

Habits of Inquiry and Reflection:
A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist
Traditions at the University of Dayton

The Marianist Education Working Group

May 5, 2006

Paul Benson (Chair), College of Arts and Sciences
Jim Biddle, Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate
Una Cadegan, American Studies Program and Department of History
Chris Duncan, Department of Political Science
Jim Dunne, School of Business Administration
Kevin Hallinan, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Judith Huacuja, Department of Visual Arts
Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Department of Teacher Education
Paul Marshall, S.M., Rector
Don Pair, Department of Geology

Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton

I. Executive Summary

The Marianist Education Working Group was charged to facilitate a campus-wide conversation about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at the University of Dayton and to present recommendations about how the common academic program for undergraduates should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. In this report, the Working Group proposes a mission statement and educational aims for the common academic program, a set of core student learning outcomes, and accompanying recommendations for academic programs, infrastructure, and faculty development. The report also considers implications for faculty work life and investment of university resources.

The Working Group proposes that five educational aims should orient the common academic program for undergraduates [section III]. Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton: 1) seeks knowledge in a sacramental spirit; 2) pursues learning in, through, and for community; 3) cultivates practical wisdom; 4) forges critical ability to read the signs of these times; and 5) supports discernment of personal and communal vocation. Key concepts in the proposed aims are explained in Section III.

Accordingly, the common academic program for undergraduates should be guided by the following mission statement [section IV]:

Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the University's academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.

Explication of the orienting educational aims suggests that all undergraduates, through the common academic program, should attain seven core learning outcomes, among others appropriate to their degree programs and to General Education. These core learning outcomes [section V] would require that all undergraduates develop and demonstrate:

- 1) advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through production of scholarly work;
- 2) ability to engage in inquiry regarding major faith traditions, and familiarity with the basic theological understandings and texts that shape Roman Catholicism;
- 3) understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others;
- 4) understanding of and practice in values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in community;

- 5) practical wisdom in addressing human problems and needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in students' chosen professions or majors;
- 6) habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by Catholic Social Teaching and multidisciplinary study, that equip students to evaluate critically and imaginatively the challenges of our times; and
- 7) ability to articulate reflectively through the language of vocation the purposes of students' lives and their proposed work.

Complete statements of these learning outcomes are presented in Section V.

The Working Group recommends certain developmentally sequenced, programmatic changes that would promote student achievement of the learning outcomes [section VI.A-D]. For the first year of study, revisions in first-year seminars and the Humanities Base Program are recommended. For the first and second years of study, the report recommends expanding Arts Study offerings and inquiry-based courses in the sciences and social sciences. Habits of mind cultivated in these fields lend themselves to multidisciplinary integration and experiential learning. For the second and third years of study, the report recommends expanding service learning, expanding and facilitating multidisciplinary minors and self-declared or occasional clusters, and creating problem-based interdisciplinary courses in General Education. Expanding opportunities for international and intercultural study, promoting global learning, and increasing foreign-language study are also recommended. For the fourth (or final) year of study, capstone seminars or projects should be developed in majors, multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education should be created, and structures for supporting student scholarship should be developed. All of these recommendations require faculty development in curricular design and pedagogy and should inform criteria for faculty hiring. The recommendations also require expanded collaboration between faculty and staff in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support.

The Working Group recommends changes in educational infrastructure that must be undertaken if the proposed educational aims are to be realized in vital and sustainable ways [section VI.E]. These recommendations concern augmenting opportunities for learning and living in community, strengthening academic advising, creating faculty seminars to generate curricular revision, and reconfiguring classroom space and course schedules. The report also underscores implications of its recommendations for faculty work life and investment of university resources [sections VI.F-G]. These implications concern faculty reviews, workload, new faculty lines and support staff, budget models, and effective program coordination. Acknowledgement of such implications is critically important if education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions is to flourish at the University of Dayton.

II. Charge and context

In February 2005, Mary E. Morton, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, in cooperation with the Deans from the professional schools and the Provost, charged the Marianist Education Working Group to facilitate a campus-wide conversation about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at the University of Dayton and to present recommendations by May 2006 about how the common academic program for undergraduates should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions.

The Marianist Education Working Group has completed the following tasks in carrying out its charge:

1. Studied current literature on curricular reform and participated in the Association of American Colleges and Universities's Institute on General Education in May 2005;
2. Studied literature on the character and history of Catholic and Marianist higher education in the United States;
3. Assembled an oral history of General Education at the University of Dayton from the late 1970s through the mid-1990s;
4. Convened in August-October 2005 a series of campus-wide forums and meetings for conversation about Catholic, Marianist education and the state of the University of Dayton's common academic program for undergraduates;
5. Solicited departmental reports about the ideals of higher education in a Marianist context and elements of the common academic program that should be retained, revised, or created;
6. Issued an interim report in November 2005 that summarized the results of these conversations and departmental reports and identified a set of focal points for further dialogue;
7. Hosted targeted meetings in November 2005-February 2006 about the focal points and other issues that emerged from campus discussions;
8. Distributed in March 2006 a draft of the final report and hosted forums for comment on the draft; and
9. Updated regularly the College Chairs and Program Directors, Provost's Council, and Academic Senate about the progress of the project.

