

November 2021

Reciprocal Relationships: AJCU Presidents & Rectors

Jeffrey LaBelle S.J.

Marquette University, jeffrey.labelle@marquette.edu

Daniel Kendall S.J.

University of San Francisco, dkendall@jesuits.org

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

LaBelle, Jeffrey S.J. and Kendall, Daniel S.J. (2021) "Reciprocal Relationships: AJCU Presidents & Rectors," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 10: No. 2, Article 10.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol10/iss2/10>

This Scholarship is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarly and Peer-Reviewed Journals at ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact epublications@regis.edu.

Reciprocal Relationships: AJCU Presidents and Rectors

Jeffrey T. LaBelle, S.J.

Associate Professor

College of Education

Marquette University

Jeffrey.labelle@marquette.edu

Daniel Kendall, S.J.

Professor Emeritus (deceased)

College of Arts & Sciences

University of San Francisco

dkendall@jesuits.org

Abstract

This study reviews literature pertinent to the changing landscape of leadership at member institutions of higher education in the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) with a view toward revising the relationship between presidents and Jesuit superiors. The purpose of this article encourages efforts to foster Jesuit mission and identity during a shift toward increased lay leadership. The research cites related insights from previous studies and mandates from documents of the Society of Jesus that together point to the need for reimagining leadership. The study underscores the importance of fostering relationships of mutuality and reciprocity to ensure the sustaining of the Jesuit mission and identity of AJCU institutions. Finally, the authors conclude with specific recommendations exhorting the enactment of actions that have been recommended or in development during the last twenty years, a period in which a leadership paradigm shift has occurred with the appointment of lay presidents at a majority of the AJCU institutions.

Introduction

In the twenty-first century, Jesuit institutions of higher education (IHEs) in the United States face a unique challenge: how to promote and sustain a strong working relationship between the superior of the Jesuit community and the president at each institution? Historically, Jesuits themselves served as presidents of nearly all the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. However, in the past ten years, the number of Jesuit IHEs with lay presidents has increased, such that a majority (21) of the 28 are now led by lay presidents (Table 1). By reviewing pertinent literature related to the relationship between presidents and rectors at member institutions of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU), this study seeks to uncover the characteristics, qualities, and dispositions of the relationships of lay presidents, as directors of the institutions of higher education, to the rectors or superiors of the Jesuit communities.

In the past, the Jesuit rector and Jesuit president had a more clearly defined relationship within the governance policies of the Jesuits.¹ Now, this historical reality is challenged and, to use a sports metaphor, no one has written the playbook. Finally, based on the review of pertinent literature and demographic factors, the present study proposes recommendations for AJCU institutions to consider regarding best practices, policies, and governance in light of the changing landscape of presidential appointments across the AJCU. Essential to the effectiveness of the Jesuit mission of these lay presidents is their relationship with the local Jesuit rector or superior.

In 1981 David O'Brien conducted a study which illustrated the bigger picture and historical challenges that the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) faced in the 1970s and 1980s, when the Jesuit order began to see the diminishing numbers of men available for the university apostolate and the tensions over how to live out General Congregation 32 (GC 32) with its call to the service of faith and the promotion of justice.²

