

## LEADERSHIP, AN INFLUENCE RELATIONSHIP

Alice B. Hayes

May 30, 9 a.m., Loras College, Dubuque, IA.

Let me begin with a thought about the relationship of dioceses to universities. Since the founding of the first colleges centuries ago, many different kinds of institutions of higher learning have been established, but all of higher education, public and private, owes a historic debt to those early bishops who founded the first colleges in the cathedral schools. The vision that formed higher education is the vision of those 12th and 13th century bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. So, although not so recognized, diocesan colleges and universities continue a historic role in higher education. This morning I would like to talk about (1) a kind of leadership that fits well with diocesan colleges, and (2) how this leadership is expressed with the bishop, the board, the higher education community, and the university community.

### 1. Definition of Leadership:

Some years ago, the School of Education at the University of San Diego decided that leadership, not management or supervision, was the real need if we wished to improve the quality of schools and other organizations. So we transformed a traditional Administration and Supervision program into a program on Leadership. Many other universities have made similar changes. A USD faculty member, Joe Rost, who was a thorough type, began by reviewing 4725 studies on leadership, including 221 different definitions and models of leadership. I'm glad he did it so we don't have to. After thinking about all of this and the many kinds of leadership expressed in history, in business, in government, and in education, Joe came up with an operating definition of leadership to be used in curriculum development for this new academic program. I like his definition and I think it's a helpful way to think about leadership. He said: **A leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.**

The first critical component of this definition is that leadership is an **influence relationship**. This emphasizes the importance of establishing a relationship or bond with whomever you expect to lead - the bishop, the chairman of the board of trustees, the faculty and staff, the higher education community, students, alumni and families. Within these relationships you express leadership not by doing everything yourself or by giving orders to others, some of whom are in fact your superiors, but rather by influencing them to act. Leadership is not a coercive relationship. Leadership is not about dominance; rather, the leader engages people to work together towards a shared goal.

Madeleine Albright commented on this in a recent commencement address. She said, *When we think about leadership, we usually think first about the grand and famous. But I ask you to consider your own life so far. I expect you have benefited most from leaders whose faces will never appear on television - from the reliable presence of a parent, the outstretched hand of a friend, the extra effort of a teacher, and the example of a classmate or teammate who challenged you to do better than you have previously done.*

Our organizations are structured so that only a few leaders at a time are recognized. There is only one teacher per classroom, one dean per college, one president per university. Yet if we adopt a paradigm of leadership as participative rather than autocratic, as serving a cause or a mission, as helping one another reach a higher level of knowledge, insight, skill, understanding, then there are many leaders at every level. We have opportunities to lead not only at the podium or the pulpit, but also in the classroom, in the board room, in the committee room, wherever there is dialogue and work to be done.

When thinking about this talk, I went to the Oxford English Dictionary to trace the etymology of the word *Influence*.  $\cong$  Influence literally means a *flowing in*.  $\cong$  I was looking for some specification of the influence, what flows in, or how does it flow, from the person who is initiating the movement or change to the person or persons being influenced. To my surprise, the original use of the word was astrological, and it referred to your horoscope, the powers or emanations flowing in from the signs of the zodiac to people on earth. The phrase *Aspheres of influence*  $\cong$  referred to the heavenly spheres. As a scientist, I know that there are no heavenly crystalline spheres, and while the zodiac is the apparent path of the sun around the earth, in fact the sun does not go around the earth, so I don't look to the stars for any emanating influence. But the early use of the word reminds us that it implies a power that affects the course of events and people's lives.

Do not think of this kind of leadership as passive or weak. Influence has its own kind of power. Time Magazine recently featured 100 people they selected as the most influential people on the planet. If you saw the article, you probably noted that these people typically were not the popular celebrities or those who controlled the most money. These were people whose ideas transform the world. Influence is less about the hard power of force than the soft power of ideas and example.