The recommendations presented in this report are offered to Dean Morton, who defined and commissioned the project and who will have responsibility to initiate appropriate review of the report. The Working Group has sought to cast recommendations in a form that would set clear directions for potential revisions in curricular and co-curricular programs without addressing details for the process and substance of such changes that are properly the responsibility of the Academic Senate, the curriculum committees of the academic units, and the Provost's Council. Therefore, as the Working Group's charge indicates, the recommendations are often broad and philosophical in content and tone. As the recommendations are also ambitious, it will be critically important that specific, feasible priorities be established and that clear and consultative processes be used to implement these recommendations.

In the preparation of this report, as in all its work, the Working Group has relied on a number of recent important formulations of the University's founding commitments and its Catholic and Marianist heritage and identity. Chief among these are the *Statement on the Catholic and Marianist Identity of the University of Dayton* (1990), *Characteristics of Marianist Universities* (1999) and *Conversing: Reflections on the University of Dayton's Catholic and Marianist Character in its 150th Year – A Report from the Task Force on the Sesquicentennial Conversation* (2002). In its more focused task of discerning the implications of Marianist education for the common undergraduate academic program, the Working Group acknowledges and draws upon the foundations and breadth of the Catholic and Marianist character of the University articulated more fully in these other resources. The Working Group has been guided, as well, by the strategic directions presented in *Vision 2005: The Foundation* (1999) and developed most recently in *A Vision of Excellence* (2005). This report should be read within the context of the University's commitment to excellence in transformative education.

The Working Group acknowledges that the ultimate fate of proposals for large-scale curricular revision such as this rests with the faculty and with those staff who develop and coordinate co-curricular elements of the common academic program. Unless the following recommendations capture the scholarly and pedagogical imaginations of the faculty and stimulate sufficient creative energy in faculty and staff to undertake the difficult, but exciting, work of refashioning many of the components that shape undergraduates' common academic experience at the University of Dayton, formally instituted decisions about these recommendations will not come to life and bear fruit for the University's students. Because of the central and critical place of the faculty for the future of this project, the present document is addressed primarily, though not exclusively, to faculty members, in the hope that the faculty will affirm and carry forward its proposals.

III. Orienting educational aims of the University of Dayton

The ideals of higher education inherent in Catholic and Marianist traditions, and expressed in the University of Dayton's guiding documents, suggest that the educational aims stated below should orient the common academic program for undergraduates at the University of Dayton, articulating its horizons and providing direction for curricular and co-curricular offerings. The entire university community should embrace and advance these aims as central to its academic purposes. At the same time, the Working Group understands that the proposed aims do not exhaust the purposes that guide any particular curricular or co-curricular academic program. Other important educational aims are compatible with the aims that manifest most clearly the ideals of university education in the University of Dayton's Catholic and Marianist context.

Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton . . .

1. Seeks knowledge in a **sacramental spirit**;
2. Pursues learning in, through, and for **community**;
3. Cultivates **practical wisdom**;
4. Forges critical **ability to read the signs of these times**; and
5. Supports discernment of personal and communal **vocation**.

The five proposed educational aims should not be regarded as discrete or independent of one another. Rather, the Working Group understands them to be inseparable elements of university education in a Catholic and Marianist context; the full realization of any one of these aims would depend upon the realization of others. While the concepts used to express these aims are familiar from the University's guiding documents, Catholic intellectual tradition, and discussions of Catholic higher education, they can be subject to multiple interpretations. The following explications are offered to clarify the senses in which the Working Group uses these concepts.

Sacramentality: Catholic universities represent a distinctive expression of the belief in the sacramental nature of the world. Belief in God as creator and as incarnate in Jesus Christ leads Catholics and many other Christians to a special awareness of the presence of God in creation and the possibility of seeing God in the ordinary things of life. Study of the world or inquiry into any subject that yields some truth about the world has the potential to reveal in meaningful ways knowledge of the God who created the world. To seek knowledge in light of the world's sacramental character is to do so in a sacramental spirit.

The sacramental spirit of inquiry does not necessarily entail that all members of a Catholic university community must assent to the theological principle that signs of God's presence may be seen in all things. It means, rather, that every form and mode of genuine inquiry can be celebrated and affirmed as inherently valuable. It implies also that the wonder and joy of beholding the world _ the animating spirit of liberal education _ should be cultivated in all learning in the university and that scholarship should be pursued rigorously and openly.

