National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education

Integrating Spirituality *into the* Campus Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

Proceedings prepared by:

Alyssa N. Bryant
Leslie M. Schwartz

Spirituality in Higher Education

Higher Education Research Institute
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles

National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education:

Integrating Spirituality into the Campus Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

Prepared by:
Alyssa N. Bryant
Leslie M. Schwartz

Higher Education Research Institute
University of California, Los Angeles

Contents

Acknowledgements

The National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education was a natural outcome of our work over the past four years in studying the spiritual life of college students. We felt that it was timely for the project team to engage colleagues from the field in a conversation of how to incorporate spiritual perspectives in the higher education curriculum and co-curriculum. With support from the John Templeton Foundation, we embarked on preparing to host the Institute that took place in mid-November 2006. Both the planning and implementation required assistance from many, and we are most appreciative for the dedication, energy, and good will of all. Leslie Schwartz was the person who, from the beginning, took responsibility for communicating with all the participants and coordinated the many aspects and details of this effort. Her spirit and energy was appreciated by all participants, and especially by the three of us. Thank you Leslie for a superb job in all you did to make this Institute a success and also in preparing these proceedings. Alyssa Bryant, a continuing colleague in our study on spirituality, was an observer at the Institute and coauthored the proceedings. We thank you Alyssa for your ongoing contributions to our work.

A number of our graduate students and other volunteers helped in taking notes during the deliberations, and we appreciate their willingness to do so with such care. They were: Chris Collins, Monica Lin, Shannon Toma, and Elisabeth Turner. Members of the project team played multiple, critical roles, including data analysis of student and faculty characteristics at the ten institutions that participated, brainstorming with us about the structure of the Institute, and making sure that we were attentive hosts to the Institute participants. They were: Nida Denson, Jeff Forrest, Julie Park, and Leslie Schwartz. Jenn Curley, the newest member of our team, offered valuable editorial feedback on these proceedings, as did Nida Denson and Julie Park. We would also like to extend a very sincere thank you to our nine consultants – Larry Braskamp, Art Chickering, Cheryl Keen, Peter Laurence, Scotty McLennan, Gene Rice, David Scott, Joe Subbiondo, and Arthur Zajonc – for leading the conversations with institutional team members and for all the wisdom and knowledge shared during the plenary sessions. We would especially like to thank Arthur Chickering, Cheryl Keen, Scotty McLennan, Gene Rice, and David Scott for their prepared remarks during the Institute sessions.

The success of the Institute has been dependent, in large part, on the contributions of the institutional participants who were very thoughtful and creative in articulating action plans for their individual campuses.

We thank them for their presence at the Institute, insights, wise conversation, and creative ideas of what needs to happen and what could happen in higher education to make it more responsive to students' search for meaning and purpose.

Finally, we would like to thank the HERI staff who helped in numerous other ways by providing us with administrative support, especially Mary Rabb and Kit Mahoney.

Alexander W. Astin
Helen S. Astin
Jennifer A. Lindholm

National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education:

Integrating Spirituality into the Campus Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

A National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education was held at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) on November 14-16, 2006. The Institute was part of an ongoing national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose conducted by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). The Institute provided an opportunity to discuss and apply the initial research findings from this project as well as explore many topics related to spiritual development and higher education through rich dialogue with participants from ten institutions from across the country, consultants, and HERI staff.

The Institute was the first effort of its kind to gather a diverse group from the higher education community to critically examine and discuss these issues and their present impact on the higher education community, while considering future implications for reform and improvement to support students' overall growth and success. What follows is a brief overview of the *Spirituality in Higher Education* project in addition to proceedings from the Institute, including the purpose and desired outcomes, planning and design, key discussion themes, consultant remarks, as well as reports on the inter- and intra-institutional sessions.

The Spirituality in Higher Education Project

Funded by a grant from The John Templeton Foundation, the *Spirituality in Higher Education: A National Study of College Students' Search for Meaning and Purpose* project seeks to study the trends, patterns, and principles of spirituality and religiousness among college students and to examine how the college experience influences spiritual development. Launched in 2003, this longitudinal study began with a pilot survey of 3,700 juniors at a representative sample of 46 colleges and universities around the country.

In Fall 2004, a revised College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Survey was administered to entering freshmen at a nationally representative sample of 236 colleges and universities in order to explore students':

- Spiritual outlook/orientation/worldview
- Spiritual well being
- Religious/spiritual practices and behaviors
- Self-assessments of spirituality and related traits
- Spiritual quest
- Spiritual/mystical experiences
- Attitudes toward religion/spirituality
- Religious affiliation/identity
- Theological/metaphysical beliefs
- Facilitators/inhibitors of spiritual development
- Compassionate behavior

Data from the 2004 CSBV Survey show that college students report high levels of spirituality and idealism and espouse many spiritual and religious virtues that they express in a variety of ways in their everyday lives. A multidimensional understanding of spirituality and religion emerged as well; the research team developed three measures of spirituality (Spirituality, Spiritual Quest, and Equanimity), five measures of religiousness (Religious Commitment, Religious Engagement, Religious/Social Conservatism, Religious Skepticism, and Religious Struggle), and four other dimensions related to spirituality and religiousness (Charitable Involvement, Compassionate Self-Concept, Ethic of Caring, and Ecumenical Worldview).

Building on our ongoing study of students' beliefs and values, the project also focuses on how college and university faculty view the intersections between spirituality and higher education. Findings from the 2004-2005 HERI Faculty Survey indicate that the spiritual dimension is relevant to many faculty, with four out of five faculty describing themselves as a "spiritual person." While faculty were more inclined to describe themselves as spiritual rather than religious, religion stills plays an important role in many faculty members' lives. However, only a minority of faculty agreed that "colleges should be concerned with facilitating students' spiritual development," a trend that is echoed by college students' reports that their professors have never or rarely encouraged discussion of spiritual or religious matters or the meaning and purpose of life within the classroom.

Thus far, findings from the project have provided considerable insight into students' levels of interest and involvement in spirituality, students' expectations of colleges and universities in terms of spiritual development, and faculty views on the place of spirituality in the academy. Currently, the research team is in the process of following up students surveyed in 2004 in order to track their spiritual development longitudinally. A follow-up CSBV Survey was administered in Spring 2007 to students who completed the 2004 CSBV Survey.

Based on these initial findings, it became clear that hosting an Institute on spirituality would further the practical application of these data on campuses representing diverse constituencies and purposes.

