff better understand the heritage and the foundress through trips to the shrine of the foundress and to get to know how the foundress first came. We've been blessed with really wonderful faculty that have a good feel. This recent effort was the work of the president. She felt that there was a lot of emphasis on the student, but she also felt that not as much had been done with faculty and staff. She wanted a renewed thrust, so she had this three-year initiative where she focused on faculty and staff, not that she neglected the student because we had a center with service and outreach which is both domestic and international. They go to Peru; they've gone to Mexico and other places. Now they have this connection with Swaziland which is one of our missions. They have given a five year commitment to do things with that mission using the educational background here to help with the education there with

students. This particular president has tried to see how the college could offer their gifts to the sponsoring order. Some of this is the thrust of the president, but we (the sponsor) have always encouraged this kind of activity at bi-annual meetings with leadership in the various sponsored entities. This allows the sponsored entities to get to know each other and to determine how to share ideas and help each other out. Is there a way the college could help another organization and vice versa? That's something that we (the sponsor) have encouraged – this exchange. For example, we sponsor two high schools and the college offers college credit to students enrolled there. You build these bridges, if you will, even among our own institutions within the province. We are an international province, which adds more to that. If you look back at our history, many years ago, there was a commitment to mission integration. We committed a member of our community to develop mission guidelines with standards. After her service, a lay woman took up that work and continued doing education with boards at our sponsored entities and with faculty and to add to the formation of lay leaders because members of the sponsoring congregation are not always going to be there. These trustee orientation programs and different activities have helped too because these leaders can take the ball and run. Laity are the people in the Church at this point. The foundress always knew that she could not do it with just sisters. Part of our history is that the foundress always partnered with the laity. This is not a new thing that happened simply because we did not have enough sisters. From the very beginning, the foundress always sought out good lay people that she could work with to foster the mission and to move it forward.

It was not out of necessity; it was always something that she always thought should happen. We were never a large congregation like some others, so this partnership was always important. (College C – Trustee)

Institutions of higher education go through decennial accreditation processes. While these regional organizations are secular in nature, there is a growing emphasis on mission in the accreditation process. The trustee at college A reflects on this.

In a way, there have been a few trends that have happened that have helped us a lot. Most of the accrediting bodies ask our colleges and universities to pay particular attention to mission. So, our presidents, the provost, the senior teams, are very conscious of the fact that they have to address mission from a very careful standpoint. (College A – Trustee)

This combination of an external requirement to reflect on mission and an institutional commitment to the mission and sponsor identity create a rich construct in which a planning process can take place. “We just finished a strategic plan, and the very first thing in that strategic plan is reinforcing the sponsor presence on campus. And that went through everything” (College B – Mission).

It’s [mission and sponsor identity] been a big part of our planning processes, certainly from the very first strategic planning process and visioning we did way back in 2001 when I first got here. And more recently, in reimagining who we need to be in this 21st century, and what is that going to look like. One of the main initiatives, even in the current strategic plan, is about mission and branding. (College A – President)

Institutions like those in the sponsor group to which college A belongs have begun to be more intentional about assessing mission and sponsor relatedness. This is not to grade or penalize institutions based on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of their programs, rather, they are designed to foster improvements and uphold best practices. Such a program, limited to this particular sponsor group, could be replicated for other church-related institutions as well.

On top of that we also have begun a mission peer visit. Every five to ten years, to coincide with the accrediting visit of each of our campuses, each of our colleges and universities, we're asking for their self-study of mission. We've formed teams of three or four persons from within the conference or people who have a particular sense of sponsor and Catholic identity to visit these campuses, much like an accreditation team. They spend about two and one-half to three days on the campuses, do a report of their findings, their commendations, their recommendations, and send that to the president, give him or her a chance to respond, then forward it on to us, and we in turn read it, discuss it, approve it, affirm the identity, and then forward it on to the institute level so that the sponsoring order knows that we're doing our work, and that we're also doing our best to help each of these campuses figure out what it is that they're doing.

(College A – Trustee)

The challenge that remains during these times of transition is how to get all elements of the institution to pull in the same direction and to embrace the mission-rich sponsor identity of the college. The external forces surrounding higher education compel institutions to professionalize many of its functions, particularly administrative ones. But

many responses gathered as part of this study indicate that the work of mission and sponsor identity is not something to be delegated to a mission office, campus ministry, or the faculty though they all play vital roles. It is best accomplished when such responsibilities are shared. The institutions in this study have done a very good job of maintaining sponsor identity, mission and fidelity to Catholic social teaching. It is intentional and begins with leadership. The work is shared among a large group. There are programs to form and educate faculty, staff, trustees and students. Some of these programs are introductory and others are lengthy and in-depth. Best practices are demonstrated in assessing the effectiveness of curricular initiatives. More broadly, institutions are engaged in assessment of mission effectiveness and at least one institution relies on peer evaluation to assess effectiveness in lifting up and remaining faithful to sponsor identity.

Question Four: What symbols and icons are present which signify the founding relationship? (This question, along with question seven, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)

Question Five: How has the presence of such symbols and icons succeeded in keeping the relationship with and identity of the sponsoring community alive and vibrant?

Question Six: How are these symbols and icons displayed on campus and in publications?

As with questions three and seven, there was considerable narrative overlap in the responses to these three questions, so all will be considered together. In addition, an

assessment of institutional symbols and icons and their presence on each of the three college campuses is included in Table 2 (p. 170).

The researcher discovered that each college in the study had a broad understanding of what was meant by symbols and icons that included artifacts, words, names, expressions, statements, edifices, buildings and people. Actions are also sometimes seen as symbolic. The researcher observed all such manifestations of sponsor identity on each campus to greater or lesser degrees. In general, colleges A and B had a much stronger presence of symbolism than college C. Interviewees from college C admitted that this was a weakness and an area to be worked upon. “Our current motto seems less appropriate the deeper we get into mission” (College C – Mission).

We do not do a good communicating our identity through symbols. We should have more artifacts on campus that demonstrate the connection to the sponsor and their mission. If you look at the web site, you have to drill down deep to find any connection to sponsor identity. (College C – Mission)

Interviews at each of the colleges moved quickly beyond discussions about particular symbols and their presence to a deeper and more useful conversation about meaning and effect of symbols. In evaluating the data, 36 codes were identified and three primary themes emerged:

- 1. Environment**
- 2. Story Telling**
- 3. Effect of Time**

Environment. Symbols help to identify the sponsored and Catholic college as different from other colleges and universities. They help to create a sense of place. They

support the brand of the college or university. The president at college B offered a valuable insight about distinction.

Without those physical attributes, if you think about it, an institution, higher education institutions can be very much interchangeable on physical aspects. Everyone's got student centers, everyone's got a gym, a recreation center, an athletic center, we all have classroom buildings. We all more or less have technology, you know, and things like that. But we've started to focus on branding the institution generally, but branding it as a sponsored institution.

(College B – President)

The one symbol that generated the most discussion was the cross or crucifix. This symbol is central to Christian and Catholic identity. The cross or crucifix may take on various forms based on the heritage, ethnicity or artistry of the sponsor. For example, the Franciscans use the cross found in the Church of San Damiano in Italy where St. Francis received his call from God and began his order. The sponsors of college A have a cross that is specifically related to their order. Colleges B and C do not have specific cross or crucifix designs. As seen in the comments below, there is a very intentional use of the sponsor cross as part of the environment to help convey the story of the sponsor and the foundress. All interviewees had positive reflections on the cross.

One of the recommendations she (director of mission) made was a very simple thing. 'Can we put a sponsor cross in every classroom and building' and I said absolutely. But they had to look nice; that couldn't be handmade-looking awful things. They have to fit so that they'll be taken seriously. (College A – President)

There are crosses in every classroom, and that wasn't always the case. They were intentional about it. About ten years ago I think someone identified "If we're really going to make our sponsor identity known – if we're going to stand on these legs of our sponsor foundation, we need to be overt with it". It's THE sponsor cross. (College A – Mission)

You learn about the cross in the orientation. I remember being taught that this is the sponsor cross. I remember learning all about that. And that conversation does happen in the first year seminar course and the transfer seminar, that every student experiences. (College A – Mission)

They have the sponsor cross. They have a chapel. They have the Bible for the Word. They have the quotes from sponsor foundress. So there is a visual piece that I am very comfortable with on all of our campuses, no matter where it is or what the physical space is, there's something there that speaks to being Catholic and sponsor identity. (College A – Trustee)

Even though there is an emphasis on the sponsor cross, the crucifix is also present. A member of the Mission Advisory Council at college A offers the following reflection on the importance of the link between the two.

I think that you can't separate the sponsor from the Church. We identify ourselves as a Catholic and sponsored institution, and we are Catholic as Catholic can be. The other statuary to us, to you, and to me helps separate the sponsor from Catholic. So that's a sponsor cross in this room, but in the next room, that's a crucifix. I think the population of folks we cater to; they see anything as being both sponsor and Catholic together. (College A – Mission)

There is no specific cross at college B that reflects sponsor identity or the founder, but the cross or crucifix has been a constant presence on campus and an ever present reminder of the college's Catholic identity. "You know we always retained the crosses in the classroom, although lots of institutions didn't, but we always did" (College B – President). The president at college C reflected on the significance of the crucifix and its centrality to its Catholic identity. College C does not have a cross in every classroom, and, as seen in the comments below, there was a time when that important symbol was being removed. There were additional comments by some of those interviewed at college C about two periods when there were moves toward secularization. Seen in that context, removal of crosses was a symbolic act. Under the current administration, there is greater emphasis on retaining and lifting up both Catholic and sponsor identity.

The one we gravitate to is the crucifix palpably present as you traverse campus. I think it is a K-12 phenomenon when you think a crucifix has to be in every classroom. On a college campus, simply having a crucifix in every classroom does not work. I would want to make sure that entrances to buildings and unexpected turns are the places for the crucifix. We've talked about other ways that Catholicity and sponsor identity could be in each room. This is a current conversation. We have mission day and core values. We do want to get something in every room. We want to be able to use as many of our documents and symbols as possible. (College C – President)

The crucifixes were brought down in the 70s or the 80s. A committee was formed to look into bringing them back and given a small budget. The person who headed that effort resigned and the program fell off. (College C – Mission)

It is clear from these comments that the cross is an essential element when trying to identify the institution as Catholic. In the case of college A, the sponsor cross also helps tell the story of the connection to the sponsor.

Buildings and architecture are also symbolic. Church related colleges and universities often have chapels, churches, houses of worship or shrines. College B made a major acquisition of an adjacent Catholic church that greatly bolstered its symbolic and actual relationship to the Catholic Church and its sponsors who now serve both the parish and the college community. As mentioned earlier, College B is in an urban location and the college boundaries are not so clearly identifiable. It is very much a part of its community and its community is very much a part of it. The church building is an important and symbolic bridge between the two.

An important initiative for us two years ago was the acquisition of a neighboring church and parish. Apparently we had looked at this over many years, but it was vastly too expensive for us. But long story short, I had the archbishop to dinner, at the end of the dinner, on his way out the door, he tells me that he would love to have a conversation with us about the future of the parish, because I think something could be worked out. I wouldn't say they gave it to us because they certainly didn't give it away, but they made it very easy for us to acquire it. We use it for Baccalaureate Mass; we use it for the Mass of the Holy Spirit. This coming year, all of our Masses are moving over there, so we've been gradually moving parish and university communities together. It's a fully functioning parish with all the sacraments, all the attributes, but we now have the university there. (College B – President)

The biggest single symbol, if you will, is an enormous structure which is almost a cathedral, a church which was acquired by the college recently after negotiations with the diocese over time. The diocesan desire to redistribute limited priestly manpower combined with the college's desire to have the church made the deal possible. It has been a big, big asset. (College B – Trustee)

The bridge between Church and college is an important one. Not every institution can point to the existence of a fully functioning church or parish that is on or adjacent to the campus to symbolically indicate the relationship.

Symbolism can also take the form of programs and rituals. The Catholic Church is full of ritual as is higher education. Sponsored colleges often blend the two in meaningful ways. For example, Catholic colleges and universities often incorporate the celebration of a baccalaureate Mass with the celebration of commencement. Evidence of such programs and rituals can reinforce and animate sponsor identity. The trustees at college C look for evidence as they evaluate the college's relationship to the sponsor and the Church.

I think first of all, one of the things that you want to look at is its Catholic identity. So, do they offer the possibility of sacraments on campus? Is there a chapel? Is there any kind of symbolism? This is one aspect of it. (College C – Trustee)

Needless to say, even something as simple as whom they are going to have as a commencement speaker, we vet for all of those kinds of things to make sure that there are no issues that would be contrary to Catholic teaching. Even on campus, as trustees, we have to have a sense of how the students are being

respected and how the faculty is being respected. Mutual respect of individuals is very important. We have a very strong calling to be aware of immigration.

We've seen over the years that the college was able to reach out, even in the local community, to help with the immigrants. I think we want to be more than looking in on ourselves. We want to see our students be helped and encouraged to do service in the community. Service has always been a huge piece of the college's legacy. How are students involved in service beyond themselves? (College C – Trustee)

Story telling. All colleges and universities have stories to tell, particularly related to their founding and history. The three colleges in this study are no different, except that each has a story that goes back beyond the founding of the college to the inspirational story of the founding of the order. All three college trace their stories to a single person who had the energy and faith to meet the challenges of his or her time and take up the work of God in a particular time and place. It is evident from this research that this connection to the founder or foundress is central to animating sponsor identity. It is also central to how the colleges animate their Catholic identity. The trustees at college C capture this well.

The foundress is a person of the Church, so she doesn't just belong to the college. She belongs to the Church. So there is nothing to say that the college can't continue the connection. The charism is a gift to the Church and other people can have it besides the college. (College C – Trustee)

These figures dominate the culture of the order and appear on the campuses in a number of forms. The current and former members of the sponsoring orders live lives based on

the example of the founder or foundress. The colleges provide a number of examples for drawing connections between the founder or foundress, the members of the sponsoring order, the faculty and staff and the students.

