

Community HIR Fellows Working Group

**A White Paper on Community as an Institutional Learning Goal at the University of
Dayton**

June 1, 2019

Submitted by

Steve Herndon, Assistant Vice President & Executive Director of Housing and Residence Life
Kelly Johnson, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Religious Studies

Introduction

*"Each Marianist, each community, and each of our institutions must discern how it can best enter into the work of building a society marked by justice and charity."
--"Vision and Journey," Society of Mary General Chapter 1986, #23.*

Blessed William Joseph Chaminade, one of the founders of the Society of Mary, saw community not as an end to rest in but as a way of changing the world by building relationships in which Christianity is practiced and re-discovered. He founded a missionary movement. From a small beginning, the Marianist movement became a major force in renewing Catholicism in France and in proclaiming good news around the world. The University of Dayton arises from and continues to claim that Marianist heritage. It is in that transformational spirit that UD also claims "community" as an Institutional Learning Goal, an essential aspect of the education of every student at UD.

But appeals to "community" at UD often have confused and sometimes diametrically opposed meanings. Is it about learning or is it about what happens when we rest from learning? In what ways does "community" refer to our living together among ourselves and in what ways to mission? To what extent does it mean focusing on what we have in common and to what extent is it about welcoming difference as part of our life? Does a community include disagreement and argument or are those failures of community? Is it about a historical identity or is it about an openness the future and to change? How does that Catholic and Marianist tradition of community apply to the religiously diverse community of the University? These questions touch on sore points in our shared life because they arise out of our greatest pleasures and our deepest hurts. At a cultural moment when we are more aware than ever that some among us are not safe from insults, hatred, and even gross injustice, we have to be willing to talk about these hard questions.

This report will consider the meaning of community both in UD's historic mission and in the ways it is practiced at UD now, with an eye to clarifying the issues and offering a vision that can address the tensions (and outright contradictions) in ways of living in community at UD. Our hope is that by both highlighting some of the fruitful approaches currently taken and frankly identifying obstacles and failures, we can contribute to the continuing work of community as a learning goal. Community is not just a collection of people; it is an intentional and ongoing practice oriented toward the common good.

Process

Community is at the core of the University's Catholic and Marianist identity, and President Spina's inaugural address on UD as a "university for the common good" offered a profound re-commitment to building and enhancing community on campus, in the broader Dayton region, and beyond. While community is vital to our identity, a careful look at our varied uses of and appeals to "community" actually reveals wide divergences in our understandings of it. Phrases such as "the common good" and "family spirit" are used as though they have a single meaning, when in fact they have different meanings that are influenced by one's culture, values, and experiences. We have rich reflections on community in the 2006 *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* and the more operational characterization of "community" as an Institutional Learning Goal (ILG). Nevertheless, appeals to community by various constituents at UD are inconsistent and often nebulous. The resulting confusion hinders good communication and creative collaboration around this topic.

In spite of its centrality in UD's mission and identity, among the seven ILGs, "community" is the one least often referred to in CAP course proposals. In October 2017, a Working Group composed of faculty and staff was constructed and charged with producing a white paper that includes a consensus-built definition of community as a learning goal for UD. The working group membership is as follows:

- Kim Bigelow, School of Engineering (*left the working group at the end of the spring 2018 term*)
- Una Cadegan, College of Arts and Sciences
- Diana Cuy Castellanos, School of Education & Health Sciences
- Alan Demmitt, School of Education and Health Sciences (*left the working group at the end of the spring 2018 term*)
- Christopher Fishpaw, Student Development
- Hunter Goodman, College of Arts and Sciences
- Daria-Yvonne Graham, Student Development
- Joe Krella, School of Business Administration (*joined the working group in fall 2018*)
- Chad Painter, College of Arts and Sciences (*left the working group at the end of the spring 2018 term*)
- Kathy Sales, Campus Ministry
- Kellie Schneider, School of Engineering (*joined the working group in fall 2018*)
- Castel Sweet, Fitz Center (*joined the working group in fall 2018*)
- Bill Trollinger, College of Arts and Sciences (*left the working group at the end of the spring 2018 term*)
- Erick Vasquez, School of Engineering (*left the working group at the end of the spring 2018 term*)
- Chanel Wright, Center for International Programs
- Mary Ziskin, School of Education and Health Sciences