Purpose and Desired Outcomes

In an effort to give life to the data through curricular and co-curricular transformation, the National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education was held at UCLA on November 14-16, 2006. Ten institutional teams were selected and invited to attend. Nine additional participants were invited to serve as consultants to the institutional teams.

The main goals of the Institute revolved around two areas. First, the Institute provided a key venue to share the research findings from the study in greater depth and discuss the importance and nature of holistic education and the role of liberal education in students' development while in college. Second, the Institute created an environment in which institutional teams could work together to find creative ways to encourage the development of curricula and co-curricula around issues of spirituality at their institutions.

The atmosphere of the Institute was one of open dialogue and discussion among institutional participants, consultants, and the project team. The primary desired outcome was for each institutional team to develop an action plan for integrating spirituality, meaning, and purpose into their campus community.

Planning and Design

Participants

We invited ten schools – a diverse representation of various institutional types and regions – that participated in the 2004 CSBV Survey. Most schools had also participated in the 2004-2005 HERI Faculty Survey.

The institutions were: Bates College; Carnegie Mellon University; Florida State University; Furman University; Grinnell College; Miami University of Ohio; Spelman College; University of California, Irvine; University of California, Los Angeles; and Wellesley College.

Three- to five-person teams that represented the diversity of interests regarding spirituality on campus were self-selected from each invited institution. Our Institute planning committee suggested that each team include an administrator (who received the initial invitation letter), a student affairs officer, and faculty members.

In order to facilitate the teams' efforts, we also invited well-known members of the academic community, all experts in their respective fields and invested in spiritual matters in higher education, to serve as team consultants at the Institute. Certain team consultants were also asked to prepare and share remarks on aspects of spirituality in higher education. A complete list of Institute participants is provided in Appendix A. For team consultant biographies, please see Appendix B.

Planners

Through a collective effort with other members of the project team, Helen "Lena" Astin, Alexander "Sandy" Astin, Jennifer Lindholm, and Leslie Schwartz took the lead in inviting institutions and team consultants to participate, planned the Institute agenda, and coordinated travel and accommodations. Other members of the project team, including Nida Denson, Jeff Forrest, and Julie Park helped with additional Institute planning and implementation details.

Structure and Schedule

The Institute took place over three days, from November 14-16, 2006. A description of the structure and schedule follows. For the complete Institute agenda, please refer to Appendix C.

Tuesday, November 14th

Institute participants arrived Tuesday afternoon and settled into the UCLA Guest House before the night's scheduled activities began. An opening reception and dinner were held in the UCLA Faculty Center where Sandy Astin welcomed everyone and introduced the Institute, institutional teams, team consultants, and the project staff. Consultant Gene Rice presented opening remarks on spirituality in society today.

In closing, Lena Astin presented the Institute agenda and its goals. After dinner, participants had an opportunity to speak informally with individuals from different institutions.

Wednesday, November 15th

The day opened with a continental breakfast followed by the plenary session in the Faculty Center. Jennifer Lindholm presented highlights from the study and invited questions and discussion of the initial findings. Two consultants, Art Chickering and Scotty McLennan, offered prepared remarks to begin the plenary session.

After a break for lunch, participants were divided into four inter-institutional groups with one individual from each institution and two to three team consultants and project team representatives per group. These smaller group discussions were intended to build upon the plenary discussion with an emphasis on institutional structure and culture. Following these conversations, the larger group convened, and representatives from each group provided summaries from the break-out meetings. After the four groups shared their thoughts, consultants Cheryl Keen and David Scott offered the day's closing remarks. Institute participants later shared a Kosher French Moroccan dinner buffet at the UCLA Hillel Center.

Thursday, November 16th

The last day of the Institute was designed to engage institutional teams in conversation with their consultants regarding the present state of programmatic efforts around spirituality on each campus, opportunities for expanding present work, and strategies for implementing institutional change. Using the plenary discussion from the previous day as a foundation for this discussion, team members were asked to develop an "Institutional Action Proposal" that included specific curricular and co-curricular measures to integrate spirituality within their campus community. After the Thursday lunch break, each institutional team presented their action proposal to Institute participants. Following the team reports, Sandy Astin and Lena Astin offered some closing perspectives, and the Institute was adjourned.

Key Institute Themes

Perspectives on Spirituality in the Academy

Dialogues on spirituality necessitate a framework for conceptualizing the nuanced meaning of the term and the inherent complexities of integrating spirituality into campus ideologies and structures.

During the opening plenary session, Institute participants were provided with an overview of project findings and were asked to reflect on the following questions:

1. What do we know (from research and practice) about students' and faculty's spirituality in higher education?
2. In attempting to facilitate students' existential/spiritual quest, what should higher education's response be?
3. What are some of the possible programmatic efforts that would incorporate spiritual perspectives into the curriculum and co-curriculum?
4. Who are other key players in these efforts at the campus level?
5. What change strategies are likely to work best?

In response to the first question, Jennifer Lindholm shared project findings with a focus on the multi-dimensional nature of spirituality, the spiritual and religious interests and commitments of college students, the diversity of approaches to spirituality that students exhibit, and the high expectations students hold regarding campus support for meaning-making and spirituality. She also emphasized faculty openness to spiritual dimensions in their own lives, contrasting this with their hesitation with respect to engaging students spiritually. Thus, there is an apparent disconnect between student expectations and the reality of institutional support for spiritual development and meaning-making.

Following the presentation on key project findings, participants were asked to reflect collectively and individually (in writing) on critical questions and areas of focus related to their understanding of spirituality in the academy. Through discussion and reflective writing, themes pertaining to language and definitions, institutional culture and structure, religious pluralism, faculty roles, innovation, and integration emerged.

Defining Spirituality

In both their spoken and written reflections, participants acknowledged the multi-faceted nature of the term "spirituality," recognizing the potential controversy and conflict that language can incite. The questions participants asked about the meaning of "spirituality" included the degree of overlap between spirituality and religion and the ways in which students and faculty define these concepts. Participants suggested that, before moving forward with spirituality-based initiatives, we must seek common definitional ground with students if spiritual growth is an outcome we are seeking to nurture in them.