Table 1. Presidents and Rectors of AJCU Institutions in Academic Year 2021-2022

Institution	President	Rector
Boston College	William Leahy, S.J.	Cyril Opeil, S.J.
Canisius College	John J. Hurley, J.D.	Thomas Slon, S.J.
College of the Holy Cross	Vincent D. Rougeau, J.D.	James Stormes, S.J.
Creighton University	Daniel Hendrickson, S.J.	Nicky Santos, S.J.
Fairfield University	Mark R. Nemecek, Ph.D.	John Mulreany, S.J.
Fordham University	Joseph M. McShane, S.J.	Thomas Regan, S.J.
Georgetown University	John J. DeGioia, Ph.D.	Ron Anton, S.J.
Gonzaga University	Thayne M. McCulloh, D.Phil.	Tom Lamanna, S.J.
John Carroll University	Alan R. Miciak, Ph.D.	Thomas Pipp, S.J.
LeMoyne College	Linda LeMura, Ph.D.	Donald Kirby, S.J.
Loyola Marymount University	Timothy Snyder, Ph.D.	Edward Siebert, S.J.
Loyola University Chicago	Jo Ann Rooney, J.D., Ed.D	Richie Salmie, S.J.
Loyola University Maryland	Amanda Thomas, Ph.D.	John Savard, S.J.
Loyola University New Orleans	Tania Tetlow, J.D.	Gregory Waldrop, S.J.
Marquette University	Michael Lovell, Ph.D.	Gregory O'Meara, S.J.
Regis University	John P. Fitzgibbons, S.J.	William Oulvey, S.J.
Rockhurst University	Thomas B. Curran, S.J.	William Sheahan, S.J.
St. John's College	Mirtha A Peralta, M.Ed.	Thomas Greene, S.J.
St. Joseph's University	Mark C. Reed, Ed.D.	Gene Geinzer, S.J.
St. Louis University	Fred P. Pestello, Ph.D.	Philip Steele, S.J.
St. Peter's University	Eugene J. Cornacchia, Ph.D.	Claudio Burgaleta, S.J.
Santa Clara University	Lisa Kloppenberg, J.D.	Luis Calero, S.J.
Seattle University	Eduardo M. Peñalver, J.D.	Arturo Araujo, S.J.
Spring Hill College	E. Joseph Lee II, Ph.D.	Robert Poirier, S.J.
University of Detroit Mercy	Antoine Garibaldi, Ph.D.	Gilbert Sunghera, S.J.
University of San Francisco	Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.	Timothy Godfrey, S.J.
University of Scranton	Joseph G. Marina, S.J.	Herbert Keller, S.J.
Xavier University	Colleen M. Hanycz, Ph.D.	Walter Deye, S.J.

We contend that the relationship of lay presidents and Jesuit rectors must be situated within these other challenges to interpret that relationship more accurately from a historical and cultural perspective.

The AJCU IHEs are now at a historical point when 1) lay people dominate the professoriate, 2) lay people hold the majority of the presidencies in the AJCU (75%), and 3) Jesuits are overextended

to cover contributed service agreements (masses, confessions, pastoral ministry, and campus ministry) and hold fewer faculty positions. It is quite apparent that O'Brien foresaw the current reality in his 1981 article. More recently (2012), Stephanie Russell explicitly pointed to the need for this area of research, when she stated, "How the appointment of lay presidents affects the religious and academic identity of Jesuit institutions and what these presidencies imply for

advancing the Catholic and Jesuit mission of Jesuit higher education in the future are topics well worth serious investigation.”³

Lay Leadership

To begin our review of the literature of this study, we turn to the theme of lay leadership in Catholic and Jesuit IHEs. Appleyard and Gray asserted that “it will largely be lay colleagues who will take responsibility for the Catholic and even the Jesuit identity of these institutions in the future.”⁴ Indeed, this has become the case in the twenty-first century. The AJCU itself documented this trend, pointing out that “Already the leadership of our institutions, whether as deans, directors of programs, or central administration, is overwhelmingly exercised by persons who are not Jesuits.”⁵

However, one of the issues that surfaces because of this demographic change is the need for leadership development in the Jesuit, Catholic tradition. “As the number of Jesuits continues to decline on our campuses, we have inadequately trained lay persons in the spiritual tradition of the Society of Jesus.”⁶ Otherwise, the ACJU IHEs run the danger of losing their essential Jesuit, Catholic character. As Ely eloquently stated, “So the choice is either for Jesuits to join with their lay colleagues in an awakened sense of mission, or to see these historically Jesuit institutions gradually become thoroughly secular in outlook.”⁷

History has demonstrated that Jesuit IHEs have competed for prominence among U.S. IHEs for prestige. Fitzgerald, reflecting on the challenges faced in the 1960s and 1970s, commented, “Far from falling behind, the prestige of Jesuit universities, enhanced by the infusion of qualified, often outstanding, lay colleagues, continued to grow.”⁸ Furthermore, in part due to the strength of lay leadership and collaboration, Fitzgerald claimed that “the influence of these institutions matched the esteem in which they were held in academic circles in the United States.”⁹ In fact, two decades later in 2006, Gardner made the bold assertion, “The transition to lay leadership, therefore, may be a catalyst for enhancement and refocus as opposed to cause for surrender of ideals and values.”¹⁰ Hence, lay leadership development has been and continues to be

essential for not only sustaining but also promoting the Jesuit, Catholic mission and identity of AJCU IHEs.

