ROOTED IN MISSION & WORKING FOR JUSTICE

“In light of the Supreme Court ruling, Jesuit institutions must continue to support the mission-inspired goal of ensuring Black and Latinx enrollment and graduation. To do so, it is imperative that trustees assume their role as moral leaders who accept this goal as their responsibility.”

Arnold L. Mitchem, President Emeritus, Council for Opportunity in Education (COE)

Above: “Our Roots Say That We’re Sisters Mural” by Mauricio Ramirez (photo courtesy of Marquette University)
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LETTER FROM AJCU'S PRESIDENT

The Jesuit, Catholic mission of our colleges and universities, which you hold “in trust” for the current and future generations of students, faculty and staff members, is authentic and credible because it is rooted, relevant and adaptive. A mission that does not acknowledge its historic and religious roots would be easily captured by the latest fad, whether in education or in the larger cultural sphere. A mission that is not relevant would fall short of its need to prepare young people for the challenges and problems of their day. Moreover, a mission that is not adaptable will soon find itself obsolete. Jesuit higher education has been successful for more than 450 years because of these three characteristics. In many ways, this is the task of those entrusted with the care and feeding of each of our Jesuit colleges and universities: to keep the mission rooted, relevant and adaptive.

The articles presented in this first issue of In Trust will help you to better understand some of the key issues being faced on our Jesuit campuses today. Dr. Arnold L. Mitchem, a former Marquette University trustee and president emeritus of the Council for Opportunity in Education, offers his perspective and advice for trustees on how to navigate the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling on race-conscious admissions in context of our Jesuit mission.

On the topic of “mission vs. money,” a president, a trustee, and a CFO from three of our schools share their candid thoughts on how the Jesuit mission can serve as a guide for sound decision-making on finances.

We hope that this new magazine will help you to grow in your appreciation for the Jesuit commitment to higher education. We welcome your feedback on this inaugural issue of In Trust, including suggestions for topics that you would like us to address in future issues. Please write to us at info@ajcunet.edu.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to Jesuit higher education, and your investment in our common project: preparing the next generation of generous, self-less, and conscientious young people for our country and for our world.

With blessings,

Rev. Michael J. Garanzini, S.J.
President, AJCU
THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON RACE-CONSCIOUS ADMISSIONS: WHAT DOES THE JESUIT MISSION CALL US TO DO NOW?

By Arnold L. Mitchem, President Emeritus of the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE)

In their June 2023 ruling on race-conscious admissions in higher education, Chief Justice John Roberts and five other justices on the U.S. Supreme Court found that racial diversity was a good thing, but that the arguments put forward by Harvard and the University of North Carolina were not sufficiently compelling to allow treating Black applicants differently on the basis of race, as the institutions did not provide sufficiently measurable and concrete justifications for diversity.

From my long perspective in working to bring about equity and diversity in higher education, however, it appears to me that in the Jesuit, Catholic tradition, there is no ambiguity. If we need support for our position that Catholic teaching requires an openness and an engagement to and with the “Other” and the world, we need look no further than Pope Francis’ encyclical, Fratelli Tutti (On Fraternity and Social Friendship), where he reminded us of St. Francis of Assisi’s visit to the Muslim Sultan.
Affirmative action (continued)

Malik el-Kamal in Egypt during the Crusades, an episode that demonstrates that “his openness of heart knew no bounds and transcended differences of origin, nationality, color and religion.”

Pope Francis speaks not simply of the saint trying to understand these differences when confronted with them, but also of going out to the sultan — seeking understanding of the differences that divide us and trying to bridge those differences. Does not the Jesuit, Catholic tradition require us to work to understand and bridge those differences? Can we think ourselves capable of bridging those differences without racial diversity in our student bodies and among our faculty?

I say these things from a particular perspective. I am an African American Catholic man who spent 16 years at Marquette University, first as a history faculty member.


I believe that because of our national history of slavery, there are major differences, regardless of their class or religion, that cause division, particularly between Blacks and Whites. In many ways, Blacks and Whites live in siloed universes. Our history, our family structures, our likelihood of having served in the military, and our experiences with government, employers, the police, and in de facto segregated schools — in many instances, they simply differ.

Mitchem to direct program for culturally distinct students

Arnold L. Mitchem has been named to the newly created position of director of the special program for the culturally distinct student at Marquette university. His appointment, which is effective Jan. 1, was announced Jan. 11 by Dr. Arthur C. Moeller, vice-president for academic affairs. Mitchem is an instructor in Marquette’s history department.

Moeller said that Mitchem will coordinate university efforts to ensure an academically rewarding experience for culturally distinct students presently enrolled at Marquette and to assist in planning and preparing for an intensified program for the culturally distinct student for the 1969-1970 school year.

To work with deans

As director of the special program, Mitchem will report to Moeller. Moeller said that Mitchem would work closely with university deans and administrators whose offices are crucial for the success of any academic program for the culturally distinct.

Mitchem was recommended for the position by a special committee on scholarship programs and courses in black and minority cultures. The committee was created in May, 1969, by the Very Rev. John P. Rayner, SJ, university president. Fr. Bayley’s first charge to the committee was the preparation of a job description for the program director and the recommendation of a qualified individual to fill the position.

Six-month search

The announcement of the committee’s formation was made last May during a period of student demonstrations and demands for increased university commitment to the inner city.

Ecumenical services planned in Christian Unity Week here

As part of a national Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, ecumenical services will be held for Christians of all churches from 6 to 6:30 pm in the Joan of Arc chapel Jan. 20 to 24. Each day a Catholic priest or Protestant minister will give a short homily and students of various faiths will lead the prayers.

“This is the first time anything tor of spiritual welfare, who is working with Pastor Alan Davis of Rehman Evangelical Lutheran church and Rev. Richard Yeo of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee campus ministry in planning the services. Scheduled to give the homily on Tuesday is Father Bernard Cook, SJ, chairman of the Marquette theology department.
Affirmative action (continued)

In 1969, I became the founding director of Marquette’s Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). While I was directing EOP, Marquette applied for and received federal TRIO Program funding to support efforts to prepare and retain low-income and minority students. In the 1980s, I left Marquette to become the founding president of the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE), an organization that represents colleges and agencies in their efforts to expand college access and support programs like TRIO. Later in my career, I had the honor of serving Marquette again, as a trustee.

