

THE PURPOSE OF A STUDENT AFFAIRS PREPARATION PROGRAM WITHIN JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

JEREMY STRINGER

ERIN SWEZEY

Seattle University

This article addresses the congruence of a student affairs professional preparation program within Jesuit higher education. It connects the mission of Jesuit education and Jesuit religious and educational principles to the philosophy of student affairs work in colleges and universities. A program in student development administration at Seattle University is presented as an example of how a student affairs preparation program honors Jesuit principles.

The hallmarks of Jesuit higher education, both vision and methods, trace back more than 450 years to the founders of the Society of Jesus. Beginning in 2005, Jesuit colleges and universities throughout the world celebrated the jubilee year of these founders, St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Francis Xavier, and Blessed Peter Favre, all once college roommates together at the University of Paris (Modras, 2004). These celebrations have been opportunities for reflection and forward visioning around the distinctive mission and purpose that Jesuit higher education animates and contributes to education as a whole, and more poignantly to the creation of a just and humane world. As faculty teaching in a student affairs professional preparation program within a Jesuit context, we, too, have paused to examine the distinctive nature of our educational milieu and how it shapes the emerging professionals whom we teach. This article is an outgrowth of this reflection, and is intended to indicate how firmly the education of leaders for the student affairs profession in higher education is placed within the 450-year-old Jesuit educational tradition.

Originally, St. Ignatius did not form the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) to teach. Nor did he start out to create an elaborate system of schools or universities. However, when the city leaders at Messina, Italy, requested that Ignatius send teachers to open a *collegio* (secondary school), it was appealing. Founding their own school would enable Ignatius and his companions to

have a strong impact on the Church and on society through education (Modras, 2004). The connection of education to the formation of the faith dimension of students is especially important (Topel, 1992). The distinctiveness of Jesuit education is directly linked to the inspiration of the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (Ignatius of Loyola, 1548/1964) and the Ignatian spirituality that emanates from the exercises. Some themes of this spirituality shape Jesuit higher education. The Ignatian worldview is world-affirming, altruistic, comprehensive, and faces up to sin. Jesuit spirituality emphasizes freedom, stresses the essential need for discernment, and gives ample scope to intellectual prowess and affectivity in forming leaders. Ignatian spirituality affirms essential human goodness, recognizes that God is present in all people, and stresses that God's love is more powerful than sin (Kolvenbach, 2000a). Since God is present in all people, Jesuit educators are free to give all students support in their educational and vocational choices. Because Jesuits believe in active engagement with the world, professional preparation is a valid educational path. Ideally, this path will be chosen after critical discernment, including analysis and reflection and principled decision making. Contemporary Jesuit education also calls students to compassion, concern for others, and justice (Kolvenbach, 2000a).

THE MISSION OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

One cannot discuss an academic program in Jesuit higher education without discussing the mission of the Society of Jesus. At the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (GC 32) in 1975, Jesuit delegates from around the world determined that the overriding purpose of the Society, "the service of faith," must be joined by "the promotion of justice" (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 2). This was not just to be the case for those working with marginalized peoples; it was to be the "integrating factor" in all of the Society's works, including higher education (p. 2).

At the heart of every Jesuit college or university lies its mission. In many cases college missions can be traced directly back to the mission of the Society. The mission and identity of a Jesuit university is integral to many other dimensions of college and university life:

The kind of teaching, learning and research that is pursued, not only in theology but throughout the curriculum; the kind of caring relationships that are experienced in and out of the classroom; and the kind of values that permeate the institution. (Rausch & Currie, 2006, para. 2)

This mission is both a "distinctive spirit" and "a way of proceeding" (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1986, p.

133). It is both the vision and the method for teaching, learning, and engaging with the world. The mission permeates all aspects of campus and institutional life both within and outside the classroom. From the reassessment of the mission of the Society at GC 32 came a revised commitment and a restating of the mission for Jesuit higher education. The service of faith through the promotion of justice is the mission that must be integrated throughout Jesuit education (Kolvenbach, 1989). Thus, the purpose of this mission-based education is to form men and women for others and to prepare graduates “to be leaders in service, men and women of competence, conscience, and compassionate commitment” (Duminuco, 2000, p. 155).

