

SYNERGIA

1. The interaction of two or more forces so that their combined effect is greater than the sum of their individual effects.

Vol. 25, No. 2

Nov./Dec. 2006

Summer Seminar: Faculty Reflect on Academic Freedom and the Catholic University

[These four excerpts are from essays produced after the Faculty Development summer seminar on Academic Freedom and the Catholic University. If you would like the complete essay of any contributor, please contact Faculty Development (pmnice@stthomas.edu) and we will send it to you. A compilation of all the essays will be made available at a later date—Ed.]



Silence As A Pedagogical Stance

by Corrine L. Carvalho
(Theology, and Director,
Luann Dummer Center
for Women)

I have heard colleagues in the humanities suggest that silence is a viable and ethical pedagogical technique. My impression is that for some of them, causing “scandal” by presenting reasoned arguments for an idea that the student(s) should not hold is the worst offense a teacher can make.¹ Within this approach to teaching, the only viable way a position contrary to the “Catholic view” can be presented in class is if it is presented as wrong. With respect to our topic, students learn that life begins at conception, that the life is morally innocent, and that its right to life trumps any other moral contingency. All other ways of viewing any of

these elements are wrong.

This model of teaching views the education process as indoctrination, the very thing that conservatives like David Horowitz abhor.² As John Mill states, “All silencing of discussion...is an assumption of infallibility.”³ We should not “teach about” various positions, rather we need to take a stand and present it as the only viable option. Silencing is an important element in this model of teaching, because reasonable views to the contrary might potentially undermine the goal of teaching by introducing a paradigm of “teaching about.”⁴

On the other hand, to do a responsible job “teaching about” various views surrounding pro-choice and pro-life positions requires that contrary viewpoints be presented. In this model of teaching, the goal is the development of critical thinking skills, and the ethical goal is to produce reasoned human beings who can take full responsibility for the ethical choices

INSIDE ...

FACULTY REFLECT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

SILENCE AS A PEDAGOGICAL STANCE .1
by Corrine L. Carvalho

ACADEMIC FREEDOM?4
by Greg Coulter

THE CATHOLIC PROFESSOR: LIVING IN TWO KINGDOMS6
by Teresa Collett

AAUP GUIDELINES9
by David Landry

IDEAS FROM THE DIRECTOR11

FACULTY GRANTS OFFICE12

SERVICE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES13

FD GRANT DEADLINES13

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES AROUND FOR OUR STUDENTS14

BUSH GRANTS15

INTERCULTURAL WORKSHOPSBACK PAGE

Carvalho *cont.*

that they make. In order to develop critical thinking skills, the strengths and weaknesses of various positions need to be presented and weighed. We provide students with an opportunity to test theories in a kind of “lab” for ethical thought so that they can develop the habit of thinking ethically. In this model, silencing of positions directly impedes the goal of education.⁵

Janet Winston rightly points out the link between silence and academic freedom. In an article that describes her institution’s process to attain a grant for the “Difficult Dialogues” program funded by the Ford Foundation, she notes that the most common result of violations of academic freedom isn’t dismissal, but silencing. Their dialogue focused on issues of sexual orientation, and, although her institution supported the dialogue, it was unwilling to be public with its support by becoming the sponsoring agent. In addition, in conversations with administration the committee was advised to censor some of the material in their proposal. “We learned that the silences that occurred during these conversations, both what we were advised to omit from our proposal and what we ourselves were afraid to say, spoke more forcefully than the speech itself.”⁶

The mission statement of St. Thomas, as well as numerous public statements from Fr. Dease, including his convocation speech last month, tells us that indoctrination is not the prevailing model of education at St. Thomas. Our recently crafted convictions statement states, “We value intellectual inquiry as a life-long habit, the unfettered and impartial pursuit of truth in all its forms, the integration of knowledge across disciplines, and the imaginative and creative exploration of new ideas.” . . .

The question remains, then, is there a way to organize a panel on pro-choice

perspectives through the Luann Dummer Center for Women that would be part of the Catholic mission of the university? . . .