The second critical component of this definition of leadership is that leaders and followers must have **mutual purposes**. If there is no agreement about goals, you will not be able to lead the group. As Peter Drucker (1992) wrote, *The first task of the leader is to be sure that everybody sees the mission, hears it, lives it.*  $\cong$  In my remarks this morning, I am going to refer primarily to our Catholic mission, but recognize that this applies also to our academic, professional and civic goals. One of the hard things to recognize when you're in a leadership position is that it's not about you, or about what you want or think. All of the energy, the effort, the time, that people put in is not really because you are such a fine human being. It's because they share your purpose. They buy into the institution and its goals. Robert Greenleaf, whose concept of servant leadership has been so persuasive, observed *A new moral principal is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader.*  $\cong$  It is because you have shared goals that you are able to influence the group to pursue initiatives. The focus should always be first on the mission, clarifying the goals, reaching mutual understanding and support. Then you can work on implementing the goals. With respect to Catholic identity, that may not be an up front priority for a student or faculty

member, but in the university environment that buy-in can be developed.

In his book, *The Plan of Attack*, Bob Woodward describes one of the first initiatives of the war in Iraq as *Influence operations*. These included dissemination of information and a wide range of psychological operations designed to create an overwhelming urge in the commercial, economic and diplomatic sectors in Iraq to get rid of Saddam. The underlying assumption was that the Iraqi people would be happy to get rid of a dictator and would then eagerly welcome the coalition forces. The influence ops failed because, although the Iraqi people may have been happy to get rid of a dictator, they were not eager to welcome the coalition forces. The influence ops only worked to the degree that there was mutual agreement.

It isn't easy to reach a mutual understanding of goals, and in diocesan institutions, special attention is given to discussion with the bishop and others outside of academe. The university operates under a model of shared governance, which is very different from hierarchical models of the Church and the executive models of the corporate sector. Rather, it is a model in which different members of the organization have different responsibilities and authority. This is not always sufficiently understood. Sometimes we hear that the hierarchical model of the Church approaches shared governance through the exercise of the principle of subsidiarity, which expects that whoever is closest to an issue should resolve it. But in the Church and in the corporate sector, that authority is only delegated, and the person receiving the delegation is still subject to the approval and ultimate authority of the person with overall responsibility. There is an expectation in hierarchical and in corporate models of governance that whatever the person on top wants to happen will happen. However, in our model, the president and the provost and deans are not the only ones in authority roles. And, in a university setting, influence is always mutual, not one-way.

Trustees, faculty and students all have important governance roles. These leaders are usually not in contact with the bishop outside of special meetings. They may not have a strong sense of a diocesan leadership role. There is an administrative hierarchy, - Pres, Provost, Dean, Chair, and people in the hierarchy have areas of authority. But the mission is teaching and learning, that's the mutual purpose. Students, who may not even appear on the organizational chart, have a role in identifying their educational needs and have many leadership opportunities in the classroom and on campus. Perhaps the most important governance role is that of the faculty, who through teaching and research, have a significant responsibility for delivering the mission. Faculty determine the admission requirements, the curriculum, the degree requirements, the research agenda. Administrators do not tell teachers what to teach, what grades to give, who can graduate, what research topics to pursue. Critical decisions about who gets hired, promoted, tenured, are all based on collegial recommendations. Although the academic administration usually has a final say on these actions, it is only in really dire and potentially litigious situations that a majority recommendation of the faculty would be rejected by academic administrators. So if leadership is defined in the traditional way as the ability to direct and control the behavior of others, leadership in a university is widely distributed throughout the institution.

I used to tell incoming freshmen that they could learn something from every person on the

campus, the gardeners as well as the distinguished professors and the bishop. On a university campus, somewhat uniquely, authority relates to expertise, not rank or title. Looking at the shared governance model of a university, we see the crucial importance of continuous consultation and dialogue so that shared governance is based on shared goals.