In recent years, many Jesuit colleges and universities have revised their mission statements to reflect more explicitly the distinctive mission and educational purpose of the Society of Jesus. Representative phrases in these mission statements include “a commitment to fashioning a more humane and just world” (Santa Clara University, 2006, para. 4), “empowering leaders for a just and humane world” (Seattle University, 2006, para. 1), and “educates women and men to be reflective life-long learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others” (Georgetown University, 2006, para. 4). Furthermore, these institutions, like other Jesuit universities worldwide, reassessed not only their missions as the vision for the kind of education they offer, but they reexamined their way of proceeding: the kind of pedagogy, educational offerings and opportunities, and collaborative partnerships that provide the means or method to achieving the mission. Critical inquiry and reflective analysis are cornerstones to Jesuit pedagogy in order to create lifelong learners and reflective practitioners. Community engagement, leadership formation and global education in terms of service learning and international education and research have emerged as central and vital learning opportunities for students enrolled and faculty teaching at Jesuit institutions. Collaborative partnerships between Jesuit and lay colleagues, academics and student affairs, campus and community, and across disciplines foster genuine dialogue as well as a shared sense of mission and opportunities.

PHILOSOPHICAL CONNECTIONS BETWEEN JESUIT EDUCATION AND THE STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSION

The mission of Jesuit higher education accords a special place to the student. Jesuit education has always placed the “education of the whole person” at the center of its efforts (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 10). The early Jesuits endeavored to address the whole person in their education ministry; their educational model contained character development and moral instruction, in addition to

intellectual pursuits. Ignatius included in the constitutions of the Society that Jesuit educators were to show *cura personalis* (care of the person) for their charges, and to be concerned with their holistic growth as human beings (Modras, 2004). This concept of holistic education—educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit—also echoes through the literature of the student affairs profession. In perhaps the seminal document providing a philosophical foundation for the student affairs profession in the United States, *The Student Personnel Point of View*, educational institutions are admonished to emphasize “the development of the student as a person rather than...intellectual training alone” (American Council on Education, 1937/1989a, p. 49). As the student personnel profession emerged as a discrete entity in American higher education in the mid-20th century, this statement was updated and expanded. A revised statement issued by the American Council in Education in 1949 not only stated that “the development of students as whole persons” was “the central concern of student personnel work,” it indicated it was the central concern of “other agencies of education,” as well (American Council on Education, 1949/1989b, p. 21). This strong emphasis on educating the whole person continues to echo in influential student affairs publications. *Learning Reconsidered*, jointly published by the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in 2004, states “the purpose of educational involvement is the evolution of multidimensional identity, including but not limited to cognitive, affective, behavioral and spiritual development” (Keeling, 2004, p. 9).

The contemporary Jesuit university is called to redefine what it means to educate the whole person. The Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, cautions that “tomorrow’s ‘whole person’ cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture” (2000b, p. 10). Taking his cue from Pope John Paul II’s address to Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Milan in 2000, in which he called for an education immersed in contact rather than concepts, he advocates for an education that actively engages students in the world through such activities as campus ministry, tutoring dropouts, serving in soup kitchens, and protesting injustice (Kolvenbach, 2000b). This active form of education ultimately leads to the goal of educating students to work for a more just and humane world.

The concept of active engagement with the world also appears regularly in the modern student affairs literature, as indicated by this sampling: “Learning derives its most fundamental meaning in the process of application” (Schroeder & Hurst, 1996, p. 175). “Active engagement involves bringing one’s experience to learning, being willing to expand one’s understanding, integrating new perspectives into one’s thinking, and applying that changed thinking to one’s life” (Magolda & Terenzini, 1999, p. 22).

“Providing students with a connected view of learning that integrates their real world experiences with classroom lectures and discussion can create a powerful learning environment” (Steffes, 2004, p. 49). *Learning Reconsidered* gives students’ “meaning making processes” center stage in explicating its view of transformative learning: “meaning making arises in a reflective connection between a person or individual and the wider world” (Keeling, 2004, p. 17). The educational imperative to connect classroom work with real-world activity is shared by both Jesuit higher education and the student affairs profession.

Fundamental to Jesuit education are the concepts that “each individual is personally known, called, and loved by God,” and that “each person has unique talents and a special role to play in the building of God’s kingdom” (Thon, 1989, p. 14). These beliefs, too, are paralleled in seminal statements about the student affairs profession. The 1949 *Student Personnel Point of View* articulated some of the many ways in which students differ: background, abilities, attitudes, expectations of college, and classroom experiences (American Council on Education, 1949/1989b). The student affairs profession has long-believed that every individual has a unique calling. An influential text in the 1950s summarized this belief: “the world has a place for everybody: a place in the social world, a place in the civic world, a place in family life, and a place in the vocational world” (Lloyd-Jones & Smith as cited in Rhatigan, 2000, p. 18). A key philosophical statement produced by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1987/1989), *A Perspective on Student Affairs*, states not only that “each student is unique,” but also that “each person has worth and dignity” (p. 12).