The Benefits of a Pro-Choice Voice on Campus

I want to push the envelope even further. Can a panel like this ever contain someone who, as a member of the Roman Catholic Church, objects to a Church teaching?⁷ The short answer is, we have done so in the past on other topics. I have heard Catholics on campus in public talks disagree with the Church’s teaching on homosexuality. I have heard views expressed that disagree with Pope John Paul II’s view of the Iraq war, the teaching on biblical interpretation in the document “The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church,” and the view that homosexual orientation is not in and of itself morally wrong.⁸ I think those who critique the Church’s position from a “liberal” perspective agree that the university has the right to demand that their position be presented as a dissenting view, and that students have available to them the official Church teaching.⁹ Within that parameter, however, I would argue that students (as well as faculty and staff) have much to learn by listening to those who dissent. . . .

I have learned a lot from dissenters. Usually I have not learned that I need to adopt their conclusions. However, I have learned immensely about my own conclusions by being in dialogue with them. I have learned to recognize and examine my own assumptions. I have learned where my argument is weak or underdeveloped. I have learned that some things I took as absolutes needed revision. For example, there has been a long discussion of when life begins throughout Christian history. Thomas



Aquinas defined it as the moment of quickening. Others have suggested that it is when there is a heartbeat or brain activity. I have come to realize that what I define as "life" is a statement of "ensoulment," i.e. when a divinely created soul is present in a physical reality. That question is a faith statement, not a biological one. It presumes the existence of a soul, and a God who creates individuals. In that sense, then, my definition of "life" is not the result of reason, but faith.

Although this self-realization has been important, even more significantly I have learned from those with a pro-choice perspective how the stances I take impact other people. The pro-choice advocates that I have read have forced me to take seriously women's experience in the discussions of crisis pregnancies. Why do women get abortions? Yes, it is true that some people have been irresponsible about their own procreative potential, and,

yes, there are people who are more casual about sexual intercourse than I believe they should be. But everyone agrees that not all abortions are the result of casual and irresponsible female sexual behavior. Rape, incest, and abandonment are everyday realities. Poverty for women and children is a pervasive social phenomenon.

What happens to a pro-life stance when we take seriously the question of why women seek abortions? It has led me to recognize the culture of sexual violence that is a perennial reality for women all over the world.

(to be continued . . .)

Carvalho *cont.*

"Even more significantly I have learned from those with a pro-choice perspective how the stances I take impact other people. The pro-choice advocates that I have read have forced me to take seriously women's experience in the discussions of crisis pregnancies."

Synergia is published by
 The Center for Faculty Development
 University of St. Thomas
 Pamela Nice, Editor

Rob Riley, Director
 Pamela Nice, Associate Director
 Nancy Hartung, New Faculty Liaison
 Patricia Alexander, Administrative Assistant
 Sara Abdelaal, Student Assistant

Rob Riley: 962-5687
 Pamela Nice: 962-6020
 Nancy Hartung: 962-5226
 Pat Alexander: 962-6022

The lobby area and resource room of the Center will be open from 8 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. M-F. Please stop by!

Carvalho *cont.*

¹ I leave aside the question whether a faculty member's personal life (such as living in a committed relationship with a same sex partner, marrying a second time after a divorce, etc.) should also not "cause scandal."

² There have been numerous discussions of David Horowitz and the subsequent "Academic Bill of Rights" in publications such as *Academe* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. He avers that conservative views are silenced in today's liberal universities and calls for a quota of Republicans and Democrats on university faculties. His viewpoint presumes that faculty only teach what they are, that they violate students' rights to think for themselves, thus leading to a liberal indoctrination. On this campus I have been told by self-identifying conservatives (and here they usually mean religiously conservative) that this viewpoint is being silenced at St. Thomas. However, these same persons publicly defend their right to teach only a Catholic view on a topic, or to teach all other views as wrong. I am asserting that both attitudes stem from a singular pedagogy that is projected on all other classrooms.

³ Quoted in Storm Bailey's article, "Uneasy Partners? Religions and Academics" *Academe*, 2001, accessed from the AAUP website, 9/21/2006.

⁴ It would be interesting to investigate whether this view toward teaching violates students' academic freedom. See the article, "Academic Freedom for Students Has Ancient Roots," by Gary Pavela, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 27, 2005.