You noticed over by Heritage Hall the bust of the foundress, and that's a very central place, particularly for residents here, and for visitors. A lot of visitors go through that particular area. (College A – Mission)

I think the pictures here on the wall are a reminder (the photos of all the presidents). They're all in their habits and are very clearly sisters, and I think it demonstrates the lineage. Two of them [are still active] – one is working in the library and the other just retired from full time faculty. So they are present not just on the wall as has-beens, but members of the community. (College A – Mission)

All through the student center are these displays of our history. Every time the president is appealing to or presenting something, it's always couched [in sponsor rich expressions]. It's on our website. If you click on the website and go to 'sponsor education' it's all hyper-texted throughout. (College B – Mission)

As we began going forward in the last couple years, we started planning for more symbolism, so we have a small (statue) of the founder of the order that was given to us by a donor. If you go to the student center and you look, we planned it a couple of years ago to have what we call the sponsor walk, which has these nice beautiful panels explaining the history of the sponsoring order in the United States and around the world and at the college. And they start on the very

first floor, and you go on every floor of the building, except for the 6th floor.

They jump out at you; they're beautiful. (College B – President)

One tradition that the chaplain has started is an office and dorm room blessing. He provides a card with an image of the foundress to those who choose to have their room or office blessed. These cards are collected by students and faculty. (College C – Mission)

Being a part of the larger community of the sponsors could be very powerful. We do have the flags and a map of where all the sisters are located. Those kinds of things are very powerful and connect us to the mission. (College C – Mission)

Every story begins with a title and moves into a narrative. The name of the college or university, phrases, slogans, logos, seals, mottos, quotes and statements all help tell the story and are expressive of sponsor identity. Each college had some evidence of this kind of symbolism. The names of colleges B and C have religious significance though the name of college C may not be as readily identifiable as Catholic or sponsor related. A relatively well-informed Catholic would immediately understand the significance, but a non-Catholic observer may very well miss its meaning. This therefore becomes an important part of the student's first year experience at college C. "The students understand the meaning of the college name [foundress name] by the end of the first semester through the first year experience" (College C – President).

College A's name holds no religious significance; rather, it refers specifically to its location and architecture. To augment its identity as a Catholic and sponsored college, it amended its name with a subtitle that includes the name of the sponsoring order.

College B uses a similar subtitle that makes specific mention of the sponsoring order.

“Our new letterhead has “The Sponsor University” written, which is new” (College A – Mission).

We’re in the process of redeveloping our logo and in our logo we’ve decided we want to use the seal, and every discussion has always been “the cross has to be more prominent on the seal.” So we’re realigning what the seal looks like to make the cross prominent. (College A – Mission)

The signage very clearly stated that the college was clearly aligned with the sponsoring order. You never said the name of the college without also stating the sponsor affiliation. (College B – Trustee)

There are many written expressions of sponsor identity, many of which come from the mouth or the writings of the founder or foundress of the sponsoring order. In addition, the colleges in the study developed statements, catchphrases, values and graphic displays that continue to tell the story. “We have a whole series of catchphrases, actually, that we have taken from the life of our founder. A lot of these have a lot of depth and complication” (College B – Mission).

She [the director of mission] also wanted to put reminders about the sponsor values. [These are now displayed at the main campus entrance]. There isn’t a person who comes to our campus who doesn’t say “I really love your entrance” because of those values. And I often will tell parents, new parents who are bringing their students for the first visit, and I’ll say “they really mean something. Your students will get to know them, and if you can’t remember them now, after you’ve driven in here, you’ll get a quiz on the way out because you get them on

the way out as well. But having them be beautiful and having them fit the architecture and having them seem like they really belong here was an important piece. They're intentional. A trustee said "These signs around with the names of the values are great, but they look awful." So he paid to have all the new ones put up. He said "It makes an impression, they're so ugly and this is such a beautiful campus." And he said "That's what I'd like to give. I want to make sure that the presentation of these is as beautiful as the place." (College A – President, quoting a member of the board of trustees)

Consultants said catchphrases aren't really helpful. I don't know, we keep remembering some of them. Anyway, the point is "Education, one person at a time" is almost, could be a, not literal, but effective translation of an important tenet of the sponsor. You come into our doors, and we will work our darndest to craft an education experience for you that takes into account your needs, your background, all that. We will do our best to get you out of here, take you as far as you can go. It's a little hard to judge effectiveness. (College B – Mission)

There are core values that this campus has which are based in gospel values. They are good human values, but they are also Christian values. We look especially at leadership and how they speak to the college and to the identity of the college. There is a way in which you are listening to that. We have a whole series of mission standards and mission guidelines that define some of these points we would look for. (College C – Trustee)

In order for the story to have meaning it has to be engrained in both the curricular and co-curricular life of the students and the faculty. College C has drawn a very strong

correlation between the foundress, the sponsor and the curriculum. The *Justice Matters* curriculum was mentioned earlier, but the trustees, both members of the sponsoring order, do a beautiful job of drawing a line from the foundress to the college today. This is both programmatic and symbolic of sponsor identity.

Just recently the college established a core curriculum which has as its base Catholic social teaching. There's this whole thrust around this new curriculum which is groundbreaking called *Justice Matters*. It's integrated throughout the entire education; it's not just a course you have to take, but it's integrated throughout the whole four years. It's a part of our foundress' heritage to be out there making sure that people were treated the way they were supposed to be. In particular, she looked toward the immigrant to make sure that they were treated well and with respect. Taking a stand on immigration in New Orleans in the early 1870s. Reaching out to the immigrants in different places where we are with our health care institutions. It's just part of us because when our foundress was called to New Orleans, she was called because they were lynching people because they were prejudiced against the Italians. She came to New York because the Italians were being mistreated. She (the foundress) may not have called it Catholic social teaching or justice but I think she was living it. Many of our healthcare institutions helped immigrants get their start in life in Chicago and Seattle and New York, because they got decent jobs in our hospitals and we got them through it. Many of them became very good and some got wealthy. It has always been a part of our heritage to look to see where the people were most vulnerable or where they needed help. Now the college has this partnership with Catholic

Relief Services. We are one of the few Catholic colleges that has that kind of partnership. (College C – Trustee)

The data clearly indicate that these colleges have done a good job of creating a story that animates sponsor identity rich with symbolism. It is a part of a continuum of learning for students and other members of the campus community.

Effect of time. As referenced earlier in chapter four, the process of formation and building awareness of sponsor identity is not accomplished by a single act or by completing a single orientation. As seen above, there are many parts to the process. As students enter, it may be enough to simply learn the history of the founder or foundress. Over time, these colleges find thoughtful and meaningful ways to infuse the deeper lessons to be learned in curriculum and through activities. There is evidence that students develop an understanding of and appreciation for the sponsor identity over time and that the efforts to keep it vibrant are successful.

I think when students come here, they don't know any of these (expressions of sponsor identity) unless they've gone to a sponsored high school or something, but they don't really know hardly any of these, but at the end of four years, a good number of them are using the term. They've come to understand some expression of sponsor identity at least, I hope, in the right sense. (College B – Mission)

And interestingly enough, there was some debate as to whether students would pay attention to that, would they really care. We see students standing and staring at panels on those floors, it's amazing. They are interested. They are, I think, discovering things about their own institution and the history of the

sponsoring order that they didn't even know. They jump out at you; they're beautiful. (College B – President)

The president at college B further reinforces this point and relates a story of a visit to alumni who had graduated 50 or more years prior.

They (students) might not understand what being a sponsored institution was about and the value of going to a sponsored institution when they come in, but they do when they leave. So over the four years, there is a very quantifiable marked change in them, in their understanding of it. And then as alumni, it's even stronger. As alumni as they go through life, they look back. I was in Florida earlier this week, and I met a couple of alums, and I guess they're both in their 70s. The power of the sponsored experience for them, I mean, it's lasted a lifetime. It's truly amazing. (College B – President)

It seems clear from the data that symbolism is present and important on these college campuses and that the presence of such symbols in all their variant forms have supported sponsor identity. Evidence also indicates that these efforts have been successful in helping students and other members of the community understand what it means to be a Catholic and sponsored college.

As a final note to this section, the Mission Advisory Council struck a note of caution about symbolism and ritual that deserves mention. More and more students, faculty and staff come from traditions that may be different from that of the sponsor. How institutions handle this is vitally important.

There is also some danger. Symbols can also be perceived in the wrong way. In our mission statement we've indicated that we are a Catholic and sponsor-related

institution and that we welcome learners of all faiths and cultures. So how do we balance those out in the symbolism? Part of this is ritual. One of the things that has happened under the current administration is there's a lot more reflection and prayer prior to meetings. Some people really like that, but that's really been hard for some people. Are you praying to Jesus Christ in those prayers? If you are sitting around a table and you are not a part of that [tradition], what does that mean? One of the things that happened a few years ago at our opening matriculation for all first year students and their families, we used to have a Mass and then opening matriculation and then we combined those and made Mass a part of opening matriculation. Some people were really disturbed by that. It was very powerful symbolism of who we are as a Catholic sponsored institution. But there were also people who were concerned because if you are not Catholic you are not quite sure. Does that paint you as an outsider immediately? At the first big ceremony, I'm not sure what to do here, and technically I'm not even supposed to go there. Those are the challenges of symbolism. (College C – Mission)

Question Eight: How does the institutional mission statement reflect the sponsor identity/relationship?

Below are the mission statements for each of the colleges in the study with identifying information removed:

- College A – [the] University, founded and sponsored by the [sponsors], provides comprehensive liberal arts education in the Roman Catholic tradition. The university has a special concern for women and is a dynamic community committed to the core

values of justice, respect, integrity, service, and compassion, locally and globally.

[The] University provides students with: a curriculum broad enough to be truly liberal, yet specialized enough to support further study and future careers; an environment for the entire university community to grow through shared educational, cultural, social, and spiritual experiences; and the will to translate concern for social justice into action.

- College B – [The] University, inspired by its [sponsored], Catholic identity, commitment to individual attention and grounding in the liberal arts, educates a diverse community of learners in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs to excel intellectually, lead ethically, serve compassionately and promote justice in our ever-changing urban and global environment.
- College C – Education of the Heart – [The] College is a Catholic institution of higher education dedicated to academic excellence, leadership development, and a commitment to social justice. The College welcomes learners of all faiths, cultures, and backgrounds and prepares them to become engaged citizens of the world.

There was very little response or discussion around this question. Basically, the theme that emerged was **Inclusion**. The answers to question eight could be summarized by saying ‘the institutional mission statement reflects the sponsor identity/relationship by including specific references to it in an intentional and clearly stated manner.’ College A and B make reference to the sponsor and Catholic identity in the first sentence of each respective mission statement. College C makes reference to the foundress from whom the college derives its name, but it does not mention the sponsoring order by name. All three colleges make specific reference to their identities as Catholic colleges and

universities. Each college had recently (within the last five to seven years) redone their mission statements. Generally each interviewee felt that the mission statement was reflective of sponsor identity especially as it related to educational and developmental objectives. Here is a sampling of comments from the interviewees. “I think we have Catholic and sponsor identity in the first six words, it’s in the first line” (College A – Mission). “Our campus mission statements in some way will address the fact that they are Catholic and sponsored” (College A – Trustee).

Yes, we redid it; if you look at the previous iteration, it’s very similar. Our regional accreditor came and recommended that we revise the mission statement to reflect the changing nature of what the institution is. They also urged us to request a change to our status, so instead of being a college we became a university, based on their suggestion. Also, in the mission statement, it was previously “undergraduate education.” That was the only thing mentioned, and they said you do more than that, so make sure you include that in your mission statement. So if you look at it now, it’s undergraduate, graduate and professional studies. We also revised the statement, so instead of being a series of declarative sentences, we changed it to be more dynamic, so it’s full of verbs about what we do. (College B – Mission)

There was a specific goal in the strategic agenda that I inherited, a strategic plan that was in place, and there was a specific goal in there that said to review and make more concise the mission statement. So I had a group looking at that for a year and getting lot of community input. It went to the board, and was with the board for a full year for them to own it and then approve, so by 2010 we

had an updated, not substantively changed but certainly condensed and more contemporary language, mission statement. (College C – President)

Question Nine: Who has primary responsibility for preserving and lifting up sponsor identity in the campus community?

After a careful review and coding of this data – there were 22 codes – two closely related themes emerged.

1. Responsibility

2. Accountability

This is the ‘where does the buck stop’ question of the study. Generally, the president was seen as the primary steward, animator, upholder of mission, but it was nuanced differently by each college.

Responsibility. There were multiple statements where the presidents assumed responsibility for preserving and uplifting sponsor identity. The president of college A, as a member of the sponsoring order, clearly sees herself holding this responsibility.

That’s my primary responsibility. The primary responsibility of every president is really protecting the mission. And as that was an important part of my initial coming here, that was one of the things that people were looking for, for it [sponsor identity] to be more intentional, or for it to be more emphasized. And that was part of the attraction for me, as a member of the sponsoring order, to say, that’s what I want to do. You know, I was on the board at that point in time and I decided to put myself into that competition, so to speak. I put my hat in the ring. But what attracted me to the position was that. The opportunity to do that [strengthen sponsor identity]. (College A – President)

The president at college B is a lay person and not a member of the sponsoring order. He is a long time member of the college community, where he served as a member of the faculty and an administrator before being appointed president. He assumes responsibility for sponsor identity, but easily shares that responsibility with others.

I am, I think. I think that's really the case. It's my job to make sure, though I have partners in that. I share it with my VP for Mission and Ministry, my director of Campus Ministry, the university chaplain; I have a wonderful cabinet, all of whom are very much committed. In fact, one, let's see, two members of my cabinet have actually gone to the sponsor program for developing future leaders, so they've gone through the program, and you know, they've got a number of different programs, and the most intensive one is an 18 month program. My VP for Advancement has done it. (College B – President)

At college C, the president accepts full responsibility for lifting up and preserving sponsor identity. She also introduces the concept of accountability, which will be discussed below. As she mentions, this was in part in response to the events and perceptions about the previous president.