## 2. Different Aspects of Leadership:

We share leadership obligations with the bishop, the trustees, the higher education community, and our own university community. Let's look at the kind of influence relationship we can have with these various constituencies.

**First, with the Church and its hierarchy, and most immediately, the Bishop.** The relationship of accountability is clear. An institution must be able to demonstrate that it fulfills the expectations of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* if it wishes to be recognized as Catholic. In recent years, much of the discussion about the relationship between the university and the Church has focused on that accountability relationship, although that is not where I want to place an emphasis in these remarks. Prior to *Ex Corde*, contact with the bishop may have been limited to special liturgies, ceremonial events, and meetings with the president. Students may not even know what a diocese is. Non-diocesan universities had very little contact with bishops prior to *Ex Corde*. The contacts that have followed *Ex Corde* have provided a beginning for developing a real relationship with the bishop. It is in these contacts that there is an opportunity for influence. We can influence and be influenced by the bishop primarily through communication, through listening, sharing and following up on concerns and successes. The recent book edited by Michael Galligan Stierle, referenced in your materials, is a useful compendium of programs and practices which can be opportunities to share leadership.

In these interactions, after the accountability issue is assured, the university leaders need to address the more day to day business of the university with the diocese. Remember that universities have no legal authority; no canonical authority; no administrative authority in our relationship with the diocese, but we have a valid and valuable mission. We need to communicate the legitimacy and the intellectual authority of the views of scholars.

**Research:** A Catholic university will naturally promote a curriculum and a research agenda that addresses some issues of interest to the Church. In research, values shared with the bishop include the value of increasing knowledge, respect for human reason, and respect for the teaching of the Magisterium. When the careful thinking of scholars leads them to question previous views and observations, it is important to also respect the logic and evidence that has given them these new perspectives. This does not necessarily always mean agreement with the ideas proposed, but there is an expectation of respect for the ideas, and humility about their significance. If our theologians are in error, this will be discovered. Bishops have an ecclesial responsibility to engage problematic areas in the writings of theologians. Scholars have the right to publish their views in an appropriate forum and receive feedback from other scholars.

I remember participating in a conference of bishops, scientists, and philosophers some years ago.

(Byers) We had a discussion about the differences between science and theology. As a biologist, I observed that in the sciences, our views are always subject to question. When we are wrong, that is not a problem because progress is achieved through the exploration of error. One of the bishops responded, Ait=s the same in theology. Our views are always subject to question. Until, of course, the question is decided.≡ Well, a scholar may think that the question that the Church considers decided can still be further explored. This does not mean that the scholar is trying to attack the Church or lead students astray. Serious research respectfully conducted is a service to the Church. The work of Catholic philosophers and theologians over the centuries may have been provocative and uncomfortable at times, but over time, scholarly work has yielded rich insights for the development of doctrine.

In my years at Jesuit universities, I learned about an interesting annotation in St. Ignatius Loyola=s ARules for Thinking with the Church.≡ In rule 11 he praises positive and scholastic learning. The original phrasing of the rule was that the scholastic philosophers define the things necessary for eternal salvation. In his own handwriting, Ignatius corrected this. After the word Adefine≡ he added Aor explain for our time.≡ He recognized that our current understanding may not be for all time. We need to continue to explore. Remember, when God created the universe, the task was not completed in the biblical 7 days. Many wonderful things, you and I for example, had not yet been created. We still have much to see and much to learn.

So, in the dialogue with the bishop about research, here are some questions that should be explored. Have you discussed with him the research interests of your faculty scholars? I always think that it is prudent to prevent surprises. If the bishop knows the scholarly interests of the faculty, particularly theology faculty, he can become aware of the intellectual resources available in the university, and can also identify and explore sensitive issues without producing a crisis environment. Is there respect for the academic freedom and expertise of the faculty or are we in trouble with the bishop if a faculty member pushes the envelope? Do we encourage research agendas that explore issues of importance to Catholic thinking? If we want our colleges to be centers of Catholic thinking, we need to provide an environment that encourages and respects intellectual efforts.