A sacramental approach to knowledge means, too, that the whole person _ mind, spirit, and body _ should be engaged in learning and should be the subject of study, as every dimension of human life bears value. In turn, inquiry in a sacramental spirit naturally supports the university's commitment to care for the development of the whole person.

The sacramental spirit of knowledge-seeking affirmed in a Catholic university also means that deep value is to be found in the plurality of the world's people and cultures. A Catholic university commits itself to respect and embrace the inviolable dignity of all persons, and to welcome the exploration of a multiplicity of perspectives, beliefs, and traditions regarding what is true, beautiful, and good. A Catholic university thrives on dialogue and collaboration among persons with diverse backgrounds, values, cultures, and abilities. A sacramental approach to inquiry anchors the distinctive Marianist affirmation of the values of inclusivity and equal dignity for genuine community.

Community: A Catholic and Marianist university is specially committed to the ideals and responsibilities of community in the design and delivery of its common academic program. These ideals and responsibilities are powerfully conveyed through the concept of "family spirit." The common academic program should reveal a community of learning dedicated to challenging itself to realize the highest academic and ethical standards and to supporting its members fully in this challenge.

The academic program should reflect clearly the primary ways in which the communal values and relationships that shape student learning also infuse students' residential life on campus. Because contemporary American society does not normally inculcate or nurture the habits, attitudes, skills, and practices that are necessary for building inclusive community of the sort that Marianists envision, the university's academic program should approach the fundamental aim of communal learning explicitly and deliberately. This means that students, faculty, and staff alike must grow in their capacities to welcome collaboration in the face of differences, to sustain dialogue even when disagreements seem insurmountable, and to turn beyond the university community in the recognition that all learning should ultimately seek to serve the common good and, in serving, to lead. All members of the university should come to realize that learning in, through, and for community generates high expectations for responsibility from each person in the community.

The pursuit of learning in community also means that the undergraduate academic program should prepare students for intelligent and fruitful participation in various forms of community that mediate human life and activity in the local, regional, national, and global spheres.

Practical wisdom: The innovative and transformative purposes of higher education in a Catholic and Marianist context mean that the search for wisdom and truth that

defines any university must ultimately be rendered practical. A Catholic, Marianist university strives to cultivate wisdom in the adoption of practical ends, in practical judgment, and in reflective decision-making. These purposes are to be distinguished from mere skill in the fruitful practical application of knowledge. A Catholic, Marianist university aims to educate persons for good and whole lives, developing rigorous theoretical understanding yet also influencing sensibilities, motives, and conduct in academically appropriate and relevant ways.

Cultivation of practical wisdom requires that deep immersion in the world through experience, activity, and imaginative exploration be central to a university education. In particular, university education must address real human problems and needs. This is why descriptions of Catholic, Marianist education properly emphasize integration of liberal and professional education and the uniting of creative imagination with analytical forms of inquiry.

Reading the signs of these times: The Society of Mary was formed in response to crises in modernity that the Marianist founding generation experienced in the wake of the French Revolution. Central to Marianist education is the forging of abilities for the critical interpretation and examination of one's times in light of the past. While higher education with a Marianist character draws upon profound and longstanding intellectual traditions, and especially Catholic intellectual tradition, it also interrogates the particular challenges of its own time and place in an open, critical, and hopeful spirit that seeks justice, peace, and the common good.

The common academic program of a Catholic, Marianist university addresses the university's specific historical, geographical, and social circumstances and prepares students to acquire habits of inquiry and reflection that enable them to identify, evaluate critically, and respond creatively to the vital issues of their own day. The university's academic program in the early decades of the twenty-first century must investigate the pressing ethical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological issues of its time.

Vocation: Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions strives to support academically students' efforts to find and explore the deep purposes that lend meaning, wonder, and fulfillment to their lives. These purposes consist not merely in what students may find themselves especially fit for pursuing but in what each student is specially called to do. The university's commitment to support students' discernment of their vocations in academically appropriate ways follows from the fundamental objective to educate whole persons, in mind, spirit, and body, for whole lives.

Students' reflections upon their unique vocations belong in the common academic program because the habits of mind and character which that program inculcates support thoughtful investigation and articulation of life purposes. The academic program also prepares students for excellence in the majors or professional studies that will influence much of their working lives, as well as their communal roles and responsibilities. Through the common academic program students come to grips with the multiple dimensions of human flourishing with which they must engage as they pursue the meaning-giving purposes of their lives.

Academic support for reflection upon vocation naturally accompanies the other orienting educational aims of a Catholic, Marianist university. Pursuit of rigorous inquiry in a sacramental spirit, through a community of learning dedicated to cultivating practical wisdom in the face of the critical issues of the times, naturally

encompasses extended reflection upon the unique contours and directions of our individual and collective lives. Excellence in university education also fosters dedication to the particular vocation of learning throughout our lives.