I am accountable for it, so if it's not happening, I am accountable to my board and to the sponsoring order. But it is everybody's responsibility. If it's not happening, it's not the faculty; it may be something I did not support. It's a very distributed approach I have to it, and that was by design because of where we were when I assumed the presidency. (College C – President)

Others interviewed also supported the idea that the president is responsible for preserving sponsor identity. Again, remembering that the trustee at college A also serves

in a similar capacity at other colleges and universities within the family of sponsored colleges, she speaks on behalf of the sponsoring order and unequivocally states, “We put it squarely on the shoulders of the presidents, because they’re the ones that are leading the institutions, but that’s why we reserve the power of appointing the president” (College A – Trustee). The vice president of mission at college B acknowledges that the president has responsibility, but observes that the president has delegated this work to him. The vice president for mission at college B is a member of the sponsoring order. He is a part of a community of 27 members of the sponsoring order who live in a building adjacent to campus. They also service the church and parish that is owned by the college and adjacent to the campus.

I guess ultimately the president does, but he’s kind of delegated that to me. The rector is certainly part of that. I think a lot of people here get it. It’s not hard work, really. The hardest part is the faculty; their standard teaching load is four courses per semester. That means that that’s the standard load and often they’re taking an overload, so they just don’t have time. There’s a huge amount of good will, and they would all love to do it if they had the time, you know. It really isn’t a burden. What concerns me is that I really haven’t had time in the last three years to do an effective orientation for the new faculty, so I’m getting a little behind the curve on that, and my challenge for next year is to find a way to catch up a little bit. (College B – Mission)

The buck stops with the president in a sense, because the president is going to set a tone for everybody else, but the faculty are the ones who are going

to see the students on a day-to-day basis. They're the ones who will give example without words. (College C – Trustee)

As noted by the president and vice president of mission at college B, there is a sense that it is also a shared responsibility. The trustees at college C see the president as primary but introduce the role of the faculty as central to the task. The Mission Advisory Council at college A places a much greater emphasis on the shared responsibility of preserving sponsor identity.

Everyone, I can't identify one. In fact, if someone were to stop, it would still be there. If our president (and of course we want our president to stay), but if suddenly she's called away or something and it's not coming from her office, it's coming from enough other places, I think. (College A – Mission)

The trustee at college B takes a much more communal view of this responsibility. He has a long association with the sponsored order that spans more than six decades. He also reflects on the changes he has seen in the Catholic Church as a backdrop to what is happening at the college.

All of us. It can't be done by the sponsor alone anymore; there's not enough of them. Fortunately, we have a significant presence of the sponsoring order because of the number of them who live on or near the university campus, even though they do not work at the university. (College B – Trustee)

Just as parish life has shifted to lay ministers and so on in terms of numbers, much greater than the number of priests in each parish, so too is the responsibility to maintain the sponsor image, goals of the university. And certainly the trustees and regents want to be a part of that. (College B – Trustee)

Accountability. The concept that seemed to emerge from the data is that shared responsibility is good, but that there has to be someone who is ultimately accountable for sponsor identity. Members of the Mission Advisory Council at college A framed this in the language of organization leadership and culture.

And yet all of the literature in organizational leadership says that the organizational leader is primarily responsible for mission-mindedness, and when the leader of an organization loses that sense of whatever that mission is, be it the guy who's running a corporation, when they lose the sense of mission, the organization rapidly, I mean it's incredible how the research shows how quickly an organization will lose its direction. You have your board of directors and you have your president, and then you have your leadership team. They have to maintain that sponsor identity or the sponsor identity will go. *Ex Corde* was about, in some ways, calling them (Catholic colleges) back to that sense of mission. And it was interesting to me that once that happened, after all the storm and drama that went along with it, there was almost universally, I think, Catholic institutions were saying that if we don't identify ourselves as Catholic we don't really have a niche. It was really the Pope's marketing tool. (College A – Mission)

Members of the Mission Advisory Council at college A go on to discuss the importance of having a person responsible for mission. This is consistent with trustee A's assertion that most of their sponsored institutions, especially those who have moved to lay leaders, have an individual responsible for mission and sponsor identity.

I don't think we've had a Mission officer here for quite a few years, and the last Mission officer was a member of the sponsoring order who fell ill and had to retire, so we have been without one for a time. Like all institutions we're analyzing funding and costs and things so the questions comes into mind "Do we need a mission officer? If everyone is really doing this, do we need it?" And I really do believe we need it. I know that this committee really believes that. It doesn't make it an easy push or sell. I think that if anything in higher education, if you're not intrusive and intentional, it will go away. If you are not intrusive and intentional with your first year students, they don't retain. If you're not intrusive and intentional with your curriculum, you're not really delivering your product. And I really do believe that if we don't maintain intentional and intrusive mission, and we don't have somebody pushing it, it could do exactly what you're asking, which is slide away. (College A – Mission)

The trustees at college C had a slightly different take since they both represent the interests of the founding order.

The Members have the primary responsibility to make sure it happens, but day-to-day, operationally, it's the president and faculty who have a key role. If faculty don't have a sense of this Catholic and sponsor identity and what education of the heart is all about... because that's who the students are in day-to-day contact with – the faculty. So the president needs to be able to speak to the identity in a public forum and make sure that policy and values and all those kinds of things permeate the college in keeping with who we are, so the president has primary

responsibility for that. In terms of the students, a lot has to do with the faculty.

(College C – Trustee)

In summary, you would get very little argument on any of the three campuses if you were to contend that the president is accountable for lifting up and preserving sponsor identity. He or she may even be evaluated on how well this is carried out. There is an equally strong sense that this is a shared responsibility of a large number of members of the college community. This shared responsibility is a positive affirmation of mission and sponsor identity at these three colleges.

Question Ten: How does the symbolic and programmatic presence of the sponsoring identity add value to the institution?

For those who participated in this study, this was the ‘so what’ question. As seen in the sometimes passionate responses to the preceding questions, individuals and institutions dedicate a considerable amount of physical and intellectual energy to discussions about sponsor identity, Catholic identity and mission and how to carry them out and make them manifest on campus and in the hearts and minds of students. An analysis of the data yielded 40 codes, and three themes emerged:

- 1. Continuation of Mission**
- 2. Formative**
- 3. Unique**

Continuation of mission. The responses to question five speak of the story of the founder, foundress and sponsoring orders as rich symbols that carry institutional identity. Responses to this question speak of the founder, foundress and sponsoring

order, not merely as symbols, but as living and vibrant figures who live lives committed to service to God and humanity. The colleges in this study were not founded for their own sake; rather, they were founded as yet another way for the order to carry out the work and mission of the founder or foundress as were other ministries. They were simply responding to the needs of the people they served. “I will often say to people, ‘The sponsoring order has responded to the needs of people because people have needs.’ We stay in some of those ministries and provide services for a bigger reason” (College A – President). This is what separates them from public college and universities that were established with specific educational goals in mind as the end game. Some of the respondents even see education as secondary to the central mission of the colleges.

You can go to college anywhere. That is not the core of our business. The core of our business is those banners and the Catholic sponsor tradition. And if we don’t deliver that, then there is no reason for us to be here. (College A – President)

There are many colleges out there that do education perhaps better than many of ours do, but if we don’t offer this [sponsored college education], there’s no reason for us to exist as an institution of higher education. (College A – Trustee)

If you looked at our curriculum, it looks pretty much like (the public university) down the road. They don’t teach theology or anything, they probably don’t have philosophy, I don’t know, I would not think so. We offer those courses. I think it’s the meta-narrative we supply. We ask the questions – it’s not what do you want to do when you graduate, it’s who do you want to be. (College B – Mission)

There is a unique contribution to these young people. It's true that there are other institutions which can educate them, but I think we bring them specific gifts that were given to us by the foundress and the Church, and I think it's the gift of the education of the heart. (College C – Trustee)

The foundress was so concerned about the person. Her expression of God's love was not just 'hi, I'll pray for you, God loves you.' Her expression was very concrete, practical, hands on, what do you need and that's how I express God's love to you. I think that the kind of education that's provided here and the type of faculty that we have and the types of service that they do, and the reflection that they have to do on that service, and trying to make a difference in the world, are all things that the foundress would be up there smiling thinking this is a practical demonstration of God's love in the world. (College C – Trustee)

The value add therefore is that students, faculty, staff, alumni, trustees, and other members of the community become a part of the narrative of the founders and the sponsoring community. They share in the mission that adds value to their lives in the way it has done for members of the orders that sponsor these colleges.

Formative. This is a concept that runs through this data. Catholics tend to think of formation as a process by which one becomes a person of faith or by which one becomes more deeply immersed in a life of faith. Education is a part of the process but only a part. These colleges distinguish themselves by going beyond education into the area of formation. This is central to the identity of each institution. Each provides evidence that this is a value-add for students, but it is also an enriching part of campus life for all involved. "Our students are going into careers and professions and they're

going in with an intentionality of making an impact deeper than just fulfilling this job” (College A – Mission). “I think it’s very important to our students because it develops their individuality. It’s important to the students to be known and to know the faculty and to ask them for help” (College C – Trustee).

We try to position what we do in terms of a bigger issue of the evolution of their narrative, of becoming who God has asked them to be, whether we explicitly talk about the God piece or not. What we’re trying to do is help them identify their own skills and talents and develop those to be the kind of person that they are, not necessarily some dream in their head, or their parents’ heads. Find what fits. The order’s founder was always an astute judge of personality, and he would never, knowingly anyway, put someone unsuited for a job on that job and expect them to flourish. If a man could barely count, he wouldn’t make them the house treasurer. Or the man who was a dreamer and not a very good judge of people, he’d never, if he could help it, make him a rector because you have to be astute at judging people. It’s the same thing here. We hope that what we help our students do is discover their own gifts and talents and pursue those, find a kind of freedom. So our education is not about piling on knowledge that we salt away and wear as a merit badge. (College B – Mission)

Do I think that 100% of our students are going into the world that way? No, that would be a fallacy. There are enough anecdotal stories out there of students [who are affected by the mission]. Our provost will tell you a story about a student who got offered a job at a fortune 500 company right out of school and was sitting there with their vice president and he was saying “Ok, I think we’re

ready, we're going to bring you on board," and she said "I'm not sure this is the place for me." He said "Excuse me?" "What are you doing for the community in which you reside?" That was her question back to him. We have a student this year graduating from the education department. She is going to give up her career for a year and do sponsor Volunteer Corps, and she's going to teach in the reservation in Arizona where she'll have no money, no cell, no car, no means of transportation. She doesn't question her decision one bit. (College A – Mission)

I also hear anecdotally of people who didn't leave here that way, but once they got into the work world, they found that they were leaning on the sponsor tradition and background and that it was when they needed it there that it suddenly grew. (College A – Mission)

The trustees at College C see the education and formation of students in the context of the foundress and how she lived her life. They believe that their students and graduates understand the life of the foundress and carry out her work in their lives after graduation.

It's that sense of care for the entire person. Our faculty will go out of their way to be attentive to the needs of students. We instill that in them (students). Whether they know it or not they are coming out as better Christians and better human beings who will make a difference in the world. That's how the foundress was. She went out and was very deliberate and concrete in what she did. She would read all the newspapers to determine the issues in a particular area and she went out. Here they reach out to neighboring areas so they get the students to connect with other people and to reach out beyond themselves. All of that is very much in

the spirit of the foundress. It's Catholic, it's Christian, but is also a part of our [sponsor] tradition. (College C – Trustee)

The trustee at college A expresses a similar sentiment.

Sponsor identity should permeate the campus. It should be a distinct feel that's going to shape the students. I see it with the students who come through our programs. They've been chosen or they self-select, but I'm hopeful they will be our legacy to the world going forward. We're saying that this has mattered, that the women that gave their lives for the foundations of these places - there's a reason why the Church says you are the heart of the Church. And then the 'so what' for me is in effect, 'What does this mean for you as graduates going into the world?' as you work at hospitals and schools and businesses and raising families and being part of society. (College A – Trustee)

The faculty carry out much of the formation that occurs in and out of the classroom, but faculty are also formed by the experience. A member of the Mission Advisory Council at college A comments on the impact of the sponsors on the lives of faculty, staff, trustees and members of the community. This is an additional indication of how a rich sponsor identity can enliven and animate an entire college community.

I came here believing I could make a positive difference in the lives of my students. My big surprise was the college made a positive difference in my life, too. It blew me away. I thought "Hey, watch what I can do!" I got here, and I was humbled by the sponsors. One of my "aha" moments was before classes even started, a week after I was hired, there was a sponsor conference here for the region, so I came and got to be part of the fun and soaked it all in. And the "aha"

moment for me, my very first one here, was I went to a workshop where trustees were talking to the group about what it is to be a trustee at the college and every one of them talked about how since becoming trustees, they have incorporated sponsor values into the businesses that they were running and whatever foundations they were running and that it was because the president asked them periodically “What have you done?” So it’s this business of really touching every aspect of everybody who’s here. (College A – Mission)

Unique. Those interviewed affirmed that the sponsor identity, sometimes combined with the Catholic identity, creates distinction in the marketplace for prospective college students. In the responses you see a variety of ways in which the market responds based on the qualities of the prospective student. For some, both Catholic identity and sponsor identity are important. For others, Catholic identity may be seen as a negative while the sponsor narrative is compelling. And for others it may not be the Catholic identity or the sponsor identity that resonates; rather, it is the narrative itself played out in student experiences like service opportunities and engagement with the community to name a few. Because the marketplace for prospective students is so competitive, these colleges each tailor marketing messages to a variety of markets while looking for ways to be seen as unique. “I think our charism is unique in one sense; it’s a gift from God to these people” (College C – Trustee).