**Teaching:** Similarly, in teaching, there are shared values. We share with the bishop the value of respect for the individual, and we share the desire to help students use knowledge to promote charity, justice and peace. We agree on the value of preserving, producing, and transmitting knowledge. However, our efforts to teach students the ability and the value of critical thinking may lead to some conflict when student critiques touch on sensitive issues, or when a student or student organization wants to explore beliefs that are not consistent with Catholic teaching, or when students who are not Catholic question institutional policies derived from Catholic identity..

While it may ruffle feathers, we should not be surprised or upset when students ask questions. That is what we are teaching them to do. We are reminded that Jesus was a model of critical thinking, always probing, questioning. We think of him as a child in the temple, asking questions of the scholars; as a young man questioning the Scribes and Pharisees, asking AWhy

do you harbor evil thoughts in your minds?≡; questioning his apostles, asking them AWho do people say that the Son of Man is? Who do you say that I am?; up to the day of his death, asking Pilate, ADo you say this of yourself or have others told you this?≡ Asking questions is an invitation to thought. It is a search for knowledge, not a challenge or an attack.

Marcrina Wiederkehr, a Benedictine, in her APrayer for a Questioning Heart≡ wrote this poem:

It seems to me Lord,  
that we search  
much too desperately  
for answers  
when a good question  
holds as much grace  
as an answer.

Jesus,  
You are the Great Questioner.  
Keep your questions alive  
that we may always be seekers  
rather than settlers.

Guard us well  
from the sin of settling in  
with our answers  
hugged to our breasts.

Make us a wondering  
far-sighted  
questioning  
restless people  
and give us the feet of pilgrims  
on this journey unfinished.≡

(From ASeasons of Your Heart: Prayers and Reflections.≡

In your dialogue with the bishop about teaching, here are some questions to explore. Do we offer enough religious studies and theology courses? In courses that claim to teach Catholic theology, is course content consistent with the teaching of the Magisterium? Do we create a learning environment that respects Catholic identity? Is the faculty competent to respond to intellectual and religious challenges from the students? Does the faculty know enough about Catholic culture to give balance to the secular culture in which we live? Can we help the bishop with the education of the faithful of the diocese who are not enrolled in our programs? As diocesan colleges, there is a special obligation to the diocesan community. Diocesan colleges shape their distinctive charism through the history and experience of the diocese. When I came

to the U of San Diego after 33 years in Jesuit universities, I wanted to know what was the distinctive educational perspective of the university. The Jesuit universities had a language to express educational goals, immediately identifiable phrases like, *Ad formandum personarum pro aliis*, *Ad maiorem Dei gratiam*, for the greater glory of God.  $\cong$  *Ad fidem que facit iustitiam*.  $\cong$  phrases that captured thinking that could inspire our students and faculty. I had to look for it at USD, and I found it in the writing of the founders, Bishop Buddy and Mother Hill. Their vision described our university's characteristics of seeking and serving; seeking the beautiful, the good, the true, and serving a very diverse community. I also learned that it was the poor and the parishes of our diocese that raised the money to fund the establishment of the university. Their faith gave us our foundation. Even though most of our institutions have a national identity, the local Catholic community shaped us and serving them should be part of our discussions with the bishop.

I am confident mutual trust and respect between the diocese and the university can be developed, and the dialogue will provide opportunities for influence. Even in difficult relationships, a persistent and consistent effort and attitude of good will can produce results.

**The Board of Trustees.** Next, let's consider leadership relationships with the board of trustees. These people are the highest authority in the college; they are the ones who set policies for the university and the ones who keep us on mission. Those of you who are presidents are well aware of this. The president's contract is with them; the board hires you, the board evaluates you, the board determines your compensation; the board can fire you. Yet most of our trustees are not otherwise involved in higher education, and rely on us to manage the university; to advise them about the issues and concerns of the university; what is unique about us, what we can provide, our values, what we hope to do.