I speak as someone who, throughout my career, advocated for class-based, rather than race-based, college access and success programming. I recall that every class admitted during my tenure as EOP director at Marquette included Black, Hispanic, Native American, and White students. At COE, I led an organization that spearheaded the effort to assure that criteria to be served in the federal TRIO programs were class-based, not race-based. In fact, COE successfully introduced the term “first-generation college student” to federal law in 1979, helping to ensure that federally-funded TRIO programs should be based on family income and parents’ education, not race or ethnicity.

I continue to believe that, in most instances, class-based targeting for opportunity in higher education is preferable to race-based targeting. For Jesuit institutions, this should be particularly true if the core belief in the “preferential option for the poor” goes anywhere beyond rhetoric. I also recognize that the past 60 years’ movement to expand college opportunity, as well as my own involvement in it, grew out of the Civil Rights movement and efforts of Black and White people of conscience to work to right national wrongs. For example, Marquette’s EOP only came to exist because Black students put their futures at risk to pressure the University to enroll more local Black students.
Affirmative action (continued)

Significantly, these advocates were supported by leading Jesuits on Marquette's theology faculty (including one future Jesuit college president) who promised to resign if Marquette did not agree to establish the EOP. Clearly, the people who made change saw the inclusion of Black students in Marquette's student body as a moral imperative.

What does the Supreme Court's admissions decision mean for trustees today?
In the wake of the Supreme Court decision, where does the state of higher education admissions leave trustees of Jesuit institutions?

First, trustees must insist that the leaders of Jesuit institutions speak clearly, and in a culturally competent way, on issues of race, equity, and diversity — and that our leaders don't say anything if they ultimately aren't going to do anything. Self-serving statements don't bridge any divides; they don't promote understanding. And if Jesuit institutions are not on a path toward increasing Black student and Pell Grant enrollment, trustees need to confront their institution's lack of progress with honesty.

Second, trustees should encourage and support admissions offices at Jesuit institutions to work collaboratively to take advantage of the one exception to the mention of race in the Supreme Court decision.

The Court found that students could mention their race while explaining who they are and why they should be admitted; it would seem apparent that high school faculty and others writing recommendations could do so as well. The implications of this exception need to be explored in light of Jesuit mission. In particular, while most Jesuit colleges and universities will not have problems identifying and admitting low-income Black students from their states based on class (the real challenge here is adequately financing them), they will have to collectively reconsider how they recruit and identify middle-income Black students.

Third, trustees of Jesuit institutions should recognize that, particularly because they are trustees at Jesuit institutions, they can be a moral force, and they should speak more openly in public forums to defend against attacks on efforts of colleges and universities — both public and private — to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion. Shouldn't our trustees be at the forefront of efforts to say that equity, diversity, and inclusion are, in fact, moral and religious issues?

Marquette University
Affirmative action (continued)

Finally, trustees need to commit themselves to becoming leaders by creating more pathways that open higher education to first-generation Black and Latinx students. One example of leadership in this area is Marquette’s former board chair, Darren Jackson, who became the founding chair of All-In Milwaukee, a college completion program that provides limited income, high-potential students with financial aid, advising, and academic and career support to ensure that participants “complete college, build meaningful careers, and transform the Milwaukee community.” Working with four public and four private institutions (including Marquette), All-In Milwaukee enrolled 415 Milwaukee students during the 2022-23 academic year. It also has a 90% college graduation rate in four or five years, with 80% of its students graduating debt-free.

In light of the Supreme Court ruling, Jesuit institutions must continue to support the mission-inspired goal of ensuring Black and Latinx enrollment and graduation. To do so, it is imperative that trustees assume their role as moral leaders who accept this goal as their responsibility.

Arnold L. Mitchem is president emeritus of the Council for Opportunity in Education. Previously, he was a faculty member at Marquette University, where he also served as a trustee and from which he received one of his eleven honorary degrees. (All archival and campus photos courtesy of Marquette University.)

Federal TRIO Programs
“The Federal TRIO Programs (TRIO) are Federal outreach and student services programs designed to identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds. TRIO includes eight programs targeted to serve and assist low-income individuals, first-generation college students, and individuals with disabilities to progress through the academic pipeline from middle school to postbaccalaureate programs. TRIO also includes a training program for directors and staff of TRIO projects.”

- U.S. Department of Education
(Learn more at ed.gov)
On a Saturday afternoon in May 1966, the presidents and treasurers of the then-28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States—by statute, all Jesuits—met at the request of Rev. Paul Reinert, S.J., then president of both Saint Louis University and the Jesuit Educational Association, which was a precursor to the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). This group encompassed the entire educational apostolate of the U.S. Jesuits, including its then-52 high schools. Together with Rev. James O’Connor, S.J., professor of canon law at Bellarmine College of Theology of Loyola University Chicago, Fr. Reinert led a series of sessions on the feasibility of handing over the governance of Jesuit colleges and universities, which had historically been overseen by Jesuits alone, to boards that included a combination of Jesuit and lay trustees. Such a transition, they explained, would involve a legal process known as “separate incorporation,” which effectively separated the institution from its sponsoring community (the Society of Jesus) to prepare the way for an independent board of trustees to take charge.

Why would the Jesuits have been interested in handing over control of the institutions that they had toiled to build and maintain? What drove them to pursue such a conversation and adopt such a strategy?
The Backstory: From Humble Beginnings to Complex Institutions
From the founding of each institution, beginning with Georgetown College in 1789 (now Georgetown University) and continuing to Wheeling College in 1954 (now Wheeling University, and no longer Jesuit), the Society’s schools were initially built by a small community of 5-10 Jesuit priests, brothers and Scholastics. These missionaries were assigned the task by their Jesuit Provincial, with little money and few other resources. They were expected to make their way into the civic community and find (really, beg for!) resources from generous, civic-minded leaders who embraced the cause of opening a school to train their sons. These fledgling institutions were modest, typically one or two rooms with extra space for faculty. For decades, they managed to enroll small classes, frequently under a hundred young men who often dropped out to take up the work of their fathers. Shortly after each school was established, the Jesuit superior (who served as both rector and president at the institution) sought to have it legally incorporated by state charter. Founded “for the education of young men” and “open to all regardless of religion,” these institutions were entrusted to a governing board consisting of the rector-president and four or five “Jesuit consultors,” all appointed by the Provincial. As “apostolic (Church) works of the Society of Jesus,” these institutions were governed by the Society’s rules for how to manage apostolic assets, rules that touched on matters of finances, community governance, the academic curriculum, and even the daily schedule. Jesuit rules for conducting a school closely aligned with the Church’s canon law.
Trustee History (continued)