IV. Mission statement for the undergraduate academic program

The orienting educational aims proposed here may be conjoined in a mission statement for the common academic program which expresses the academic significance of the University of Dayton's Catholic and Marianist heritage and ideals for all undergraduates.

Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the University's academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.

The Working Group intends the proposed mission statement to articulate the academic life of the University's Catholic and Marianist traditions and so to guide future development of the common academic program for undergraduates.

V. Core student learning outcomes for the common academic program

For the past year, the Marianist Education Working Group has facilitated campus-wide conversations about the purposes and substance of education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton. These conversations have also considered where the University best displays its central academic ideals and where the common academic program stands in greatest need of further development or significant reform. Considered in light of these conversations and the substantial study conducted by the Working Group, the five educational aims and mission statement presented above point toward certain student learning outcomes as being particularly important for guiding future developments in the common academic program for undergraduates.

The learning outcomes presented below are intended to function at the level of the common academic program. They could be promoted in different ways, through different structures and activities, in the student's major, in General Education and the Competencies programs, in co-curricular programming, and in learning experiences that transpire outside the formal curriculum. They are not to be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of a limited segment of the university community. Rather, they should shape all intentional planning for students' educational experience in every division of the university.

The proposed outcomes do not necessarily map onto unique elements of the common academic program, and they do not exhaust the goals of the academic program for students.

1. **Scholarship:** *All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.*
2. **Faith traditions:** *All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students' abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.*
3. **Diversity:** *All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students' understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.*
4. **Community:** *All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.*
5. **Practical wisdom:** *All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.*
6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** *Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.*
7. **Vocation:** *Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students' developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions,*

and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

VI. Recommendations for programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development; implications for faculty work life and university resources

The Working Group offers the following recommendations concerning academic programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development as preferred ways to advance the educational aims and student learning outcomes proposed for the common academic program. These learning outcomes reflect an educational approach that must attend carefully to undergraduate students' academic and personal development over the course of a four-year degree program. Recommendations in the first four sub-sections [VI.A-D] are organized in relation to the developmental progression of students' academic experience. The Working Group recognizes that "year of study" does not constitute a discrete developmental stage. Rather, the concept is used to provide a practically manageable way of highlighting certain appropriate points of emphasis along students' four-year educational experience at the university. The final three sub-sections [VI.E-G] identify features of educational infrastructure, faculty work life, and investment of university resources that must be addressed if the recommended programmatic and pedagogical changes are to flourish and the proposed educational aims are to be vital and sustainable.

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by the Provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in *A Vision of Excellence*.

VI.A. Recommendations for the first year of study

1. Revise **first-year seminars** substantially to become academically challenging courses that foster engaging academic inquiry and reflection and orient students to the nature and purposes of a University of Dayton education. First-year seminars should be designed to promote the core learning outcomes, especially in scholarship, diversity, community, and vocation. They should also be coordinated with the Humanities Base Program. Some seminars may be offered in conjunction with first-year learning-living communities. First-year seminars should require that students begin construction of academic portfolios and also offer opportunities for service-based learning, focused partly on the campus community. First-year seminars would also be powerful vehicles through which to promote student learning about health and personal discipline in the context of students' educational development. In order to achieve these aims, first-year seminars should be expanded in curricular significance, either by counting for 3-4 semester hours of General Education credit or through linking with General Education courses. Ideally, these should be small, interdisciplinary, writing-intensive courses. The University should explore the possibility that writing-intensive seminars might replace one of the English composition courses in the first year. Collaboration with the Libraries, Student Development, and Campus Ministry will be essential to future development of first-year seminars. [Learning outcomes 1, 3-4, 7]

2. Revise the **Humanities Base Program** to lay the foundation for all core learning outcomes for the common academic program and to facilitate coordination with the objectives of first-year seminars and first-year learning-living communities. In particular, all Humanities Base courses should contribute to students' examination of faith traditions and to their academic encounters with diversity. As expressed in the current Humanities Base goals, all Humanities Base courses should actively support consideration of global perspectives. [All learning outcomes]

VI.B. Recommendations for the first and second years of study

1. Expand **Arts Study** offerings for first- and second-year students. Some of these courses should be coordinated with first-year seminars, Humanities Base courses, and first-year learning communities. Some Arts courses might be coordinated with proposals below for the second or third years of study. Study of, and active participation in, the arts provide uniquely powerful occasions to explore modes of inquiry, reflection, and experiential immersion in the world that advance the proposed student learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]
2. Incorporate **scientific inquiry**, as pursued in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and technology, more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry using the methods of these fields should be pursued in some first-year seminars. Some introductory science courses in General Education should be coordinated with courses in the Humanities Base or with first-year courses in the social sciences or arts. Courses that explore the distinctive methodologies and habits of mind in scientific fields advance learning outcomes for scholarship, community, practical wisdom, and critical evaluation of our times. Scientific inquiry is also inherently a form of global, transnational learning that relies on collaborative, communal work. [Outcomes 1, 4-6]
3. Incorporate **social scientific inquiry** more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry that employs methods of the social sciences should be pursued in some first-year seminars and should be coordinated with other first- or second-year courses in General Education. Courses that develop the habits of mind necessary for critical study of human societies are potentially germane to all of the proposed learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]