Jesuit colleges and universities have a much more daunting challenge regarding the formation and development of lay presidents to serve the AJCU. In their survey of Catholic college and university presidents, Morey and Piderit discovered “a significant lack of formal theological and spiritual preparation among [lay] presidents” as well as “widespread agreement among presidents that inadequate lay preparation presents a problem for the future of Catholic higher education.”¹¹ However, they pointed out that, in contrast to these concerns, “few lay presidents ... personally feel ill equipped to lead the religious mission of their institutions.”¹² Furthermore, the president of a Catholic IHE is a spokesperson and representative of the mission and vision of the institution. Morey and Piderit later go on to insist, “One of the most important ways presidents of Catholic colleges and universities distinguish themselves is by successfully shaping the religious culture at their institutions.”¹³ Responding to this context, Russell observed: “Since 2006 there has been a notable increase in the number of American Jesuit colleges and universities selecting non-Jesuit leaders to serve in the position of president.”¹⁴ She posed an important consideration regarding inculturation of lay leaders in Jesuit IHEs, “How are lay leaders incorporated into the culture of Jesuit higher education?”¹⁵ In response to her own rhetorical question, Russell pointed to the “cooperation with the laity in mission” of the Society of Jesus as a way “to describe the partnership between Jesuits and lay leaders in running universities, high schools, social centers, and other ministries.”¹⁶

In the *Complementary Norms of the Society of Jesus* (1996), it is quite clear that lay collaboration is essential to carry out the mission of the institutions:

285 §2. In order to ensure the proper character of our schools and a fruitful Jesuit-lay cooperation, it is altogether necessary to carefully select administrators and teachers, both Jesuits and others, and to form them adequately in Ignatian spirituality and pedagogy,

especially those who will assume positions of major responsibility.¹⁷

Furthermore, according to Decree 13 of the *Documents of the 34th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus*, a lay person can serve as the director of the work of the Society of Jesus, which carries with it responsibilities previously held by a Jesuit:

343/ 13. A lay person can be the director of a Jesuit work. When this is the case, Jesuits receive from the provincial their mission to work in the institution, and they carry out this mission under the direction of the lay director. In institutions where Jesuits are a small minority, special attention should be given both to the leadership role of lay colleagues and to appropriate means for the Society assure the Jesuit identity of the work.¹⁸

Indeed, the Congregation went on to speak about the importance of the commitment to the mission of the institution when it stated in **194/ 11**, “The leadership of a Jesuit work depends upon commitment for mission and can be exercised by Jesuits or by others.”¹⁹

Jesuit Leadership

With the advent of lay presidents at many of the AJCU IHEs, Jesuit leadership has taken a different role. In many IHEs, lay presidents rely heavily on vice presidents or directors for mission and identity to facilitate and foster efforts toward sustaining Jesuit identity through the campus.²⁰ At some, the rector of the Jesuit community plays a key role in major events, on the board of trustees, and in dialogue with the lay president. Wide variation exists among the member IHEs of the AJCU regarding the role of Jesuits in the higher administration of the institution.

Historically the rectors were also the presidents of the IHEs. As O’Keefe noted, “The presidents for a long period of time were also the rectors, i.e., the local superiors of the Jesuit religious community.”²¹ This dual role on campuses sometimes led to conflicts of interest or tensions between faculty and the Jesuit community. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the

rector no longer has this capacity or authority. During the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, Jesuit IHEs, under a directive from the Jesuit Superior General, legally separated the university corporations from the Jesuit community corporations. At that time, boards of trustees, composed of both Jesuits and lay people, were established to guide the university corporation. In essence, the rector’s role became that of religious superior, and head of the Jesuit community corporation, and the president assumed the role of CEO of the university corporation. Some boards of trustees included the rectors as ex officio members, but others did not. Years later, the AJCU delineated the new role of the rector as one who

leads the community in its corporate animation of the apostolate and its initiatives as a community within the college or university. The rector supports each Jesuit in his apostolic work, helps the community discern common apostolic initiatives, leads the community in its hospitality of university colleagues and students, helps it decide how to promote vocations, and at times represents and articulates the Society’s apostolic priorities and commitments. The apostolic assistance of the rector to the college or university in this regard will likely increase as fewer presidents, as Directors of the Jesuit Apostolic Work, are themselves Jesuits.²²