While each of the Jesuit colleges and universities that exist today has its unique history and growth trajectory, they commonly evolved from an initial high school program. An undergraduate curriculum that emphasized higher learning in the liberal sciences was added as graduates of the high schools desired further studies. Gradually, professional programs were acquired as those professions sought to be legitimized by attachment to a university. Many, if not most, Jesuit professional schools began outside the university and later petitioned to join with a larger and mission-aligned institution. It should be noted that the impetus for these schools came from the common rejection of both Catholics and Jews at institutions founded by Protestant Churches. (This history is thoroughly documented in Michael T. Rizzi’s new book, Jesuit Colleges and Universities in the United States: A History.)

Foundations of Lay Collaboration: Sharing the Responsibilities of Teaching and Administration

As many of these schools grew into universities, the Jesuit leadership adjusted and expanded the team of administrators, faculty, and staff to include lay colleagues. For instance, admitting women to the student body meant adding deans and directors entrusted with their care. Since there were rarely enough Jesuits to fill key posts, lay colleagues joined the “upper and lower administration,” bringing talent in finances and budgeting, legal affairs, student life, and in many other areas, just as they had in teaching. Nevertheless, the Jesuit administration tried to maintain at least the appearance of control and oversight. For example, since professional schools required leadership by a member of the profession, i.e., a nursing school led by a dean who was a nurse, the administration would often assign a Jesuit “regent” to assist the dean in managing and representing the school in the central administration.

Assisting the Jesuit leadership were often councils of civic leaders and business professionals who came together at the request of “Father President” to advise on economic matters and to help identify resources in the community that could be tapped to aid the ever-expanding institution. Still, governance of the schools remained in Jesuit hands from their founding until the 1960s even as Jesuit administrators worked diligently to adjust their “European” approach to education to the newer American approach.
A Rising Tide: Catholic and Jesuit Higher Education in 20th-Century America

Throughout the first half of the 20th century, the reputation of colleges and universities in the U.S. grew as Americans looked to higher education for advancing the "American project": expanding opportunity for the middle class and propelling immigrants into the mainstream. Jesuit institutions played an important role in providing this opportunity for access to the professional classes, especially during the years between World War I and World War II. Their assistance became even more significant once the GI Bill, which provided financial support for returning soldiers seeking higher education, flooded colleges with new recruits after 1945. Outside of several high-quality institutions in Europe, higher education in the U.S. became recognized as the "best educational system for undergraduate and graduate education in the world."

The developing "power" of the American higher education enterprise had a considerable impact on Catholic educators of the era. Bigger, better, and more competitive academic programs grew among the array of Catholic institutions, whose leaders naturally sought to make them as attractive as possible in order to reap the benefits of the nation's postwar investment in higher education. From among the then-300 Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S., the postwar era saw several emerge as "major players" in U.S. higher education. Their presidents, both men and women, began urging for them to be recognized as the important institutions that they were.

"Men and Women for and with Others"

Achieving this "national status" would involve moving out from the shadows of the parochial communities in which the institutions had been embedded.
Trustee History (continued)

Achieving this would require demonstrating their capacity for significant scholarship in critical fields of science and technology, as well as their importance to those cities where they were located. Beyond a more concerted post-WWII effort to hire the “best” faculty with the most prestigious qualifications, Catholic and Jesuit institutions found themselves having to contend with intensified social strife, including riots that laid bare the great social, racial and economic inequalities of the age. Many Catholic and Jesuit universities, located in cities, committed to remain there precisely to be a force for healing and renewal into the future. In this respect, Catholic and Jesuit institutions shared in a larger resurgence of the commitment to values-based education in the 1960s.

By the 1970s, then-Jesuit Superior General, Rev. Pedro Arrupe, S.J., provided a vital source of inspiration and renewed commitment by articulating a vision of Jesuit education whose chief purpose was the preparation of “men and women for and with others.” In doing so, he offered a new rationale for why Jesuit institutions needed to turn their attention to the wider needs of the communities in which they were built. Amid the enormous changes in the country after WWII (and their impact on American higher education), many Jesuit presidents thus prodded Catholic universities in the 1960s and 1970s to become agents of “social progress” and valued assets to their cities and to the world. They also continued their work to attract first-rate faculty, cultivate generous donors, build state-of-the art research facilities, and recruit talented students.

In short, Catholic institutions set out to modernize themselves in ways that would allow them to be seen for the civic community asset that they were and needed to be. This included developing a new governance model to sustain and advance this agenda.

New Leadership for a New Era: The Logic and Implementation of “Separate Incorporation”

Two important features of the emerging new governance model involved removing the perception that Jesuit institutions were controlled by religious authorities and incorporating the insights and expertise of civic and business leaders in developing institutional strategies.
Further, two years after his meeting with the Jesuit treasurers and presidents, Fr. Reinert explained to a group of 250 Jesuit and lay administrators that modernizing the governance structures at both the board level and through incorporation of faculty participation would, in fact, be critical to this re-invigoration of mission and purpose. Private institutions like Yale and Harvard (which were founded by religious authorities a century or more earlier), had already begun to experiment with the incorporation of others outside the founding group's authority. Between 1969 and 1978, all 28 U.S. Jesuit institutions petitioned Jesuit leaders in Rome to change their governance structure to put major decisions in the hands of lay-dominated boards of trustees. Fr. Arrupe decided that each institution would have to come to this decision on their own terms. Instead of imposing a model for the new boards, Frs. Reinert and Hesburgh believed that the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, founded in 1921, could be a significant resource for Catholic institutions by showcasing examples of best practices in the governance of private institutions of higher learning, including the construction of bylaws, selection of members, and managing relationships and differences between policy and organizational operations.

For Jesuit institutions, the challenge would be retaining ties with the Church. The blueprint for doing so had just been released by a group called together by the University of Notre Dame's then-president, Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., with support from Fr. Reinert. The “Land O'Lakes Statement” (issued in 1967) outlined the role of theology as central to Catholic higher education’s academic vision, underscoring the necessity of academic freedom for faculty, as well as their participation in governing the internal affairs of the institution. Its central message: academic freedom is not incompatible with allegiance to the Catholic Church’s teachings. A secondary message: modernizing Catholic colleges and universities also required a change in governance and an end to the appearance (and even the reality) of Church control.