Although Jesuit education and the student affairs profession have these fundamental beliefs in common, Jesuit education takes them further. Jesuits ask students to use their unique talents for a purpose outside of themselves. After GC 32, all Jesuit apostolates, including colleges and universities, needed to respond to this imperative by incorporating the promotion of justice into their educational missions. Kolvenbach captures this intention well when he asks: “I want to affirm that university knowledge is valuable for its own sake and at the same time is knowledge that must ask itself, ‘For whom? For what?’” (as cited in Spohn, 2001, p. 11).

STUDENT AFFAIRS PREPARATION WITHIN JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

Although some have tried to trace the beginnings of the student affairs profession to Athenian education or to universities in the Middle Ages (Rhatigan, 2000), the student affairs profession as we know it today began in 20th century American universities. Although there are many pathways into

the profession, an undeniably important one is the graduate program for student affairs preparation. As of May 2006, 121 graduate preparation programs in the field were listed on the website of the American College Personnel Association. Most are master's degree programs; a few are doctoral-granting only. Less than three dozen preparation programs in the field are in private universities, and only five are located in Jesuit universities; the five Jesuit programs are situated at Boston College, Canisius College, Loyola University (Chicago), Saint Louis University, and Seattle University (Coomes & Gerda, 2006). Therefore, an opportunity exists to craft preparation programs in Jesuit institutions that are different from those of most others in the country.

But what characteristics might set them apart? What is the distinctive role of a student affairs preparation program in a Jesuit university? Like any other academic program, student affairs preparation programs in Jesuit colleges must fit the mission of the institution, which in turn must be tied to the overarching goals of Jesuit education, and Jesuit higher education, in particular. Given the unusually good fit between the philosophy of Jesuit education and that of the student affairs profession, a preparation program in a Jesuit university should be well situated to create a distinctive experience for educating student affairs practitioners.

Beyond mission, student affairs preparation programs in Jesuit colleges must fit the Jesuit way of proceeding in education. At the 34th General Congregation of the Society (GC 34) in 1995, the Jesuits reconsidered the characteristics of their way of proceeding in order to adapt them to changing situations and contemporary challenges and times (McCarthy, 1995). Some of these characteristics have critical application to essential aspects of the educational process for student development graduate students' learning within a Jesuit context. These include teaching student development graduate students how to be contemplative in action, how to understand, participate in, and develop authentic community, how to become agents of enculturation so as to truly understand and work in solidarity with those most in need, how to be a learned professional, how to be in partnership with others, and finally, how to be ever searching for the *magis* (McCarthy, 1995). *Magis*, translated from Latin as "more," is "a recurrent theme within Ignatian Spirituality—doing 'more' for the 'greater' glory of God (*ad majorem Dei gloriam*)" (Modras, 2004, p. 37).

Contemplative in action describes a way of being reflective and aware while still being engaged in the world and one's work. In Ignatius's day, the Jesuits found themselves in the city centers where the needs were numerous (Modras, 2004). They remained engaged with those in need, yet held fast to their spiritual practice of prayer and discernment. Our emerging profession-

als will find themselves responding to the numerous developmental needs and concerns of students against the backdrop of institutional demands and societal complexities. How can they be equipped to serve the diversity of students in our contemporary world and still recognize divine goodness in each person they encounter and within themselves? A deepening awareness comes from an Ignatian practice of discernment “as a constant interplay between experience, reflection, decision, and action” (Padberg, 1977, p. 436). Our students need a framework of inquiry that provides the arena to grapple with significant issues and complex values within our world (Duminuco, 2000). Furthermore, reflective discernment requires an interdisciplinary framework connecting humanistic education with our professional practice (Topel, 1992), as well as the integration of imagination, ingenuity, and rigorous analysis (McCarthy, 1995).

As discussed earlier, *magis* can be viewed as both a vision and a method, both as a way of being and a way of doing or proceeding. *Magis* compels “the fullest possible development of each person’s individual capacities at each stage of life, joined to the willingness to continue this development throughout life and the motivation to use those developed gifts for others” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1986, p. 146). Applied to student affairs professional preparation, this vision requires educating students to be the most effective professionals, always striving to serve and always willing to learn and grow over time. *Magis* also challenges the educational community “to witness to excellence by joining growth in professional competence to growth in dedication” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1986, p. 146). The latter form of *magis* becomes the method or way of proceeding. It includes evaluation of programs and pedagogy, assessment of student learning outcomes and community impact, as well as accountability for the very character of Jesuit universities—how they proceed internally and how they influence society from a justice perspective (Kolvenbach, 2000b). Inherent in this ideal is a graduate preparation program that teaches accountability, assessment, and outcome-based evaluation for continuous improvement. More importantly, such a graduate education inspires students to value excellence and the desire to serve and constantly improve.