There’s lots of different Catholic colleges, but I have heard people say that there is something different about this college, and it’s not just because it’s Catholic. We as a sponsoring body wouldn’t necessarily even do the effort to keep a Catholic college if it was just because it was Catholic. Lots of people can run a

Catholic college. It [the college] really does form men and women in this particular way of being in the world. I think that does make a difference, and it's a value. In the foundress' letters to alumni, she always spoke of how critical education was and how important that education is to making a difference in their world and what they do to be of service to the world. (College C – Trustee)

As a marketing piece. Our presidents know that identifying themselves as different in the market area is a plus, so they will most often use the [sponsor] identity as a piece for marketing, if not the Catholic identity, at least the sponsor charism, because that's the piece that has sold with students. (College A – Trustee)

It [sponsor identity] helps us, oddly enough, to attract non-Catholics to the institution – it's amazing. You know, our Muslim students, our Jewish students, our Buddhist students, they all feel comfortable here, and they all feel comfortable here because our values as a Catholic, sponsored institution are ones of openness. We're open to the world; we invite them in to participate. It's really incredible. So I think in many ways, what we're doing is in an age of materialism and social disconnect as a result of technology and everything else, I think our commitment to our values shows our connection and commitment to people, as people. I think it gets through. Again, I see parents of all different persuasions at the accepted student day or open houses and you know, they just get it. They want their kids in a safe environment, a place that has values, that does their best to teach them right from wrong, respect for themselves and for others, and these are all part of our values, our core values. (College B – President)

Professional marketers and consultants will sometimes try to move institutions into positions that may be more popular, but may, in fact, push the institution away from sponsor identity. College B experienced just such an effort. “The emphasis on embracing key elements of sponsor identity and philosophy have been much stronger. I think high school students are selecting this university because of the sponsor identity” (College B – Trustee).

We’ve done a number of marketing studies, branding, related to branding, and one of the things that comes out of it, always, is don’t lead with Catholic, don’t lead with the sponsor in your messages, because no one understands what it means. In fact, “Catholic” is a negative for lots of people given everything that’s happened out there, so you should never play that. Sponsor identity is more neutral, no one really knows what it means, so it really doesn’t do anything for you. So we went through a lot of soul searching as we were getting ready to do our new University branding initiative, and you know, we came to the conclusion that you know what? We don’t care what the surveys say. We are Catholic. We are sponsored, and it means something to us; it’s a glue that keeps us together and helps motivate and energize and excite us. And so, without that as part of our identity, we’re not going to be as excited, and that will ultimately funnel through to the experience students have. They feel welcomed when they come here to visit, so we’ve kept it. Now, I would say that the sponsors have a reputation for academic excellence, for being the, many would disagree, the elite among the Catholic higher education institutions, that’s certainly how they envision

themselves. I think it does, for those that know of them, it does matter. It genuinely is a distinguishing point. (College B – President)

Geography and the local demography also play a part in how colleges position themselves in the marketplace. College C happens to be in an area where there are an additional ten Catholic colleges and universities all with different and unique sponsor affiliations. This presents a particular challenge.

It should be about one's distinctiveness. In a crowded marketplace it is more difficult. If you take this college and put it in a less crowded market it is much easier to be perceived as distinctive. We need to learn how to message our distinctiveness so we don't sound vanilla. We need an out of the box market expansion, more of a spider web. Are there places and populations where *Justice Matters* will resonate? (College C – President)

In summary, there is evidence to support the idea that sponsor identity adds value to the institution. The sponsor identity provides a narrative that gives deeper meaning to the educational experience. Students, faculty, staff and others are formed in ways that give meaning to their lives. The sponsor identity enhances the Catholic identity and makes it unique in the crowded student marketplace. There is some evidence to suggest that it has helped create a compelling recruitment message.

Question Eleven, an emerging question: How confident are you that, should there come a time when members of the sponsoring order are no longer present on campus, that the sponsor charism will continue and remain relevant?

In preliminary discussions with the presidents at the three colleges in the study, this question arose. It seemed to get at the heart of the matter in a way that the previous questions did not, and it challenged the participants in the study to consider how the institutions would look and feel when and if the sponsor was no longer present. Grant and Vandenberg (1998) challenged sponsored organizations to consider this 15 years ago when they published *After We're Gone: Creating Sustainable Sponsorships*.

An analysis of the data yielded 21 codes and a single organizing theme emerged.

1. There's work to do!

Interviewees expressed some uncertainty and hope and discussed some programs in development, but no one was completely confident that enough was in place to assure sponsor identity. Interviewees are able to recognize weaknesses in preparation for future transitions.

I'm confident that we want to prepare the laity well. That we're doing it now, I'm not as confident. In fact, I can tell you that I don't think that we're doing it well. That's why we're developing this leadership program. That's why we're trying to encourage the board chairs and vice chairs with programs. We had them all gathered last June for a meeting and we really brought in top notch speakers, and they left feeling great, but that's been a year now, and what has that meant for them in their board room, in their decision making? So no, I'm not confident, but I think there is a will there to want to do this, and you mention the Holy Spirit – I'm counting on the Spirit to help us with it. (College A – Trustee)

As I look at the faculty and staff here, the people that have been around, the tenured people, I think that they get it. What worries me is the turnover on

both ends. In these financially fragile times there's a bit of a turnover; they need more than we can offer and they go. So, for example, there are some serious programs available, 18 month programs for example, that bring faculty, administrators, campus leaders, to give them a real, in depth understanding of our founder and the sponsor and how that all works with higher education. I've sponsored four or five, and two who took it and finished then had to find a job elsewhere. (College B – Mission)

There is also some uncertainty about who is responsible for planning for the transition. Responses to question nine above about who has ultimate responsibility for lifting up sponsor identity were not nearly as ambiguous as the responses that considered leadership in a hypothetical post-sponsor era. It was generally clear that leadership, particularly the president, held that responsibility, but it was a responsibility that needed to be shared. But that question can and should be seen in a current context. Who is upholding sponsor identity today? This question asks respondents to comment on an uncertain future when many will not still be at the institutions themselves. A member of the Mission Advisory Council at college A challenged the sponsoring order's leader as recounted below.

We invited the congregational leader (to campus), and we were surprised to hear that this was the first institution that invited her to come. This was the first place she had visited as a college. And that to me bespeaks some of the concerns that we have about what's going to happen in the future; if these sponsoring orders are no longer present and active on campus, then what's the linkage going to be? Being the new kid on the block, I was bold enough to ask her, 'Sister, you guys

are kind of disappearing here, so what's the plan''' and she looked at us and she said 'You're the plan.' (College A – Mission)

What this indicates is that, in these places, the conversation about the future is just beginning. There are pieces of a solution in place, but none are seen as the final solution.

...Our [lay] women [students] will do a good job of orienting these guys; that would be my guess. They do a good job, usually, of orienting the next class of students that come in, I mean in their own way. You don't find litter and graffiti here, there are no signs that say 'don't do this' and 'don't do that'. So that happens by osmosis or by somebody saying, 'That's just not how we live here. This is not how we do things'. So I'm hopeful that what is important will keep on getting transferred. (College A – President)

This is one of the things we're trying to figure out, how to maintain this: all of our first year students have a meeting with the members of the sponsoring order and sit with them and talk to them about "How did you make this discernment? How did you make this discovery about yourself and that this was your calling, and what does it mean to live as a member of the sponsoring order?" I was thinking of another activity centered around our sponsor identity, and our students love this piece. Two of the sisters go into the residence halls to bless pencils for finals today. They have been asked by the students. This is a student-led initiative. (College A – Mission)

The key to it is getting a core of people who really do get it and are the opinion leaders and campus leaders who will help make sure that every project, every institute or special program reflects the values. If you don't get that core,

then I think it will gradually dilute to a place that may retain the slogans, but not understand the nuance. (College B – Mission)

There seemed to be a consensus that this work was going to largely fall to the laity to carry out, and that leadership would be important. The trustee at college A, who, again, works with all of the colleges in the sponsor family, discusses the importance of identifying presidential leaders who understand and embrace sponsor identity.

I do believe that we want to make sure they [presidents] have something, they have a stake in the sand of sponsor identity when we're hiring them, and I know that that intentionality is because we recognize it will be on our [laity's] shoulders to keep this moving forward, and we think it's ultimately important. We believe that if you can buy into what the sponsor foundress and the sponsoring order are about, you can transform the way you're going to do whatever your career is going to be. We can instill in our students that it's great that you want to be a teacher. How are you going to live compassionately? How are you going to work for those students and that school board in a just manner? How are you going to behave along those lines so that you are fulfilling the needs of the world? (College A – Mission)

Preserving sponsor identity has to be worked on. It is a part of the work of mission and ministry. The mission and ministry committee of the board has to take up the conversation about what happens when all of the sponsor members are gone. It's probably something that should be planned for. (College B – Trustee)

It depends on the lay people. We can't look into the future and see what's going to continue, but I think a lot of it depends on what lay people you have and

how it's passed on. When people own the sponsor charism as their own. How does the current generation instill it [the charism] in the next generation of the laity so that it doesn't just get lost? On this campus, we have a very strong group of laity that have been here for years and who really know the identity well. How do they pass it on? That is part of what this president's initiative is – to pass it on to some of the newer faculty and the newer staff so that they can catch this fire as well. So it's faculty and staff teaching other faculty and staff. It wasn't sisters who were teaching, it was the current faculty and staff that are here teaching it. So as long as there's a mechanism by which they can continue to pass it on and maintain a connection to the sponsor community is important as much as it's possible. The foundress is a person of the Church, so she doesn't just belong to the college. She belongs to the Church. So there is nothing to say that the college can't continue the connection. The charism is a gift to the Church and other people can have it besides the college. (College C – Trustee)

The three responses below from each interviewee at college A provide a nice summary for this analysis. The work has to be intentional; laity have to relate deeply to the sponsor identity and the call to serve; and there is hope based on the skills and abilities of the sponsors and an undying faith in God that this work will continue even when the sponsors are gone.

I think the more important thing is being intentional about mission and recognizing that the future isn't really about the number of sisters; it is really about having our colleagues and coworkers be as on fire with that mission as we

are. Getting people to that point, so that when there aren't sisters there, there is a continuation of the mission. (College A – President)

I know I have been called to be here because of sponsor identity and that somehow I have sponsor identity in me; I believe that wholeheartedly. I believe that I have been asked and challenged to be one of the moderators with sponsor Collegiate Society and to be the chairperson for the Mission Advisory Committee, to be a member of the Year of Faith committee, because I believe I am being asked to carry this sponsor charism to the next generation and the next generation and the next generation. To make sure it stays present. (College A – Mission)

I think there is always going to be a sadness when you have a life that you've given yourself to and you see that that life might not be going on in the way that you've known it, but the members of the sponsoring order are very smart women, they're very savvy. I think there's a lot of hope, too, because they're considering their associates, they're considering others who partner with them, and they're investing a lot of their money into [those efforts], at a time when I know they need to be cautious about going forward in terms of the retirement for their sisters, in terms of their own future as a population that's getting older. So there's a sadness, but also a hope, I think, and a curiosity to see what God is doing next in all this. (College A – Trustee)

Assessment of Presence of Sponsor Identity

Campus environment. During the visit, the researcher conducted a visual survey of each campus for evidence of symbols, artifacts and icons of sponsor and Catholic identity using the taxonomy created in response to research question four. For the

purposes of this document, the word artifact will be used to describe all icons, symbols, art, keywords, and expressions that convey sponsor or Catholic identity. The interviewees on each campus defined artifacts that had specific meaning for the particular college. The researcher determined generic names for each artifact that are noted in Table 2. The researcher did not go into every room or space on campus. The purpose of the survey was to assess the presence of sponsor identity as a first time visitor to campus would experience it. Therefore, the researcher limited the scope of the survey to public spaces and common areas in academic and administrative buildings and main thoroughfares and walkways outdoors. Colleges A and C were completely open and accessible, and the researcher was able to wander freely about the campus and in and out of buildings. As noted in chapter three, college B was in an urban location. The researcher was free to roam about the exterior, but most of the building required electronic card access. The director of security for college B accompanied the researcher and granted access to buildings as requested. The researcher scored the presence of items identified using a Likert scale as follows:

3 – Highly Visible – The artifact is readily seen in five or more locations around campus and/or it is prominently placed so that the casual observer would easily happen upon it during a campus tour or visit.

2 – Moderately Visible – The artifact is visible in two to four locations though not centrally located in such a way that the casual observer would easily happen upon it.

1 – Barely Visible – The artifact is seen in a single location and is not centrally located in any way. The casual observer may or may not see the artifact.

0 – Not Visible – The artifact is not visible on campus.

Table 2 indicates that colleges A and B have a fairly strong presence of sponsor identity in the campus environment with scores of 2.29 and 2.07 (out of 3 maximum). College C scored below the Moderately Visible range with a score of 1.64. There are a number of items that deserve attention or explanations. The sponsoring order of college A has a cross that is significant to their identity that is placed prominently throughout the campus. Colleges B and C do not have a single symbol or cross that identifies the sponsoring order. Each campus has at least one chapel or church, and college B has a chapel and a church. Because of the prominence of these structures and their centrality to the campus visit experience, each was given a full score of three. Visible history refers to panels or images that tell the story of the founding of the sponsoring order, stories of how mission is carried out by the sponsor, and/or stories reflecting the founding of the college. College A made very effective use of this in several locations. College B had such a history displayed in its newest building on multiple floors, but only the first floor was generally part of a campus visit. College C is an interesting case. The official name of the sponsoring order is virtually unseen on campus and in publication. It can be found on the web site by going to the mission and history page. However, the name of the college is the name of the foundress of the sponsoring order, and the sponsors are sometimes referred to by the name of the foundress. In their other ministries, the actual name of the sponsoring order is much more prominent.

Table 2

Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity in the campus physical environment

Artifacts	College A	College B	College C
Sponsor Symbol	3	0	0
Crucifix or other cross	3	3	3
Name of Sponsor	2	3	0
Images of Sponsor	3	2	1
Name of Founder/Foundress	2	1	3
Image of Founder/Foundress	2	1	3
Visible History	3	3	2
Banners/Posters of Values	3	2	1
Religious Statuary	3	2	3
Religious Art	2	2	2
Mission Statement	0	3	0
Chapel/Church	3	3	3
Signage that conveys sponsor ID	1	3	0
Building Names Expressive of sponsor ID	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	2.29	2.07	1.64

Publications and the web site. The researcher accessed electronic versions of the most recent campus magazine and view books (admissions marketing piece). Looking at single, most recent versions gave the researcher a snapshot of presence of sponsor identity in much the same way a single visit to campus did in evaluating the campus environment. Using the same methodology described above, the researcher scored the printed publications for presence of sponsor and Catholic identity. Additional items scored in assessing campus publications included stories about the sponsor, stories of a general religious nature, and stories about the mission of the institution or sponsor. References to campus architecture were removed from this assessment. Similarly, the researcher viewed each institution's web site to assess presence of sponsor or Catholic identity. Pages viewed included the main landing page for each institution. The

researcher then accessed additional pages using links from the main navigational headings (typically top and left). In assessing the web sites, the researcher also scored how readily accessible the institutions' mission statements and information about the sponsoring order were based on how many clicks it took to find them. For colleges A and B, it took two clicks to locate both the mission statement and information about the sponsor. College C had a substantial portion of its mission statement on the main landing page and on every page observed. Information about the sponsor of college C was two clicks into the web site.