In valuing student conceptions of spirituality, we respect their personhood and their right and responsibility to make their *own* meaning. Failure to accommodate student understandings might result in "power over" violations. Yet, many participants affirmed the importance of conversations on spirituality, noting as well the criticality of identifying terminology that facilitates open dialogue. Above all, as we seek further definition and infusion of spirituality into our campuses, we must remain mindful of the fact that nothing is value-free. When spiritual dimensions are excluded – when we fail to incorporate ethics, meaning, and purpose into curricular and co-curricular efforts – what we value (and do not value) is still communicated by default.

Based on their experiences at various institutions, participants and consultants shared their perspectives on how spirituality fit within the academy. Their comments revolved around three key areas of concern: Institutional culture and structure, religious pluralism, and faculty roles and the curriculum.

Institutional Culture and Structure

The first area of concern centered on institutional skepticism regarding the appropriateness of engaging students on a spiritual level. Given present barriers, are there ways to transform institutional culture such that the spiritual dimension achieves a foothold in the academy? Participants suggested that transformative efforts begin with a holistic consideration of institutional values and purpose. Revisiting, assessing, and potentially refining institutional documents and the rationale for a liberal arts education may be ways to stimulate campus-wide conversations.

Institutional structure was also seen as a factor that either hindered or promoted the integration of spirituality within the curricula and co-curricula on campuses. Overall, private institutions that had offices and departments that were created to directly support students' spiritual needs served the purpose of providing access to issues of spirituality within the academy. Public institutions found it much harder to begin work around spirituality due to certain barriers of entry, such as criticism from colleagues and administrators and the separation of church and state within education.

Religious Pluralism

The second area of concern participants identified was how to honor the freedoms of inquiry and religion and the separation of church and state while initiating and maintaining conversations on spirituality and religion. Participants perceived evident value in linking multicultural efforts on campus to religious pluralism and diversity. They stressed the need to proactively address religious illiteracy and conflict, but also articulated inherent challenges: How do we encourage students to think critically about their assumptions? How do we navigate the convergence of political and religious identity among students? How do we encourage empathetic dialogue? How do we forestall the dominance of Christian perspectives and resistance from conservative Christian students in these dialogues?

Faculty Roles and the Curriculum

The third area of concern related to the challenge of incorporating spirituality into the classroom. Participants cautioned against indoctrinating students, although conceded that current patterns of indoctrination revolve around scientism, empiricism, and rationalism – not spirituality. Nonetheless, participants maintained that in opening space for spiritual dialogue, proselytizing must be expressly avoided.

In addition to circumventing indoctrination, faculty reticence must also be addressed. Faculty reservations about spirituality derive from a number of sources, including the challenge of incorporating spiritual matters within the disciplinary content of a course, fears of challenging academic norms or undermining one's intellectual status, and lack of expertise in issues relating to spirituality, meaning, and purpose. Perceived lack of expertise is based in the expectation that faculty *know* and *deliver* their classroom content with authority.

When authority is both prized and assumed, there is much vulnerability in *not* knowing. As a result, how might faculty open up about their assumptions, spiritual backgrounds, creative passion for inquiry, and humanity in a way that is appropriate and comfortable? How can experiential and first-person knowledge appropriately enter the classroom? How can we transform traditional pedagogy into a space open to spiritual themes? In light of the apparent gap between faculty's academic loyalties and interests in supporting students' spiritual development, these critical questions warrant our attention as educators and practitioners.

Innovative Approaches

In response to these multi-level concerns – ranging from macro-level institutional challenges to micro-level classroom dynamics – participants suggested diverse strategies for addressing spirituality on campus. In her written reflection, one participant indicated, "we are in a fluid, fertile stage of development – and it is good that we each seem to be approaching this subject with very particular strategies." Among the potential sites for change, participants noted advising/mentoring, chaplaincy programs, speaker programs, living/learning communities, first-year experience initiatives and classes, service learning opportunities, community partnerships and programs, vocational and "calling" programming, and varied curricular innovations (experiential methods, reflective activity and dialogue, as well as new interdisciplinary courses). Above all, participants affirmed the need to collect and publicize programs, syllabi, and approaches.

Integration and Collective Action

Amidst the diversity of practices and innovations, there is a need for coherence and a unified educational approach. Instead of a singular programmatic structure, an ecology – or a culture – for spiritual integration is imperative. The theme of collective, holistic action carried through participants' reflections on connectedness within the academy. That is, participants advocated bridging varied fields and disciplines, integrating theory and practice, connecting curricular and co-curricular efforts, linking academic and student affairs, connecting the spiritual and religious spheres with the intellectual and rational domains, and facilitating communication between stakeholders who support spiritual initiatives on campus and those who reject them.

In short, participants maintained that the preservation of illusory dualisms is counterproductive to efforts to connect, integrate, and unify. With these foundational themes as the basis for the Institute, the following sections detail further conversations among inter-institutional and intra-institutional groups and consultant remarks.

Inter-Institutional Session

The inter-institutional break-out session served the purpose of extending the large-group plenary dialogue with an emphasis on the following issues:

- Current institutional beliefs and values that represent potential obstacles to integrating spirituality into the curriculum and co-curriculum.
- Current institutional beliefs and values that offer opportunities for integration.
- Possible structures or strategies for cultural change.

Subsequent to discussing these issues within the inter-institutional groups, participants reassembled and representatives from each group presented highlights from their discussion.

Group one considered potential structures for changing campus culture, particularly the addition of contemplative practices in disciplinary courses. Moreover, the group debated whether proponents of spirituality in the academy have generated a collective movement in higher education analogous to the feminist movement or the diversity movement. Some group members expressed skepticism on this point because the terms "spirituality" and "religion" are fraught with negative connotations for many in the academy. The group also considered whether a movement necessitates the full participation of everyone in academe. Lastly, group participants posited that spirituality has two potential points of entry into the academy. First, drawing attention to the fragmented and chaotic nature of student, staff, and faculty lives suggests this work is needed. Second, in producing thorough, well-crafted empirical research that demonstrates the effectiveness of spirituality in teaching, the merits of these efforts are legitimized.

The second inter-institutional group also began their conversation deliberating language associated with the word "spirituality." To widen the dialogue to include those who do not connect with the language of

spirituality, the group arrived at a list of alternative terms: passion, transformation, justice, authenticity, vocation, integrity, intuition, meaning, purpose, value-driven, embodiment, and engagement. In their discussion of culture, the group suggested that culture is the predecessor of structure; any boundaries that exist are learned. To reformulate organizational culture, we must expand the range of legitimate conversations and address the structural obstacles, including the promotion and tenure system and the disconnect between student and academic affairs. We must work with faculty to shape the curriculum and with staff to develop the co-curriculum. Because of their spiritual interest, students must be involved in driving the movement as well. In closing, the group indicated that this work must point us outward as well as inward so that we may invite, inquire, and guide.