Seeking the *magis* in Ignatian spirituality means paying attention to means and ends and discerning what is “more conducive” to achieving the end results desired. It is a matter of discriminating between options and choosing the better of the two. (Modras, 2004, p. 49)

Antithetical to *magis* is mediocrity and status quo. General Congregation 34

discussed *magis* this way: “We are constantly driven to discover, redefine, and reach out for the *magis*. For us, frontiers and boundaries are not obstacles or ends, but new challenges to be faced, new opportunities to be welcomed” (McCarthy, 1995, p. 243).

The concept of the *magis* in Ignatian spirituality is consistent with the emphasis on standards for graduate preparation programs. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) publishes outcome-based standards for graduate preparation programs in student affairs/student development. These are helpful standards that provide useful benchmarks for all programs, regardless of institutional type, to consider. A criticism that has been levied of them is that they focus too heavily on content areas, and insufficiently on affective and behavioral outcomes (Keeling, 2004). To the extent this criticism is valid, a graduate program designed solely around meeting the CAS standards might be deficient in stressing affective and behavior components. As the *Greater Expectations* report (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002) suggests for all students, graduate students should leave preparation programs as empowered, responsible, and informed citizens. We believe that graduate preparation programs in Jesuit universities should lay a foundation of appropriate content, but should also go beyond in order to make meaningful connections between the university, the student, and the world. It is in this arena that the faith that does justice can create lasting meaning.

Graduate preparation programs in a Jesuit university must be concerned with the personal formation of their students. As Kolvenbach indicates, “the real measure of our Jesuit universities lies in who our graduates become” (2000b, p. 10). Coupled with the paradigm that Jesuit education is person-centered, not content-centered, this approach frees Jesuit preparation programs to devote at least part of their educational efforts to affective and behavioral areas. In the curriculum, this might translate to courses in counseling skills, fostering diversity, and understanding and removing personal as well as structural barriers to learning. It is also entirely appropriate in a Jesuit university to encourage students’ attempts to understand their own spirituality and to include spirituality in discussions about student development during the college years.

The student affairs profession is shifting to a paradigm of enhancing student learning as the primary goal of its activities (Schroeder, 1996). This shift is in accordance with many of the principles of Jesuit education: care and concern for the individual person, student responsibilities within the community of learners, and active participation of students in the learning process (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1986). Because of this, preparation programs in Jesuit universities may

already be engaged in learning activities that programs in many secular institutions have yet to adopt.

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY'S PROGRAM IN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Seattle University's master degree program in student development administration is one graduate program that has attempted to apply the principles of Jesuit education to student affairs graduate preparation. This program has four interlocking program themes: understanding students, understanding and fostering diversity, ethics and values, and environment and culture. The way each of these themes connects to the principles of Jesuit education will be described.

The theme of understanding students is fundamental to the program. An unofficial slogan is that students in this program are becoming "students of students." Students learn to explore the changing demographics of student populations at all types of institutions. They learn to identify the unique issues presented by various subgroups of students and to endeavor to meet those needs. In order to understand others, it is important to begin with an understanding of oneself. The Seattle University program is characterized by a large amount of student reflection. Being contemplative in action requires that graduate students prepare themselves to serve as thoughtful professionals who have studied the clientele with whom they will be working as professionals. In a sense the body of knowledge they must learn is the college student, and an appropriate starting point is oneself. This beginning place is inspired by the Jesuit *Spiritual Exercises* (Ignatius of Loyola, 1548/1964), intended to help people understand themselves and their lives and to make a decision. The *Spiritual Exercises* are intended to help retreatants discern God's will for them (Modras, 2004). Although admittedly less religious in form, the reflection component of the master's program is intended to lead students to self-understanding in much the same way.

This reflection is meant as a springboard for work with students, not as an end in itself. The Jesuit Educational Association stated that each Jesuit college should resolve to locate the student at the heart of the institution's efforts, understanding the student "not as subject or financial resource or academic prime matter, but as a person" (Thon, 1989, p. 14). Implementing the Jesuit philosophy of *cura personalis* as a student affairs professional, regardless of the setting, requires an understanding of others that is formed from the type of self-understanding that only results from intensive self-reflection. One of the goals of professional education is to help students acquire the thought processes of the profession in order to help professionals diagnose specific needs and to determine, recommend, and take appro-

priate action concerning the areas of their professional responsibility (Hoberman & Mailick, 1994). In the Seattle University master's program this aspect of professional development is grounded in the principles of Jesuit education.