⁵ The letter that we received from the administration confused these two pedagogical paradigms. They stated that our panel would "advocate" for a pro-choice position. Similarly, many people assume that whatever we teach about in a Theology class is being advocated or promoted. Having taught Religion in a state university for 5 years, I know that there is a vast difference between "teaching about" and "advocating." Our context within a Catholic university makes these distinctions less clear to the public. Many a theology professor has had to spend the first class explaining to students that they will receive

an academic introduction to a given topic, not a catechism class.

⁶ "Difficult Silences," *Academe* July-August 2006, accessed from the AAUP website, 9/21/2006. Storm Bailey also notes that strong religious commitment often keeps scholars from pursuing their discipline. "To profess to *have* the truth (as religions do, after all) is, one might suppose, to offer grounds for not continuing to look for it, or to ask questions" ("Uneasy Partners? Religions and Academics" *Academe*, 2001, accessed from the AAUP website, 9/21/2006).

⁷ This is not the same as what I had proposed. I wanted a pro-life Catholic who would explain why a Catholic might choose to vote for a pro-choice candidate.

⁸ In few of these latter cases has there been someone "official" there whose job it was to point out that these were not the Church's position (although it usually came up in discussion).

⁹ See Michael Allen Mikolajczak's piece on the difference between having teaching available to students as opposed to having it taught to them in "Literature and Tolerance at the University of St. Thomas," *Academe* 2001, accessed from the AAUP website, 9/21/2006.



Academic Freedom?

by Greg Coulter
(Philosophy)

At the start of this faculty seminar, we were invited to explain our reason for participating. I said that I was concerned about infringements on academic freedom, *AF*, by my colleagues. Almost nothing I heard in the seminar alleviated those concerns. I discovered that there are significant confusions about *AF* and more disturbingly, there are powerful

prejudices regarding who or what it should protect.

Let me begin by offering some common points of reference with which to begin a dialogue with my colleagues. I take it that all would agree to the following.

1. *AF* is an important good.
2. Its importance is rooted in the fact that it is a basic good of the university—or at least is necessary to some basic good of the university.
3. One's role or "the voice with which one speaks," affects the weight and significance of one's words.

And possibly:

4. *AF* is under threat at universities—ours and others.

Many faculty want to affirm an incoherent view of *AF*, indeed some seem completely unaware of it. On the one hand, they think that if *AF* belongs anywhere, it belongs in higher education. *AF* is necessary to the life of a university because it is indispensable to its unique work. This is the "truth-seeking" view of *AF* which argues that since the search for truth is basic to a university and the only way to conduct that search is by allowing faculty to research, to question, to think and to express themselves in an unfettered climate of intellectual inquiry, it follows that *AF* is a necessary good of the university.

What follows from this "truth-seeking" defense? It means that *AF* properly belongs to faculty alone since they alone have the training and expertise to conduct this inquiry. It also means that *AF* applies only in the area of one's expertise. A professor has a right to publish and teach in her expertise because she is credentialed in that area. In other matters, for example religion, social policy or politics, where that same faculty member has no

special expertise, her opinions are no more deserving of special protection or accommodation than anyone else's—technically, *AF* does not apply.

Faculty resist these implications and object to the suggestion that *AF* does not permit expressions of views outside one's expertise. This fact was brought to light in vivid terms through our discussion of a hypothetical case. A professor at a Catholic university displayed a "pro-choice" button during her class. Should this expression be protected by *AF*? My colleagues leaned sharply in favor of the faculty member's right to display it, regardless of course subject.

When asked whether student complaints matter, one colleague replied that education sometimes makes students "uncomfortable." Others agreed about this "uncomfortable" aspect of learning. None of them seemed to notice the illogic of their response—education sometimes makes students uncomfortable, this display makes them uncomfortable, hence it must be educational.

Although accepting the "discomfort" of students, this same colleague, when asked whether she would accept advice from a department chair to reconsider displaying the button, said without hesitation, "Oh, I wouldn't be *comfortable* with that!" A moment later she declared, "I want to say whatever I want!"