Essential to this new role is the leadership capacity of the rector. Hence, the selection and formation for such Jesuits becomes even more critical. However, recognizing the lack of Jesuits available for leadership at the level of IHE presidents, Ely observed that “the formation Jesuits have received does not necessarily prepare them to the new ‘crisis’ (meaning ‘opportunity’) of our time.”²³ In an era of decision-making grounded in consensus and process, Lannon insisted that “Presidents must consider what leadership skills that they can bring to bear on their effort to promote Catholic identity *vis-à-vis* the power and influence of the various coalitions.”²⁴

Effective Communication

Not surprisingly, communication between leaders in any IHE is essential. Even more crucial is the effective communication between the Jesuit rector and the president of a Jesuit IHE. In fact, the importance of this communication is underscored in various documents of the AJCU itself. In 2010, the sitting presidents of the AJCU stressed this very factor:

Presidents, as “Directors of the Apostolic Work”, and rectors, as religious superiors of individual Jesuits and of the Jesuit community (or a delegate of the rector in the instance where the rector is not involved in the college or university), need above all to have regular, open, and trusting communication.²⁵

To ensure the fostering of this communication between rector and president, the AJCU presidents made a strong commitment, referenced the increased need for such communication with the advent of more lay presidents and made a commitment: “to highlight the responsibility and role of the rector of the community” and to “seek occasions and communications to make the Jesuit community more recognized for its key role in the college or university.”²⁶ The presidents, then, expressed concern for those IHEs “where the president is not a Jesuit,” to ensure that communication be “strengthened in order that the knowledge of the community about the university and its role in it be clear.”²⁷

One distinct way in which such communication can be promoted is through open dialogues between lay leadership and members of the Jesuit community. Gardner insisted that “Lay leaders should openly and consistently communicate with members of the founding religious order of the institution. . . . Lay leaders must embody and exemplify the institutional mission in their daily lives and encourage others to do the same.”²⁸ Such discourse and interaction could yield a mutually beneficial result, i.e., the ongoing spiritual and mission formation of both lay and Jesuit leaders. Just as the AJCU looks carefully at the structures in place for leadership development by means of the Ignatian Colleagues Program (ICP), the AJCU also recognizes the importance of

communication. That is essentially why Tierney posed two crucial questions, “How do constituencies communicate with one another? Who communicates with whom?”²⁹

Jesuit Mission, Vision, and Identity

Underlying the concerns regarding leadership and communication is the central issue of how Jesuits IHEs can “continue to animate mission and keep from drifting away from core values when the real numbers of Jesuits are in severe decline?”³⁰ In part this can be fostered by lay leadership development and improved lines of communication. A variety of local, regional, and national programs for mission and identity promotion exists, such as the Ignatian Colleagues Program (ICP). Other examples of local and institutional efforts for lay leadership formation in the Ignatian tradition include Boston College’s Center for Ignatian Spirituality, Marquette University’s Faber Center for Ignatian Spirituality, the Marquette Colleagues Program, and Xavier University’s Center for Mission and Identity, with its highly regarded online resource. In addition, many Jesuit IHEs encourage board members to participate in mission immersion trips often combined with ongoing Ignatian spiritual formation. According to Cole, “Mission programs created a common language by which community members could better engage in mission conversations by allowing the layperson to understand the Jesuit, Catholic context.”³¹ The challenge is how to foster and sustain these efforts to ensure the Jesuit identity of AJCU IHEs. This becomes even more urgent with the predominance of lay presidents.