Group three focused their discussion on current efforts and issues on their respective campuses. Participants reflected on a number of initiatives, including interdisciplinary and thematic courses, interfaith conversations (with trained student leaders to facilitate these conversations), mission statement development, service learning, and integration of centers on campus (e.g., career centers and leadership/civic engagement centers; social justice living-learning centers). The group identified sources of challenge on campus, namely faculty discomfort with raising spiritual issues in the classroom. This discomfort most frequently emerges from lack of expertise, concerns about proselytizing and indoctrinating, and the desire to maintain privacy. To address this discomfort, the group suggested initiating efforts with faculty who are willing to have these discussions, modeling behaviors (perhaps through team teaching), and creating a climate in which vulnerability and *not* knowing are acceptable.

The fourth inter-institutional group identified the tensions that exist within campus culture. Some group members wondered about the feasibility of change and debated the legitimacy of these changes. Participants also reflected on the challenge of language and the need to derive conceptual clarity in discussions of spirituality. The group raised the issue of religious pluralism and ways to help students confront diversity such that multiple perspectives are valued. Similar to the other groups, faculty concerns were also addressed. Participants noted that while engaging students on this level is meaningful, the tenure-track system rewards distance from students and self-disclosure in the classroom is difficult. Finally, the group encouraged mergers between student and academic affairs and suggested engaging religious studies faculty in these efforts.

In short, the general themes from the groups' discussion included:

- Culture as the predecessor of structure
- Importance of campus mission statements that include spirituality as a focus
- Uneasiness with the word "spirituality" – re-operationalize terms to be more inclusive and integrative
- Expansion of the range of legitimate conversations
- Work with faculty to shape curriculum around spiritual issues
- Obstacles in higher education: promotion/tenure system, divide between academic affairs and student affairs, unwillingness to let students drive the agenda, discomfort of faculty to discuss spirituality in classroom

Intra-Institutional Session

The intra-institutional session was intended to incorporate current efforts to integrate spirituality on each campus with future plans to expand present work and implement positive institutional change in this area of student development. Institutional teams were charged with developing action proposals outlining curricular and co-curricular measures to integrate spirituality within their campus communities.

As previously indicated, each institutional team met with one of the designated consultants to consider action plans that they could develop and implement at their institutions upon their return. The team consultant assignments were as follows:

- Bates College – Peter Laurence
- Carnegie Mellon University – Arthur Zajonc
- Florida State University – Larry Braskamp
- Furman University – Sandy Astin
- Grinnell College – Cheryl Keen
- Miami University of Ohio – Art Chickering
- Spelman College – Scotty McLennan
- University of California, Irvine – Joe Subbiondo
- University of California, Los Angeles – David Scott
- Wellesley College – Gene Rice.

Examining the institutional teams' action plans, we found that a number of very similar categories of activities emerged across institutions, independent of institutional size or type, including use of data, curricula, co-curricula, faculty, and campus community, among others.

Use of Data

Participants talked about the importance of arranging for sessions with others at their institutions to present and discuss data collected from their students and faculty as part of the HERI national study on spirituality. Some participants also indicated their desire to have a member of the research team visit their institution to share these data with their colleagues.

Curricula

There were a number of ideas that surfaced with respect to curricular development in introducing the topic of spirituality, including developing one-unit seminars; creating new courses; utilizing initiatives in the freshman and sophomore years; and designing capstone experiences on spirituality. In discussions about curricular efforts, ideas also surfaced about the use of pedagogical tools to assist students in their spiritual quest, such as meditation, contemplation, and reflective writing and journaling.

Co-Curricula

Participants felt that residence life might be an appropriate site for including spirituality as a hall theme. Organizing conversations around the topic of spirituality in residence halls was also seen as a promising avenue. Developing student/faculty lunch gatherings and bringing speakers to campus who could talk about the topic of spirituality were also offered as intervention ideas. In addition, there was a rich conversation on how to use existing campus efforts such as interfaith councils, the Difficult Dialogues programs, the Lilly grants on vocation, and other similar programs that could lend themselves to conversations about spirituality.

Faculty

Each team deliberated how to introduce faculty to the conversation of spirituality and how to assist them in this work. The ideas that surfaced included developing seminars for faculty on how to introduce the topic of spirituality in the classroom; producing resource materials and best practice guides on the topic; using faculty retreats to discuss the topic of spirituality and incorporating spiritual perspectives into the curriculum; using new faculty orientation as a vehicle to hold discussions on the role of spirituality in higher education; as well as developing book clubs and selecting books on the topic for such discussions.

Campus Community

There were a number of ideas about mechanisms to create greater campus community through offering speakers' series, facilitating round table discussions, and providing space for meditation and/or contemplation.

Presentation and Implementation of Action Plans

Highlights from the individual discussions that occurred between each institutional team and designated consultant were presented by team representatives orally to the entire Institute gathering. As can be seen from the categories discussed above, there was a richness of ideas in the teams' proposals and considerable consensus as to what needed to occur once the team returned to campus.

Following the Institute, the project's research team wrote to each institutional team in late January and early February to inquire about the progress they had made with their action agendas. Each team received an email that provided a brief summary of their proposed action plans, based on our review of their deliberations reflected in the notes taken and in the transcribed materials from the team sessions. We received responses from most of the teams, and some sent us detailed updates of their work on implementing their action agendas.

For example, one public research university told us that they already have underway three components of their action plan: They are forming a campus-wide committee on faith traditions and spirituality, are conducting an audit of existing programs that are relevant to concerns about spirituality, and are preparing models to be used by faculty, staff, and peer leaders to assist leading discussions about spiritual development on campus.

Another public research university has been targeting its efforts on coursework. They are adding questions about spirituality to their senior survey, redesigning the capstone experience in ways that will attend to students' personal development, and developing plans to think more creatively about the sophomore year experience. In addition, the academic unit that is concerned with undergraduate education is collaborating with student affairs in redesigning the freshman year experience to include discussions of issues such as life skills and reflection activities.