Table 3 clearly indicates a lack of presence of sponsor or Catholic identity in campus publications, with all three colleges scoring below barely visible. Table 4 provides evidence of a slightly better presence of sponsor and Catholic identity on the college web sites, but all still score just above Barely Visible.

Based on the evidence, when comparing the qualitative data and the quantitative data, there appears to be a disconnect in how the colleges talk about their emphasis on sponsor and Catholic identity and how it is manifested visible and literally. All three in the study do a better job of making sure that the campus environment includes artifacts that shape the physical campus, and such images can be powerful in helping to tell the story of identity. The college magazines and web sites potentially reach much larger audiences on a more regular basis, but these areas lack adequate references to sponsor identity.

Table 3

Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity in campus publications (magazine, view book)

Artifacts	College A	College B	College C
Sponsor Cross	2	0	0
Crucifix or other cross	1	0	1
Name of Sponsor	1	3	0
Images of Sponsor	3	3	0
Name of Founder/Foundress	1	1	3
Image of Founder/Foundress	0	2	0
Visible History	0	0	0
Banners/Posters of Values	0	0	0
Religious Statuary	0	0	0
Religious Art	0	0	2
Mission Statement	0	0	0
Stories of Sponsor	2	0	0
Stories of Religion	1	1	0
Stories of Mission	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
	0.86	0.71	0.64

Table 4

Presence of artifacts of sponsor identity on the campus web site

Artifacts	College A	College B	College C
Sponsor Cross	0	0	0
Crucifix or other cross	0	0	0
Name of Sponsor	3	3	0
Images of Sponsor	1	2	0
Name of Founder/Foundress	3	0	3
Image of Founder/Foundress	0	0	0
Visible History	1	1	1
Banners/Posters of Values	1	1	3
Religious Art	1	1	0
Mission Statement (Ease to locate)	2	2	3
Access to Sponsor Information	2	2	2
Other Items of Sponsor Identity	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	1.17	1.08	1.08

This does not indicate that sponsor identity or Catholic identity are not important or central to each college's identity. As seen in table 5 and as indicated in responses to questions three and seven above, there is a considerable programmatic emphasis on each campus. This list was culled from the campus interviews, and the check mark simply indicates the presence of the program. No judgment was made as to frequency or regularity the programs were offered, but, based on interview responses, it is appropriate to infer that programs are currently or recently in place. The lack of a check mark does not necessarily imply that the college does not conduct such a program; it merely indicates that it was not referenced in the interviewee responses. Similarly, there may be additional programs in place that did not get mentioned by the interviewees.

Table 5

List of programs expressive of sponsor and Catholic identity

Program	College A	College B	College C
Sponsor Orientation	✓	✓	✓
Service Immersion	✓	✓	✓
Mission Internships			✓
Mission Trips	✓	✓	✓
Core Curriculum/Curriculum Inclusion	✓	✓	✓
Faculty Mission Education	✓	✓	✓
Staff Mission Education	✓	✓	✓
Trustee Mission Education	✓	✓	
Pilgrimages/Trips to Sponsor Sites			✓
Regular/Formal Interaction with Sponsors	✓	✓	
Leadership Development in Sponsor Tradition	✓	✓	
Retreats	✓	✓	✓
Founders Day/Week	✓	✓	✓
Prayer/Ritual	✓	✓	✓
Mission Peer Assessment	✓		

Summary. The qualitative evidence indicates a significant interest in and commitment to sponsor and Catholic identity as an element that gives distinction to institutional identity. This commitment is most visible in the programs in place at each college that animate this identity and form members of the community: students, faculty, staff, trustees. The colleges have generally done a good job of creating environments that support sponsor and Catholic identity through the placement of artifacts that animate this identity and tell the story of the sponsors. None of the colleges do a good job of capturing sponsor or Catholic identity in campus publications that are available for large target audiences (magazines for the campus community, alumni, parents, friends, businesses, community) or on the college web sites that are probably the single most available and accessible source of information about the colleges.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine how Catholic institutions of higher education in the U.S., that were founded by religious orders of men and women (priests, brothers, sisters), also known as the sponsor, maintain sponsor identity at a time when actual members of the sponsoring communities are diminishing in number nationally and, in particular, on these college and university campuses. It challenges the notion suggested by some of the literature that such institutions should drop sponsor identity in favor of a single Catholic identity (Morey and Piderit, 2006). The researcher asserts that sponsor identity provides a unique identifier for these institutions that gives them market distinction, especially if they are located in markets where there are multiple Catholic colleges. In addition, the particular charism of each sponsor is formative for students and those who work (faculty and staff) and serve (trustees, board members, volunteers) at these institutions. This final chapter will recap the study, provide a summary of key findings, present recommendations regarding the benefits of lifting up sponsor identity for similarly situated institutions, and suggest possible additional research relative to the subject.

Summary

The problem. As discussed in Chapter One, there is considerable evidence, both quantitative and anecdotal that confirms the number of members of religious

congregations of men and women – the sponsor – is declining and aging. The decline is particularly acute at the colleges and universities that they established. The sponsoring orders founded these institutions and imbued them with the philosophies and practices that are unique to each sponsor. In most cases, the sponsoring order can trace their founding to an individual who, by inspiration and determination, set about doing what they saw as the work of God, which then inspired others of like mind to follow this leader. Some of these sponsor groups are ancient and can trace their lineage back as far as the sixth century A.D. Others were established as recently as the later 19th and early 20th century. Most of these orders trace their roots to founders of European origin who then later emigrated to the U.S., which was seen by the Catholic Church as mission territory. These groups of men and women often followed waves of immigrants of similar ethnicity and originally served largely ethnic populations. Today, these men and women serve more diverse populations that reflect current demographic trends in the U.S., or, more specifically, the local or regional population where the college or university is located. The first Catholic college, Georgetown University, was established in 1789. There are over 200 Catholic college and universities in the U.S. today, and 183 of them can trace their heritage to these orders of men and women.

Early in their history, these colleges and universities were staffed by a large number of members of the sponsoring order, and the institutions were reflective of the particular charism of the order. This physical and philosophical dominance by the religious orders continued well into the middle of the 20th century. With the large influx of veterans seeking higher education after World War II, college populations grew dramatically, as did their faculties. These colleges and universities had to enhance their

faculty by hiring lay men and women to work alongside the members of the religious communities. At first, the sponsor community began to diminish as a percentage of the overall population of faculty and staff, but they maintained their presence in positions of leadership as presidents and in institutional governance. In the mid-1960s and continuing through the post Vatican II era, the number of men and women entering religious life sharply declined, and men and women started leaving vowed religious life and living as lay men and women. The presence of vowed religious men and women on the college and university campuses they established also declined. The decline continues today.

The challenge of this study, therefore, was to examine how institutions preserved sponsor identity even when the sponsor was no longer present or present in diminished numbers.

Purpose. Hellwig (2001) speaks of this transition and states “Where the religious congregations are diminishing, a new generation of lay leadership has come to the helm with considerable energy, good will and sense of purpose and direction” (p. 24). This dissertation examined the importance of and practices related to preserving the sponsoring identity as it passes to a new generation of lay leadership. Sponsor identity animates and defines these institutions and gives each a unique presence in the higher education marketplace. Catholic colleges and universities need to distinguish themselves, and the sponsoring tradition provides an important distinguishing characteristic. Sponsored colleges animate charism, tradition and identity by incorporating programs (co-curricular and curricular) that link the college mission to the sponsor philosophy and history. In addition, they further animate identity by elevating icons and symbols in the campus environment, in publications and on the college web site. The three institutions

in this study, experiencing the decline in members of the religious community on campus, have been intentional in finding ways to make sponsor identity more present and vibrant as the decline has occurred. This study assessed the presence of such programs, symbols and icons as the presence of members of the sponsoring order continued to diminish. The purpose therefore is to identify best practices (and shortcomings) that support this effort, that can then be recommended to other institutions as each seeks to deal with the decline of sponsor members. There is also a potential for application to other non-Catholic, church related institutions that may be experiencing a similar type of detachment from their founders.

Research questions.

1. In the last generation (since 1990), how has the presence of members of the sponsoring religious community diminished and by how much?
2. How has the leadership of the institution transitioned or changed in character, if at all, during that period?
3. Over that same period, how have these colleges and universities preserved the presence of the sponsoring identity?
4. What symbols and icons are present which signify the founding relationship? (This question, along with question seven, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
5. How has the presence of such symbols and icons succeeded in keeping the relationship with and identity of the sponsoring community alive and vibrant?
6. How are these symbols and icons displayed on campus and in publications?

7. What programs exist which animate the sponsoring identity? For students? For faculty/staff? (This question, along with question four, will lead to the creation of the sponsorship/identity taxonomy.)
8. How does the institutional mission statement reflect the sponsor identity/relationship?
9. Who has primary responsibility for preserving and lifting up sponsor identity in the campus community?
10. How does the symbolic and programmatic presence of the sponsoring identity add value to the institution?

An additional question emerged during introductory conversations with the participating presidents. This question was incorporated into the semi-structured interviews with each institution and its representatives:
11. If in the next generation or so there are no members of the sponsoring order serving the institution in leadership, on the board or as an employee, how confident are you that the sponsoring charism can be preserved?

Methodology. The researcher selected three colleges where sponsor identity was judged to be vibrant in order to determine how each institution accomplished the preservation of this identity when faced with the reality of declining numbers of sponsors on campus. A purposeful sample was selected in consultation with staff members at the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities in Washington, DC. This study used a mixed methods exploratory design: taxonomy development model. The study proceeded in two phases – qualitative (QUAL) followed by quantitative (quan). The qualitative phase of the study consisted of interviews with key personnel at the colleges and/or universities in the study group. The researcher made initial contact with the three college

presidents to seek their support for the project and then scheduled visits to each campus. Interview subjects included: the president, the director of mission, a member of the board of trustees, and a member of the sponsoring order. In all cases, a member of the sponsoring order also filled one of the other three slots. A total of nine interviews were conducted. All interviews took place on campus except as noted in Chapter Three. The semi-structured interviews followed the sequence of interview questions above. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed at a later date. Two interview questions led to a creation of taxonomies of sponsor identity. The first included symbols, artifacts and icons of sponsor or Catholic identity. For the sake of brevity, these are simply referred to as artifacts. A second taxonomy included a list of programs which featured sponsor identity, charism or history. The purpose of creating these taxonomies was to assess how each college connected discussion of sponsor identity to application of sponsor identity. As discussed in Chapter Three, appropriate measures were taken to safeguard the privacy of the colleges and the individual interviewees. Interrater reliability was achieved by using an expert in the field of sponsored, Catholic, higher education to examine the data for themes. Validity was achieved.

Major Findings

Decline of sponsor. In addition to the considerable literature referenced in Chapter Two that chronicled the actual decline in members of sponsored communities in general and on campus, the interviewees at each institution confirmed the decline on their campuses. There were actual declines in numbers, but, perhaps more importantly, there was a decline in the quality of presence. The population of sponsors was referred to as “aging” and less engaged. At college B the majority of the sponsors present in the

community are “in their 70s” according to the vice president for mission, and the president there said “it’s become a little bit of a retirement home.” Exacerbating the decline is evidence that those who remain as members of the sponsoring order have shown little interest in higher education as a calling. The head of one of the sponsoring orders was quoted as saying that of the 30 sisters currently in formation around the country, she was not aware of any who have an interest in higher education.

Leadership. Statistics clearly indicate that there are fewer presidents who are members of the sponsoring order who remain at the helm at Catholic colleges and universities than there were a generation ago. The percentage of presidents from the sponsoring order has declined from 60% to 36% between 1990 and 2010. A complete list is included in Appendix B. In the three years since 2010, there is evidence that several more presidencies have been filled by lay leaders. The study also revealed that the number of sponsor members serving on boards of trustees has also declined, with one institution going from a board made up entirely of sponsor members to a board on which only five of the 35 members are from the sponsoring order.

In addition there were references made by the president and Mission Advisory Council at college A indicating that there are no members of the sponsoring order coming up through the ranks with either the interest or the ability to lead an institution of higher education. There was considerable commentary about the growing complexity of the business of higher education and the increasing need for presidents and board members to be well-versed in many aspects of both higher education and business management.

Some sponsoring orders have begun focusing on developing lay leaders to assume leadership positions at sponsored institutions. The sponsors at colleges A and B have

such leadership development programs in place. The current president of college B, its first lay president, was part of such a program. The focus of the program is developing leadership in the spirit of the charism of the sponsoring order.

Preserving sponsor identity in times of transition. All three colleges emphasized the need for affirming the importance of sponsor identity as a necessary condition for changes in leadership. The trustee at college B discussed this in the context of the search for a president that took place in 2006-2007 and resulted in the appointment of the first lay president after 21 members of the sponsor community had served in that role. The board of trustees and the search committee, which was broadly representative of the college constituents, the sponsoring order and other higher education figures, were adamant that the successful candidate must be committed to preserving sponsor identity. This was shared with the president elect after his appointment so that there would be no doubt about the importance of preserving sponsor identity. Beyond the hiring of the president, there was also an emphasis on the need to hire for mission. The Mission Advisory Council at college A made special note of the importance of hiring for mission and emphasized the importance of making sure that the college or university mission statement contained direct references to sponsor identity. This emphasis on intentionality continued as a theme throughout this data.

There was a consensus of opinion that the work of preserving and animating sponsor identity was best accomplished when it was shared.