The working group began its work on December 1, 2017, and throughout the spring term met biweekly for discussion, beginning with review of the *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* and study of the Marianist founders and their work. Working Group members also contributed readings from their various disciplines, drawing attention to topics such as the cosmopolitan canopy, diverse anthropologies, support for students of color on college campuses, the moral dynamics of privileged groups, the relation of human communities to biological communities, and communities of differently-abled people. The group gained important insight from a short presentation given by our colleague Chris Agnew for the "Global Voices" symposium in January of 2018, which both pressed the question of what end community serves at UD and sharpened our sense of community's inevitable boundaries. We discovered with gratitude a bit of wisdom from Parker Palmer: because we always come to community with our own issues, "community is that place where the person you least want to live with always lives" ("Thirteen Ways of Looking at Community").

Additionally, the Working Group convened to construct a vision for community that aligns with the University's identity and strategic priorities, showcasing the complexity, depth, and breadth of the learning goal, so that it can be applied in a manner that has intellectual coherence and practical meaning for students.

In an attempt to gain a comprehensive view of work related to community at the university, the co-chairs divided the working group into five teams that addressed community from the following perspectives: curricular efforts, co-curricular efforts, community partnerships with Dayton,

employment concerns, and the student experience. The work teams met throughout the spring term to construct and execute their plans. The Working Group, after consultation, chose not to engage questions related to graduate programs. The community ILG does apply to them. However, because such programs are oriented to formation into a particular professional community, it will apply in distinct ways to different programs. The question of how the ILG applies to each may more fruitfully be taken up by those programs, in light of this paper's vision and findings.

The working group reconvened in August 2018 and began to hone in on the relationship of community to scholarship. At the risk of oversimplifying, we can say that on one hand, at UD as elsewhere, scholarship is often understood as the rigorous work of an individual mind. On the other hand, "community" concerns what is affective, relational, and unintellectual. While we will describe some outstanding examples of initiatives at UD that model a different approach to community and scholarship, those examples are notable because they still cut against the grain of our collective habit, which is to assume that community is what we do when we are finished with scholarship for the day. This bifurcation seems to be the root of the difficulty.

In particular, the working group discussed the representation of community as a feeling of comfort and belonging among people who are all similar, so that it

- justifies insularity and the exclusion of those who are different;
- serves to suppress disagreement, as though the expression of critique is counter to community;
- can be used to reject discipline and structure, as though the exercise of authority is per se opposed to community; and
- is invoked as an alternative to the intellectual work of the community, as though happy relationships are the real business of the college experience, while academic work is just an external and superficial business of credentialing.

Maintaining this feeling of comfort and belonging is imagined to be the responsibility of Student Development and other offices that contribute to our students' co-curricular learning experience. This conception of "community" does not require students to value difference, conflict, and the exploration of one's values and their alignment with one's decision-making, behaviors and actions. Instead, community is romantically pictured as open doors and front porches, while in fact it underpins behaviors that compromise the integrity and safety of its members. The Student Development staff becomes responsible for controlling and entertaining students, thereby diminishing the credibility of co-curricular learning and the Division's contribution to our students' holistic development. This portrayal of Student Development is supported by a narrative that characterizes co-curricular learning, and by default Student Affairs divisions, as supportive of "real" learning, which for most people is classroom learning. This narrative is widely observed and experienced at universities across the United States. Removing silos that reinforce the division and separation of the curricular and the co-curricular is imperative to advancing community as a learning goal and providing students with an example of community that showcases its complexity and depth.

Throughout September and October, the work teams met to gather data, report findings and develop recommendations for advancing community as a learning goal at UD. The co-chairs drafted the final report using the working group's vision and the work teams' research as their guide.

Vision

The Working group was charged with offering a clear and precise account of the significance of “community” at UD. Aware that community is a living reality composed of particular relationships rather than a static concept, the group offers the following vision to guide future discussions.

At UD, “community” refers to the ongoing work of promoting the common good, arising from the Catholic and Marianist mission, based in Dayton, Ohio.

the ongoing work: Community is not a possession we hold or a destination at which we will one day arrive. It is a difficult and joyful process of engagement with each other. The UD community embraces new members of staff, faculty, and student body as they arrive, welcoming the hopes, talents, and ideas they bring. Each member of the community learns, in formal and informal ways, how we will be community together.