The leadership function with the Board is: first, of course, to listen; learn from their expertise and experience. Then the leadership task is to work with them to form a vision and a strategy for the future of the university that reflects realistically what it is and what it can be. Many, probably most, of the trustees are Catholic and want to be custodians of the Catholic mission of the university. They will bring different views of what a Catholic identity means. They are able to bring an independent, objective view of our efforts. They will be attentive to religious aspects of the curriculum and the public image of the university, so it is important to bring sensitive issues to their attention before they become concerns. They will be more anxious than you are about critical comments. We are used to being attacked from all sides, from liberal groups promoting an agenda, and conservative groups like the Cardinal Newman Society. We need to give our trustees the information they need to be assured that the university is faithful to its mission and is well managed.

Getting information requires a trusting relationship. If the board starts questioning and challenging everything the university does, it will quickly be shut out of the most critical information flow, the tacit information that comes forward when the university community trusts that the board understands how to relate to this information and use. The university will keep information to itself if it fears board intervention, and there is no opportunity for influence in that

kind of relationship. Open, trusting relationships allow the university and the board to influence each other.

**The Higher Education Community.** We have serious responsibilities and opportunities to influence the higher education community. Our leadership role is to engender respect for the legitimacy of our positions; assure protection of our existence in case of constitutional and legal issues; and to assure society that there will be a diversity of learning opportunities in higher education. There are great homogenizing pressures, particularly under the current Secretary of Education, to set common standards for all institutions when there are really quite different kinds of colleges. The Secretary has recently stated that there will not be a *one size fits all* set of standards, but we need to be attentive to developments. What we do is important even though it may not always correspond to the values of the broader academe.

The perspectives that Catholic institutions promote would not likely be included in common standards and indeed are frequently scorned by other universities. For example, the discussion that followed the recent decision of Harvard University against a proposed core curriculum requirement in religion often demeaned the position that we take on requiring students to seriously study religion.

The best selling book lists now include a number of books written by what Anthony Gottlieb calls *Atheists with Attitude*. I'm referring to books like Sam Harris's *The End of Faith*, Daniel Dennett's *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, Richard Dawkins' *The God Delusion*, and Christopher Hitchens' *God is Not Great. How Religion Poisons Everything*. I cannot comment on these books because I have not read them, but book reviews quote passages that suggest that those of us who are religious are not fully rational and that religion is responsible for all of the problems in the world.

It is clear that many individuals at institutions that do not have a religious commitment do not think that a religious commitment is appropriate in a university. The wall of separation of Church and State is not only legal and political; for the past century it has also been intellectual. Issues of religion and values have been scrupulously avoided, and this has been seen as a kind of intellectual purity or openness.

Recently James Maher, the provost at Pitt, claimed that *We're institutionally value-neutral*, which allows us to be a meeting ground for all the different viewpoints that are characterized in the human condition. (Balch).

Similarly, Professor John Mearsheimer made these remarks to incoming freshmen students at the U. of Chicago a few years ago. He said, *Let me now shift gears and focus on two particular goals that the University might pursue, but in fact does not. These two non-aims concern truth and morality. There is a powerful bias at the University of Chicago against providing you with the truth about the important issues we study. Instead, we aim to produce independent thinkers who can reach their own conclusions. To put the matter in slightly different terms, we expect you to figure out the truth, if there is one...*

Not only is there a powerful imperative at Chicago to stay away from teaching the truth, but the University also makes little effort to provide you with moral guidance. Indeed, it is a remarkably amoral institution. I would say the same thing, by the way, about all other major colleges and universities in this country...There is no question that the University of Chicago makes hardly any effort to provide you with moral guidance. Moreover, I would bet that you will take few classes here at Chicago where you discuss ethics or morality in any detail, mainly because those kind of courses do not exist...[We are] largely mum on ethical issues.≡ I quoted these observations at some length not only to highlight the contrast between Catholic universities and most other universities, but also to capture the self-congratulatory tone and conviction they use in setting forth their claim of ethical value neutrality or indifference.