One wonders whether she and others would say the same about a button exhibiting something offensive to people of other faiths—a cartoon depiction of Mohammed. Would the display of a button which read, "What Holocaust?" at a Jewish university be enough to justify limiting the faculty's *AF* rights? If yes, then why are Catholic students any less deserving of consideration?

Coulter *cont.*

Coulter *cont.*

My colleague's troubling, albeit candid, remarks point to a disregard for the rights of others not to be subjected to, and indeed forced to hear, the private opinions of teachers and colleagues. Faculty often see *AF* as a *carte blanche*, "free-expression" right protecting not only speech related to academic research or teaching but also their inexpert opinions on a broad range of topics, even on practical matters regarding the operation of the university. This "free expression" view of *AF* contradicts the "truth-seeking" view which requires expertise. Indeed, as students and employees clearly see, given the "free expression" view, there is no good reason to deny *AF* to those who have no *prima facie* expertise—students, regular employees such as librarians and program coordinators.

Which account of *AF* is correct? Is it a "truth seeking" right held only by experts equipped to conduct the search for truth in particular subject areas or is it a right to "free expression" on any topic requiring no expertise and thus deserved by everyone? It cannot be both.

Despite how extreme the "free expression" view of *AF* is, at least I understand it. "*AF* is really, really important, man."—Got it, loud and clear. And if this incoherent and imprudent view of *AF* were the only concern about Catholic higher education, it might not be so bad. But, there is something worse.

Although many faculty insist on a *carte blanche* right to *AF*, they are often the first to deny it to other faculty who use it to express opinions they find unacceptable. At UST there are numerous recent examples—faculty outcry after Ann Coulter's speech on campus, faculty complaints about the Catholic Studies program, including how and what is being taught, and criticisms of the administration and its

faculty supporters over the same sex travel policy, denouncing it as discriminatory and intolerant. You might see this behavior by some faculty as "inconsistent"—one could use other synonyms.

The trend of denying *AF* to unpopular faculty voices is not unique to UST. Let me provide just one recent case at Boston College.

(to be continued . . .)



The Catholic Professor: Living in Two Kingdoms

by Teresa Collett
(School of Law)

[Case Study from Summer Seminar]

Professor Anna Bates is the senior scholar of New Testament at St. Martin's University, where she has held tenure for a quarter century. In all respects her teaching and her scholarship have been exemplary – save for one recent and troubling development. Along with several Catholic colleagues at other universities across the country, she recently co-authored and signed a letter — addressed to the Pope — urging reconsideration of Vatican policy on the ordination of women. The letter was reprinted in the local daily newspaper and has been cited and discussed extensively on popular blogs and other electronic media. Although Profes-

sor Bates did not initiate any of the publicity, she made no effort to counteract it, nor did she disclaim responsibility for her role in the writing or sending of the letter. The president of the university has initiated dismissal charges against her for “cause” – specifically an act “inimical to the most basic values and interests of St. Martin’s University.” What should be the outcome?

At some time in their lives, every Catholic will be confronted with his or her contemporary version of the question, “Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar?”¹ If faithful to their baptismal calling, they will have to discern what duties are owed to Caesar and what are owed God. This discernment can be even more difficult if, like Professor Bates, the questions arise from an apparent conflict between the duties owed to those who represent some form of authority within the Church and an interior calling to appeal to pastoral authorities. Absent rightly formed consciences within all concerned, conflict seems almost inevitable.

Anna Bates is presented as an “exemplary” faculty member in terms of her teaching and scholarship. These characteristics are sufficient to warrant praise and appointment in a secular university, but the Code of Canon Law imposes additional requirements for faculty at Catholic universities. Canon 810 provides in relevant part, “It is the responsibility of the authority who is competent in accord with the statutes to provide for the appointment of teachers to Catholic universities who, besides their scientific and pedagogical suitability, are also outstanding in their integrity of doctrine and probity of life ...”² The facts give no basis for assessing Professor Bates “integrity of doctrine” or “probity of life,” yet her “integrity of

doctrine” should be of special concern in light of her duty to teach courses in sacred scripture.³ Her expertise in sacred scripture suggests she may have not only the right, but the duty “to manifest to the sacred Pastors [her] views on [related] matters which concern the good of the Church.”⁴ In voicing her views, Professor Bates has an obligation to exercise prudence⁵ and to “respect the integrity of faith and morals, show due reverence to the Pastors and take into account both the common good and the dignity of individuals.”⁶ It is her failure to exercise prudence and take into adequate account the common good that brings her into conflict with the university administration.