This work of community is countercultural: rather than aiming to gain and protect individual security, education at UD aims to discover our connections to each other and to recognize our differences from each other. We challenge false universalism and false individualism, promoting forms of study and life in which people attend to the limitations of our perspectives and welcome mutuality as a strength.

Community should not be presumed to be the concern of students alone. The responsibility for maintaining continuity and leading adaptation belongs to faculty and staff. Discovering and committing to our interdependence is intellectual work that has to be advanced in scholarship, modeled in the classroom, and cultivated in student life.

of promoting the common good: Community at UD refers to our participation in a common good: this Catholic and Marianist university that educates the whole person. Each person here benefits from that good and each person’s flourishing is constitutive of it. We are bound together by our commitment to the university, our arguments about it, our work for it, and our pleasure in each other’s good company along the way.

But the common good is not only about the university we share. We at UD also share an orientation toward the common good of humanity as understood in Catholic tradition: “the good of all people and of the whole person.... The human person cannot find fulfillment in himself, that is, apart from the fact that he exists ‘with’ others and ‘for’ others” (Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church, #165). No person can truly thrive while others are excluded or diminished; humans flourish by living together. Attention to the universal common good shapes our thinking, as well as our living together. In every discipline, scholarly work on human dignity and human interdependence particularly contributes to community at UD and beyond.

Attention to our common good does not reduce conflict. It may increase it. We do not always agree what the common good at UD or the common good of humanity will require. Indeed, we do not agree what precisely we are aiming at, in its fullness. We bear histories of injustice that distort our perceptions and harm our relationships. Dismantling systems and structures that continue to marginalize and oppress members of our community based on some aspects of their identity is essential and will be controversial. We must affirm each other’s worth, but we will not always agree with each other’s ideas. A commitment to the common good means that we “stay at the table” with each other, using processes of dialogue and conflict management, peacebuilding and collaboration,

to continue to learn from each other what our shared good is. Some differences will be resolved. Some will persist. We will continue to value each other and to seek the good that we share.

arising from the Catholic and Marianist mission: Two central affirmations of Catholic teaching, the common good and human dignity, share the same basis: the God who made, sustains, and brings to fullness each human life also made all creation to flourish together. This knowledge fosters our courage to work together, even when our differences seem insurmountable.

UD's Catholic and Marianist commitments cannot be everything or speak for everyone. The community shaped by these commitments has a particular history and mission, as every community does. However, its educational mission is open and welcoming, benefiting from the gifts and work of all people of good will who are drawn to it. We both embrace the traditions that have brought us to where we are and welcome the developments that come as new members and generations join in the mission.

Among Catholic religious congregations, Marianists are remarkable for beginning as lay communities. Their story is both inspiring and pragmatically illuminating. William Joseph Chaminade's vision was to renew life in France after a period of brutal division and suppression of faith by establishing communities that would include people from all walks of life, to learn from each other and to grow in mutual love. Marie Thérèse de Lamourous, the founder of Marianist lay communities, sought the material and spiritual well-being of the women with whom she worked on terms that respected their dignity and autonomy. Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon, founder of the Marianist sisters, tended ceaselessly to relationships in ways that transcended time and distance. The purpose of community for these founders was the renewal of Christian faith and human society, and they saw in the mission of educating people from all classes a key source for that renewal. We likewise seek an understanding of educational community that, in our own time and place, fosters renewal of civic life, of faith, and of the common good.

based in Dayton, Ohio: The University of Dayton was founded in 1850 as St. Mary's School for Boys in Dayton, Ohio. Throughout its history, the University has maintained a commitment to this place, formalizing this commitment in 1920, when St. Mary's College was renamed the University of Dayton. Therefore, the work of community at UD does not exist in a vacuum, but is informed by its particular history, including legacies of injustice, and by the land and water of this place. The history and characteristics of this city shape us, our choices, and our actions. We work alongside other residents of the area to build a just and sustainable city.

UD is more than Dayton. While our community grows from our history, it is also shaped by national and global trends, and our community is no longer limited to this location. UD's community now includes its members when they are studying abroad or working in internships and cooperative education, as they join UD for study online and in digital communities, and as they relocate after graduation. Nevertheless, even as it extends beyond our geography, UD's community is not a theory, an idea, or a brand. It is the actual people who are living and studying together, carrying forward the university's mission.