Such a task is not an easy one nor can we presume that these mission program efforts will succeed. “Perhaps the most hopeful sign today comes from the willingness on most Catholic campuses to address the question of Catholic identity.”³² Lay faculty and staff members are engaged in this project that goes beyond a desire to merely maintain the Jesuit and Catholic nature of the AJCU IHEs. Indeed, the vision of these institutions has changed in this century. As Currie eloquently asserted:

Rather, we are trying to create something that has never existed: a Jesuit, Catholic identity combining Ignatian spirituality,

the Catholic intellectual tradition, and Catholic Social Teaching, all forged with diverse colleagues, in a pluralistic, postmodern university setting, while facing all of the challenges of a globalizing world.³³

In essence, the task is not merely fostering and sustaining the Jesuit and Catholic identity of the members IHEs, but rather re-envisioning this identity in light of the context of the universal missioning of the intellectual apostolate in the new millennium.

Even earlier, Lannon already insightfully recognized the need for preparation for Jesuit and lay presidents to address the issues of Catholic and Jesuit identity at the onset of the twenty-first century:

St. Ignatius of Loyola had a brilliant insight when he suggested that Jesuit education must be adaptable. This requirement for adaptability will continue into the future so that Jesuit university presidents, whether Jesuit or not, and their colleagues can provide an educational opportunity that will support both the values of higher education and the university's Catholic identity in serving the needs for their students to prepare them to be men and women for others "who live not for themselves but for God."³⁴

Ultimately, Jesuit and lay leaders need to grow in their capacity to work together. As Ely stated, "Laypeople and Jesuits must *learn to cooperate* in mission."³⁵ Furthermore, Ely went on to claim that more is involved than the identifiable characteristics of AJCU IHEs, i.e., "the integrity of Catholic, and therefore Jesuit, higher education itself."³⁶

In addition, the effort to foster and sustain the Jesuit, Catholic identity of the IHEs is more than a numbers game of how many Jesuits are missioned or how many lay colleagues are trained. Rather it must entail "forming faculty and staff who make 'critical Ignatian connections.'"³⁷ Furthermore, in his study of Jesuit and lay leaders, Lowdon observed a unanimous assent regarding

the importance of "mission offices and their leaders" efforts toward sustaining those programs. It is the only way to ensure the Jesuit mission is carried out even when there are fewer Jesuits, and in select cases, no Jesuits present on campuses."³⁸ To that end, in the past several years, Jesuit provincial assistants for higher education in the United States have overseen and directed Mission Priority Examinations on a rotating basis to help Jesuit IHEs identify strengths and weaknesses in living out their missions as Jesuit institutions. The Jesuit rector, the Jesuit community, lay faculty, and staff participate in this in-depth study to review the Jesuit characteristics of each IHE and make recommendation for future implementation. The Mission Priority Examination is, as it were, a form of mission and identity accreditation process.

Finally, promoting Jesuit, Catholic identity needs to face the challenges of balancing that effort with the contemporary goals of U.S. higher education to educate today's young, emerging adults to flourish in the technological, globalized era of the twenty-first century. Some of these challenges might be attributed to the secular trends of de-emphasizing the humanities due to pressures to accommodate curricula that train undergraduates for more scientifically-oriented careers. In addition, the percentage of Catholic students attending Jesuit IHEs has been decreasing over time. Gallin recognized this tension when she noted, "The conscientious setting of priorities and policies to further the Catholic mission of the institutions will determine the outcome in the twenty-first century."³⁹ Addressing Catholic IHEs in general, Gallin went on to describe a Catholicity that historically "would have to be cultivated and strengthened by a partnership of men and women, both lay and religious, who understood and believed in it. The promotion and safeguarding of the mission and heritage of the college had become a shared responsibility."⁴⁰

New Vision for Catholic IHEs

Clearly a new, twenty-first century vision is needed for not only Jesuit but all Catholic IHEs. This need is due in part to the growth in lay participation as faculty members and in leadership positions along with the growing desire for collaboration and openness of communication that is evident in Jesuit and Catholic IHEs in the

U.S. This evolution is only a natural consequence of U.S. academics insisting on shared governance of their respective IHEs whether they are public or private. O’Keefe identified three major changes in Jesuit higher education in 1967: 1) presidents rather than provincials as head of boards; 2) separate incorporation, and 3) Jesuit and lay participation in boards of trustees. These three developments in governance of Jesuit IHEs mark an ideological shift from predominantly hierarchical oversight to an increase in lay shared governance. From another perspective, Appleyard and Gray framed the development of four distinct models of Jesuit IHEs: 1) Control Model, 2) Professional Model, 3) Permissive Model, and 4) Mission Model. In a sense, these models describe a natural progression toward the current trend of institutional organization based upon Jesuit mission. This shift in envisioning Jesuit higher education is situated within a similar trend in Catholic colleges and universities in general. In fact, the International Federation of Catholic Universities saw change as crucial to ensure the future of Catholic universities, stating, “The evolving nature of the Catholic university will necessitate basic reorganizations of structure ... not only to achieve a greater internal cooperation and participation, but also to share the responsibility of direction more broadly and to enlist wider support.”⁴¹