A third institution, a private research university, is working toward developing stronger links between student affairs and academic affairs. One immediate consequence of these efforts has been the formation of teams of faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and student affairs advisors that will hold discussions in the residence halls about students' "big questions." They also invited a member of the UCLA research team to present project findings and engage faculty and administrators in an extended discussion of the implications for institutional policy and practice.

A fourth public research university has started an all-campus forum on religious diversity. The forum was organized by the Center for American and World Cultures and a student-led interfaith council. Plans are also underway for faculty dialogues on religious/spiritual questions in the classroom. These dialogues are designed as part of a program for faculty development to be offered through the university's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. In addition, a preliminary outline has been drafted for a proposed curriculum with a clear focus on meaning-making and finding purpose to be offered as a second-year residential requirement.

The action plans developed in these intra-institutional sessions allowed participants to specifically tailor the group discussion that occurred previously at the Institute to a specific vision of how they can implement change within their individual campus communities. This type of discussion serves as a model for other institutions that seek to examine and discuss how their current cultures and structures are supporting students' spiritual development as they search for meaning and purpose throughout their undergraduate experience.

Consultant Remarks

Eugene "Gene" Rice

Gene Rice, Senior Scholar at the Association of American Colleges and Universities, spoke on faculty roles and priorities in the context of infusing spirituality into higher education institutions. He reflected on the impact of modernization and secularization on faculty perspectives in the post-World War II era. During that time, positivist epistemologies assumed a favored position within the academy while rational inquiry, science, technology, and university expansion became normative.

These commitments were challenged in later decades during and after the Vietnam War as postmodern and post-secular influences emerged in the academy. With the transition from modernism to postmodernism, alternative pedagogies and epistemologies are no longer at odds with institutional culture. While pedagogical transformations involve relational learning, engaged/active learning, and technology-enhanced learning, new epistemologies invite reformulation of faculty-student relationships, recognition of the limitations of objectivity, and affirmation of marginalized voices. In short, postmodernism has effectively opened the door to new ways of thinking, teaching, and living.

Quoting Max Weber, Rice suggested that the "moral obligation of a teacher is to ask inconvenient questions." These inconvenient questions are essential in this new pedagogical period in which students and faculty are concerned with meaning-making. Moreover, faculty in the current era can incorporate faith into their priorities through openness, humility, respect for students' personhood, avoidance of indoctrination, and finding balance between autonomy and collaboration.

Arthur "Art" Chickering

Art Chickering, Special Assistant to the President of Goddard College, offered four clusters of comments in response to Gene Rice's remarks, including the importance of: (1) maintaining openness in communicating one's own assumptions; (2) ensuring that indoctrination has no place in the academy; (3) providing both challenge and support in students' cognitive and ethical development; and (4) learning to talk about religion despite its tendency to act as a "conversation stopper."

In his reflection, Chickering remarked on the ever-evolving complexity of the social, political, economic, and religious spheres, as well as our own individual and collective movements toward greater complexity in our cognitive and affective capacities. He specifically affirmed the significance of challenge and support in furthering students' development. During their undergraduate years, students shift from dualism to more complex levels of knowing and relating, and in this shift become increasingly accommodating of relativism while forming commitments within the context of these pluralities.

Moreover, Chickering underscored the reality of value-laden higher education. Nothing is value free, and more often than not students continue to be indoctrinated in scientism, rationalism, and consumerism. A material identity has been imposed on students.

Finally, Dr. Chickering recounted the importance of learning to talk with one another about such "hot topics" as religion, as comfort and confidence in these conversations are impetrative in our pluralistic society.

William "Scotty" McLennan

As Dean of Religious Life at Stanford University, Scotty McLennan discussed how chaplains and campus ministries can enrich university life and help foster religious and spiritual development among students. He stressed the significance of this challenging time in history in which interfaith awareness has become evermore necessary in our globalized society. In fact, global citizenship, an outcome most institutions expect of their graduates, includes religious understanding.

McLennan went on to highlight the role of chaplains as leaders in promoting freedom of intellectual inquiry and as supporters of the diversity of traditions represented among students, faculty, and staff. He also highlighted the challenge professors face in honoring the spiritual diversity of their students, while ultimately encouraging them to move beyond ethical relativism; to become religiously literate; to embrace empathetic learning; to not only deconstruct ideas but reconstruct them; and to serve as effective citizens within our global society.

Cheryl Keen

Cheryl Keen, Faculty Chair for Student Success for the Ph.D. in Education program at Walden University, began her reflection by providing a rationale for exploring spiritual issues as educators. First and foremost, spiritual issues deserve our attention because students are spiritually curious and require sustenance and support in their meaning-making quests. Further, spirituality relates to outcomes we hope to nurture in our students. Thus, our exploration of spiritual matters will help us to create environments that are conducive to student development along these dimensions.

Keen went on to address best practices for providing space for students' spiritual development, including exposure to diverse worldviews to strengthen students' sense of clarity regarding their own convictions and faith; community service; informal dialogue with peers; curricular and co-curricular alliances; and interfaith dialogues. She also underscored the relevance of faculty mentors in students' lives.

Faculty are uniquely positioned to provide hospitable spaces for students; to encourage students' consideration of meaning and purpose; and to inspire students to uphold the values of justice, service, and integrity in their lives.

David Scott

David Scott, former Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts Amherst, discussed the need for a new epistemological model for incorporating spiritual knowledge and discourse within the academy. Although notions of service, activism, and pluralism are supported on many campuses, very often the spiritual dimension is not addressed explicitly. Instead of merely adding activities and programs, a coherent strategy is imperative.

For the first time, humankind now has access to the knowledge of all cultures in the world. This immense power requires us to approach spirituality holistically, emphasizing integration, rather than the dualistic model so often used in education today. Scott expressed that we need to engage in contemplative practice to help us understand the nature of reality, the nature of tensions in oneself, and the nature of diverse cultures. For students specifically, the rational environment so prevalent within institutions does not provide the means through which students might progress in their faith. An integrative approach – one that illuminates and liberates – will solidify the interconnectedness of students' spiritual and academic lives.

Conclusion

We believe that the Institute met our intended goals by providing a valuable opportunity to open up and continue dialogue on issues relating to spirituality in higher education. Throughout the Institute, participants reflected and shared their thoughts about the role of spirituality on campus, examined programs and activities at their institutions that already address issues of spirituality and religiousness, and thought creatively about how to expand their ongoing work on spirituality. Moreover, they developed plans to create new policies, programs, and initiatives to integrate spirituality into their campus communities.