Methods and Findings

The five work teams were asked to identify initiatives, processes and/or structures that exist to promote community, support that is needed to deepen the good work that currently exists, and structures and processes that are missing or broken that inhibit further development,

understanding, and application of community as a learning goal. Teams used a variety of methods as appropriate to their topic, including meetings with campus constituents and researching University websites, databases and inventories. Their findings point out the necessity of approaching community as a learning goal which requires work by both faculty and staff across campus to attend to the particular histories and relationships that shape our thinking, to promote justice, and to embrace the intersection of our identities. Below is a summary of the work teams' methods and findings.

Community Partnerships: Chris Fishpaw, Hunter Phillips Goodman, Castel Sweet, Erick Vasquez.

Method: The community partnership work team conducted an initial survey of engagement and partnerships between the University and the members of the City of Dayton. The team reviewed information available on the internet, including the City of Dayton Community Engagement Strategy, partnerships surrounding onMain, facilities partnerships with The Dayton Foundation and the Dayton Development Coalition, artistic partnerships with DCDC, and community building partnerships with the Lincoln Hill Gardens. The work team also researched available data on community partnerships, including the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification (approved in 2015), the student and faculty engagement survey conducted annually by the Fitz Center, student organization recognition and event registration data, and community-engaged learning courses. Finally, the work team engaged faculty, staff, and community partners in discussions to identify and explore any missing data. Through these methods, the team explored how the City thinks about and characterizes community, institutional partnerships, ways that faculty and staff engage the community and leverage partnerships with community agencies and organizations, and partnerships between student organizations and the community.

Findings:

- The University values community partnerships as demonstrated by the fiscal resources invested in partnerships with the City of Dayton. Examples of these investments include the partnerships with the Dayton Foundation and the Dayton Development Coalition, the Dayton Arcade, and the partnership with RTA, Premier Health, and CareSource in the development of the Flyer, a free circulator, connecting UD with downtown Dayton.
- The University has institutional memberships with organizations that value and focus on community partnerships. Imagining America, the Coalition of Urban Metropolitan Universities, Campus Compact, Vote Everywhere, and the International Association of Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement are examples of organizations with which the University has institutional memberships.
- The Community Building Coordinating Consortium was convened in 2017-18. The consortium engaged internal campus stakeholders and community partners to determine a plan for how the University can work collaboratively across campus and with community partners. In particular, the consortium's report called for greater collaboration and training on how to structure and assess partnerships in ways that strengthen and enhance the University's partnerships within the city of Dayton.
- Faculty are highly engaged with the greater community through the partnerships established in each school. Examples of such partnerships include the Center for Catholic Education, the Urban Teacher Academy, DECA, and the Bombeck Center in the School of Education and Health Services, the Dayton Law Clinic in the School of Law, the International, Service and Experiential Education (BWISE) program in the School of Business, and the partnerships with local chapters of technical societies in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering.

- Student organizations are highly engaged and committed to developing partnerships with the City of Dayton, with over 35% of organizations establishing formal partnerships with local non-profits, schools, business, chapters of national organizations, and hospitals.
- Our community engagement work is decentralized. Great work is happening but without key coordination and common expectations for community partners.
- The relationship between the University and the city of Dayton is one-sided insofar as the University sends faculty, staff, and students into the greater community but does not consistently invite partners into the University community. Moreover, some partners expressed that the relationship with the University focused more on service than the development of a partnership, leaving some partners questioning the value of the relationship.

Co-Curricular: Daria Graham, Steve Herndon, Kelly Johnson, Chad Painter

Method: The co-curricular work team surveyed the Engagement Generator and the Residential Curriculum as the sites that reflect current efforts in Housing and Residence Life and Student Development toward community. The work team identified common themes that ran through the various initiatives. The team used those themes to analyze how the initiatives are reflective of the Community ILG. As part of its analysis, the work team also noted aspects of the ILG that were less developed and areas of co-curricular life that are under addressed.

Findings:

- Student Development offers a wide variety and large number of opportunities for students to make progress toward meeting the community ILG. The Co-Curricular team found fewer initiatives that develop students' awareness of power imbalances, increase their capacity to address injustice, particularly racial injustice; promote recognition of interdependence; and the transformational (or missional) quality of community.
- UD lacks intentional co-curricular support for commuter students. We need ways to honor their role in the community, create more opportunities for them to develop the skills related to community, and elicit their wisdom about and for community.
- Housing and Residence Life's residential curriculum offers a framework and structure for exploring the intersection of the curricular and co-curricular, thereby deepening students' understanding of the ILG.
- AVIATE is the alignment of Housing and Residence Life's residential curriculum with the housing assignment process. Students accumulate PATH credits either by engaging in learning opportunities offered in the residential curriculum or participating in faculty and staff sponsored events that align with Housing and Residence Life's learning goals. Students' PATH credits, in turn, determine their priority in obtaining their desired housing. AVIATE is an important structural support for co-curricular efforts that address the ILG. It incentivizes student learning, which is necessary, but can also shift the focus from learning to earning credits. This remains a matter of concern and some debate.