Soon thereafter, Marsden took a very urgent stance when he asserted, “The crucial question is whether there is a willingness in the American Catholic church and its academic culture to be different or whether the trend toward ever-increasing conformity to non-Catholic American models will continue.”⁴² Then, Steinfelds, holding out a more hopeful perspective, eloquently summarized the new reality: “Ultimately, there is in fact no panacea, no silver bullet, no once-and-for-all solution to ensure the Catholic identity of Catholic higher education ... but rather a constant alertness to opportunities, initiatives on many fronts, with some successes, some failures, no quitting.”⁴³ Finally, Morey and Piderit, referring to the crucial role of boards of trustees, insisted that they need to “take it upon themselves to become better informed about Catholic culture and how it is changed. Developing tools that assist trustees in assessing religious performance is essential ... in

hiring the most effective religious leader when it comes time for presidential transition.”⁴⁴

Reciprocal Relationships⁴⁵

Implicit in the preceding factors regarding leadership, communication, mission, and vision is the need for a reciprocal way of relating between Jesuits and laity in AJCU IHEs. By reciprocal, we mean that quality of a working relationship which is both mutually supportive and interdependent.⁴⁶ Russell, when pointing to the quality of the influence of the chief executive, referred to “creating paths of legitimate, reciprocal influence between the Society of Jesus and the lay president [which] is a matter for presidents, Jesuit superiors, and provincials to consider together.”⁴⁷ In interviewing several AJCU Jesuit rectors, Russell found that “rectors were not of one mind regarding the appropriate role of a rector in a university.”⁴⁸

The *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* set forth a clear mandate for the development of this type of reciprocal relationship:

There should always exist ... a close collaboration in their respective functions between the superior ... and the director of the work.... The relation of each of them has with the members both of the community and of the work should be clearly defined, as well as the relation of the members with each of them.⁴⁹

Much later historically, at General Congregation 34, Jesuit leadership further outlined how to proceed to implement this rule when they insisted that, “it will be necessary, at the local level, with the help and approval of the major superior, to develop local guidelines that fit the local situations.”⁵⁰ The General Congregation concurred that this would entail the formation of an “apostolic team... of realizing the Jesuit identity and mission of the work,”⁵¹ which could participate in the discernment and planning for the implantation of the apostolic mission of the work.⁵² Such an apostolic team would not be limited to Jesuits, but most assuredly would include lay colleagues. Finally, “The local superior is to work collaboratively with the director of the work in fostering the Ignatian and Jesuit identity

of the institution [and] ... should verify that the director of the work is in fact carrying out his or her mission.”⁵³

Such mutuality in relationships among leaders at Jesuit IHEs should not end with the formation of lay colleagues and partnership in mission and planning, but also must include a very close working relationship between the rector and the president:

The relationship between the superior and the director of the work goes well when the two persons involved get along together personally, are able to work well together, can speak openly and honestly with one another, are willing to support one another in their respective roles, and are both committed to the success of the work as an apostolate.⁵⁴

In essence, this directive signifies a response to the growth in lay leadership in general, and more specifically to lay directors of apostolic works, especially lay presidents of IHEs.