Courses in the master's program are designed to help emerging professionals understand the students they will be serving. Student development theory is mined, not only to understand classic conceptions of students and student development, but also for contemporary models to help our graduates better understand the learners from more diverse backgrounds who are now studying on our campuses. Because a graduate preparation program needs to include the development of the skills that will be needed in practice (Creamer & Winston, 2002), several courses provide students with specific skills in order to serve students. These include counseling skills, conducting research, conflict resolution, and leadership development. The leadership development aspect of the program proceeds from the assumption that leadership comes from within. This perspective is grounded in the Ignatian understanding of the value of the *Spiritual Exercises* (Ignatius of Loyola, 1548/1964) as an important tool for self-understanding and decision making. But leadership is not valuable for its own sake, only in service to others, so practical skills must be added to self-knowledge and philosophical writings about the nature of leadership in order to make a complete program.

A second major theme of the Seattle University master's program is understanding and fostering diversity. This is another area where the foundations of Jesuit higher education and the student affairs profession intersect. When the early Jesuits opened their schools to all who were qualified, regardless of class structure, they had a transformative impact on society (Modras, 2004). In this spirit, student affairs educators today are called to work with diverse populations and to help students learn to live productively in our pluralistic world. They must assist students to develop interpersonal and intrapersonal competence, be sensitive to cultural differences, and have a respect for those with values and beliefs different from their own (Keeling, 2004). The master's program at Seattle University gives students an understanding of theories of student development for students across the spectrum of diversity on college campuses today, requires a course in multicultural perspectives, and exposes students to best practices in the area of meeting the needs of multicultural students and programming for diverse student populations. Successful services and programs are analyzed for why they work and how they can be replicated.

A third theme of the master's program at Seattle University is ethics and values. Similar to professional preparation programs in other disciplines, contemporary student affairs programs must have a strong ethical foundation

(Keeling, 2004). Some have gone so far as to say that student affairs professionals are “the moral conscience of the campus” (Brown, 1985, p. 69). In keeping with its Jesuit educational tradition, faculty and students in the Seattle University master’s program explore together ethical dilemmas in higher education and the role of values on college campuses. Students receive grounding in ethical principles, case study applications, professional association standards, and learn about theories of student ethical development. Educators in all disciplines in Jesuit universities are called to go beyond secular ethical principles, “cultivating moral concern about how people ought to live together” (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 12). In a Jesuit university, students should be challenged to translate a moral perspective to the student affairs profession. Educators who have studied in a Jesuit university should have a heightened commitment to injustice inside the academy, as well as outside it.

A major distinction of Jesuit institutions is their values-centered curriculum. In describing the Christian orientation of major public universities in the 19th century, historian Veysey (1965) noted that even as their religion became largely ethical in content, it still retained ties to its more orthodox past. Until the proliferation of state-supported American universities in the latter half of the 20th century, the “development of Christian moral character” was the “predominant developmental theory” that guided the university-student relationship (Upcraft & Moore, 1990, p. 42). These religious connections are now largely absent from the public institutions where over 70% of graduate preparation programs in student affairs reside. However, Jesuit university educators are called to experience “personal involvement with innocent suffering, with the injustice others suffer” (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 10). They are called to instill in their students acts of solidarity and compassion for others, especially for the disadvantaged and oppressed. The application of this to graduate education is found in the selection of readings, classroom activities, service-learning, and the example of faculty who are attempting to lead lives of active engagement within their communities. Jesuit educators have publicly stated that their defining commitment is to ask, “When researching and teaching, where and with whom is my heart?” (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 12). Encouraging our students to ask this question as they provide services to students will go a long way toward bringing their Jesuit education to life in the world of student affairs professional practice.

The final theme of the Seattle University master’s program is adapting student services to the educational environment of a particular institution’s culture. This could be said to flow naturally from the early Jesuits and their efforts to accommodate to various cultures. Many of the meditations in the *Spiritual Exercises* (Ignatius of Loyola, 1548/1964) begin with a “composi-

tion of place,” described as “an exercise of the imagination to situate prayerful contemplation in concrete human circumstances” (Kolvenbach, 2000b, pp. 8-9). Composition of time and place is also needed by student affairs professionals. Graduate students need to learn to adapt programs and services to the unique characteristics of individual educational institutions. This is another form of diversity, institutional diversity, which must be included in graduate preparation. Compared with just a few years ago, part-time enrollments continue to grow, as do enrollments in certificate programs of less than 2 years. Distance learning and online courses also make up an increasing share of the educational marketplace (Magolda & Terenzini, 1999). As the Jesuits have done with their ministries, higher education also needs to adopt a stronger global perspective. As the nations of the world grow more interdependent, national boundaries are more permeable than ever before. It is incumbent upon emerging professionals in the student affairs field to understand international perspectives of education, as well as the backgrounds and characteristics of the students who come from other countries. It will also become increasingly important for graduate students in student affairs preparation programs to study abroad in order to understand issues of educational and social justice from an international perspective. Just as Jesuit missionaries have excelled at accommodating diverse cultures, exemplified by early Jesuits like Matteo Ricci and Roberto di Nobili and more contemporary leaders like Pedro Arrupe (Modras, 2004), student affairs professionals need to adapt student services to various types of educational environments.