There was considerable evidence that all three institutions have invested heavily in developing programs that help to preserve the sponsor identity and to form students, faculty, staff, trustees and members of the community in the sponsor charism. The

programs range from single-day orientations for new members of the community to year-long programs and seminars with the sponsors. Students experience sponsor charism through similar orientations, and, perhaps more importantly, through charism infusion in curriculum. Faculty on the Mission Advisory Committee at college A discussed the importance of having the sponsor core values embedded in the institutional learning goals. The core curriculum at college C has been designed around the college's core values and a focus on Catholic social justice, which is an essential element of the sponsor charism and ties directly to the order's foundress. This core curriculum called *Justice Matters* is a prominent and distinguishing feature of this college.

Rather than simply talking about and discussing sponsor identity and its charism, each of the three colleges has operationalized sponsor identity through programs that require action like service requirements, community outreach and internships. This "doing" breathes life into the theoretical and gives sponsor identity vibrancy for faculty, staff and students alike.

A final finding that deserves note is the influence of external forces on discussions of mission. Regional accreditors have asked institutions to be more intentional in their reflections on mission during their decennial self-studies. Church-related institutions seem naturally more drawn to this type of reflection, but the requirement helps place the concept more prominently in the process. Pope John Paul II's promulgation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in 1990 also began a period of serious reflection on the Catholic college's relationship to the Church. This document, its subsequent application for the U.S. and the recently completed ten year review by bishops of the U.S.

have continued to play an important role in promoting thoughtful discussions about Catholic and subsequently sponsor identity.

Artifacts of sponsor identity. The colleges in the study could readily identify artifacts that conveyed sponsor identity. In general, the colleges were successful in creating campus environments that were visibly expressive of sponsor identity and Catholic. None of the three colleges were nearly as successful in displaying these artifacts or other symbols of Catholic identity in campus publications, including the view book, used for college admissions, and the college magazine, a principle communications vehicle for a broad audience. College web sites were only slightly better in indicating sponsor or Catholic identity.

Artifacts are not simply individual images, pictures, word, statues, etc. They may be story boards or a series of banners that tell a more complete story of sponsor identity. Colleges A and B did this to great effect. College A used a series of images that showed the sponsors in ministry around the world. College B had a series of panels throughout a new campus structure that told the story of the order, its founder and its ministry. The president at college B said that there was initially some criticism about the investment in such a display, but the president remarked that the students are drawn to them and that he often sees students studying them. The physical and visible representation of sponsor identity in the campus environment seems to have the effect of passing on sponsor identity by osmosis whereas the sponsor-related programs described above are much more intentional.

The placement of artifacts is also something that needs to be carefully considered. Prominent figures and symbols need to be in prominent locations. This was done with

great effect at college A where a bust of the foundress was placed in a location where student, faculty and visitors were likely to pass. Banners that mark entrances and campus borders also make a statement about sponsor identity and, more broadly, mission. This was done well at colleges A and B.

Names and words are also very important. As stated earlier, college C has the advantage of being named for the foundress, so there is a moment when a conversation about sponsor identity can occur when prospective students and potential new hires can be introduced to the sponsor charism.

Mission statements. All three colleges felt that their mission statements were relevant, recent, current and expressive of sponsor and/or Catholic identity. Colleges A and B specifically mention the name of the sponsor in the statement. College C's mission statement does not include the name of the sponsor, but it does mention items that specifically express sponsor identity like "social justice." As noted in the literature review, a study by Estanek, James and Norton (2006) showed that 94.5 percent of the Catholic colleges and universities in their sample made direct references to their Catholic identity, and 76% of the sample made reference to the sponsor identity or heritage, in their mission statements. The mission statement is an important marker of Catholic and sponsor identity, but a mission statement alone is not enough to preserve or animate sponsor charism.

Responsibility for sponsor identity. This discussion was one of the most interesting in the study. The first response by the presidents in the study affirmed their role as the primary person responsible for preserving sponsor identity. The trustee at college A was unequivocal in her assertion that the president has that responsibility.

Others like the trustee at college B and the Mission Advisory Council at college A, assert that it is a shared responsibility. The president at college C introduced the concept of accountability as different than responsibility. The president is accountable to the board and ultimately to the sponsoring order, so while the responsibility for supporting sponsor identity might be shared, the accountability to see that it is present and supported falls to the president.

Value of sponsor identity. There was clear consensus that sponsor identity did add value to the colleges in numerous ways. First, such an effort helped to continue the mission of the sponsoring orders, which started well before each of the colleges in the study. The colleges were all begun as manifestations of the sponsoring orders and their founders and foundresses. All would argue that the stories of these individuals are important not just to the colleges, but to the Church as well. The trustees at college C discussed the dual role of their foundress as having founded an order and also being a dynamic figure in the Church. The founders and foundresses of these orders often occupy prominent places in the Church around the world. Two of the three founders/foundresses have been canonized (made saints) by the Catholic Church, and the third has been declared as venerable by the Church, a step before sainthood. Their stories are important to the broader life of the Church. Many people have been and continue to be influenced by and served by the men and women who have fashioned their lives after these influential individuals. Association with these prominent individuals adds value to the colleges.

Thousands of students, faculty, staff, alumni and members of the community around these colleges have continually been formed in the sponsor charism. Formation is

different than education. In the Catholic context, it is a process by which one develops as a person of faith. The vice president for mission at college B discussed this process as the “evolution of their [the student’s] narrative” which parallels the process of formation. Each institution freely admitted that their students could get an education at any number of colleges or universities, public or private, and admitted that there are places that deliver better education. Each would argue that the difference is the formation, based in sponsor identity that enhances the educational experience of each student. Each would contend that many students graduate with a deeper sense of vocation prepared to live lives with deeply seated values. This is the value of a sponsor-rich education.

Finally, the sponsor identity does uniquely identify each college in the study. In a competitive landscape, such a unique identifier helps the college distinguish itself from the competition, even from other Catholic colleges in regions where there may be multiple Catholic colleges founded by different sponsors.

The future. Each college was asked to consider a time when no members of the sponsoring order would be present on the campus, a likely scenario if current trends continue. Will these colleges be able to maintain sponsor identity when the sponsors are absent? The question seemed to catch the respondents off guard. All of the aforementioned data suggests that these three colleges believe deeply in the value of sponsor identity and expend vast amounts of intellectual and human capital in promoting and preserving it. But none of them are certain that they have taken the steps necessary to assure the continuance of sponsor charism on campus. Implications for future action, discussed below, will use this as a starting point.

Findings from the Readings

What is evident from a majority of the readings related to Catholic higher education is that there is a concern about the preservation of Catholic identity on these college campuses. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* challenged colleges and universities to conduct a self-assessment of Catholic identity. Writers like Burtchaell (1998), Cuninggim (1994), Morey and Piderit (2006) and Steinfels (2003) warn about the degradation of Catholic identity in colleges and universities. Others like Hellwig (2001) and Gallin (1996) are a bit more sanguine about the future of the important and increasing role of the laity in leading sponsored institutions. There is also considerable literature that discusses the Catholic intellectual tradition and its various elements which is available as resource material for colleges and universities as they consider their Catholic and sponsor identity.

Surprises

There were a number of comments from interviewees that focused on Catholic *versus* sponsored rather than Catholic *and* sponsored. Two respondents mentioned that Catholic, for some, is a negative aspect of identity, especially given the recent scandals in the Church. Another point of view holds that focusing on sponsor identity versus Catholic identity makes it easier to tell the story to and recruit non-Catholic students. One president shared that professional marketers advised “‘Catholic’ is a negative for lots of people given everything that’s happened out there, so you should never play that.” He goes on to state that “It [sponsor identity] helps us, oddly enough to attract non-Catholics to the institution; it’s amazing.” And a member of the Mission Advisory Council at college C cautioned that overplaying the Catholic identity could make some non-Catholic members of the community feel unwelcome or disenfranchised at the institution.

The researcher was surprised that very few of the interviewees had contemplated a future when no sponsor would be present on campus and the ramifications of such a scenario. All were aware of the downward trend, but had just not thought that far ahead. In part, such an oversight may be logical. The complicated business of higher education, particularly given the national climate and current economic trends, requires administrators to focus on short term and near term challenges and on the survival of their institutions.

Conclusions

Change is not always a welcome guest in institutions of higher education. Looking at the history of higher education in the U.S. and its culture, the observer will see a pattern of slow transition and reluctance to make necessary adjustments to preserve the institution. Today's contentious climate surrounding higher education, particularly private higher education, requires institutions to act more quickly than institutional culture allows. The ongoing challenges presented by changes in institutional mission and sponsor identity are difficult as well. Leadership can play a vital role in helping to make such transitions.

Lacking a focus on preserving sponsor identity, institutions run the risk of losing their way philosophically. Some Catholic and church-related schools have dropped their religious identity altogether. Such a move diminishes the unique character of the college or university, leaving it vulnerable to competition and indistinguishable from its competition. Over time, college C experienced some challenges to its mission and sponsor identity;

I think what we experienced was a real secularization period that manifested itself in numerous ways in terms of how we messaged ourselves, diminishment of Catholic rituals, if you want to characterize it that way. But at the same time, I think our faculty, because we're still such a young college, who have been here from the beginning, have been the best stewards of that charism, if you would, in our curriculum. So I saw the secularization in the functional areas that are outside of the academic enterprise, and you create a corporate structure, you bring in finance and marketing, and these things grow up, but they're not influenced by the mission. So that's a bit of our journey through the 90s to use your timeframe, and into the next century. (College C – President)

Relationships with sponsoring orders have not always been positive. This relationship can be cyclical, and it depends on the quality of the relationship between college and congregational leadership. Sometimes the members of the sponsoring order have doubts about the value of maintaining a college, as observed by a member of college C's Mission Advisory Council whose service to the college spans five decades.

I think the sisters have always been, in the past, suspicious of this college as not being a really sponsor-related mission. When you travel around the world and you see the hard circumstances that the sponsors work at, I think that there has been a group of sisters that is suspicious. Should we really be sinking money in this place? They have been generous financially with us in the past. I would think some of the sisters that have worked in South Africa and South America, they look at us and our mission and there is a conflict there and how rich we are and how wealthy we are. I think they are happy now because of the relationship

between the Engagement with the Common Good (ECG) series on campus and the work with the sisters in Swaziland as part of the *Justice Matters* curriculum. They (the sisters) are now looking to the college as leaders for ways of thinking about social justice under the new program. They have a new missionary vision for the sponsors that is really articulated well and I think they see how it fits together well with some of the work we are doing in *Justice Matters*. The new missionary vision is so inspiring. (College C – Mission)

The key takeaway here is that both the college and the sponsor have to work at finding common ground that is mutually beneficial.

But all is not doom and gloom. There is a great deal of promise on the horizon for sponsored and Catholic higher education. As cited in the literature, Fr. Paul Reinert, S.J. stated as far back as 1967, that “it is clear that dominance by religious will be replaced, not typically by total turn-over to lay control, but by shared responsibility by religious and the laity” (in Gallin, 1996, pp. 2-3). Hellwig (2001) is optimistic about this transition and states “Where the religious congregations are diminishing, a new generation of lay leadership has come to the helm with considerable energy, good will and sense of purpose and direction” (p. 24). A respondent to Morey and Piderit’s (2006) study suggested that lay leaders are not adequately formed and theologically less literate than the sponsors. Morey and Piderit then assert that no group of lay men or women could ever have the same significant preparation and formation as members of the founding congregations of men and women who preceded them. The evidence found in this study indicates that a robust set of programs related to forming people in the sponsor charism can indeed achieve a level of formation that adequately prepares them to lead

these institutions. The respondents to this study affirm this claim. The president at college B stated “lay people can be people of strong faith devoted to our mission and sustaining our identity.” There is evidence of success, even from relatively new members of campus communities. A member of the Mission Advisory Council at college C relates the following;

When I arrived here in 2005, I had very little knowledge of the sponsors, but I think we have had a real connection in the last three or four years with the sisters in a new way that has been really nice. That’s come from various ways like more intentional partnerships. Various units of the college do work with the sisters in other places where the sisters work and are present. There is an awareness among faculty and staff about the great work the sisters are doing. (College C – Mission)

How present does the sponsor have to be to preserve sponsor identity? According to the president at college A, a critical mass of members of the sponsoring order is not required to preserve sponsor identity. In her opinion, it harkens back to a time, nostalgic though it may be, that has passed. She states, “but I don’t believe it’s necessarily having a critical mass of religious women or men, you know, whoever’s sponsoring; it’s more about intentionality” (College A – President).

I think there is some sense in the old traditional kind of universities or colleges that many of us sponsored where everybody was residential and critical mass of those living on the same property as the students were members of the sponsoring congregation and certainly made their presence known, without having to be as intentional. I think that was a different time. (College A – President)

So what do institutions need to do to prepare for a future when the sponsor is not present and to preserve and animate sponsor identity? Here are several steps which borrow from the literature and the research and which were determined by the researcher.