The preceding recommendations do not mean that the General Education Program's present emphasis on humanistic inquiry should be diminished. Rather, these other forms of inquiry should be explored more deliberately in the first and second years of study as complementary with, and in relation to, forms of humanistic inquiry and reflection.

VI.C. Recommendations for the second and third years of study

1. Expand curricular and co-curricular offerings in, and support for, **service learning**. In the second year of study, service-learning opportunities should be focused substantially on the City of Dayton and the Greater Miami Valley; in the third year, service learning should be coordinated especially with study abroad or cultural immersion programs. Programmatic structures and pedagogical methods for integrating service experience with academic inquiry, scholarship, and reflection should be promoted. Support for faculty and staff

- who deliver and coordinate service-learning programs must be increased significantly. The expansion of service-learning programs must proceed with particular attention to respect for the dignity of community partners and the integrity of the University's relationships with them. [Learning outcomes 3-7]
2. Expand and facilitate **multidisciplinary minors and self-declared clusters** as successors to the current thematic cluster requirement. The goals of the thematic clusters are worthy, but their realization could be achieved more meaningfully through either multidisciplinary minors or student designed, self-declared clusters. Such multidisciplinary, integrative structures should focus on addressing real human problems and needs in light of critical evaluation of these times. They should also assist students in their on-going vocational reflections. There may also be a role for occasional course clusters that examine issues of special relevance to our times. Integration could be supported through an expanded student portfolio. Support for development and coordination of multidisciplinary minors would need to be increased significantly. [Learning outcomes 5-7]
 3. Create **problem-based, interdisciplinary courses** in General Education designed especially for second- or third-year students. Such courses would aim at developing practical wisdom and critical evaluation of these times. They should develop familiarity with forms of technological and economic analysis, as well as with critical modes of ethical, social, and ecological inquiry, including Catholic Social Teaching. Such courses could belong to multidisciplinary minors or to self-declared or occasional clusters, and should be linked both to the Humanities Base and to majors, where feasible. [Learning outcomes 5-6]
 4. Expand opportunities for **international and intercultural study**, including curricular revisions to promote **global learning**. Objectives for global learning should be incorporated in all multidisciplinary minors and in many capstone courses, in addition to the Humanities Base. Cultural immersions should incorporate explicit links to the curriculum in order to promote academically-informed reflection and analysis. Opportunities for and incentives to promote **study of foreign language** should be developed wherever possible for each academic unit. [Learning outcomes 3-4, 6]

VI.D. Recommendations for the fourth (or final) year of study

1. Develop a culminating **capstone seminar or project in each major**. Such a seminar or project would aim at promoting scholarship and culminating reflection on vocational discernment and life plans. Such a course or project should also aim to integrate study at various levels in General Education with study in the major. An expanded student portfolio could document such integration and vocational reflection. [Learning outcomes 1 and 7]
2. Create **multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education**. Where feasible within a course of study, such a capstone course could support the previous recommendation, helping to develop and integrate culminating study in General Education in relation to the major. An expanded portfolio system could again be valuable for such a course. The course would also be linked clearly to the Humanities Base and could provide students opportunities to build upon a multidisciplinary minor or self-declared or occasional cluster. The course should emphasize all core learning outcomes. Where feasible, it could be coordinated with capstone seminars in the majors. General Education requirements may need to be modified in order to accommodate such a multidisciplinary capstone in General Education. [All learning outcomes.]

3. Develop and expand structures for requiring, coordinating, funding, and reviewing **student scholarship**. Undergraduate research programs would need to be developed that are appropriate to serve each unit's majors. A portfolio structure could be helpful for coordination and review of student scholarship. [Learning outcome 1]

Recommendations for the common academic program, and especially the third and fourth years of study, should be pursued in ways that support valuable relationships between undergraduate and graduate education, so that undergraduates will be well prepared for graduate work and so that the University's emerging strategies for graduate education are well coordinated with its approach to undergraduate education.

The foregoing recommendations [section VI.A-D] all require substantial investment in faculty development for curricular design and pedagogical innovation, and should inform criteria for faculty hiring.

VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

1. Expand structures and coordination of opportunities for **learning and living in community**. These should include, but by no means be limited to, learning-living communities for first-year students. Opportunities for multi-year learning communities should also be explored as vehicles through which third- and fourth-year students can exercise academic leadership in the campus community and contribute to younger students' academic development. Values and skills for learning and living in community should be developed, in part, in the context of engaging the culture and structure of the student neighborhood in both academically guided and religiously grounded ways. This recommendation requires faculty-development support for planning of the curricular elements of learning communities and for expanded collaboration with Student Development and Campus Ministry staff on co-curricular programming. [Learning outcomes 2 and 4]
2. Strengthen structures, support, and faculty preparation for **academic advising**. More effective and better supported academic advising is essential for developmentally sensitive delivery of the common academic program, for meaningful integration of learning across disciplines, for integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, and for sustained reflection on vocation. An expanded portfolio system could facilitate student interaction with advisors. Tools for evaluating academic advising by faculty should be developed and incorporated into reviews for performance, promotion, and tenure. Academic advisors should also work in tandem with the mentoring activities carried out through Student Development and Campus Ministry. [All learning outcomes]
3. Create and fund **faculty seminars** to develop proposals for key elements of a revised curriculum. Possible areas for faculty study might include undergraduate scholarship, the Catholic and Marianist context for the components of the first-year curriculum, service learning and community-based learning, global learning, or pedagogies for experiential learning in multiple fields.

Where possible, faculty seminars should build upon recent faculty development efforts in scholarship, curriculum, and pedagogy. Such seminars would be well suited to the University of Dayton's faculty culture and would be likely to yield thoughtfully developed, innovative pilot programs. [All learning outcomes]

4. Reconfigure **design and assignments of classroom space and course schedules** to facilitate student inquiry, collaboration, and reflection. Successful coordination among courses or between courses and co-curricular experiences also requires creative scheduling and use of space. Protected opportunities for reflection, community building, service activity, or prayer should be created. The busy, distraction-filled environment of the campus otherwise will preclude the deep forms of engagement recommended in this report. The new master plan for the campus should place high priority upon the architectural implications of this report. [All learning outcomes]

Just as the recommendations presented here will require investment in faculty development, they also entail substantially expanded collaboration between faculty and staff, especially in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support in general.

The Working Group recognizes that the recommendations presented in this section are ambitious and will require thoughtfully prioritized and sensitively planned implementation. Planning for implementation falls outside the scope of the Working Group's charge. However, the ambitious character of the recommendations reflects the high aspirations for the University and its students that were expressed consistently and repeatedly by the many faculty and staff who contributed to this project.

VI.F. Implications for faculty work life

Curricular and co-curricular revisions motivated by the educational ideals expressed in this report will require special investments of faculty members' time, talent, and energy. Unless faculty members have the time, funding, and support needed to take meaningful ownership of the programmatic revisions recommended here, the resulting curricular changes will lack academic depth and vitality and will become unsustainable. The following implications for faculty work life are, therefore, particularly important for the flourishing of Catholic, Marianist education at the University of Dayton.

1. Significant contributions to major curricular-revision efforts must be recognized and rewarded appropriately in **annual performance reviews** if faculty commitment to these efforts is to be sustained for the long term. Significant faculty involvement in experiential, inquiry-based learning outside the classroom and the integration of co-curricular activities with the curriculum should also be recognized and rewarded in annual merit reviews.
2. **Reviews for tenure and promotion** likewise must give appropriate recognition to significant faculty contributions to major curricular revisions. This does not mean that standing responsibilities of tenure-line faculty members to be active and productive scholars and contributing members of their departmental, university, and professional communities should diminish. Rather, significant contributions to curriculum revision and co-curricular planning must be supported generously (e.g., through course releases or summer salary) so that faculty working toward tenure or promotion have sufficient time and receive due recognition for such activities.

3. **Faculty workload expectations** may need to be revised in light of the demands imposed by the initiation of major pilot projects in the curriculum and co-curriculum.

VI.G. Implications for resources and coordination

The recommendations presented in this report carry substantial implications for university resources. If these recommendations are to be implemented effectively, the University will need to consider reallocation of current resources and major investment of new resources. The Working Group's study of the history of the current General Education Program revealed that, according to key faculty and administrative advocates for the program, the resources needed for the program to reach and sustain over time its full potential were never realized. Future work on the common academic program should benefit from the lessons of this history.

1. Effective multi- or interdisciplinary curriculum development and teaching, integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, creation of new seminars, and the development of innovative pedagogies suited to these projects will require increased **budgetary support** for new full-time faculty lines and for faculty development, as well as for expanded support staff in such critical areas as service learning, international and intercultural learning, and Residence Education.
2. **Budget models**, including means of accounting for delivery of student credit hours, will need to be revised in order not merely to permit but also facilitate faculty collaboration across departments, programs, and academic units. Many promising collaborative initiatives in the past have died in their early stages because of the inflexibility of current budget models.
3. Funding for effective **coordination** of pilot programs and their eventual full-scale implementation will also be required. The work of coordinating programs of the proposed nature and scale will need to be performed collaboratively by faculty members, staff, and administrators alike. Coordination of these programs with other University initiatives will be important and may also require additional resources.