To foster and achieve such collaboration, the rector and director should meet regularly to discuss “their shared responsibility for the life of the apostolate, practical guidelines (statutes) at the local level, reviewed regularly by the major superior.... These should be revised as the need arises.”⁵⁵ In addition, provincials must take care to assure a compatible relationship between the director of the work and the superior. Finally, the General Congregation envisioned an important role for the provincial to “work out with the director and any other relevant parties how the local superior will be involved, according to his proper role, in fostering the mission of the work.”⁵⁶

Much later, at General Congregation 35, the Society of Jesus saw the need to be even more explicit in directing that “The relations between superiors and directors of the work must be developed in accordance with the *Guidelines for the Relationship between the Superior and the Director of the Work* ... adapted to the local context in dialogue with the Major Superior.”⁵⁷ Finally, the same General Congregation stressed the importance of

the provincial “to consider ahead of time the ways in which the relationship between the director and the relevant local superior will develop.”⁵⁸

Time to Pivot

An opportune historical moment has arrived during which IHEs are challenged to contribute to the creation of a new vision of lay Jesuit, Catholic leadership which fosters reciprocal, mutual relationships with Jesuit rectors in member IHEs of the AJCU. We draw upon the historical, philosophical, and spiritual traditions of Jesuit, Catholic higher education in the U.S. to develop recommendations for best practices, policies, and governance of sister institutions of the AJCU. It is our aim to challenge lay and Jesuit leaders to critically reimagine the direction of their institutions and educational practice for the twenty-first century in light of the signs of the times

Recommendations

In summary, we recommend more frequent meetings between presidents and rectors, the missioning of lay presidents by provincials, regular Jesuit community meetings with presidents (whether lay or Jesuit) as directors of works, and ongoing dialogue between presidents and partners in mission. As previously underscored, lay formation is essential to achieve these aspirations for reciprocal relationships at the AJCU IHEs. This lay formation may entail sponsoring leaders to participate in the Ignatian Colleagues Program. However, due to financial constraints and other practicalities, some lay leadership formation would be best conducted locally or regionally. Lastly, the AJCU presidents need to revisit this topic with more urgency than ever to direct and guide policies and procedures to support dialogue and interaction among presidents and rectors, and to ensure the flourishing of Jesuit higher education in North America. Their role is essential to guide and govern the landscape of the Jesuit, Catholic mission into the middle of the twenty-first century.⁵⁹ 

Notes

- ¹ Paul Fitzgerald, *The Governance of Jesuit Colleges in the United States: 1920-1970* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1984).
- ² David J. O'Brien, "The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 8, no. 5 (1981): 1-35.
- ³ Stephanie Russell, "Lay Presidents in Jesuit Higher Education: Examining a Culture of Companionship," (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2012), 7-8.
- ⁴ John Appleyard and Howard Gray, "Tracking the Mission and Identity Question: Three Decades of Inquiry and Three Models of Interpretation," *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 18, no. 3 (2000): 11.
- ⁵ Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU), *The Jesuit, Catholic Mission of U.S. Jesuit Colleges and Universities* (Washington: Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 2010), 11.
- ⁶ AJCU, *Some Characteristics of Jesuit Colleges and Universities: A Self-Evaluation Instrument* (Washington: Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 2012), 21.
- ⁷ Peter Ely, "Partnership in Mission: The Future of Jesuit Higher Education," in *Promise Renewed: Jesuit Higher Education for a New Millennium*, edited by Martin R. Tripole (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1999), 186.
- ⁸ Fitzgerald, *The Governance of Jesuit Colleges in the United States: 1920-1970*, 168.
- ⁹ Fitzgerald, 168.
- ¹⁰ Megan Moore Gardner, "Envisioning New Forms of Leadership in Catholic Higher Education: Recommendations for Success," *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice* 10, no. 2 (2006): 228.
- ¹¹ Melanie Morey and John Piderit, *Catholic Higher Education: A Culture in Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 14.
- ¹² Morey and Piderit, *Catholic Higher Education*, 14.
- ¹³ Morey and Piderit, 275-276.
- ¹⁴ Russell, "Lay Presidents in Jesuit Higher Education," vi.
- ¹⁵ Russell, 17.
- ¹⁶ Russell, 18.
- ¹⁷ Society of Jesus, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts*, trans. George E. Ganss (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), in *Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation Series* 1, no. 15, 304.
- ¹⁸ Society of Jesus, *Jesuit Life & Mission Today: The Decrees & Accompanying Documents of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, in *Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation Series* 1, no. 25, ed. J. W. Padberg (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), 611.
- ¹⁹ Society of Jesus, *Jesuit Life & Mission Today*, 783.
- ²⁰ For more detail on these roles, see Stephanie Russell, "Lay Presidents in Jesuit Higher Education."
- ²¹ Vincent O'Keefe, "Who Owns Jesuit Colleges and Universities?" *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 1, no. 5 (1992): 1.
- ²² AJCU, *The Jesuit, Catholic Mission of U.S. Jesuit Colleges and Universities*, 18.
- ²³ Ely, "Partnership in Mission," 181.
- ²⁴ Timothy Lannon, "Catholic Identity at Jesuit Universities: How Do the Presidents of Jesuit Universities Promote the Schools' Catholic Identity?" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2000), 66-67.
- ²⁵ AJCU, *The Jesuit, Catholic Mission of U.S. Jesuit Colleges and Universities*, 17.
- ²⁶ AJCU, 17.
- ²⁷ AJCU, 17.
- ²⁸ Gardner, "Envisioning New Forms of Leadership in Catholic Higher Education," 226.
- ²⁹ William G. Tierney, *The Impact of Culture on Organizational Decision-Making: Theory and Practice in Higher Education* (Sterling: Stylus, 2008), 174.
- ³⁰ Xavier A. Cole, "Answering the Call: An Examination of the Development of Lay Leadership on Jesuit, Catholic University Campuses," (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013), 54.
- ³¹ Cole, "Answering the Call," 217.
- ³² Charles E. Curran, "The Catholic Identity of Catholic Institutions," *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 108.
- ³³ Charles Currie, "Pursuing Jesuit, Catholic Identity and Mission at U.S. Jesuit Colleges and Universities," *Catholic Education* 14, no. 3 (2011): 355.
- ³⁴ Timothy Lannon, "The Role of Presidents Promoting Catholic Identity at Jesuit Universities," *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 20, no. 7 (2001): 36.
- ³⁵ Ely, "Partnership in Mission," 181.
- ³⁶ Ely, 183.