Yet, think about this for a moment. What is left out if values are not explored? to quote Fr. Kolvenbach, AA value literally means something which has a price, something dear, precious or worthwhile, and hence something that one is ready to suffer or sacrifice for, which gives one a reason to live and, if need be, a reason to die...Values provide motives. They identify a person, give one a face, a name and a character. Values are central to one's own life and to every life, and they define the quality of that life, marking its breadth and depth.≡ (Kolvenbach, 1990).

Of course, education has rarely been value neutral and few people have ever really wanted it to be. Robert Bellah observed that, AWe need to affirm the healthy function of doubt at the same time that we see that doubt only makes sense in relation to effective belief.≡ (Lindsay)

Society does not want students to be indoctrinated, but does want education to inculcate shared ideals of personal conduct and the public good. It is culturally impoverishing to reject views simply because they may have a religious or theological origin. (Sommerville). It is difficult to have a real understanding of much of art, literature, or history without some knowledge of religion.

Stanley Fish recently observed in an article in the Chronicle that in the years ahead he thinks Areligion will succeed high theory, and race, gender and class as the center of intellectual energy in academe.≡ Certainly after 9/11, religion as a force motivating action cannot be denied. Several recent studies have concluded that curricula need to deal with religious questions and address values. Alexander Astin of UCLA whose research team conducts the annual student survey found that, of the 112,232 college freshmen surveyed, 79% believe in God, 81% attend religious services, 69% pray, 80% discuss religion and spirituality with friends and family, 69% agreed that religious beliefs provide strength, support and guidance. Astin concluded that colleges should be searching for ways to incorporate spiritual and religious questions into the curriculum, and a national committee is now industriously trying to discover what Catholic universities have always known.

Universities are also under pressure from the corporate and civil community to address issues of ethics. Post Enron and post Sarbanes Oxley, most of higher education has come around on the

importance of ethics and may be, despite Harvard's non-leadership, becoming more responsive to the importance of religious studies. There have been a rash of articles in popular news magazines like Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News in the last few months lamenting the loss of religious literacy. Charles Taylor of Northwestern U, who recently received the John Templeton Award, noted that we don't understand what's going on unless we understand that as human beings we are spiritual beings. Our preoccupations are not simply social, economic, power or pride. They're also concerned with finding meaning to life, dignity, and being recognized in the sense of being fundamentally good.

I believe that, despite the critics of religion, the social climate today can be very favorable to the mission of Catholic colleges. Catholic institutions have a real opportunity to provide leadership in higher education to the growing awareness of the need to address that something seen as missing at the heart of American life. We assert, as we have for centuries, that religion and values are legitimate objects of study and fundamental to education.

A very interesting study was reported to the ACCU presidents in February. Some of you were likely there and can add to this discussion. I have not yet seen the full report, but found the summary very interesting. The study was conducted by Hardwick and Day, studying 2000 alumni from 4 different kinds of colleges: (1) Catholic Colleges and universities, (2) flagship national public universities, (3) church affiliated and (4) non church affiliated private institutions. The differences between alumni of these 4 classes of colleges universities were striking. Let me share a few of their findings.

On most measures, the category of other church affiliated institutions mirrored the Catholic response, and the unaffiliated private institutions category was closer to the public colleges response, so I will emphasize 2 categories, public institutions and the Catholic institutions.