1. Based on the current demographics of the sponsoring order, determine a theoretical date by which the sponsor will no longer be present on campus. Use this date as an end point and create a plan for passing the torch of sponsor identity completely to the laity.
2. Create or bolster current programming for leadership development and formation in the sponsor tradition. The study showed that there are few or no members of the sponsoring order who are adequately prepared to assume positions of leadership in higher education, but there are numerous lay leaders who are coming up through institutional ranks and pursuing advanced studies in higher education administration. These lay leaders need to be formed in the sponsor tradition either before or after they are hired. Institutions that have the same sponsor as college B have done this to great effect. Once in place, leaders need to be intentional in keeping the link to the sponsor alive and well. The three colleges in this study have done this by incorporating messages rich in sponsor identity and charism in public speeches to multiple constituencies. The president is accountable for how well sponsor identity is present, but he or she should share or distribute this responsibility to a broad group.
3. Continue to provide substantial programming related to sponsor identity for faculty, staff and trustees. Substantial implies something more than a once-a-year program. For boards of trustees, it needs to be a regular part of board orientation and each meeting. For faculty and staff there need to be regular, periodic programs where they

- can learn about the sponsor founder or foundress and the ongoing ministerial work of the sponsoring order. Where possible, members of the sponsoring community should be invited to campus to share stories of their work and members of the campus community should be offered opportunities to join them at other mission sites.
4. Students should be oriented to the sponsor identity and the story of the founder/foundress early in their experience on campus. Where possible, as was the case at all three colleges in the study, sponsor identity, charism and philosophy should be incorporated into the curriculum and co-curriculum in meaningful and systemic ways: first year seminar, core curriculum, service requirements, and opportunities to join the sponsors in mission.
 5. Colleges should look for ways to strengthen sponsor identity in the campus environment by strategically displaying artifacts of identity around campus and in campus structures. Those which appear to be most effective tell the story of the founding order through the lives and stories of the founder or foundress and the men and women who continue to minister in his or her name. New students and their parents as well as faculty and staff should be oriented to their meaning and a guide or glossary of artifacts should be developed and distributed. This would reinforce the more subtle message of presence and give the viewer an informed starting point for contemplation of their deeper meaning.
 6. Colleges should look for ways to strengthen the presence of sponsor identity in campus publications like the view book, the magazine and the campus web site. The magazine provides a link between alumni – many of whom remember a time when there were more sponsor members present on campus – and the current leadership,

faculty, students and administration. Emphasis on sponsor identity will resonate well with these alumni and perhaps increase the likelihood of financial support. The view book is primarily used as a recruitment tool for new students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. While studies show that the “integration of faith and learning” is not a major factor in the college decision process, the concept of ‘right fit’ is (Lipman Hearne, 2009, p. 18). It is clear from the research that students graduate from these institutions formed in part by the example of the sponsor identity and charism and that this formation stays with them for the rest of their lives. The trustee at college B, a 1960 graduate of the college, echoes this sentiment, and the president at college B related a similar story about older alumni he visited in Florida. Entering students generally do not have a sophisticated understanding of their own religious faith and beliefs, but there has been considerable discussion in the higher education literature about young people and their search for meaning. A possible marketing angle for prospective students could be around these concepts of fit and finding meaning. This is captured in recommendations for further research below.

Recommendations for Further Research

As noted above, there has been a great deal of study about what motivates students to choose to attend a particular college or university. The aforementioned Lipman Hearne (2009) study, which focused on where high academic achievers chose to go to college indicated that “the integration of faith and learning” scored poorly as a factor. They also reported that students who felt a sense of “overall fit” with their college tended to stay. The researcher would recommend a market study that focuses on the average to above-average learner. The data in this study indicated that these three

colleges tend to attract students in that category. The study should focus on testing messages for prospective student that carry meaning associated with the unique traits of the sponsor and the sponsored institution. Colleges could then use messages that resonate well with students to strengthen their marketing efforts.

Another area of research would be focused on graduates of sponsored college and universities to determine the formative effects on life after graduation. The evidence in this study showed that there was evidence that the education was indeed formative for some, but it just scratched the surface. Additional questions need to be asked of the alumni of these colleges including was this type of education worth the investment of time and money and why? This data could then be used to help strengthen sponsor messages and programs.

Concluding Remarks

Based on the data, the researcher is convinced that sponsored, Catholic education fills a very important role in the higher education landscape of the U.S. The character of each college that is steeped in the traditions of the founding order and the important figure of the founder or foundress is unique in a crowded marketplace. There is more than ample evidence that the sponsor charism, when infused in curricular and co-curricular programming, has a positive and formative effect on students. During the visit to college A, the researcher had an opportunity to visit with a group of students over lunch. The conversation was not recorded nor transcribed since it was not a part of the research, but the researcher did receive informed consent from each participant. The group at lunch was made up of undergraduate women and included first year through fourth year students. The researcher was struck with how passionate and knowledgeable

these students were about the sponsor, the foundress and the work of the sponsoring order. All of them were somehow involved in activities that specifically related to the sponsor identity.

The trustee at college B would not be surprised by the passion for the sponsor charism displayed by these students. He noted,

The students get it. I'm incredibly positive about young people. The young men and women of this university are incredibly responsive to the needs of others in the community or in times of tragedy and they respond in the spirit of the sponsoring order. (College B – Trustee)

Like this trustee and these students, the researcher is optimistic that sponsor identity should be and will be preserved, albeit not without some serious effort. The world and the Church needs to continue to follow and animate the lives of the founders/foundresses who gave birth to these orders of men and women that carry out the work of the Church in the world today. While the number of men and women entering these orders continues to decline, lay men and women are joining them in their ministries. The colleges and universities sponsored by these orders should be places where these charisms are preserved and promulgated so that men and women entering professions do so with a deep sense of meaning in their lives and a commitment to serving humanity.

REFERENCES

- Beal, J. (2006). From the heart of the church to the heart of the world: ownership, control and Catholic identity of institutional apostolates in the United States. In R. Smith, W. Brown, & N. Reynolds (Eds.), *Sponsorship in the United States context: theory and praxis*. (31-48). Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.
- Benedict XVI. (2008). *Comments delivered to American Catholic college and university presidents*. On the occasion of the Papal visit to the United States, Washington, DC.
- Benne, R. (2001). *Quality with soul: how six universities keep faith with their religious traditions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Burtchaell, J. (1998). *The dying of the light: the disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian churches*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Carney, M. (2011, June). *Sponsorship presentation*. Presented at the June 15, 2011 meeting of the Alvernia University Board of Trustees.
- Catholic Health Association of the United States. (2007). A Brief History of Sponsorship. In *Core Elements for Leaders of Catholic Ministry: A Reflection Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.srcharitycinti.org/resources/images/sponsorshiphistory.pdf>
- Cernera, A., & Morgan, O. (Eds.). (2000). *Examining the Catholic intellectual tradition*. Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.
- Cernera, A., & Morgan, O. (Eds.). (2002). *Examining the Catholic intellectual tradition: volume II, issues and perspectives*. Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.

- Chernail, R. (2011). Presenting qualitative data. In S.N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy, *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cummings, T., & Worley, C. (2010). *Organization development & change*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning
- Cuninggim, M. (1994). *Uneasy partners: the college and the church*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Currie, C. L. (2010, January). *Hesburgh award speech*. Given at the annual meeting of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- Dillon, M. (2002). Catholic educators and maintenance of Catholic identity. In A. Cernera & O. Morgan (Eds.), *Examining the Catholic Intellectual Tradition: Volume 2, Issues and Perspectives*. (39-80). Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.
- DiPietro, M. (2006). A juridic meaning of sponsorship in the formal relationship between a public juridic person and a healthcare corporation in the United States. In R. Smith, W. Brown & N. Reynolds (Eds.) *Sponsorship in the United States context: theory and praxis*. (101-122). Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.
- Estanek, S., James, M., & Norton, D. (2006, December). Assessing Catholic identity: a study of mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 10, 2, 199-217.

- Freeland, R. (1992). The world transformed: a golden age for American universities, 1945 - 1970. In H. S. Wechsler, L. F. Goodchild & L. Eisenmann (Eds.), *The History of Higher Education* (pp. 597 - 618). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Gallin, A. (1992). *American Catholic higher education: essential documents, 1967-1990*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Gallin, A. (1996). *Independence and a new partnership in Catholic higher education*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Gallin, A. (2000). *Negotiating identity: Catholic higher education since 1960*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Gallos, J. V. (Ed.). (2006). *Organizational development: a Jossey-Bass reader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gambescia, S., & Paolucci, R. (2011, September). Nature and extend of Catholic identity communicated through official websites of U.S. Catholic colleges and universities. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 15, 1, 3-27.
- Gleason, P. (1995). *Contending with modernity: Catholic higher education in the 20th century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Golden, P. (2006). Sponsorship in higher education. In R. Smith, W. Brown, & N. Reynolds (Eds.), *Sponsorship in the United States context: theory and praxis*. (85-100). Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.
- Grant, M. & Vandenberg, P. (1998). *After we're gone: creating sustainable sponsorships*. Mishawaka, IN: Ministry Development Resources.
- Grant, M. & Vandenberg, P. (2004). *Partners in the between time: creating sponsorship capacity*. Michigan City, IN: Ministry Development Resources.

- Hellwig, M. K. (2000). The Catholic intellectual tradition in the Catholic university. In A. Cernera & O. Morgan (Eds.), *Examining the Catholic Intellectual Tradition* (1-18). Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.
- Hellwig, M. K. (2001). The Survival of Catholic Higher Education. *America*, 185(2), 23.
Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hesburgh, T.M. (Ed). (1994). The challenge and promise of a Catholic university. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S.N. & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Holland, S. (2011, January). *A structure to sustain Catholic identity: sponsorship in higher education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities in Washington, DC.
- Imbrelli, R. (2002). Stewards of the tradition. In A. Cernera & O. Morgan (Eds.), *Examining the Catholic Intellectual Tradition: Volume 2, Issues and Perspectives*. (3-10). Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.
- Introcaso, C. (1996). *The strength of institutional culture: reframing Catholic identity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Claremont Graduate School.
- Janosik, C. M. (1999, September). An organizing framework for specifying and maintaining Catholic identity in American Catholic higher education. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 3, 15-32.
- John Paul II, Pope (1990). Ex Corde Ecclesiae: Apostolic Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on Catholic Universities. Retrieved from

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_excorde-ecclesiae_en.html

King, W. (2006). Sponsorship by juridic persons. In R. Smith, W. Brown, & N. Reynolds (Eds.), *Sponsorship in the United States context: theory and praxis*. (49-72).

Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.

Langan, J. (2000, April 21). Reforging Catholic identity. *Commonweal*.

Lipman Hearne. (2009, October). Key insights: a report on high achieving seniors and the college decision. Retrieved June 15, 2012 from

<http://www.lipmanhearne.com/Libraries/>

Resources_Documents/Lipman_Hearne_High-Achieving_Seniors_Study_2009.pdf

Marsden, G. (1994). The soul of the American university: from protestant establishment to established nonbelief. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McMillan, J. (2008). *Educational research: fundamentals for the consumer*. Boston: Pearson.

Moore, S. (2008). *Ribbon culture: charity, compassion and public awareness*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan

Morey, M. & Piderit, J. (2006). *Catholic higher education: a culture in crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, L. A. (2012, January 30). Guarding Catholic identity. *Inside Higher Ed*.

Retrieved May 3, 2012 from

<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/01/30/catholic-colleges-consider-role-trustees>

- Newman, J. H. (1960). *The idea of a university, defined and illustrated: I. In nine discourses delivered to the Catholics of Dublin. II. In occasional lectures and essays addressed to the members of the Catholic University*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- O'Brien, D. (2002). Catholic intellectual life. In A. Cernera & O. Morgan (Eds.), *Examining the Catholic Intellectual Tradition: Volume 2, Issues and Perspectives*. (17-20). Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.
- O'Brien, G. D. (2002). *The idea of the Catholic university*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Pannozzo, G. (2008). Introduction to mixed-methods research. In J. McMillan, *Educational research: fundamentals for the consumer* (pp. 310-311). Boston: Pearson.
- Roberts, C.M. (2010). *The dissertation journey: a practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: a history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Saint Vincent Archabbey. (2012). About us. Retrieved November 26, 2012 from http://www.saintvincentarchabbey.org/about_us-historyvii
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sisters of Charity of Nazareth. (2012). Our history. Retrieved November 26, 2012 from <http://www.scnfamily.org/archives/history/index.html>
- Smith, R., Brown, W. & Reynolds, N. (Eds.). (2006). *Sponsorship in the United States context: theory and praxis*. Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.

Spalding University. (2012). History and heritage. Retrieved November 26, 2012 from
<http://spalding.edu/about-spalding/history-and-heritage/>

Steinfels, P. (2003). *A people adrift: the crisis of the Roman Catholic Church in America*.
New York: Simon and Schuster.

Turner, F. (Ed.). (1996). *The idea of a university: John Henry Newman*. New Haven, CT:
Yale University Press.

Wechsler, H., Goodchild, L. & Eisenmann, L. (Eds.). (2007). *The history of higher
education*. Boston: Pearson.