Curricular: Kim Bigelow, Diana Guy Castellanos, Joe Krella, Kellie Schneider, Bill Trollinger

Method: The curricular work team conducted an analysis of "Community" CAP courses in CIM and interviewed faculty within in their respective schools and colleges to learn more about their understanding of community. As part of the interviews, faculty discussed the opportunities and challenges they have experienced with incorporating the Community ILG into their courses.

Findings:

- Five themes regarding the incorporation of the “community” concept were identified from the course “Community” analysis. 1) Students collaborate and work with other students in shared space. 2) Students understand the historical roots, intellectual characteristics, limits and interconnections of communities (including religious communities), 3) students understand and prepare selves to interact with “the other”. 4) Students understand themselves as part of learning or professional community. 5) Student work focuses on local community, community of origin and community engagement.
- Community is not viewed as a significant, scholarly pursuit, and while incorporated in many courses, is often not the focus or identified as a focus. Consequently, there are questions regarding what pedagogical approaches would be most effective in integrating community into the curriculum
- Lack of development funding; a need to prioritize other ILGs and keep the total number low for the sake of assessment; and a lack of understanding of the approval process were cited as reasons for the dearth of CAP courses that address community. Moreover, there is general recognition from faculty that the idea of “community” is important, but an underdeveloped understanding of what that concept means.
- The work team noted the important relationship between space and learning. The GEMnasium, a collaborative hands-on ‘test lab’ that allows UD students, faculty, staff, and regional partners to prototype new teaching and learning models for servant-leadership and social innovation provides an example of attention to this relationship. Creating new kinds of spaces for learning in, about, and for community should be a consideration as UD constructs and renovates campus facilities.

Employment: Una Cadegan, Alan Demmitt, Kathy Sales

Method: The Employment work team interviewed faculty and staff to learn about their understanding of and experience with community at UD. Upon completion of the interviews, the work team identified structures and systems that either promote or inhibit the development of community among faculty and staff.

Findings:

- There is an inevitable tension between a vision of community grounded in religious commitment and the contractual relationship between a university and its employees. The University can work to minimize this tension, and to make its processes as compatible with genuine community as possible, but it will never be entirely absent.
- For many employees of the university as well as for observers, the university’s commitment to community will be judged primarily on whether basic economic justice is present. To teach students to see and name and aim to transform relationships on this level will inevitably open us to internal criticism, but we should see that as a victory.
- How well the university lives up to other calls to justice also serve as a powerful witness to students and affect their learning. For example, how we address issues related to employment and community members who identify as LGBTQ, particularly in light of Catholic teaching, is an urgent sign of the times, to which students are probably paying more attention than we realize. Honesty about the difficulties and transparency about the processes are crucial. The confidentiality of personnel matters complicates these issues, but cannot be used as a screen to mask the difficulties.
- For faculty, the university’s commitment to community is powerfully reflected in whether they have the resources--especially time--to serve their students well, particularly in the

courses that are at the heart of the curriculum for every student. Extensive reliance on non-tenure-line faculty in CAP courses is a systemic issue in higher education, not just at UD. However, that does not release us from the obligation to find ways to mitigate its dangers.

- As much as possible, we need to avoid giving the impression that participating in community at UD is an “extra,” requiring attendance at social events, and that employees who do not or cannot participate in them are somehow not observing “community” at UD. Faculty who give dedicated attention to students and to research within a network of scholars are profoundly doing the work of community, and our institutional language should recognize and celebrate these dimensions as much as possible.

Student Experience: Steve Herndon, Chanel Wright, Mary Ziskin

Method: The Student Experience work team facilitated a campus forum for students to share their understanding of and experience with community at UD. Additionally, the work team conducted focus groups with commuter students and students from the Office of Multicultural Affairs, Center for International Programs and LGBTQ + Services to learn about their experience with community as a member of an underrepresented population.