The research team, with assistance from consultants, is planning to continue the conversation with participants and visit some of these campuses to follow-up on their progress since returning from the Institute and assist with their work, as possible. In addition, the April 2007 issue of the *Spirituality in Higher Education Newsletter* (Volume 3, Issue 3) was dedicated to the Institute, and included reflections from two consultants and participants representing two institutions. To read this issue of the Newsletter and to keep abreast of our research findings and other activities, please visit the project website: www.spirituality.ucla.edu.

Appendices

A: List of Institute Participants
B: Team Consultant Biographies
C: Institute Agenda
D: Behind the Scenes
E: Invitation Letters and Correspondence

Appendix A
List of Institute Participants

Spirituality Project Team

Alexander "Sandy" Astin
Helen "Lena" Astin
Nida Denson
Jeff Forrest
Jennifer Lindholm
Julie Park
Leslie Schwartz

Team Consultants

Alexander "Sandy" Astin
Larry A. Braskamp
Arthur "Art" Chickering
Peter Laurence
Cheryl Keen
Joseph Subbiondo
Eugene "Gene" Rice
William "Scotty" McLennan
David Scott
Arthur Zajonc

Observer

Alyssa Bryant

Participants

Bates College

Anna Bartel, Associate Director of the Harward Center for Community Partnerships
Bill Blaine-Wallace, Chaplain
Rachel Herzig, Assistant Chaplain
Sue Houchins, Special Assistant to the President; Associate Professor, African American Studies

Carnegie Mellon University

Patricia Carpenter, Professor of Psychology
Jennifer Church, Dean of Student Affairs
Indira Nair, Vice Provost for Education; Professor of Engineering & Public Policy
Harriet Schwartz, Assistant Director of the Career Center

Florida State University

Mary Coburn, Vice President for Student Affairs
Jon Dalton, Director of the Hardee Center, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Bill Moeller, Director of the Center for Civic Education and Service (CCES)
Carrie Tucker, Program Coordinator in the LEAD Center and CCES

Furman University

Linda Barlett, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean
Susan D'Amato, Professor of Physics
Carol Daniels, Coordinator of Student Services
David Rutledge, Professor and Chair in the Department of Religion

Grinnell College

Bradley Bateman, Gertrude B. Austin Professor of Economics; Associate Dean of the College
Marc Chamberland, Associate Professor of Mathematics
Harold Kasimow, Professor of Religious Studies
Deanna Shorb, Chaplain

Miami University of Ohio

Mary Jane Berman, Director of the Center for American and World Cultures
Richard Nault, Vice President for Student Affairs
Michael Stevenson, Assistant to the President of Institutional Diversity; Associate Provost; Professor of Psychology

Spelman College

Veta Goler, Associate Professor & Chair (on-leave) in the Academic Affairs Division; Drama & Dance Department
Desiree Pedescleaux, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Lisa Rhodes, Dean of the Chapel
Rosetta Ross, Associate Professor in the Academic Affairs Division

University of California, Irvine

Manuel Gomez, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
Aaron Kheriaty, Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, UCI Medical Center
Susan Klein, Associate Professor and Director of Religious Studies, East Asian Languages & Literature
Ralph Purdy, Professor of Pharmacology
Jen'nan Read, Assistant Professor of Sociology

University of California, Los Angeles

Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost in Undergraduate Education Initiatives
Mark Morris, Professor of Astronomy
Suzanne Seplow, Director of Residential Life
Judith Smith, Vice Provost/Dean for Undergraduate Education; Professor of Physiological Science
Pam Viele, Director of Student Health Education

Wellesley College

Ji Hyang Sunim, Buddhist Chaplain
Sun-Hee Lee, Assistant Professor of East Asian Languages and Literature
John O'Keefe, Director of Advising and Academic Support
Patti Sheinman, Director of Hillel

Special Guests

Sylvia Hurtado
Cynthia Johnson

Other Volunteers

Chris Collins
Monica Lin
Shannon Toma
Elisabeth Turner

Appendix B
Team Consultant Biographies

Alexander W. Astin

Alexander W. Astin is Allan M. Cartter Professor Emeritus of Higher Education and Founding Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. He is also the Founding Director of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, the nation's largest and oldest study of college students and faculty. Previously Dr. Astin was Director of Research for both the American Council on Education and the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. The author of 20 books and some 400 other publications in the field of higher education, Dr. Astin has been a recipient of awards for outstanding research from 12 national associations, a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, a recipient of eleven honorary degrees, and a member of the National Academy of Education. The *Journal of Higher Education* has identified Dr. Astin as the most frequently-cited author in the field of higher education. In 1985 readers of *Change* magazine selected him as the person "most admired for creative, insightful thinking" in the field of higher education. Dr. Astin is currently principal investigator (with H. S. Astin) on a national study of spiritual development among undergraduates at 236 higher education institutions. His latest book is *Mindworks: Becoming More Conscious in an Unconscious World.*

Larry A. Braskamp

Larry A. Braskamp is a professor emeritus in the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago, where he has worked since 1998. From 1998 to 2002, he served there as Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Prior to assuming this position at Loyola University, he was a professor at University of Nebraska-Lincoln and a Dean and Associate Vice Chancellor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Braskamp also served for one year as the Executive Director of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. He received a mid-career teaching fellowship from the Danforth Foundation and a Distinguished Teaching Award from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Braskamp has published, presented, and consulted widely on such topics as assessment of faculty work, student development, university-community partnerships, and, most recently, the issue of student identity development at faith-related colleges and universities.

His recent book, *Putting Students First: How Colleges Develop Students Purposefully* (2006) presents findings from case studies at ten church-related colleges. Braskamp holds a B.A. in psychology from Central College in Iowa and a M.A. and Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Iowa. He is currently a senior fellow at the Association of American Colleges & Universities and a senior scientist at the Gallup Organization.

Arthur W. Chickering

Arthur W. Chickering is a nationally respected writer and teacher of higher education, now retired from a Distinguished University Professor position at George Mason University. He currently serves as Special Assistant to the President of Goddard College. Chickering received his B.A. (1950) in modern comparative literature from Wesleyan University, his M.A. degree (1951) in teaching English from the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, and his Ph.D. degree (1959) in school psychology from Teachers College, Columbia University. Chickering is the author of many publications, including *Education and Identity* (1969, 1993), *Commuting Versus Resident Students: Overcoming Educational Inequities of Living Off Campus* (1974), *The Modern American College: Responding to the New Realities of Diverse Students and a Changing Society* (1981), *Improving Higher Education Environments for Adults: Responsive Programs and Services from Entry to Departure* (1989, with N.K. Schlossberg and A.Q. Lynch) and *Getting the Most Out of College* (1994, with Nancy Schlossberg).