	Public	Catholic	Other Church	Unaffil.Private
Sense of community	53	82	84	77
Experienced integration of values and ethics in classroom discussion.	27	75	70	47
Integrate faith with other aspects of life	12	57	60	25
Benefited very much from opportunities college offered for spiritual development.	7	52	51	16
How effectively had college helped them develop moral principles that guide their action rank 4 on scale of 5	38	85	71	53

The margin of error on measures of Catholic alumni response is 6.7%, and on that of the other samples, the margin of error was 4-4.3%. The investigators also took random samples from graduates from the 1970's through 1999 to see if the # yrs out from graduation was a factor in

response, and found that it was not. This data is very similar to that found by William Bowen and Derek Bok for public colleges. They found that only 7% of white students and 11% of black students rated their colleges as contributing a great deal to the formation of religious values.

There is a lot of good data emerging for the conclusion that there is a substantial desire for exploring values and ethics in college education, that public institutions are not fulfilling these needs, and Catholic institutions are. This is a wonderful leadership opportunity for Catholic colleges. It is very encouraging to be able to demonstrate that these values and ethics are a recognized and effective component of the experience in Catholic colleges and universities.

How can you influence this climate in higher education? I would urge you to write papers, publish books, give speeches, articulate the value of Catholic education for Catholic and non-Catholic students. I remember a businessman coming up to me after a speech on the importance of the learning environment in helping students develop moral principles, and he said that he didn't think that there was another president of a major university in the United States saying the things I was saying about the importance of educating for character and faith. Of course, he was wrong about that, since I am sure many Catholic college leaders were making the same point. But he wasn't hearing it. It wasn't being heard. I think that the climate today is better for getting this message out and being heard.

### **Those relationships which call for leadership of colleagues within the university.**

Within our own community, the leadership function is to listen; to question; to empower; to support; to keep focused on the mission, ethics and good management. The leader needs to present a perspective that is broader than that of any constituent group; and to bring a caring concern for all of the people and perspectives.

We can influence our colleagues to further the mission in many ways. We can influence the research agenda by assuring the necessary support structures are in place; by establishing centers, institutes for mission-related research; providing secretarial, research, financial management and grant-writing support for initiatives that further the mission. We can influence teaching by rewarding those who teach in mission centered programs such as Catholic studies, service learning courses, and the core curriculum. We can provide rewards and incentives for research and teaching efforts related to mission. To be realistic, rewards are rarely motivations for faculty members, but they appreciate them as an acknowledgement of the importance of their work. Giving a reward for a particular initiative identifies it as an institutional priority. It isn't enough to hope that these things will happen. And, when necessary, leaders must make the tough decisions to hire or not hire, dismiss or tenure, schedule or cancel a program in the light of the university mission.

In summary, then, how does diocesan identity affect the way that leadership is conceived and exercised, internally and externally?

First, leadership can be seen as an influence relationship, not a position of control or an authority relationship. This is a good leadership concept whether diocesan or not. The diocese and the

university share a mutual leadership responsibility. Neither seeks to control or dictate; both seek to influence. In a non-hierarchical institution like a university, where the ability to persuade is always more important than the power to command, this emphasis on influence is very appropriate.

Second, a relationship is essential for seeking and pursuing mutual goals. It is so important to build relationships with our many constituencies. Both moments of celebration and times of conflict are more easily approached when there is an existing bond of understanding.

Third, promote broad and consistent communication with those with whom we expect mutual influence. In hiring interviews, faculty seminars, curriculum meetings, board meetings, leaders should always articulate the mission and goals. Invite others to share them and explore how their perspectives can enhance our success.

Fourth, build on the relationships and identity that comes from your geographical and historical base in the diocese. Welcome your neighbors to campus and learn how their faith and dedication can nourish the campus. Invite the bishop to participate in university events. His presence will be a visible reminder of Catholic identity and will affect the tone of events.

Fifth, provide the values and religious study opportunities not available in broader academe. This is something that we do well and it is a service to society and all of higher education. We can be true leaders in this.