Findings:

- Community as an institutional learning goal is not commonly understood by students. Community is a “good” or a “feeling” that students enjoy and value, not an ongoing process that requires their active participation and engagement. Consequently, conflict is viewed negatively, and dissonance is not a component of students’ concepts of community.
- Students view community as an experience that occurs outside the classroom, as illustrated by their references to open doors in the residence halls and the student neighborhood, and initiatives such as Christmas on Campus, Culture Fest and New Student Orientation.
- Students talked about how community was enacted in the classroom only when prompted. Students pointed to examples of faculty members checking in on them after failing an exam or missing an assignment as illustrations of community. For students, this gesture was demonstrative of faculty members’ acknowledgement of students’ lives outside the classroom.
- Commuter students and students from the Center for International Programs, the Office of Multicultural Affairs and LGBTQ+ Support Services provided examples of exclusion that contradicted the inclusive image of community articulated by our majority students. Members of these groups cited a superficial sense of community, an assumption and culture on campus that all students are residential and negative experiences with poor climate, bias incidents and microaggressions as circumstances that contributed to their exclusion. Members of these groups were able to articulate ways in which they were actively engaging in community in their own spaces and amongst peers with shared identities.
- The climate for diversity is central to how community is lived. The lack of compositional diversity is itself a barrier to an equitable climate and therefore to community. In order to enact community, the university has to interrogate its approach to framing and marketing community to determine the degree to which the approach is effective in supporting the inclusivity of its members.

Recommendations

Appeals to community are not always good: they can promote complacency, insularity, and even injustice. For community at UD to be the transformational and joyous reality of the Marianist charism, we must be clear in speech and practice that community is not just a feeling of comfort and belonging among those who are similar. It is an ongoing process of building the common good together. It requires that we, as scholars, teachers, and educational professionals, continually promote a climate of justice and inclusion, intellectual engagement with questions about the nature of the common good, openness to challenge and conflict, and attention to our particular and intersectional identities.

The co-chairs asked each work team to provide recommendations for advancing community as a learning goal at UD. Upon review of the recommendations, four themes emerged as priorities that the University must address for the ILG to have purpose and meaning for our students' curricular and co-curricular education. Below are the work team's recommendations for enhancing the University's vision and structure, faculty engagement, communication, and resources pertaining to the ILG.

Vision and Structure:

- Prioritize justice as a fundamental aspect of community. For community to be transformational, the University must be intentional and strategic about including analysis of privilege, oppression, and social identities as constructive aspects of students' curricular and co-curricular learning experiences. Justice, ordered toward human dignity and the common good, must also visibly be a priority in the university's dealings with employees and the city.
 - Those charged with implementing the University's Strategic Plan should engage this report concerning the ILG of community, to ensure alignment of this vision with efforts toward experiential/ community-based learning and intercultural learning and living.
 - CAP should promote the relationship between Diversity/Social Justice and the ILG of Community. Grants supporting development of courses that model the interconnection of the two ILGs as well as their distinction could motivate faculty initiatives.
 - The Provost and Vice President for Student Development should organize an ongoing dialogue among staff, faculty, and students about Christmas on Campus and other signature events related to community, with the aim of creating a shared vision of community as a learning goal.
- Provide a unified vision and developmentally- sequenced structure for onboarding new members (faculty, staff, and students) of the community and supporting their gradual learning about community over time.
 - Messaging to new students should emphasize that they are now members of the UD community and that they will spend their years here learning what that means, both in academic work and in student life. At least one orientation session should discuss the way "community" can be misused as an excuse to justify exclusion, to avoid conflict, and to demand sacrifices from those with less power. The orientation session should treat community both as an aspect of student life and as an academic topic, i.e. as an Institutional Learning Goal.