A hallmark of Seattle University’s student affairs preparation program is the internship experience and accompanying course component. It serves as one of the central opportunities for the integration of student development principles and practice with the characteristics of Jesuit education, mission and method. In the context of this opportunity, students engage in 300 hours of field experience for exposure to practice in student affairs settings and to integrate their academic coursework with this professional practice by observing and applying theory, principles, and best practices learned in their graduate program. Within the accompanying course structure, students critically reflect upon their internship experience in relationship to the preparation program themes of understanding students, understanding and fostering diversity, ethics and values, and environment and culture. In addition, guided assignments and in-class activities also require them to reflect upon mission and leadership, with the primary goal to enable graduate students to become reflective practitioners, contemplative in action, within the student affairs profession. Through class reflection groups, guided journal writing, an analysis paper, and seminar presentation, each student is challenged to

make meaningful connections among the university, the student, and the world. They are given a framework of inquiry that encourages the process of wrestling with significant issues and complex values of life, with professors capable and willing to guide that inquiry (Duminuco, 2000). Engaging graduate students in this very Ignatian process of reflection, faculty challenge emerging professionals to discover the significance of their experience and learning,

its implications, likely effects upon his or her own life and those of others, and possible choices to be made. This moves learning beyond the realm of an objective grasp of facts, principles, and skills to the level of personal meaning...and is more likely to lead to action based upon conviction. (Duminuco, 2000, p. 157)

The student educational experience through the entire internship process becomes one of active participation in learning, engagement in the community, and values-centered discernment, and exposes them to acts of solidarity, diverse communities and cultures, as well as leadership and compassion for and with others.

Most Jesuit universities are located in large urban centers. This intentional urban focus has been captured this way: “‘Ignatius loved the great cities’ because they were the places where...the transformation of the human community was taking place” (Daoust, 2001, p. 18). The opportunities often found in the urban locations of most Jesuit universities expose students to all aspects of urban life. As the former president of Fordham University in New York City has written, “the city, then, represents a resource for the university community that takes conflicting forms: exciting career opportunities but also disturbing social pathologies” (O’Hare, 2000, p. 5). Both forms are rich opportunities for student learning. It is incumbent upon student affairs preparation programs in Jesuit universities to capitalize on their urban locations by extending the campus into their larger communities. An obvious way in which this might happen is by a commitment to utilizing the principles of service learning within the curriculum.

Many Jesuit universities over the past decade have created centers for service learning. Within these centers’ names, the Jesuit mission blossoms. Examples include: Georgetown University’s The Center for Social Justice Research, Teaching, and Service (<http://www.georgetown.edu/home/service.html>); the University of San Francisco’s Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good (<http://www.usfca.edu/acadserv/catalog>); and Santa Clara University’s The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education (<http://www.scu.edu/ignatiancenter/index.cfm>). The umbrella organization of the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education at Santa Clara University includes

the Pedro Arrupe, S.J., Partnerships for Community-Based Learning, the Bannan Institute for Jesuit Educational Mission, and the Kolvenbach Solidarity Program. In discussing service learning at Santa Clara, its president says, “integrating critical thinking with personal engagement challenges the illusions of privilege and individualism. It makes learning come alive for students as they learn to believe that they can make a difference in their world” (Locatelli, 1998, p. 5). Finally, in the 2005-2006 academic year, Loyola College in Maryland’s Center for Community Service and Justice collaborated with a campus-wide “Year of the City” initiative in which, through discipline-specific service-learning courses, departmental programs, and community-wide events, students became actively engaged in their learning and community in order to experience well-educated solidarity (Kolvenbach, 2000b).