VII. Membership of the Marianist Education Working Group

With the exception of Dr. Jim Biddle and Fr. Paul Marshall, the following members have worked on the project from its inception in February, 2005. Dr. Biddle and Fr. Marshall joined in the project in July, 2005 to represent, respectively, the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate and the vowed Marianists at the University of Dayton.

Paul Benson (Chair): Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum, College of Arts and Sciences; Professor, Department of Philosophy

Jim Biddle: Chairperson, Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate; Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education

Una Cadegan: Director, American Studies Program; Associate Professor, Department of History

Chris Duncan: Chairperson and Professor, Department of Political Science

Jim Dunne: Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Information Technology, School of Business Administration; Professor, Department of

Management Information Systems, Operations Management, and Decision Sciences

Kevin Hallinan: Chairperson and Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Judith Huacuja: Assistant Professor, Department of Visual Arts

Katie Kinnucan-Welsch: Chairperson and Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education

Paul Marshall, S.M.: Rector

Don Pair: Chairperson and Professor, Department of Geology

Appendices

Appendix A: Consultations, presentations, and forums

The Working Group made presentations to the College Chairs and Program Directors and to the Educational Leadership Council in May, 2005.

During June and July, 2005, the Working Group interviewed faculty members and administrators who were deeply involved in the development or oversight of the present General Education Program in order to construct an oral history of General Education at UD since the late 1970s. These interviews included Mike Barnes, Jim Farrelly, Ray Fitz, Jim Heft, Pat Johnson, Tom Lasley, Paul Morman, and Pat Palermo.

At the beginning of the 2005-06 academic year, the Working Group invited reports from each academic department on campus, especially those that teach undergraduate students, about their understanding of the key elements of education in a Marianist context and the implications of that understanding for future development of the University's common academic program for undergraduates. The Working Group received reports from the following academic units: Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, Communication, Computer Science, Counselor Education and Human Services, Economics and Finance, Geology, Health and Sports Science, History, Languages, Libraries, Management and Marketing, Mathematics, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, MIS/OM/Decision Sciences, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Religious Studies, the SBA Administrative Committee, Sociology/Anthropology/Social Work, Teacher Education, and Visual Arts.

The Working Group met at the beginning of the Fall Term, 2005 with the Provost's Council, the SBA Administrative Committee, and the Chairs Collaborative. Presentations were given in September for the Faculty Exchange Series and the Academic Senate; a Faculty Exchange Series Roundtable was also convened. The Working Group hosted forums for untenured tenure-track faculty and for non-tenure-line faculty members. Meetings were held with the Humanities Base Committee, the Department of Religious Studies, the 2005-06 Leadership UD cohort, and representatives of the SBA's Catholic and Marianist Heritage Advisory Committee. The Fall Humanities Base faculty workshop discussed the Marianist education project. After the Working Group released an interim report on November 22, 2005, discussions of the report were held with the College Chairpersons and Program Directors, the vowed Marianist community on campus, the Deans Council, the Integrated Natural Science Sequence faculty workshop, and the black faculty. The Working Group also received written comments on the interim report, including a report on the common educational experience from the School of Engineering's Integrated Engineering Core Committee.

During Winter Term, 2006, discussions of focal points identified in the November interim report continued. A presentation was given for the Faculty Exchange Series, and an open forum was convened. Meetings were held with Campus Ministry staff, Student Development heads, the Department of Philosophy, and the Cluster Coordinating Committee. A forum on ethics education was hosted by the Working Group in conjunction with the Jacob Program in Professional Ethics. An early version of the first sections of the final report was presented to the Academic Senate in March. A full draft of the final report was released March 28, 2006 and discussed in two open forums, as well as with the College Chairs and Program Directors, in April. Many

written comments on the draft were received from faculty and staff members prior to the final revisions of the report in late April.

Appendix B: Selected bibliography

Important sources studied by the Working Group in the course of the project included the following.

Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Office for Social Justice. n.d. Catholic social teaching. Online, May 4, 2006. Available at <<http://www.osjspm.org/cst/index.html>>

Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Available at <<http://www.greaterexpectations.org>>

Cadegan, Una M. 2001. Life, the universe and everything: Universities, Catholic universities and general education. Paper presented at Chaminade University, Honolulu, HI.

Chaminade University, St. Mary's University, and University of Dayton. 1999. *Characteristics of Marianist universities*. Dayton, OH: Association of Marianist Universities. Available at <<http://www.udayton.edu/~amu-usa/pdfs/characteristics.pdf>>

Committee on General Education. 1981. *Final report: Committee on general education*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. [Also known as *The Darr report*.]