Wilcox, J. & King, I. (Eds.). (2000). *Enhancing religious identity: best practices from
Catholic campuses*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

APPENDIX A: Order affiliation by percentage

Charism/Affiliation	No. of Institutions	% of ACCU US Membership
Jesuit	27	14%
Franciscan	21	11%
Mercy	17	8%
Dominican	16	8%
Benedictine	13	7%
Diocesan	10	5%
Holy Cross	8	4%
Sisters of Charity	8	4%
Sisters of St. Joseph	8	4%
Lasallian	6	3%
Ursuline	4	2%
Basilian	3	2%
Marian	3	2%
Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur	3	2%
Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary	3	2%
Vincentian	3	2%
Adorers of the Blood of Christ	2	1%
Augustinian	2	1%
Schools Sisters of Notre Dame	2	1%
Sisters of the Presentation of Mary	2	1%
Sisters of Divine Providence	2	1%
Society of the Precious Blood	2	1%
Other	28	15%
	193	
**There are 193 US Members of ACCU		

APPENDIX B: ACCU Institution Presidents 1990 to 2010

Institutions	Founding Order	Religious 1990?	Religious 2010?
Albertus Magnus College	Dominican Sisters of St. Mary of the Springs	no	no
Alvernia University	Bernardine Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis	no	no
Alverno College	School Sisters of St. Francis	yes	no (first lay)
Ancilla Domini College	Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ	yes	no
Anna Maria College	Sisters of St. Anne		no
Aquinas College	Dominican Sisters of Grand Rapids	no	no
Aquinas College	Dominican Sisters of St. Cecilia Congregation	yes	yes
Assumption College	Augustinians of the Assumption (Assumptionists)	no	no
Assumption College for Sisters	Sisters of Christian Charity (Daughters of the BVM of the IC)	yes	yes
Avila University	Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet	no	no
Barry University	Adrian Dominican Sisters	yes	yes
Bellarmino University	Archdiocese of Louisville, Conventual Franciscan Fathers	no	no
Belmont Abbey College	Benedictine Monks of Belmont Abbey	no	no
Benedictine College	Mount St. Scholastica and St. Benedict's Abbey (KS)	no	no
Benedictine University	Benedictine Monks of St. Procopious Abbey	no (first lay)	no
Boston College	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Brescia University	Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph	yes	no (diocesan)
Briar Cliff University	Sisters of St. Francis of Dubuque	yes	no
Cabrini College	Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus	yes	no
Caldwell College	Sisters of St. Dominic with assistance from Archdiocese of Newark	yes	no
Calumet College of Saint Joseph	Missionaries of the Precious Blood	no	no
Canisius College	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Cardinal Stritch University	Sisters of St. Francis	yes	no
Carlow University	Sisters of Mercy	yes	no (first lay)

Carroll College	Diocese of Helena	no	no
Chaminade University of Honolulu	Society of Mary (Marianists)		yes
Chatfield College	Ursuline Sisters of Brown County	yes	no
Chestnut Hill College	Sisters of Saint Joseph	yes	yes
Christian Brothers University	Institute of the Brothers of Christian Schools	yes	no
Clarke University	Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary	yes	yes
College of Mount Saint Joseph	Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati	not SC	no
College of Mount Saint Vincent	Sisters of Charity of New York	yes	no
College of New Rochelle	Order of St. Ursula	no	no
College of Notre Dame of Maryland	School Sisters of Notre Dame	yes	no
College of Saint Benedict	Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict	yes	no
College of Saint Elizabeth	Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth	yes	yes
College of Saint Joseph in Vermont	Sisters of Saint Joseph	no (first lay)	no
College of Saint Mary	Sisters of Mercy	no	yes
College of Saint Scholastica	Benedictine Sisters	no	no
College of the Holy Cross	Diocese of Boston/Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Creighton University	Society of Jesus		
De Paul University	Congregation of the Mission		yes
DeSales University	Oblates of St. Francis DeSales	yes	yes
Dominican College	Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt	yes	yes
Dominican University	Sinsinawa Dominican Sisters of the Most Holy Rosary	yes	no
Duquesne University of the Holy Spirit	Congregation of the Ghost (Spiritans)	no (first lay)	no
D'Youville College	Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart	yes	yes
Edgewood College	Sinsinawa Dominican Sisters of the Most Holy Rosary	no	no
Elms College	Sisters of Saint Joseph/Diocese of Springfield	yes	yes
Emmanuel College	Sister of Notre Dame de Namur	yes	yes
Fairfield University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Felician College	Felician Sisters	yes	yes
Fontbonne University	Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet	no	no
Fordham University	Diocese of New York	yes	yes
Franciscan University of Steubenville	Third Order Regulars	yes	yes
Gannon University	Diocese of Erie	no	no
Georgetown University	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Georgian Court University	Sisters of Mercy of New Jersey	yes	yes

Gonzaga University	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Gwynedd-Mercy College	Sisters of Mercy	yes	no
Hilbert College	Franciscan Sisters of St. Joseph	yes	no
Holy Cross College	Brothers of the Holy Cross	yes	yes
Holy Family University	Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth	yes	yes
Holy Names University	Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary	yes	no (first lay)
Immaculata University	Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary	yes	yes
Iona College	Congregation of Christian Brothers	yes	yes
John Carroll University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
King's College	Congregation of the Holy Cross (from Notre Dame U)	yes	yes
La Roche College			
La Salle University	Institute of the Brothers of Christian Schools	yes	yes
Laboure' College			
Le Moyne College	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Lewis University	Archdiocese of Chicago	yes	yes
Loras College	Diocese of Dubuque, Iowa	yes	no
Lourdes College	Sisters of St. Francis	yes	no
Loyola Marymount University	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Loyola University Chicago	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Loyola University Maryland	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Loyola University New Orleans	Society of Jesus		yes
Madonna University	Felician Sisters of Livonia	yes	yes
Manhattan College	Institute of the Brothers of Christian Schools	yes	no (first lay)
Manor College*	Sisters of St. Basil the Great (Byzantine Ukranian)	yes	yes
Maria College*	Sisters of Mercy	yes	yes
Marian Court College	Sisters of Mercy	yes	no
Marian University	Sisters of St. Agnes	no	no
Marian University	Sisters of St. Francis, Oldenburg		no
Marquette University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Marygrove College	Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary	no	no
Marymount College	Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary		no

Marymount University	Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary	yes	no
Marywood University	Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary	yes	
Mercy College of Northwest Ohio	Sisters of Mercy		no
Mercyhurst College	Sisters of Mercy	no	no
Merrimack College	Order of St. Augustine		no
Misericordia University	Sisters of Mercy	no	no
Molloy College	Dominican Sisters of Amityville	yes	no
Mount Aloysius College	Sisters of Mercy	no	no
Mount Carmel College of Nursing	Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Cross	no	no
Mount Marty College	Sisters of St. Benedict	yes	no
Mount Mary College	School Sisters of Notre Dame		no
Mount Mercy University	Sisters of Mercy	no	no
Mount Saint Mary College	Sisters of Saint Dominic	yes	no
Mount Saint Mary's University	Diocese of the United States	no	no
Mount St. Mary's College	Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet	yes	no (first lay)
Neumann University	Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia	no	no
Newman University	Adorers of the Blood of Christ	no	no (first lay woman)
Niagara University	Vincentian Priests	yes	yes
Notre Dame College	Sisters of Notre Dame	yes	no
Notre Dame de Namur University	Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur	yes	no
Ohio Dominican University	Dominican Sisters of St. Mary of the Springs	yes	no
Our Lady of Holy Cross College	Marianites of the Holy Cross	no	no
Our Lady of the Lake College	Franciscan Missionaries of Our Lady		no
Our Lady of the Lake University	Sisters of the Congregation of Divine Providence	yes	no
Presentation College	Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary	no	yes
Providence College	Dominican Friars of the Province of St. Joseph (Diocese of Providence)	yes	yes
Quincy University	Franciscans of the Province of Sacred Heart	yes	no
Regis College	Sisters of St. Joseph	yes	no
Regis University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Rivier College	Sisters of the Presentation of Mary	yes	no (first lay)
Rockhurst University	Society of Jesus	yes	no

Rosemont College of the Holy Child Jesus	Society of the Holy Child Jesus	no (first lay)	no
Sacred Heart University	Diocese of Bridgeport	no	no
Saint Ambrose University	Diocese of Davenport	no	no
Saint Anselm College	Benedictine Monks of St. Mary's Abbey (Newark, NJ)	yes	yes
Saint Bonaventure University	Franciscan Friars	yes	yes (not a friar)
Saint Catharine College	Dominican Sisters of Peace	yes	no
Saint Edward's University	Congregation of the Holy Cross	no	no
Saint Francis College	Franciscan brothers	yes	no
Saint Francis University	Third Order Regular Franciscans	yes	yes
Saint Gregory's University	Benedictine monks	yes	no
Saint John's University	Vincentian Order	yes	yes
Saint John's University	Order of St. Benedict	yes	yes
Saint Joseph College	Sisters of Mercy		no
Saint Joseph's College	Missionaries of the Precious Blood	yes	no
Saint Joseph's College of Maine	Sisters of Mercy	yes	no
Saint Joseph's University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Saint Leo University	Order of St. Benedict	no	no
Saint Martin's University	Order of St. Benedict	no	no
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College	Sisters of Providence	yes	no
Saint Mary's College	Sisters of the Holy Cross	no	no
Saint Mary's College of California	Archdiocese of San Francisco	yes	yes
Saint Mary's University	Society of Mary (Marianists)	yes	no
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	Diocese of Winona	yes	yes
Saint Michael's College	Society of St. Edmund	no	no
Saint Norbert College	Norbertine Order	no	no
Saint Peter's College	Society of Jesus	yes	no (first lay)
Saint Thomas Aquinas College	Dominican Sisters	no	no (diff order)
Saint Thomas University	Dominican Friars	no	no
Saint Vincent College	Benedictine monks	yes	no
Saint Xavier University	Sisters of Mercy	no	no
Salve Regina University	Sisters of Mercy	yes	yes
Santa Clara University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Seattle University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Seton Hall University	Archdiocese of Newark	no	no (first lay)
Seton Hill University	Sisters of Charity	no	no

Siena College	Franciscan Friars of the Province of the Most Holy Name	yes	yes
Siena Heights University	Adrian Dominican Sisters	no	yes
Silver Lake College of the Holy Family	Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity	yes	no
Spalding University	Sisters of Charity of Nazareth	yes	no
Spring Hill College	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
St. Catherine University	Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet	no (first lay)	no
Stonehill College	Congregation of the Holy Cross	yes	yes
The Catholic University of America	US Catholic Bishops/Pope Leo XIII	no	no
Thomas More College	Benedictine Sisters of Covington, KY	no	
Trinity University	Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur	no	no
Trocaire College	Sisters of Mercy		no
University of Dallas	Diocese of Dallas	no	no
University of Dayton	Society of Mary (Marianists)	yes	no
University of Detroit Mercy	Society of Jesus, Sisters of Mercy	yes	yes
University of Great Falls	Sisters of Mary of Providence, Ursuline Sisters, Diocese of Great Falls	no	no
University of Mary	Benedictine Sisters of the Annunciation	yes	no
University of Notre Dame du Lac	Congregation of the Holy Cross	yes	yes
University of Portland	Congregation of the Holy Cross (started by archdiocese)	yes	yes
University of Saint Francis	Congregation of the Third Order of St. Francis of Mary Immaculate	no	no
University of Saint Francis	Franciscan Sisters of Perpetual Adoration		yes
University of Saint Mary	Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth	no	yes
University of Saint Thomas	Basilian Fathers		no
University of Saint Thomas	Archdiocese of St. Paul	yes	yes
University of San Diego	Diocese of San Diego	no	no
University of San Francisco	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
University of Scranton	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
University of the Incarnate Word	Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word	no	no
Ursuline College	Ursuline Sisters of Cleveland		yes
Villanova University	Augustinian Order	yes	yes
Viterbo University	Franciscan Sisters of Perpetual Adoration		no

Walsh University	Brothers of Christian Instruction	no (diocesan)	no
Wheeling Jesuit University	Society of Jesus	yes	no
Xavier University	Society of Jesus	yes	yes
Xavier University of Louisiana	Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament	no (first lay)	no

APPENDIX C: Institution Consent to Participate Letter

I have been contacted by John Michael Pressimone (the researcher), a doctoral candidate in Benedictine University's program in Higher Education and Organizational Change about participating in his study examining sponsoring traditions in U.S. Catholic institutions of higher education.

I understand that his mixed methods study involves several on-campus interviews with the following:

- me in my role as the President of the college
- a member of the college's Board of Trustees
- the chief mission officer of the college
- and a member of the sponsor community. (if the chief mission officer is a member of the sponsor community, this latter interview is not necessary.)

These interviews will take place sometime from the end of April 2013 through the end of June 2013.

In addition, Mr. Pressimone will conduct a quantitative assessment of symbols and icons reflective of our Catholic and sponsor heritage on our campus.

I have been assured that all data and transcriptions of interviews will be held in the strictest confidence, that individual and institutional identity will be protected and that research findings will be presented in a way that protects both institutional and individual identity. I understand that electronic transcriptions of interviews will be deleted/destroyed within three months of the successful dissertation defense.

I support and approve his project and welcome him to come to the college.

Sincerely,

President

APPENDIX D: Informed consent letter

Preserving the Sponsoring Tradition

Dissertation

John Michael Pressimone

(Face to Face Structured Interview – Informed Consent)

Dear _____,

You are invited to participate in a research study titled Preserving the Sponsoring Tradition.

The study will be conducted by John Michael Pressimone, a doctoral student at Benedictine University under the supervision of Margaret Dougherty, RSM, Ph.D. The purpose of the research is to determine best practices for preserving and animating the various sponsor traditions at Catholic colleges and universities founded by and/or sponsored by congregations of men and women religious. The time you will spend in this project will be about 45 to 60 minutes. The procedure involved will be a traditional structured interview conducted in person. There are no experimental procedures involved.

Risks to interview participants are minimal. Interviewees will not be identified nor will the institution where the interviewee is employed or affiliated. An alias will be assigned to both the institution and the interviewee. Only the researcher, the researcher's faculty supervisor and the Benedictine Institutional Review Board will have access to the names of the participants and the names of the participants in this project will not be divulged by the researcher other than as required by legal directive.

Interviews will be recorded electronically and later transcribed by the researcher. Electronic recordings will be maintained for a period of not more than 30 days after successful defense of the dissertation, at which time the recordings will be erased.

Individual participants in this study will not receive tangible benefit from the study other than to discuss the research topic.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. If you decide not to participate or if you decide to participate and then decide to stop participating there will be no penalty.

You may contact John Michael Pressimone at 610-796-8282 for additional information about the research project. You may also contact Margaret Dougherty, RSM, Ph. D at 610-796-5519 or at margaret.dougherty@alvernia.edu. For additional information about your rights as a research subject contact the Benedictine University Institutional Review Board at (630) 829-6295.

Name of Subject: _____

(Signature of Subject)

(phone number of subject)

(date)

In my judgment the subject is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent and possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study.

John Michael Pressimone, Researcher

(Signature of Researcher)

VITA

J. Michael Pressimone earned a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in theatre from the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He later completed a Master of Arts degree in Leadership in Higher Education through Regis University in Denver, CO.

He has served as an advancement professional in education for more than 28 years with 25 of those years in higher education. He has served as an advancement vice president at three higher education institutions including Elizabethtown College in Elizabethtown, PA; Belmont Abbey College in Belmont, NC and Alvernia University in Reading, PA.



Doctoral Dissertation Approval Form

PRESERVING THE SPONSORING TRADITION: A STUDY OF CATHOLIC
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOUNDED BY RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of
Doctor of Education
in the College of Education and Health Services

John Michael Pressimone
Doctor of Education in Higher Education and Organizational Change

Approved:

_____	_____
Dissertation Committee Director, Margaret Dougherty, RSM, PhD	Date

_____	_____
Dissertation Committee Chair, Tamara Korenman, PhD	Date

_____	_____
Dissertation Committee Reader, Dean de la Motte, PhD	Date

_____	_____
Acting Dean, College of Education and Health Services, Ethel Ragland, Ed. D.	Date