In those early days, there was some wrangling over the number of Jesuits required on boards. But the presidents, now no longer rectors of their Jesuit communities and thus with more time to devote to matters of administration, cultivated new trustees for their time, their wisdom, and their treasure. Following the way of proceeding established by the board at Saint Louis University, board meetings were often held over two or three days. Faculty and student groups made presentations, and trustees got to know the Jesuit community. Mutual suspicions dissolved. And, one has to believe that,
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despite the mounting tensions of the late '60s and early '70s, a community of shared concern for the health and vitality of the institution developed.

The Board’s Function: From Supporting “Father President” to Serving the Common Good

Those early boards, however, worked for the “Jesuits” and especially for “Father President.” The list of challenges facing Catholic and Jesuit institutions were of two kinds—secular and religious. When it came to religious matters, boards typically had little to say. Trustees with special knowledge and expertise in finances, investment, real estate, budgeting, human resources, corporate governance, etc., were happy to share their wisdom and were intrigued by the social and political issues raised by faculty and students.

Academic matters, especially policies governing faculty life and student life, were brought to the board, but deference to what the academic administration felt was best was a sure outcome of such discussions. Debating a potential financial investment or property acquisition was a more comfortable activity than how to deal with the faculty senate’s latest request or approving the contours of a core curriculum reform. The Jesuits—well, the administration under Father’s leadership—were assumed to know best.

One of the most important and difficult decisions of a board (and this is true for nearly any kind of board) is hiring a chief executive. Even more anxiety-provoking is deciding whether to retain a controversial president. Experience with recruitment and retention, and even removal of a president, is what one might call a “growth opportunity” for boards. Tough decisions like this force an end to complacency, rarely end without some hard feelings, and nearly always raise critical and existential questions, like purpose and commitment to the mission and future of the institution.

[Image of Gonzaga University]
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Early on—certainly within the first 25 years of the introduction of lay boards—trustees looked to the Jesuit Provincial to help “rescue” the organization from failing leadership. But over the past two decades, boards with a crisis in a presidency found that the Provincial was unwilling to take responsibility for “changing horses.”

More than any other factor, the dearth of Jesuit leaders to pick up the baton, and the necessity of replacing presidents, both lay and Jesuit, has helped usher in a new era of board leadership: an era in which boards have felt increasingly comfortable with making consequential decisions on their own authority.

Consequently, today’s boards are much more aware of their oversight function. For most of this period of lay board leadership, the board has been well-aware of its fiduciary responsibilities: oversight of the financial management of the institution and its assets; risk management; faculty and staff policies that are both fair and equitable; strategic planning; and town-gown relationships. To varying degrees, most are aware of the obligation to understand and promote the mission of the institution. Boards hold in trust both the civic responsibilities that all educational institutions bear for the wider public, but also the integration and direction of the Jesuit mission.

As Jesuit and Catholic institutions, this mission to serve the common good though the promotion of faith and justice as its core responsibility is increasingly understood as perhaps the chief responsibility of a board member. The Jesuit mission allows for and even encourages all persons of good will to share this mission. But the mission also asks that trustees share in the commitment to the institution’s spiritual aims: to advance knowledge to build a more just and humane world for all, especially the least fortunate among us. One’s specific religious beliefs are of less consequence than a shared commitment to such an endeavor. Today, trustees carry these responsibilities along with their Jesuit and other religious partners on the board. There is no parsing or petitioning of the responsibilities for the health and vitality of the mission.

Today’s Trustee: Helping Students Meet the World’s Critical Needs and Challenges

No one could have imagined in those early years of lay governance that today’s Jesuit institutions are led by lay men and woman in all areas, from its board to its staff, nor that the number of Jesuits intimately involved in the institution has dwindled so drastically. Chief mission officers (CMOs) now assist presidents in incorporating mission sensitivities and advancing the mission into all aspects of their institutions.
The Mission Priority Examen (MPE) now offers an opportunity for each institution to review its efforts and challenges and to re-imagine, if necessary, and reinforce, when appropriate, how the Catholic and Jesuit mission will be “lived out” in the daily life of the institution.

Fifty years ago, no one could have imagined the challenges facing American higher education today, not the least of which is a growing frustration among the American public with the rising cost of higher education. Some even openly question the value and worth of a college degree. This rhetoric may “fly in the face of the facts,” but it forms a powerful underlying current in the national debate over support for higher education.

However, much like the situation 50 years ago, higher education is still a battleground for many of our most challenging social and political problems. The role of affirmative action in admissions, for instance, is but one aspect of our broader national struggle over access and affordability. The debate over free speech and tolerance of diverse opinions continues to haunt our public airwaves and our classrooms.

These were issues in the heady days of the anti-Vietnam War and Civil Rights movements that (not for the last time) changed the nature of higher education.

Just as it did decades ago, the role of the board, its size, its composition, its presence in the life of the institution and relationships to its many constituencies—students, faculty, administration, staff, alumni, the local bishop, the Jesuits, the civic community—will continue to occupy the energy and imagination of trustees. And, as we tackle today’s many challenges—right-sizing the faculty, monitoring diversity, equity and inclusion goals, creating pathways for economically disadvantaged students, paying just wages, updating our curriculum and program offerings, balancing the budget, serving our Church faithfully, being true to our Jesuit mission—trustees might ask themselves how they can best fulfill their central responsibility: helping to form men and women whose unique talents and deep passions will be focused on the world’s critical challenges and needs.

Rev. Michael J. Garanzini, S.J., is president of AJCU. He previously served as the president of Loyola University Chicago, as well as Secretary for Higher Education for the Society of Jesus and Chair of the International Association of Jesuit Universities.
MISSION VS. MONEY: IS IT REALLY AN “EITHER OR”?

What roles should mission and market play in making financial decisions at a Jesuit institution? What do campus communities need to know about topics like tuition rates and endowments? How should college and university leaders approach conversations about institutional agility in a period of financial instability for higher education?