- New faculty orientation should include a presentation that models scholarly work relevant to the ILG. Chris Agnew’s consideration of ‘community’ in Asian history is a model of the thought-provoking treatment.
- Human Resources should draw on this report to develop onboarding for new staff. Staff should be clearly briefed on the necessity of consistent messaging that community first means justice, and that the joy of community arises from full participation and engagement of all members.
- Establish best practices for integration of the ILG into curriculum.
 - The CAPC should develop ways to address the competition our assessment structure creates among the ILGs as faculty prioritize only two or three ILGs they identify for their course.
 - The university should revisit the current statement of the ILG in light of this white paper, to ensure the vision and implementation are consistent.
 - In order to promote deeper student learning related to this ILG, CAP and the Provost’s office should foster the creation of guidelines for pedagogies of reflection on community consistent with this paper’s vision, as well as appropriate assessment strategies .
 - Innovation in shared space for community learning is a promising area for further exploration.
- Establish associations for employees who are members of affinity groups.
 - The Black Employee Association meets a significant need insofar as it provides a platform for black employees to build connections and relationships around shared identities and experiences.
 - Establishing associations for other affinity groups can provide a similar experience for employees who need and want a greater connection with others who have shared identities.
- Foster greater integration between faculty and staff around this ILG.
 - The Learning-Teaching Forum should be used as a key occasion for integrating faculty and staff efforts toward this ILG, especially for communicating co-curricular offerings that directly connect to course content.
 - The content of the Residential Curriculum should be presented in Humanities Commons workshops, at Academic Senate, and in CAP materials for Crossing Boundaries courses, so that instructors can explore ways to coordinate their approach with it.
 - Housing and Residence Life should explore participation by external stakeholders, faculty and staff in the review process for the Residential Curriculum content and pedagogy.
 - The Academic Senate should consider adding co-curricular representation, as a way to foster mutual understanding and collaboration.
- The Vice President for Student Development and his leadership team should enlist student leaders to identify aspects of the student experience that are consistent with this document’s vision and help to articulate them for students.

Faculty engagement

- Findings indicate that at UD, the ILG of community is more widely considered to be the domain of staff, rather than faculty. For that reason, we give particular attention to ways of promoting faculty engagement, both in scholarship and curriculum.

- To promote greater engagement with community as an intellectual topic, the university should offer an annual award for faculty scholarship related to the learning goal of community. This could include projects that promote a better understanding of and ability to achieve the common good; work that addresses obstacles to the common good, particularly racial injustice and white privilege, sexism, economic inequality, and xenophobia in its many forms; and diverse understandings of community, attentive to historical, intercultural, and philosophical questions. This will motivate faculty to consider identifying ways their scholarship is pertinent to the ILG of community.
- To address the wide variation in ideas about what “community” as an ILG looks like in pedagogy, the CAPC should convene a group of tenured faculty from each academic division to examine the implementation of this ILG in courses and establish guidelines concerning appropriate disciplinary variations. Faculty serving on this committee should be rewarded for this challenging service and given authority collectively to influence the implementation of CAP. Their work should be in conversation with efforts related to the ILG in the residential curriculum and the Fitz Center.
- In addition to the course development grants relating Community to Diversity and Social Justice, course development grants should be offered to support faculty who engage in creative collaboration with Student Development, Campus Ministry, the Fitz Center, and other appropriate units. Participation should be counted as an asset in departmental evaluation of teaching.
- As such collaborations become more frequent, an annual award could be offered to highlight successful faculty/ staff collaboration around this ILG, to be featured at the end of year faculty and staff meetings, as we currently have no shared meeting. Development of a shared faculty/ staff celebration of this award to highlight its significance would be beneficial.
- The Provost should convene a committee to explore ways to promote more robust faculty engagement with the ILG of community.

Communication

- A special working group should be created to address the particular challenges of messaging about community in Enrollment Management and University Advancement, drawing on the findings of this white paper.
- CAPC should work with Housing and Residence Life to improve communication regarding the residential curriculum and its potential to integrate academic and co-curricular silos.
- Improve the marketing of activities and opportunities for development that encourage and establish sustained communication and relationships between faculty and staff.
- The Fitz Center should provide support for a central point of communication for community partnerships, to improve communications and promote a shared understanding of strategies and initiatives the University is employing to establish and maintain a relationship with external partners.
- The President’s office should promote consistent communication across divisions that the joy of community comes from deep engagement with each other around the work of promoting the common good. The hard work of community-- promoting justice, making room for difference, navigating conflict, and exercising discipline in personal life-- are not the enemies of conviviality. They protect and deepen it for all members.