The Church teaching on the ordination of women is clear and definitive. It is found in the declaration by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “On the Admission of Women to the Priesthood,” *Inter Insigniores* (1977), and in the apostolic letter of Pope John Paul II, “On Reserving Priestly Ordination to Men Alone,” *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (1994). His Holiness wrote:

Although the teaching that priestly ordination is to be reserved to men alone has been preserved by the constant and universal Tradition of the Church and firmly taught by the Magisterium in its more recent documents, at the present time in some places it is nonetheless considered still open to debate, or the Church’s judgment that women are not to be admitted to ordination is considered to have a merely disciplinary force.

Wherefore, in order that all doubt may be removed regarding a matter of great importance, a matter which

Collett *cont.*

Collett *cont.*

pertains to the Church's divine constitution itself, in virtue of my ministry of confirming the brethren (cf. Lk 22:32) I declare that the Church has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women and that this judgment is to be definitively held by all the Church's faithful.⁷

The infallible nature of this teaching was subsequently noted by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in its response to an inquiry regarding the nature of the Church's teaching on this issue:

This teaching requires definitive assent, since, founded on the written Word of God, and from the beginning constantly preserved and applied in the Tradition of the Church, it has been set forth infallibly by the ordinary and universal Magisterium (cf. Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* 25, 2). Thus, in the present circumstances, the Roman Pontiff, exercising his proper office of confirming the brethren (cf. Lk 22:32), has handed on this same teaching by a formal declaration, explicitly stating what is to be held always, everywhere, and by all, as belonging to the deposit of the faith.⁸

While the magisterial authority of these pronouncements is the subject of limited debate, the majority of scholars have concluded that the question is now closed.⁹

(to be continued . . .)

¹ Matt. 22:17.

² CODE OF CANON LAW (1983), Canons 210. A copy of relevant provisions of the CODE OF CANON LAW are attached as an appendix to this essay. See also Pope John Paul II, "From the Heart of the Church," *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* Art. 4 §1 (1990) at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae_en.html.

³ I am assuming Professor Bates is a practicing Roman Catholic and therefore subject to canon law both as a member of the laity and as a faculty member at a Catholic university.

⁴ See CODE OF CANON LAW (1983), Canons 212(3) and 218.

⁵ CODE OF CANON LAW (1983), Canon 218.

⁶ CODE OF CANON LAW (1983), Canon 212(3).

⁷ Pope John Paul II "On Reserving Priestly Ordination to Men Alone," *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (1994) at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_22051994_ordinatio-sacerdotalis_en.html.

⁸ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Responsum ad dubium circa doctrinam in Epist. Ap. "Ordinatio Sacerdotalis" traditam* (Oct. 28, 1995) available at <http://www.wff.org/ResDub.html>. The Holy Father approved the response.

⁹ "Can Catholic theology treat the question as an open one? In view of the supreme teaching authority of the pope and the forcefulness of the present declaration, I would judge that theologians are no longer free to advocate opposed positions. While legitimate questions can be asked, Catholic theology cannot responsibly contradict the official teaching on this point." Avery Dulles, *Women's Ordination: Six Responses*, COMMONWEAL (July 15, 1994).





AAUP guidelines for Academic freedom

by David Landry
(Theology)

[On the same Anna Bates case study]

My answer to this final question is simple: Professor Bates should keep her job, the president of the university should apologize to her and to the university community for his appalling attempt to dismiss her, and the university's board of trustees should start looking for a new president. In what follows I will attempt to defend this answer based on the principles of academic freedom and their historical and proper relationship with religious colleges and universities in general, and with Catholic colleges and universities in particular. In doing so I will make two assumptions. One is that St. Martin's University—like the University of St. Thomas—is committed to the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The other is that—like St. Thomas—St. Martin's University does not impose any restrictions on the academic freedom of its faculty at the time of their appointment because of the religious or other aims of the institution.¹