In June 2023, a group of leaders in Jesuit higher education explored these questions together. Rev. Matthew Carnes, S.J. is an associate professor in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a trustee of Santa Clara University and Creighton University. Dorothy A. Hauver is senior vice president for administration and finance at the College of the Holy Cross. Natasha Holiday is a managing director at RBC Capital Markets and is a trustee and alumna of Xavier University. Alan Miciak is president of John Carroll University.

Carnes: I find that many people think about finances only when a tuition increase or a salary change is announced. But each of you thinks about finances daily, so I want to start by surfacing your principles and processes, and how you balance what I’ll call “mission analysis” and “market analysis” in financing your schools. Jesuits like to talk about discernment: trying to choose the best for the current moment, choosing from a number of good things (hopefully), not between good and bad. In your discernment process, I wonder if you have any particular principles you employ.

Miciak: I start with this: Never compromise on values and mission. And when I talk about values and mission, the two most important things are first, serving students, and second, serving the long-term health and prosperity of the institution. I think if everyone is aligned on keeping students first, we serve the mission by generating a personal, formative, academic experience so they might go out into the world. Of course, there is no end to the immediate needs in the world and in the needs of communities around our institutions. But our mission really is focused, first and foremost, on the students and their development.

Hauver: Balancing mission and the market is difficult because we operate within financial realities we can’t change. Holy Cross has been educating people for 180 years, and we’d like to continue for 180 more. To do this, a key part of our financial balancing act is to make serving the long-term health and prosperity of the institution a core principle.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

Getting down to the practical reality, we have to understand and analyze market risks and trends. At our best, we’re using market analysis to support our mission-driven institutions into the future. One important thing I think about when making financial decisions is supporting and retaining a best-in-class workforce. We need the top of the line in faculty, student affairs, IT, facilities, athletics, and beyond. In this vein, we’ve responded to changing market needs and desires by creating new wellness benefits around mental health and family support, professional development and mentoring — thinking about the totality of compensation. And we’ve been getting really strong feedback and support for these things.

**Holiday:** As a trustee and finance committee member for the past 13 years, I think the place to start is recognizing that good financial stewardship is a core tenet of good governance, and is what enables institutions to fulfill their mission. I really do believe that institutional values should be centered in financial decisions and other decisions, too. I also believe that what you invest in reflects what you care about — particularly when you’ve got a more strained fiscal situation, which a lot of universities, Jesuit and non-Jesuit, are facing today. But I also want to highlight the importance of Ignatian values in trustees’ work.

We’ve been able to help support and center Xavier’s board around Ignatian values, for example, by anchoring every committee meeting with shared prayer to start off right. We also have a reflection period about our work and our commitment to mission and, more recently, we added reflection on our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our decision-making. So we’re asking together: Given our limited financial resources, how do our decisions impact various constituencies that are part of the University’s fabric? How do our financial decisions impact the most vulnerable people in our communities? What are the investments that cannot wait? What are the things we need to change?

**Carnes:** I appreciate what you focus on first at your committee meetings — prayer and core values — as preparation for your work.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

It sounds like that could be considered a “best practice”: foregrounding mission in everyone’s minds as they make financial decisions. Natasha, do you think your board work at this Jesuit institution is different from other boards you’ve served on?

**Holiday:** Yes, these practices anchor our ability to serve and make good decisions in a way that’s very different from other boards I’ve served on. Every board — whether it’s a corporate, nonprofit, or university board — is there to support an institutional mission. But the difference with a Jesuit approach comes in using the specific tools that allow us to come together and focus on the best outcome for our specific Jesuit mission.

**Miciak:** Speaking of practices that center mission, I would just highlight that trustees and administrators need practices that align them not only on what we do and why we do it, but also on how we are going to go about doing it. I think that’s a critical piece when it comes to stewardship and good governance.

During my time, I’ve experienced good alignment with trustees around balancing mission analysis and market analysis. But I know that other leaders haven’t always experienced that alignment. It has to be there, though.

Otherwise, there can be some disruptive forces in play that are detrimental both to mission and to our competitiveness in the marketplace.

**Carnes:** In my experience as a trustee, I’ve come to recognize that appropriate onboarding and formation is necessary — and that’s true at every level, from faculty to administrators. We want to make sure that people can come into the community, learn its values, and contribute to advancing those values because they feel like they own them. So, turning to the present moment, institutions face some great opportunities, but also some economic tensions, or potentially even economic crises. What do you see as key financial challenges and variables at work today?

**Hauver:** For many of us, the challenges of access, affordability, and setting tuition rates are constant. And that’s because, at Jesuit institutions, we take accessibility and affordability seriously as part of our mission. At Holy Cross, as at many of our institutions, we are tuition-dependent. As costs rise, tuition rates need to rise. Still, for financial aid purposes, we meet 100 percent of students’ demonstrated need. We’re faced with the challenge of how to balance the budget while ensuring that students and families are able to pay tuition.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

Holiday: The first thing we have to do is acknowledge the overarching economic climate and remember that many institutions may not survive. So, we have to figure out a business model that works to allow them to operate for the next 100 years. As we do this, some of the biggest challenges include the pressures of maintaining or expanding enrollment, combined with the pressure to lower tuition. And there’s the fact that we’re not just competing against other private institutions, but also against public ones that are seeing significant enrollment gains because families and students are making a choice about affordability and “value proposition.”

A big part of this conversation is about that value proposition. We need to be really clear not just about communicating our mission, but also communicating that value proposition. We are creating people of high integrity: thoughtful and discerning people. But we’ve got to ensure that these people have pipelines for employability and that we’re strengthening our alumni networks to help with that. Doing these things allows our value proposition to address what people are looking for today.

Miciak: I’d also add another challenge we all face: In this market, you have to be premium at everything you do — academics, residence life, athletics, campus facilities.

And so you have to find ways to finance it all. But beyond that, it’s difficult for organizations that have been around for 100 years or more to come to grips with the challenges they face. So, it’s important that we inform our campus communities about our financial challenges and that everyone understands that the future does not look like the past.

When we really consider the financial realities — the challenges of access and affordability, of pricing competition, of competition around our value proposition, of the fact that we’re in a shrinking demographic market — that different future becomes clear. And I agree, both internally and externally, we have to communicate that value proposition. I don’t think everyone sees how much it matters in this environment to communicate this.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

Of course, part of this work is sharing the good news that Jesuit education demonstrates tremendous outcomes. One thing we know is that people make the difference, and an engaged campus community, as our campuses tend to be, will outperform a disengaged campus every time.