To be effective, such a utilization of the urban area as a classroom requires a commitment of the university as a whole to take into its own life the sufferings and authentic strivings of the wider human community. This commitment to solidarity—as an educational goal and institutional priority—is expressive of an incarnate spirituality that honors the dignity of all persons and is informed by God’s special love for those who are poor and oppressed. (Loyola College in Maryland, 2006, p. 1)

Student affairs professional preparation programs in Jesuit settings embrace service-learning through internship opportunities and seminar courses. The program at Seattle University has supported internships in which graduate students have served as service-learning course assistants accompanying undergraduate students in their service within local communities and then facilitating reflection components integrating the academic coursework with the service experiences. Some graduate interns have organized urban immersion service opportunities for first-year orientation programs and others have integrated, into their studies, projects of educational access with men who are homeless and living in Seattle’s Tent City. Finally, one student completed an international internship in Australia to compare service-learning programs within a more global context. In order to provide more of the educational framework and theory as well as the Jesuit context to service learning, we have included service learning within the best practices course in the master’s program. During this course, Jesuit concepts of active engagement, the holistic development of the student, reflection as a learning tool, and justice education are presented as both theoretical constructs and through a case-study approach. The interconnectedness of student development theory and practice and Jesuit education is apparent when the service-learning model of student development (Delve, Mintz, &

Stewart, 1990) and foundations of justice (McGinnis, 1984) are interwoven throughout the seminar.

Underlying the successful implementation of mission and the many dimensions of the Jesuit way of proceeding is collaboration and partnership. No one Jesuit, no one student affairs professional, no one student acts alone or proceeds solo. Therefore, partnership and collaboration are more than pragmatic practice. They are essential elements of the “way of proceeding” that are “rooted in the realization that to lead and serve in our complex and divided world requires a plurality of gifts, perspectives, and experiences, both international and multicultural” (McCarthy, 1995, p. 240). Therefore, collaboration and partnerships across academic disciplines, between academic and student affairs, and extended to campus and external communities are encouraged. Graduate students working in graduate assistantships and internships within academic affairs and student development departments experience this collaboration and learn to contribute their unique gifts and perspectives and cultivate their skills of effective partnering.

CONCLUSION

A graduate program to prepare student affairs administrators is an ideal fit with Jesuit higher education. If there is one overriding disposition we would like emerging student affairs practitioners to possess, it is putting concern for the education and development of students at the heart of their activities. This orientation flows naturally from the centuries-old tradition of the Society of Jesus, a tradition that has always placed the education of the whole person at the center of its activities.

The Superior General of the Society of Jesus has challenged educators in Jesuit universities to conceptualize anew what it means to educate the whole person. He has called for a more “educated awareness of society and culture” (Kolvenbach, 2000b, p. 10). If this direction is seen as imperative to Jesuit universities, then it is logical to expect that graduate preparation programs in Jesuit settings should attempt to link their missions and ways of proceeding to this purpose. This aim could be transformative for graduate preparation. It could refocus the target of graduate professional education from the profession to the society in which the profession exists. It takes to heart Kolvenbach’s admonition that we ask the following questions about the nature of knowledge acquisition: “For whom? For what?” (as cited in Spohn, 2001, p. 11).

In keeping with the jubilee moment of celebrating the Jesuit founders’ mission and tradition passed on through the centuries, we also rejoice in the professional formation extended to student development graduate students in Jesuit universities. Our hope and our goal as educators is that these students

will become active and engaged learners, develop into leaders of competence, conscience, and compassionate commitment, and that they will contribute to the creation of a more just and humane world. Enriched by their Jesuit education, they possess skills, experiences, and values to become critical thinkers, reflective practitioners, lifelong learners, and dedicated professionals committed to the promotion of justice. Our graduates gain a clearer appreciation for multicultural diversity and global interdependence. They consider institutions of higher education not only from organizational and student development perspectives but also from the lenses of mission and practice, leadership and service, and excellence devoted to having the greatest positive impact on society. Given the Jesuit context in which these emerging student affairs professionals are prepared and educated, we continue to pause and reflect on their *magis* and their striving to witness to excellence and justice in their professional field and world. These emerging leaders will help to shape their profession and the institutions, Jesuit or not, where they will work. In a Jesuit preparation program attuned to the mission of Jesuit education, one which strives to incorporate the legacy of the Jesuit educational tradition into both the academic and out-of-class activities of its students, these future alumni of a Jesuit student affairs preparation program will learn to put their focus on the students with whom they work, not for their sake exclusively, but for the society and world in which they will live and lead.

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education. (1989a). The student personnel point of view. In National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (Ed.), *Points of view* (pp. 47-63). Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1937)
- American Council on Education. (1989b). The student personnel point of view. In National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (Ed.), *Points of view* (pp. 21-46). Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1949)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Brown, R. D. (1985). Creating an ethical community. In H. J. Canon & R. D. Brown (Eds.), *Applied ethics in student services* (pp. 67-79). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Coomes, M. D., & Gerda, J. A. (Eds.). (2006). *Directory of graduate programs preparing student affairs professionals*. Retrieved May 24, 2006, from <http://www.myacpa.org/c12/directory.htm>
- Creamer, D. G., & Winston, R. B. (2002). Foundations of the supervised practice experience: Definitions, context and philosophy. In D. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Learning through supervised practice in student affairs* (pp. 1-34). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Daout, J. (2001). Of kingfishers and dragonflies: Faith and justice at the core of Jesuit education. *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education*, 19, 13-20.
- Delve, C., Mintz, S., & Stewart, G. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C. Delve, S. Mintz & G. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (pp. 7-29). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Duminuco, V. J. (2000). *The Jesuit ratio studiorum: 400th anniversary perspectives*. New York: Fordham University Press.