Sixth, assure the support structures, people, and funds needed to deliver the mission. To encourage initiatives without supporting them appropriately is a hollow message and suggests the mission is not really as important as other initiatives may be.

In all this, remember how fortunate we are. As I have observed frequently, we can do things they can't do at public universities. We can freely discuss the moral significance of facts and ideas. We can seriously explore intellectual issues with a religious dimension. We can pray in public. In times of sorrow and of joy, we can celebrate the liturgy. We can enjoy great religious art and music. We can respect the religious commitments of people of all faiths. It's a good foundation for leadership - for developing influential relationships that lead to the fulfillment of our mutual purposes .

#### REFERENCES CITED

Albright, Madeleine K. 2007. Commencement Address, U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, May 13, 2007.

- Byers, David, ed. Religion, Science, and the search for wisdom. 1987. Proceedings of a Conference on Religion and Science. Washington: U.S. Catholic Conference.
- Drucker, P.E. 1992. Managing the nonprofit organization. NY: Harper Business.
- Fish, Stanley. 2005. One university under God? Chronicle of Higher Education, Jan. 17, 2005.
- Galligan-Stierle, Michael, ed. Promising Practices. 2005. Collaboration among Catholic bishops and university presidents. Fairfield: Sacred Heart University Press.
- Gottlieb, Anthony. 2007. Atheists with attitude. New Yorker May 21, 2007, pp. 77-80.
- Greenleaf, R.K. 1977. Servant leadership. NY: Paulist Press.
- Kolvenbach, P.H. 1990. Themes of Jesuit higher education. Origins, Vol. 19, 81-85.
- Rost, Joseph 1991. Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger..
- Wiederkehr, Marcrina, O.S.B. Prayer for a questioning Heart, in Seasons of your heart: prayers and reflections.
- Woodward, Bob. 2004. Plan of attack. New York: Simon and Schuster.

#### DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

For college senior officers and board of trustee representatives: Do you know anything about the history, - the goals and responsibilities, the needs and strengths of the parishes and parishioners - of the diocese in which the college is located? Have you ever met the bishop? Ever talked to

him? How would you like to influence the diocese? How can the college benefit from its relationship with the diocese? How can you be a leader in your community? In terms of developing a strategy for living and communicating the diocesan relationship, what would you suggest would be successful Ainfluence ops.≡.

For diocesan representatives: Do you know anything about the history, - the goals and responsibilities, - the needs and strengths of the faculty and students - of the university in your diocese? Have you ever met with students, faculty and staff? Ever talked to any of them? How would you like to influence them? Do you attend events at the university? If so, how could they be improved to reflect the diocesan identity more effectively? How can the Church benefit from having a college in its diocese? In terms of developing a strategy for living and communicating the diocesan relationship, what would you suggest would be successful Ainfluence ops.≡

For development, student affairs and admissions staff: Do you have a relationship with the parishes and schools in the diocese? Do you recruit or raise funds locally? How do you communicate the diocesan character of the college to groups who are Catholic and to groups who are not? How can your activities benefit from the diocesan relationship? How can you be a leader of your colleagues? In terms of developing a strategy for living and communicating the diocesan relationship, what would you suggest would be successful Ainfluence ops.≡

For students: Have you been made aware of the diocesan character of the college? Does it have any influence on you in classes or on the campus? How can you be a leader among the students? Can you give examples of situations in which you have seen a student or a faculty member or administrator influence others? What can we learn from those examples? In terms of developing a strategy for living and communicating the diocesan relationship, what would you suggest would be successful Ainfluence ops.≡

For faculty members: Have you been made aware of the diocesan character of the college? Does it have any influence on you in classes or on the campus? How can you bring leadership to the fulfillment of the college mission? Can you give examples of situations in which you have seen a student or faculty member or administrator influence others? What can we learn from those examples? In terms of developing a strategy for living and communicating the diocesan relationship, what would you suggest would be successful Ainfluence ops.≡