The 1940 AAUP Statement makes it very clear that unless restrictions on academic freedom are stated in writing at the time of the faculty member's appointment, they shall enjoy full freedom "in research and in the publication of the results" and full freedom "in the classroom in discussing their subject." So long as it is related to her field and does not demonstrate

professional incompetence, Professor Bates cannot be punished for anything that she says in the classroom or for any statements in her writings or professional presentations. Now one might immediately notice that the letter co-written and signed by Professor Bates is not technically part of her research, nor is it something that came up in the classroom. It is an "extramural" activity: a letter, initially sent privately but ultimately becoming a public statement. Fortunately for Professor Bates and for the rest of us, the 1940 AAUP Statement also addresses this kind of extramural activity. What it says is this:

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

There is no indication in the facts of the case that Professor Bates indicated in any way that she was speaking for her institution—even if she had included her institutional affiliation along with her signature this cannot reasonably be seen to imply that she is speaking for her institution. There is no indication either that she wrote anything that was inaccurate or that she

Landry *cont.* did not show respect for the opinions of others. The letter simply “urged reconsideration” of the Catholic Church’s position on the ordination of women—this hardly seems disrespectful. Finally, one should note that the main clause here is that “when they [faculty] speak or write as citizens, they should be *free from institutional censorship or discipline*,” unless certain narrowly defined circumstances apply. In this case most of these circumstances obviously do not apply.

Whether she exercised appropriate restraint is perhaps an arguable point, and the AAUP Statement does provide for the possibility of institutional action against faculty members who are believed to have violated their obligations with respect to extramural utterances.

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher’s fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph 4 of the section on Academic Tenure.²

However, the Statement includes the following caveats about such institutional action:

In pressing such charges, the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens.

and,

The controlling principle is that a faculty member’s expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the

faculty member’s unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member’s fitness for the position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member’s entire record as a teacher and scholar.³

If one takes into account the case’s description of Professor Bates’s career—“In all respects her teaching and her scholarship have been exemplary”—then it would seem obvious that to fire her for a single extramural utterance would not be taking into account her entire record as a teacher and scholar and would be manifestly unjust. More importantly, though, I would submit that in no way does signing this letter indicate that Professor Bates is unfit for her position.

(to be continued . . .)

¹ In its 1970 Interpretive Comments on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the AAUP stated that the exception granted to religious institutions allowing them to restrict the academic freedom of their faculty was probably obsolete. “Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 *Statement*, and we do not now endorse such a departure.” However, the University of St. Thomas has endorsed the 1940 Statement without explicitly endorsing the 1970 Interpretive Comments.

² This paragraph actually comes from the 1970 Interpretive Comments issued by the AAUP rather than from the original 1940 Statement.

³ Both of these quotations also come from the 1970 Interpretive Comments.

IDEAS FROM THE DIRECTOR



by Rob Riley

This issue of Synergia continues the conversation that began with last year's April/May issue about academic freedom and the Catholic University. We have reprinted here excerpts from a few of the essays that faculty participants in our summer seminar on the same topic wrote for us (space limitations, of course, prevent us from printing excerpts from all the essays). It is our hope that this is a next step in an important ongoing conversation about academic freedom at St. Thomas, and how that is tied to our mission broadly defined.

What is perhaps clear from the selections here is that there is not a real consensus about the range of academic freedom (or limitations on it) at St. Thomas. This is partly due to the fact that this issue anywhere is not a settled one; it vexes all types of institutions, both private as well as public universities, secular and religiously-affiliated ones. One need only look at the intense debate that takes place on campuses and in legislatures when 9-11 conspiracy theorists publish or speak their views. It is also partly due to the fact that there is not a settled view of what the term "academic freedom" means and when it applies; indeed, we clearly grappled with this issue in the seminar ourselves.