Carnes: I want to ask about some of the variables you have at least some control over — the levers you can push or pull in financing your institutions. For example, salaries and benefits, tuition, endowment spending, capital investments, and philanthropy to finance parts of our institutional work. What would you want people to understand about these variables and how much you can engage them in financing your institutions?

Hauver: To begin, there’s not a complete understanding of how much of a lever the endowment actually is. As someone at an institution that has a $1B endowment, I can say we’re incredibly fortunate. But the reality of that endowment is that it is there in perpetuity to ensure intergenerational equity. Generations before us have spent at a reasonable rate to help sustain later generations, and we need an appropriate spending rate to meet current needs in a way that leaves a sustainable endowment for future needs. And so even though that’s the lever everybody tends to go to — “let’s just spend more of the endowment” — the reality is that it’s meant to be available in perpetuity.

Another thing that many don’t understand that well is how institutions manage the “discount rate” — the extent to which they discount tuition from the advertised price. We’ve had to put a cap on our discount rate, and though we had been “need-blind,” we couldn’t continue that in a sustainable way. We hold firmly to the Jesuit belief that education should be accessible to all who want to pursue a life of passion and service to others. Providing financial aid to students is part of our mission, so we pursue partnerships with foundations and specific fundraising to allow us to support as many needy students as possible. But people don’t always understand how strategic we have to be about the discount rate, and they sometimes see it as another lever that we can move more easily than we can in reality.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

Holiday: I also think it's important to understand the difference between restricted and unrestricted assets. At most institutions, endowment funds are restricted in some way, and so we can't just spend more without going back to each of the donors who, sometimes long ago, made agreements about how their money will be spent over time. Having said that, there is a need for institutions to increase unrestricted funds in their endowments, particularly in a rapidly changing economic environment where you need more institutional flexibility and adaptability. So, I think our institutions need to explain to their donor bases about partnerships and invite them into agreements that leave open the ability to have a later conversation about changes in the utilization of their funds.

Another point I want to make is that allocating money for tuition discounting is a social justice issue. Still, we have to balance that with the need to remain competitive with the highest achievers and performers. And so the challenge is how to balance the mission-based desire to address social inequities by supporting students who can't pay, while also having enough top performers at the institution. Studies show that students who grow up in two-parent households where parents have college degrees typically live in wealthier communities with better schools and perform better on standardized tests.

So, when we allocate dollars, we need to take the opportunity to help correct for societal disadvantage, and we also need to remain competitive institutions that attract the highest achievers and performers.

Miciak: I think we're also trying to recognize that what our institutions looked like historically will often be different from what they need to look like in the future. And when it comes to socioeconomic diversity, it's all in the execution. You set goals, act on them, and then measure effectiveness. You're trying to shape a class, and you have the ability to set parameters for how much financial aid you give, both merit and need-based.

But you allocate knowing that you want to shape that class. So, the questions are: What are the goals? Where do we allocate the money to support those goals? And all of this can be tricky because we are a nonprofit and not a charity. We have to work within that reality, even as we all want to make the gift of a Jesuit education available to people with greater financial need. I try to encourage people to think that they're spending their own money, not the institution's money. If they really want to know how to make a smart decision, I think this is a good place to start. This is ultimately a cultural thing: how to build a culture of making smart decisions knowing that we have limited financial resources.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

Finally, in a world where financing higher education is not getting easier, I want to highlight the importance of partnerships. In order to work our way through this, we’re going to have to be more efficient, to concentrate efforts, and to look for partners that align with our mission. At the same time, we have to realize that there’s no magic formula, no one solution.

**Carnes:** We’ve learned that there’s not a single solution to complex problems and that even a billion dollars doesn’t fix everything. But when you put students and the institutional workforce first, you’re thinking both about the community right now and that of the future. You want to make credible promises to each group — now and in the future — that can allow them to flourish. And so you don’t want to be irresponsible and make offers of financial aid that you ultimately can’t provide. Nor do you want to deprive a future generation of an education that you might be able to provide to a group now.

What I’m hearing is that, for the flourishing of the community, you may have to say, “I’m sorry I can’t do that because it would jeopardize someone else.” Or, “I could make a promise that I’ll give you this financial aid, but it might turn out that in year three, I can’t fulfill it.” It seems this is where the rubber hits the road in terms of communicating about institutional finances.

A final question: We all hear about new models for higher education — partnerships, for example, or even mergers. As you think about new models being proposed, where do you see them fitting into our Jesuit educational landscape?

**Holiday:** I think in considering partnerships, we’ve got to be very focused on “motivational alignment.” What are our motivations, and what are our partner’s motivations? Do we or do they want to partner because of dire financial straits? Is it a way out of a bad situation? Is it a revenue-driven partnership from one partner’s perspective? What blind spots might we each have? I think the key is in finding true motivational alignment. We spend a lot of time focused on “mission alignment” in thinking about partnerships, but we need to be focused on motivational alignment if we’re going to get better outcomes.

**Miciak:** I love this idea of motivational alignment and thinking about how these motivations can move toward something transformative in nature, even in terms of smaller successes with partners. I think there’s a lot of consolidation coming in higher education, but I think it’s consolidation driven by financial difficulties rather than motivational alignment. It’s good to remember the old adage that two wrongs don’t make a right: in the same way, two weaknesses do not make a strength.
Mission vs. Money (continued)

**Holiday:** It’s important to remember, too, that the projection is rarely as good as the reality, despite all the institutional energy invested in the partnership. Every Jesuit institution should be focusing on what in the partnership makes us special.

**Hauver:** I wonder if we can find ways that Jesuit institutions can strategically partner, where we can do some shared services that make significant operational improvements and savings at the local level. Can we distinguish between the things that make us distinctive that we need to do locally, and things that we all do, but that don’t add to our distinctiveness?

Part of what our institutions do right is emphasize how mission makes us unique and special. At the same time, this can cause us to think that we can’t possibly collaborate because we’re all so unique and special.

But if we were able to develop some shared services, maybe at the local level, we could then hire another faculty member or give out another scholarship. Think about supplies and procurement, for example. Maybe we could invite Jesuit institutions to work together in this area to save money and limit inefficiencies while also working with minority and diverse vendors.