Resources

- Provide more activities to promote awareness of the Marianist approach to community.
 - The University Rector should commission a pamphlet/booklet which could be widely distributed on community and the Marianist charism, focusing on the connection between community and mission. To promote the use of the pamphlet, follow-up programming should be coordinated with developmental onboarding described under “Vision and Structure.”
 - The university should create a position that focuses on supporting spiritual growth and development for faculty and staff. This staff member could develop initiatives supporting a richer understanding of community in coordination with existing initiatives of the Office of the Rector. Such initiatives could include:
 - A half/full day Symposium in coordination with Marianist Family (Brothers/Sisters/Lay People) on Pillars of Marianist Charism
 - Lunch-time presentations: "What the heck do the Marianists mean by Community" where people try to connect the vision of community with their experiences on campus
 - Meals on Chaminade Feast day in January with Marianist family members (Brothers, Sisters, Lay) at tables discussing Marianist Charism, Spirituality, and approach to Community.
 - Small group book read led by Marianist Educational Associates, focusing, for example on the Manual of Marianist Spirituality by Quentin Hakenewerth, S.M.
- Increased support for OMA and ODI will help them sustain their key roles in promoting community at UD.
- In keeping with the recommendations of the Community Building Coordinating Consortium report, provide resources to support curriculum development and the implementation of "training and workshops" that promote community engagement in the Marianist Tradition for faculty, staff, and students.

Closing

The process in which the working group engaged to produce its vision for community and this report was collaborative and demonstrative of the University’s potential to integrate curricular and co-curricular learning. The University is fortunate to have faculty and staff who are invested in our students’ holistic development and success. Integration of the curricular and co-curricular will result in stronger collaboration between faculty and staff and a concept of community that will prepare our students to be transformational leaders who value the common good. In a culture so torn by legacies of injustice, by falsehood and suspicion and hatred, our ability to be and to continue to learn to be community is not a luxury or “added value.” It is the crucial task of our university.

“Let us then courageously put ourselves to work, not letting ourselves be frightened by the greatness of the task. Let us think only of what we are doing at the moment, of doing it well, for it is only in the fidelity and perfection with which we do our ordinary actions that our progress in virtue consists.”
Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon, Letters, August 3, 1814.

Bibliography

Agnew, Christopher. "Thinking Critically about 'Community.'" Presented at *Global Voices on the University of Dayton Campus*, January 23, 2018.

Anderson, Elijah. The Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life. New York: Norton & Co., 2011.

"Being in Community." International Convocation of Lay Marianist Communities. Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2001. Marianist Soundings, vol.6, no. 1 (Fall 2001), 42-52.

Francis. *Laudato Sí: On Care for Our Common Home*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2015.

Giardino, Thomas F. "Chaminade's Principles for Community Building." The Promise and the Path: Starting and Sustaining Marianist Communities. Dayton, OH: North American Center for Marianist Studies, 2011.

Guiffrida, Douglas A., Judy Marquez Kiyama, Stephanie J. Waterman, and Samuel D. Museus. "Moving from Cultures of Individualism to Cultures of Collectivism in Support of Students of Color." Creating Campus Cultures: Fostering Success among Racially Diverse Student Populations. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Hauerwas, Stanley. A Community of Character: Toward a Constructive Christian Social Ethic. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

Langan, John. "Catholicism and Liberalism-- 200 years of Contest and Consensus." Liberalism and the Good, edited by R. Bruce Douglass, Gerald M. Mara, and Henry S. Richardson, New York: Routledge, 1990.

Latham, Andrew. "Is the Common Good Obsolete?" Commonweal Magazine, December 2, 2016. www.commonwealmagazine.org/common-good-obsolete (accessed October 20, 2017).

Marcos, Sylvia. "Teología India: Indigenous Contributions to Theological Thought." Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology Vol 19, no. 1 (Noviembre 2013): 23-31.

Moyer, Isabella. "What Do You Mean, 'Community is a Gift and a Task?'" Things Marianist. Dayton, OH: North American Center for Marianist Studies, July 2003.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. Moral Man, Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics. New York :Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. "The Social Nature of Human Beings" (#149-163) and "The Principle of the Common Good" (#164-170). Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005.

Stefanelli, Joseph. Marie Therese de Lamourous: Firm of Hand, Loving of Heart. Dayton, OH: North American Center for Marianist Studies, 2001.

"Strategies for Enhancing and Advancing University/Community Engagement Practices." A Consortium Report. Dayton, OH: 2017

Vanier, Jean. Becoming Human. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1998.

Wilson, E.O. "Bernhardsdorp." Biophilia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Zack, Naomi. "A Response to My Critics." Radical Philosophy Review 15(2) (2012): 373-382.