As importantly, the particular nature of St. Thomas matters to our views of academic freedom as it is practiced here. This is not just an issue of our Catholic identity, but also – I think – of our institutional history and

broader mission. People of good will do not agree on the questions that arise as we deal with (typically) proposed limitations on our work as teachers, scholars, and members of the St. Thomas community as we teach, research and speak about particular topics. Ultimately, as many faculty members have already noted, saying that we are a Catholic university or a teaching university, end of story, is not enough. Rather, we must argue about the kind of Catholic university we want to be; we have to carefully discuss what it means to be a "teaching university" as well. After all, Catholic institutions of higher education range (in, say, what they effectively allow faculty to teach) from Ave Maria to Georgetown. In the same way, what we label "teaching universities or colleges" have a variety of institutional practices and incentives that lead to quite different classroom dynamics and expectations of teaching performance that can in less obvious ways constrain what faculty members say in the classroom or write on the printed page.

Often, the degree of academic freedom or the limits on the kind of teaching that we do in the classroom and what we say outside of it are not explicit but subtle, if not invisible. These are driven not just by the Administration but also by the views and demands of both our peers and our students. If, for example, we attract students who are fairly sheltered and who are not open to alternative points of view, we might be induced to avoid discussion of hot issues and topics; likewise, if we worry that we will not receive the approbation of our peers, we might be constrained in thinking out loud or making certain arguments. If

we worry that we will be reprimanded or threatened from above, we will more likely censor what we think and say.

It seems to me that the best way to identify the delimiters on academic freedom that we want is through frank and open conversation, rather than by waiting for "defining moments" that force us to deal with the issue in a crisis mode. That is the spirit of the last Faculty Development summer seminar and the recent issues of Synergia that have explored this area. By no means do we believe that we have offered clear-cut answers to vexing questions. On the contrary, as the seminar conversation and the excerpts printed here show, we still have work ahead of us in clarifying what type of institution we want to be.

✍

NEWS FROM THE FACULTY GRANTS OFFICE www.stthomas.edu/fgo 651-962-6038

Faculty and staff interested in applying to a state or federal agency should consult the Faculty Grants Office website for links to powerful search engines designed to help you find the most appropriate agency and program. Some programs of particular note include the following (see FGO website for links to these programs):

Sociology Program

National Science Foundation

Deadline: January 15, 2007

Economics Program

National Science Foundation

Deadline: January 18, 2007

Fellowships Program

National Endowment for the Humanities

Deadline: May 1, 2007

FIPSE Comprehensive Program

U.S. Department of Education

Deadline: Spring/Summer 2007

Links to these programs are provided on our website:
www.stthomas.edu/fgo/deadlines.htm



SERVICE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

“Best Practices” in Service Learning Workshop

Location TBA

January 9 - 12, 2007

9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

This workshop is for all St. Thomas faculty who are interested in developing a course with a service-learning component. Participants will learn the meaning of the acronym “OTIRE,” hear from faculty who have coordinated courses with service-learning components successfully in the past, think together about where best in the community to partner for mastery of particular course objectives, and gain feedback from colleagues as courses and components are developed. This workshop is pending grant funding. A decision is anticipated in November. To register your interest in attending, contact Interim Director of Service Learning: Jessica Cook (jrcook@stthomas.edu), or Interim Faculty Coordinator of Service Learning: Kimberly Vrudny (kjvrudny@stthomas.edu).

“Service Learning at Open Arms Minnesota” Workshop

Location TBA

January 16-19, 2007

9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

This workshop is for all St. Thomas faculty who are interested in developing a course with a service-learning component partnering with Open Arms Minnesota. Open Arms Minnesota is an organization that prepares meals for and delivers meals to people living with HIV/AIDS and other chronic illnesses in the Twin Cities. Open Arms welcomes involvement with every discipline. Come to explore whether it is a partnership that will enable students to learn the content of your course. This workshop is made possible by a grant from Minnesota Campus Compact. To register your interest in attending, contact Interim Faculty Coordinator of Service Learning: Kimberly Vrudny (kjvrudny@stthomas.edu).

APPLICATION DEADLINES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Note that deadlines are 4 p.m. on dates below. Late applications are not accepted. Bring to Faculty Development Center, OSF Library Suite 403-406 or mail to Mail 4034 in time to reach us by 4 p.m. of the deadline date.

Teaching Enhancement Grant: April 15 (for 07-08 academic year)

Faculty Partnerships: February 15 for Spring Semester
April 15 for Summer (after July 1)

Partnership-in-Learning: February 15 for Spring Semester
April 15 for Summer (after July 1)

Distinguished Visitor Grant: One month prior to visit. No applications accepted between May 15 and August 15.