Committee on the Catholic and Marianist Identity of the University. 1990. *Statement on the Catholic and Marianist identity of the University of Dayton*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://rector.udayton.edu/documents/CatholicID.pdf>>

Ex Corde Ecclesiae: Apostolic Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II On Catholic Universities. 1990. Available at <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae_en.html>

Fitz, Raymond L., S.M. 2001. Practical wisdom as an aim of education: Some contributions of Marianist universities. Presented at the Academic Convocation, Chaminade University, Honolulu, HI. Available at <http://www.udayton.edu/~amu-usa/pdfs/fitz_1.pdf>

Gaff, Jerry G. 1980. Avoiding the potholes: Strategies for reforming general education. *Educational Record* 61(4): 50-59.

Gaff, Jerry G. 1999. *General education: The changing agenda*. The academy in transition series. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Gleason, Philip. 1995. *Contending with modernity: Catholic higher education in the twentieth century*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapters 5-7.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 1984. *How to save the Catholic church*. New York: Viking. Chapter 3.
- Groome, Thomas H. 1996. What makes a school Catholic? In Terence McLaughlin, et al., eds., *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity and diversity*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hallinan, Kevin, et al. 2005. A Catholic and Marianist engineering education at the University of Dayton. Presented at The Role of Engineering at Catholic Universities, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH.
- Heft, James L., S.M. 1997. Theology's place in a Catholic university. In Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., eds., *Theological education in the Catholic tradition: Contemporary challenges*. New York: Crossroad Publishing.
- Heft, James L., S.M. 1999. Academic freedom: American and Catholic. *Origins* 28: 614-662.
- Heft, James L., S.M. 2003. The "open circle": The culture of Marianist universities. Marianist University Meetings, Chaminade University, Honolulu, HI. Available at <http://www.udayton.edu/~amu-usa/pdfs/open_circle.pdf>
- Himes, Michael J. 2001. "Finding God in all things": A sacramental worldview and its effects. In Thomas M. Landy, ed., *As leaven in the world: Catholic perspectives on faith, vocation, and the intellectual life*. Franklin, WI: Sheed and Ward.
- Huber, Mary Taylor, and Pat Hutchings. 2005. *Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain*. The academy in transition series. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Jackson, Shirley Ann. 2001. Engineering and the liberal arts. Presented at Designing the Future: A Summit on Engineering Education, Smith College, Northampton, MA. Available at <<http://www.rpi.edu/president/speeches/ps033101-smithcoll.html>>
- Johnson, Patricia Altenbernd. 2005. Spiritual friendship and the Christian academic community. Thompson Christian Philosophy Lecture, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH.
- Knoespel, Kenneth J., et al. 2001. Thoughts on building a new model, or what does it mean to call engineering a liberal art? Presented at the 4th International POSTI Conference, Oslo, Norway. Available at <<http://www.lcc.gatech.edu/~knoespel/pdfsPublication/HumanitiesandEngineering.pdf>>
- McGrath, John A., S.M. 2005. Men and women on a mission: Catholic education in the Marianist tradition. First Annual Catholic and Marianist Education Lecture, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH.

- McGreevy, John T. 1997. Thinking on one's own: Catholicism in the American intellectual imagination, 1928-1960. *Journal of American History* 84(1): 97-131.
- Objectives and Purposes Committee, University of Dayton Board of Trustees. 1977. *The nature and purposes of the University of Dayton*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://rector.udayton.edu/documents/PurposeNature.pdf>>
- Roche, Mark W. 2003. *The intellectual appeal of Catholicism and the idea of a Catholic university*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Shulman, Lee S. 2005. Pedagogies of uncertainty. *Liberal Education* 91(2): 18. Available at <<http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-sp05/le-sp05feature2.cfm>>
- Task Force on the Sesquicentennial Conversation. 2002. *Conversing: Reflections on the University of Dayton's Catholic and Marianist character in its 150th year*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://rector.udayton.edu/documents/Character.pdf>>
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. 1998. *Sharing Catholic social teaching: Challenges and directions*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Available at <<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/projects/socialteaching/socialteaching.htm>>
- University of Dayton. n.d. *The University of Dayton mission*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://president.udayton.edu/Documents/The%20University%20of%20Dayton%20Mission.pdf>>
- University of Dayton. 1999. *Vision 2005: The foundation*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://rector.udayton.edu/documents/Vision2005.pdf>>
- University of Dayton. 2005. *Catholic and Marianist philosophy of community living at UD*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton.
- University of Dayton. 2005. *A vision of excellence*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. Available at <<http://provost.udayton.edu/Vision/VOE%20final%20-%20Sept05.pdf>>
- University Task Force on General Education. 1980. *General education: The report*. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. [Also known as *The Kepes report*.]