And this may be a good example of where a motivational alignment and mission alignment match up and might help us: where a simple emphasis on mission alignment might cause our institutions to just go back to doing our own thing.

**Carnes:** What I like about this conversation is that it hasn’t been just highlighting all good things, but has allowed everyone to talk about financial challenges realistically. It suggests that when we talk about financing Jesuit higher education, we need to allow room for the various tensions in the conversation. Thank you for helping to model that for us.

This article originally appeared in the Fall 2023 issue of Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education, and is re-published here with permission from the National Seminar on Jesuit Higher Education.
PREVIEW: FALL 2023
AJCU TRUSTEE FORUM

By Rev. Michael J. Graham, S.J.,
Senior Advisor for Formation Programs, AJCU

AJCU is pleased to announce that it will convene the next Trustee Forum at Loyola University Chicago from Friday, Oct. 13 through Sunday, Oct. 15, 2023. This Forum will build upon the successes of previous iterations, and has been adapted based on what we have learned along the way.

As before, our emphasis will be on the multiple ways in which the underlying Jesuit and Catholic mission touches all aspects of our schools’ identities, shapes the work of trustees in important ways, and contributes to the growth and perspectives of the trustees themselves. Our time together will balance input on key issues from noted speakers, with time to consider implications for governance. Highlights will include:

- The relationship between mission / identity and diversity / equity / inclusion, and how both are essential for building vibrant and authentic Jesuit schools in today’s world.

  Relationships between AJCU schools and the Jesuit Provinces within which they are located will be a particular point of discussion, as well as the Mission Priority Examen (MPE), and AJCU schools within the context of larger national and international Jesuit higher education organizations. Provincial Assistants for Higher Education from the Jesuits West and Midwest Provinces will join us for a conversation on the MPE.

- How the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and Catholic Social Thought shape and influence curricular issues fundamental to Jesuit and Catholic higher ed.;

- Characteristics of our students today vs. previous generations; how student-life personnel shape programs to ensure the full development of students in line with Jesuit and Catholic values;
In this conversation, Loyola University Chicago’s President, Dr. Mark Reed, (formerly president of Saint Joseph’s University) will share his perspective as a president of two different AJCU institutions, located in two different Jesuit Provinces. This session will help orient trustees to specific work they will engage at their schools: not only the MPE, but initiatives under the general heading of the Universal Apostolic Preferences, which were affirmed by Pope Francis for the Society of Jesus after an extensive discernment process, and which guides all works of the universal Society through 2029.

Based upon feedback from previous participants, the weekend will provide ample time for both formal and informal conversation. Trustees who have attended the Forum in the past report that one of its most important features is the opportunity it provides for getting to know trustees at other institutions, comparing notes, and building a network.

Several specific conversations will take place regarding important issues faced by individual campuses, not only to surface these for discussion by the larger group, but also to explore how Jesuit principles of communal discernment might contribute to board conversations on these issues. Likewise, there will be time to get to know the other participants better through informal conversations.

Click here to view the schedule and list of speakers for the Forum. Further, you might enjoy hearing reflections from a variety of trustee participants who participated in the April Forum in a brief video available on YouTube. Looking ahead, the Spring 2024 AJCU Trustee Forum will be held on Friday, April 12 through Sunday, April 14 at Loyola University Chicago’s Water Tower Campus. This event will be open to all trustees, and is optional for presidents.

We look forward to welcoming you to Loyola University Chicago in October!

Rev. Michael J. Graham, S.J. serves as senior advisor for formation programs at AJCU. He previously served as president of Xavier University.
GETTING MORE FROM YOUR MPE: NEW TOOLS FOR TRUSTEES

By Stephanie Russell, Vice President for Mission Integration, AJCU

Beginnings
Nine years ago, the Society of Jesus in the United States, through collaboration with AJCU, launched the Mission Priority Examen (MPE). Encouraged by then-Jesuit Superior General Rev. Adolfo Nicolás, S.J., the MPE pilot was envisioned to have a dual purpose. First, it was to help the Society connect regularly with its higher education “apostolates” (i.e., ministries). The thoroughgoing process would build strong relationships between the Jesuit Provinces and the colleges and universities they sponsor; inform the decisions of Jesuit leaders regarding ongoing sponsorship; and enable the Jesuit Superior General to confirm in a public way the institution’s Catholic and Jesuit identity.

Second, the MPE was seen as a mechanism for Jesuit institutions to reflect deeply on their Jesuit and Catholic identity, setting explicit mission priorities for the future and building a stronger network among institutions. By listening to constituencies across campus, writing a self-study, and reflecting on the school’s mission priorities alongside peer visitors, each school would put building blocks in place to strengthen the mission of Jesuit higher education.

All of this was to take place not as an accreditation, but as an Ignatian Examen: a practice drawn from the heart of St. Ignatius of Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises. Like an individual Examen, the MPE is designed to be prayerful, reflective, dialogic, and
MPE (continued)

seeking the common good in the company of valued colleagues and Jesuit companions. A good Examen, whether individual or institutional, presupposes a level of spiritual freedom that allows us to be responsive to the call of God, insofar as we can discern it.

The Pilot Phase
The pilot spanned five years: overall, feedback on the experience was positive. Faculty and staff appreciated the time to talk across departments and divisions, and to think broadly about the direction of their schools. The very process of undertaking an MPE served to strengthen the understanding of and commitment to being Jesuit and Catholic universities. For some colleagues, the MPE constituted an introduction to Jesuit higher education nationally and to the role of the Jesuits and Jesuit community in their school. Even veterans, however, expressed gratitude for the opportunity to refresh their college or university mission commitments.