Cheryl Keen

Cheryl Keen is Faculty Chair for Student Success for the Ph.D. in Education program at Walden University. Previously she was Dean of Community Learning and College Professor at Antioch College. She is also the Senior Research Fellow at the Bonner Foundation in Princeton, NJ, where she and her husband Jim lead an outcomes assessment for the 25-campus scholarship program for co-curricular service-learning. Cheryl serves on the Fetzer Institute's working group on spirituality and wholeness in higher education and is a consultant for the Wellesley College Education as Transformation project. Keen also co-founded and directed the peace and conflict studies program at Harvard University and received her doctorate from the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She was given the Experiential Education Higher Education Leader of the Year award by the National Society for Experiential Education in 2001. Additionally, she is co-author of the book *Common Fire: Leading Lives of Commitment in a Complex World* (1997).

Peter Laurence

Peter Laurence is Executive Director of the Education as Transformation project at Wellesley College. He is currently serving as grant administrator for a federally funded project on *Changing Attitudes across Religious Communities: Developing Models for College Campuses.* Laurence has been a consultant to various national and international interfaith organizations for the past twenty years, has served as Chair of the Board of the North American Interfaith Network and as a member of the Assembly of Religious and Spiritual Leaders for the Parliament of the World's Religions (Chicago, 1993; Capetown, 1999). Laurence also is the co-editor of *Education as Transformation: Religious Pluralism, Spirituality, and a New Vision for Higher Education in America* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2000), and co-editor of the Peter Lang book series, *Studies in Education and Spirituality.* In 2005 he produced *Beyond Tolerance: A Campus Religious Diversity Kit* in collaboration with the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). He also serves on the Editorial Board of the *Religion and Education* journal and is a member of the Collaborative on Spirituality in Higher Education (CSHE). He received his Ed.D. from Columbia University.

William L. McLennan

William L. McLennan is the Dean for Religious Life at Stanford University. He received his B.A. from Yale in 1970 and his M.Div. and J.D. degrees from the Harvard Divinity and Law schools in 1975. He is both an ordained minister and an attorney. McLennan has been at Stanford since 2001, having taught previously at Tufts University and the Harvard Business School. For the first decade of his career he practiced church-sponsored poverty law in a low-income neighborhood of Boston. McLennan has authored *Finding Your Religion: When the Faith You Grew Up With Has Lost Its Meaning* (Harper San Francisco, 1999) and co-authored *Church on Sunday, Work on Monday: The Challenge of Fusing Christian Values and Business Life* (Jossey-Bass, 2001). In 1994, he was the recipient of The Rabbi Martin Katzenstein Award, the oldest annual award given to Harvard Divinity School Alumni/ae "to honor among its graduates one who exhibits a passionate and helpful interest in the lives of other people."

R. Eugene Rice

R. Eugene Rice recently became Senior Scholar at the Association of American Colleges and Universities and accepted an appointment in the new Ph.D. Program in Leadership and Change at Antioch University. For ten years he served as Director of the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards and the New Pathways projects at the American Association for Higher Education. Before moving to AAHE he was Vice President and Dean of the Faculty at Antioch College where he held an appointment of Professor of Sociology and Religion. Earlier, Rice served as a Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Foundation engaged in the national study of the scholarly priorities of the American professoriate and collaborating with the late Ernest Boyer on the Carnegie Report *Scholarship Reconsidered.* His work on that topic is available in the New Pathways Working Paper Series in an essay entitled "Making a Place for the New American Scholar" (Stylus), and appears in a new book *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship* edited with KerryAnn O'Meara (2005, Jossey-Bass). In Change magazine's survey of leadership in American higher education, Rice was recognized as one of a small group of "idea leaders" whose work has made a difference nationally.

David K. Scott

A nuclear scientist, David K. Scott served as Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts Amherst for eight years, from 1993 until 2001. Under Scott, the campus made many important advances, including the successful completion of the first comprehensive capital campaign, attention to neglected infrastructure, the installation of network wiring across the campus, the development of a new communications and marketing strategy, and the formation of Commonwealth College as well as a campus-wide initiative on Community, Diversity, and Social Justice. Scott championed the vision of an integrative University in which transdisciplinary research and holistic learning communities would overcome the fragmentation of knowledge and support the development of wiser human beings to create a better world. Before coming to Amherst, Scott served as Provost at Michigan State University. His administrative career was preceded by a distinguished research career in nuclear physics, highlighted by work at leading cyclotron laboratories. He is now interested in building upon these experiences to explore integrative leadership and action in organizations.

Joseph L. Subbiondo

Joseph L. Subbiondo, president of California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) since June 1999, has an accomplished background in both administration and academics. He brings a distinguished thirty-year history of achievement in higher education, including appointments on several international academic committees, and he has been active on numerous accreditation teams for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the Institute's accrediting body. Subbiondo has published extensively on the history of linguistics; among his specialties is the study of the relation between English words and the evolution of consciousness. Prior to coming to CIIS, he served as Dean of the School of Liberal Arts at St. Mary's College of California; Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of the Pacific; Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Santa Clara University; and as tenured faculty at several universities.

Arthur Zajonc

Arthur Zajonc is professor of physics at Amherst College, where he has taught since 1978. He received his B.S. and Ph.D. in physics from the University of Michigan. He has been visiting professor and research scientist at the Ecole Normale Superieure in Paris, the Max Planck Institute for Quantum Optics, and the universities of Rochester and Hannover. He has been Fulbright professor at the University of Innsbruck in Austria. His research has included studies in parity violation in atoms; the experimental foundations of quantum physics; and the relationship between sciences, the humanities, and contemplation. He is author of the book *Catching the Light,* co-author of *The Quantum Challenge,* and co-editor of *Goethe's Way of Science.* In 1997 he served as scientific coordinator for the Mind and Life dialogue with H.H. the Dalai Lama published as *The New Physics and Cosmology: Dialogues with the Dalai Lama* (Oxford 2004). Zajonc currently directs the Academic Program of the Center for Contemplative Mind which supports appropriate inclusion of contemplative practice in higher education and is currently writing a book on the peace work of twelve Nobel peace laureates.