³⁷ Jennifer Haworth and Megan Barry, “Making Critical Connections: Identity and Mission Officers Tell What Works,” *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 34, no. 8 (2008): 1–5.

³⁸ Melissa Lowdon, “Leading Change: Jesuit Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century” (Ph.D. diss., Gonzaga University, 2010), 206.

³⁹ Alice Gallin, *Negotiating Identity: Catholic Higher Education Since 1960* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000), xiii.

⁴⁰ Gallin, *Negotiating Identity*, 126.

⁴¹ International Federation of Catholic Universities, *The Land O’ Lakes Statement*, University of Notre Dame Archives, 1967, no. 10. The original document can be found at David J. O’Brien, “The Land O’ Lakes Statement,” in *Boston College Magazine* (Winter 1998): 1–14.

⁴² George M. Marsden, “Protestant Examples,” in *The Challenge and Promise of a Catholic University*, ed. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 195.

⁴³ Peter Steinfels, *A People Adrift: The Crisis of the Roman Catholic Church in America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), 160.

⁴⁴ Morey and Piderit, *Catholic Higher Education*, 288.

⁴⁵ This term “reciprocal relationships” is drawn from the work of Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001).

⁴⁶ For further development of the importance of interdependence regarding Jesuit identity and mission, see Jeffrey LaBelle and Daniel Kendall, “Characteristics of Jesuit Colleges and Universities in the United States: A Reciprocal Interdependence Analysis,” *Journal of Catholic Education* 19, no. 3 (2016): 264-289.

⁴⁷ Russell, “Lay Presidents in Jesuit Higher Education,” 41.

⁴⁸ Russell, 269.

⁴⁹ Society of Jesus, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms*, 390, no. 407, §3.

⁵⁰ Society of Jesus, *Guidelines for the Relationship between the Superior and the Director of the Work* (Rome: Curia of the Society of Jesus, 1998), 3.

⁵¹ Society of Jesus, 7.

⁵² Society of Jesus, 7-8.

⁵³ Society of Jesus, 10.

⁵⁴ Society of Jesus, 11.

⁵⁵ Society of Jesus, 11.

⁵⁶ Society of Jesus, 14.

⁵⁷ Society of Jesus, *Jesuit Life & Mission Today*, 779.

⁵⁸ Society of Jesus, 779.

⁵⁹ Peter Ely, “Jesuit Higher Education in the Age of Pope Francis,” *The Cresset* 80, no. 4 (2017): 32-41.