Unsurprisingly, the pilot phase also shed light on areas for improvement. Among them was the need to better include those trustees who felt peripheral to the MPE. A new emphasis was placed on soliciting board input on the school’s mission strengths and weaknesses; tracking progress on the MPE at board and committee meetings; approving the self-study for submission to the Society of Jesus and AJCU; assuring that the school’s mission priorities are integrated into academic and operational decision-making; and communicating the institution’s mission priorities to external audiences. Recommendations from the current Jesuit Superior General, Rev. Arturo Sosa, S.J., focused on increasing student and Jesuit community involvement and better connecting the MPE to the Society’s newly discerned Universal Apostolic Preferences (i.e., common directions for all Jesuit ministries over the next decade).
MPE (continued)

In response, a Joint Commission of the Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States was tasked with monitoring the progress of the MPE and exploring other collaborations between Provinces and colleges and universities. As a result of their work, the central document for the MPE process was revised and expanded. Now titled *Characteristics of Jesuit Higher Education: A Guide for Mission Reflection*, this booklet was approved by the Provincials and Presidents as the agreed-upon reference point for conducting the MPE. The *Characteristics* document examines Jesuit colleges and universities through seven lenses:

1. Leadership and Public Commitment to the Mission;
2. The Academic Life;
3. The Pursuit of Faith, Justice, and Reconciliation;
4. Promoting an Ignatian Campus Culture;
5. Service to the Church;
6. Relationship to the Society of Jesus; and
7. Institutional Integrity.

The Current Round

The MPE is now a permanent, if evolving, process for the Society; we are currently in Year 3 of a seven-year rotation. St. John’s College in Belize participates as a member institution and our associate member in Canada, Campion College at the University of Regina, is undertaking a modified MPE, as well. Jesuit universities in other parts of the world are free to use MPE resources for setting their own mission priorities in ways that are culturally relevant.

A Tool for Trustees

Every board member holds in trust the mission — fiduciary, academic, religious, and social — of our colleges and universities, and the MPE has become a go-to resource for governance that far exceeds its use as a measure of mission authenticity every seven years. Like a “mission dashboard,” it has effectively established a set of guideposts and a common language for boards to address mission integration and exercise effective governance.

Strengthening Trustee Recruitment & Onboarding

When trustees are recruited to a board, they are typically provided with a packet of materials to familiarize them with the mission statement and work of the university. This, along with their in-person orientation, is essential for those new to the institution, but also for alumni whose reference point is that of a bygone era. Providing trustee candidates and new trustees with your self-study offers a comprehensive window into your school’s mission priorities today and how you are acting upon them.
MPE (continued)

Strengthening the Mission Dimension of Board Committees
Board committees sometimes struggle to find logical links between their work and the overall mission of the institution, especially in a Catholic, Jesuit cadence. What exactly does our mission mean for the work of Academic and Student Affairs? Finance? Buildings and Grounds? The Characteristics document and your self-study can serve as launchpads for committees to draft their own goals, processes, and mission-specific questions that will support the mission priorities that the school and Society have endorsed. This also mitigates against the temptation among trustees to delegate all things “mission” to the Mission Committee of the board.

Helping Boards Grow as Discerning Bodies
Ideally, the MPE normalizes and fosters a “way of proceeding” for mission-driven, institutional decision-making. Rather than being a mere checklist of expectations and responses, the best MPE processes dig deeply into core questions that can be explored and responded to over the next seven years. A successful MPE will also set the table for how the board does its regular business in the discerning tradition of the Society of Jesus. Done consistently and honestly, the Examen is an essential building block for discernment.

Boards can use the MPE as a discussion-starter for how they think, pray, and deliberate together as a group of discerning leaders.

Designing Board Retreats
Most of us have experienced board retreats that are nothing more than offsite meetings with a few extraneous bells and whistles. The board does its usual business with an added keynote speaker or a video, but deep board engagement is elusive. The MPE is, by nature, an interactive process. Schools that have completed it spend the next seven years exploring how to implement it in lasting ways.

Using the Characteristics document and mission priorities as a starting point, boards can develop “Mission KPIs (key performance indicators),” establish quantitative and qualitative assessment criteria, and benchmark the school’s progress in living out its Jesuit, Catholic mission. Doing so engages trustees deeply in the work of mission governance, which can no longer be ceded only to the Jesuits on the board. It can be a revelation to some trustees that they now carry the torch of their school’s mission in ways they had perhaps not imagined. What better setting than a board retreat for discussing the new normal of mission co-responsibility?
Assessing the President
As any good guidebook for trustees will say, the most important work of the board is in hiring and overseeing the president. Supporting the president relies on the board’s clear-eyed view of presidential performance in team-building, academic administration, enrollment and financial management, fundraising, community and civic relations, crisis response, and a host of other areas.

But how are boards to assess the performance of the president as a mission leader, especially since the institution’s mission intersects with so many other areas? The complex times in which we find ourselves (e.g., a turnover of half of all AJCU presidents in the last three years) require boards to identify evidence of good mission leadership. The Characteristics document can help trustees look at performance from multiple perspectives without getting overwhelmed by the breadth of mission leadership.

Conclusion
The Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius is a text of contradictions: on one hand filled with rules for discernment and detailed advice for the retreatant, and yet tempered by adaptation and prioritizing whatever would bring a person closer to the heart of God. The Mission Priority Examen seeks to echo, in its own way, that spirit. Through it, we are invited to a process that can guide our schools’ mission choices far into the future. We have only scratched the surface of what taking the MPE seriously and adapting it to new forms might mean for how we serve as boards, faculty, staff, and students. Our college and university communities will take their cues from the practices of boards, and thus trustees will lead the way.

Stephanie Russell, Ed.D. serves as AJCU’s vice president for mission integration. She previously served as vice president for mission and ministry at Marquette University, as well as Provincial Assistant for Lay Formation and Social Ministry for the former Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus.
NEW PRESIDENTS: LOYOLA NEW ORLEANS, REGIS & SAINT JOSEPH’S

Three new presidents are being inaugurated on Jesuit campuses this fall: Dr. Xavier Cole (Loyola University New Orleans), Dr. Salvador Aceves (Regis University) and Dr. Cheryl McConnell (Saint Joseph’s University). All are marking firsts at their institutions: Dr. Cole is Loyola’s first Black president; Dr. Aceves is Regis’ first lay and first Latino president; and Dr. McConnell is the first woman to lead Saint Joseph’s.

Visit sju.edu and regis.edu for highlights from the respective Saint Joseph’s and Regis inaugurations held in September (Loyola New Orleans will host its inauguration on November 10; visit loyno.edu to learn more). We congratulate all of our new presidents and wish them many fruitful years leading our schools into the future!

Below left: Dr. Xavier Cole; Above right: Dr. Cheryl McConnell; Below right: Dr. Salvador Aceves
We welcome your feedback!
Please share your thoughts and suggestions for future issues of In Trust by writing to info@ajcunet.edu.

All photos featured in In Trust are courtesy of Jesuit colleges and universities.