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES ABOUND FOR OUR STUDENTS



*By Jane Canney
Vice President for
Student Affairs*

It is hard to believe that we have more career opportunities than we have students seeking these opportunities. The Career Development Center on the St. Paul Campus works closely with employers in search of students as future employees. However, the challenge is finding enough students who are looking for career positions to meet this demand.

The Center provides information and support for students (primarily undergraduates) as they identify and reach their vocational/career goals. Assistance is offered in the following areas:

- General career exploration
- Identification of skills/interests/values
- Understanding career paths/trends
- Connecting careers to majors
- Resume/cover letter development
- Interview skills
- Job /internship search
- Graduate school preparation

The career staff is available for classroom presentations. Student clubs and organizations also sponsor career related activities and work cooperatively with the Center. Annually the Center provides outreach programs to approximately 4,000 students and parents.

The comprehensive Career Development Website provides

students with part-time, full-time job and internship postings. Other services include drop-in sessions, individual appointments, interest/ personality assessments, and workshops.

Opportunities for students to make direct contact with employers through on-campus interviewing occur each semester and the Minnesota Private College Job Fair is held in February.

Please call Diane Crist, Director, at 962-6761 with questions.



S.O.S.: Supporting Our Students is a series of student development issues articles provided by the Division of Student Affairs at the University of St. Thomas. For more information on this article or student programs, services and event provided by Student Affairs, please contact the Vice President for Student Affairs office at 962-6120, or www.stthomas.edu/studentaffairs/officeofvp.asp



BUSH GRANTS



by Robert Werner
Director, (Geography,
and Bush Foundation
Grant)

one-page letter to Dr. Vanca Shrunk in the History department by Friday, Dec. 1 (Mail # JRC 432, (idschrunk@stthomas.edu). Say how you expect to use the knowledge you'll gain, in what courses, to accomplish what goals. Direct questions to Bob Werner (rjwerner, 2-5565).

“How can I get my students to think?’ is a question asked by many faculty, regardless of their disciplines. Problem-Based Learning (PBL) is an instructional method that challenges students to ‘learn to learn,’ working cooperatively in groups to seek solutions to real-world problems. These problems are used to engage students’ curiosity and initiate learning the subject matter. PBL prepares students to think critically and analytically, and to find and use appropriate learning resources.” (Barbara Duch).

UST’s Bush grant announces the opportunity to attend a three-day workshop on PBL at the University of Delaware, Jan. 17-19, 2007, all expenses paid.

This workshop will demonstrate PBL and model ways that PBL can be used effectively in all disciplines, in upper and lower division courses, and in all size classes. One focus of this program will be writing effective problem-based materials; participants will leave the session with new or revised problems for use in their courses. Another focus will be engaging students in research and communication as part of the process of PBL.

More information on the conference is available at the Institute for Transforming Undergraduate Education: www.udel.edu/inst.

Faculty who apply must be teaching undergraduate courses. Simply send a

Descriptions of all UST Bush-funded programs are online at: www.stthomas.edu/bushgrant. UST’s Bush Foundation grant stems from Archibald Bush, a founder of the 3M corporation. UST graciously acknowledges their support.

Upcoming Bush Grant Deadlines

Dec. 1 for J-Term or spring, 2007

For more information, see the web site:

www.stthomas.edu/bushgrant

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT INTERCULTURAL WORKSHOPS

Co-sponsored with the Office of Institutional Diversity

Nov. 1

**Case Studies on the Challenges
of Intercultural Teaching**

Faculty Discussion

3:30 - 5 p.m.

304 Murray Herrick

Nov. 13

**Strategies for Teaching
in the Intercultural Classroom**

Faculty, Staff and Student
Presentation/Discussion

3 - 5 p.m.

304 Murray Herrick

Nov. 17

**Evaluating the Effectiveness of
Human Diversity Requirements—
A Diversity Initiative**

Information Session

Noon - 1 p.m.

100 New McNeely



UNIVERSITY of ST. THOMAS

Faculty Development
Mail 4034
University of St. Thomas
2115 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105