- Georgetown University. (2006). *Mission statement*. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from <http://216.181.21.96/tier.aspx?bid=141#gu>
- Hoberman, S., & Mailick, S. (1994). Introduction. In S. Hoberman, S. Mailick, & R. Ebert (Eds.), *Professional education in the United States: Experiential learning, issues, and prospects* (pp. 3-6). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Ignatius of Loyola. (1964). *The spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius* (A. Mottola, Trans.). Garden City, NY: Image Books. (Original work published 1548)
- International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education. (1986). *Go forth and teach: The characteristics of Jesuit education*. Rome: General Curia of the Society of Jesus.
- Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience* (Unabridged). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association & the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Kolvenbach, P. (1989, June). *Assembly 1989: Jesuit ministry in higher education*. Address delivered at Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
- Kolvenbach, P. (2000a). Themes of Jesuit higher education. In J. J. Callahan (Ed.), *Heartland III*. Retrieved May 31, 2006, from <http://www.creighton.edu/Heartland3/r-themes.html>
- Kolvenbach, P. (2000b, October). *The service of faith and the promotion of justice in American Jesuit higher education*. Public lecture delivered at Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA.
- Locatelli, P. (1998, September). *Cultural understanding in Jesuit education: A pedagogy of engagement*. Convocation address delivered at Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.scu.edu/president/publiccommentary/fallconvocation1998.cfm>
- Loyola College in Maryland. (2006). *Year of the city: A message from the president*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://www.loyola.edu/yotc>
- Magolda, M. B., & Terenzini, P. T. (1999). Learning and teaching in the 21st century: Trends and implications for practice. In C. S. Johnson & H. E. Cheatham (Eds.), *Higher education trends for the next century: A research agenda for student success* (pp. 20-29). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.
- McCarthy, J. L. (Ed.). (1995). *Documents of the thirty-fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus*. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources.
- McGinnis, J. B. (1984). *Educating for peace and justice: Religious dimensions*. St. Louis, MO: Institute for Peace and Justice.
- Modras, R. (2004). *Ignatian humanism: A dynamic spirituality for the 21st century*. Chicago: Loyola Press.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (1989). A perspective on student affairs. In National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (Ed.), *Points of view* (pp. 1-19). Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1987)
- O'Hare, J. A. (2000). The city as classroom. *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education, 17*, 4-10.
- Padberg, J. W. (Ed.). (1977). *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*. St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources.
- Rausch, M., & Currie, C. L. (2006). Preface. In *Mission and identity activity at Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States*. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from <http://www.ajcunet.edu/tier.aspx?bid=109>
- Rhatigan, J. J. (2000). The history and philosophy of student affairs. In M. J. Barr & M. K. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (pp. 3-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Santa Clara University. (2006). *Mission statement*. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from <http://216.181.21.96/tier.aspx?bid=141#scu>
- Schroeder, C. C. (1996). The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 118-122.
- Schroeder, C. C., & Hurst, J. C. (1996). Designing learning environments that integrate curricular and cocurricular experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 174-181.
- Seattle University. (2006). *Mission*. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from <http://216.181.21.96/tier.aspx?bid=141#su>
- Spohn, W. (2001). The university that does justice. *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education, 19*, 4-12.
- Steffes, J. S. (2004). Creating powerful learning environments beyond the classroom. *Change, 36*(3), 46-50.

- Thon, A. J. (1989). *The Ignatian perspective: The role of student affairs in Jesuit higher education*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University.
- Topel, J. (1992). *Some characteristics of Jesuit higher education*. Seattle, WA: Seattle University, Office of Jesuit Identity.
- Upcraft, M. L., & Moore, L.V. (1990). Evolving theoretical perspectives of student development. In M. J. Barr & M. L. Upcraft (Eds.), *New futures for student affairs* (pp. 41-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jeremy Stringer is an associate professor and director of the Student Development Administration Master's Program at Seattle University. Erin Swezey is co-director of Magis and an adjunct professor in Student Development Administration at Seattle University. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Dr. Jeremy Stringer, Seattle University, Department of Professional Studies/Student Development Administration, 901 12th Avenue, P. O. Box 222000, Seattle, WA 98122-1090.