Appendix C
Institute Agenda

National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education
November 14-16, 2006, University of California, Los Angeles

November 14, Tuesday

6:00pm - 8:00pm
Reception and Dinner
Downstairs Lounge, Faculty Center

Alexander "Sandy" Astin, Welcome and Introduction
R. Eugene "Gene" Rice, Opening Remarks
Helen "Lena" Astin, Agenda for the Institute

November 15, Wednesday

8:30am - 5:30pm
Plenary Session
Sequoia Room, Faculty Center

8:30am - 9:00am	Continental Breakfast
9:00am - 12:00pm	Meeting in Plenary Session

Jennifer Lindholm, "Spirituality in Higher Education" Project Highlights
Arthur "Art" Chickering, Opening Remarks
William "Scotty" McLennan, Opening Remarks

Discussion

12:00pm - 1:30pm	Lunch
1:30pm - 5:30pm	In Plenary Session, Continue Discussion

Cheryl Keen, Closing Remarks
David Scott, Closing Remarks

6:30pm – 9:30pm	Dinner, *Hillel Center*

November 16, Thursday

8:30am – 3:30pm
Institutional Work
Sequoia Room, Faculty Center

8:30am – 9:00am	Continental Breakfast
9:00am – 12:00pm	Team Meetings with Consultants
12:00pm – 1:00pm	Lunch
1:00pm – 3:00pm	Team Reports
3:00pm – 3:30pm	Future Plans

Appendix D
Behind the Scenes

This section presents some of the behind the scenes efforts that contributed to creating an Institute environment that facilitated open communication and dialogue on issues relating to spirituality. While the above discussion outlines the conversation and major themes of Institute participants and team consultants, the Institute fostered an overall environment that was conducive to supporting and encouraging open dialogue on these issues. Feedback from those who attended the Institute was overwhelmingly positive in this regard; many found the experience very enlightening and educational, and reported on the many practical ways they envisioned applying the information they gained. The following sections outline the process by which we planned the Institute.

History and Rationale

As our project team focused on the research efforts related to the *Spirituality in Higher Education* project, we discussed ways to expand and apply our initial findings. There was much enthusiasm around the idea of holding a National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education in order to initiate meaningful conversation around topics relating to spirituality, meaning, and purpose with institutions from across the country. As a result, we proposed holding such an Institute as part of Phase II of the *Spirituality in Higher Education* project. Planning for the Institute began in May 2006. The National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education was then held on November 14-16, 2006 at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Planning and Implementation

From the onset of the planning process, we wanted to create an atmosphere at the Institute that was both educational and exploratory – one in which participants could openly discuss matters of spirituality and its relevance to the culture and mission of their institutions. The desired outcome of these conversations was the development of action proposals for integrating spirituality into the campus communities. With these objectives in mind, the Institute was designed to create an atmosphere of open communication and critical educational inquiry and discussion.

When selecting campuses to participate in the Institute, we sought four-year public and private colleges and universities that participated in the student and faculty surveys. A team coordinator from each institution – generally the academic vice chancellor, provost, or president – was initially contacted regarding the scope of the Institute and was invited to compose a team of faculty, staff, and administrators from their institution to attend the Institute. Three- to five-member institutional teams were selected by the team coordinator to reflect the diversity of spiritual inquiry and research foci on each campus. Once the complete teams were assembled, we sent participants a personal invitation to the Institute (See Appendix E for invitation letters).

We also invited nine team consultants to help guide the discussion at the Institute as well as to offer comments on specific topics related to spirituality and higher education. We chose individuals who were considered experts in their respective fields and who had engaged in extensive research and published on spirituality and related areas. Each consultant was assigned to a campus team and asked to serve as a facilitator during the Thursday morning sessions.

Each participant received an Institute workbook that contained a preliminary Institute agenda, participant biographies, related readings, an annotated bibliography of recommended readings, and an institutional report summarizing data from the 2004 College Students Beliefs and Values Survey. Graduate students in the Higher Education and Organizational Change program at UCLA were also invited to help serve as note takers for the Thursday morning sessions. These sessions were also audio-taped and later transcribed.

All Institute participants and consultants stayed on campus at the UCLA Guest House which is located in close proximity to the UCLA Faculty Center where the Institute sessions were held. Due to the convenience of these locations, conversations related to Institute topics were able to continue beyond scheduled sessions, which helped foster an ongoing atmosphere of dialogue around issues of spirituality in higher education.

Participant Interaction

One of the unique aspects of the Institute was the diversity of individuals represented – Academic Administrators, Deans and Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, Chaplains, Residential Life Directors, and faculty members from a plethora of fields. This rich diversity added depth to our discussions and allowed for the emergence of different perspectives and

points of view on a range of issues. The overall atmosphere of the Institute was one of open communication and dialogue in which many participants shared their experiences and opinions freely with the group. The plenary session on Wednesday was a prime opportunity to foster an environment of collective discourse. While much of the discussion assumed serious overtones given the nature of the topic, humor and storytelling were also integrated into the environment to lighten the mood – particularly when team consultants responded to questions or presented opening or closing remarks. This open-communication was furthered outside of the formal sessions over meals and in the shared residence of the Guest House.

Appendix E
Invitation Letters and Correspondence

Initial Spirituality Institute Invitation

June 06, 2006

Spirituality Institute
To: Provost/President of participating institutions

Dear _____:

We would like to invite members of your College/University to participate in a National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education to be held at UCLA on November 14-16, 2006.

Over the past three years, the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute has been engaged in a project on Spirituality in Higher Education funded by The John Templeton Foundation. Students and faculty from your institution have participated in our data collection efforts, and we have shared reports on the findings from these studies with you. We do thank you for being a participant and for helping us understand this important aspect of student development.

The second phase of the project involves longitudinal data collection in 2007 from students to enable us to examine student growth and development over a three year time period. In addition to collecting these data, we plan to host an invitational National Institute at UCLA this November.

From the 236 institutions that have participated in the 2004 study, your institution has been selected as one of 10 schools to participate in this invitational National Institute (please refer to the attached list of prospective institutions). This letter is our formal invitation to your institution to participate in this groundbreaking area of Higher Education research as an active part of our Institute.

We would like to invite a four-person team from your institution, including yourself, two faculty members that you consider strong opinion leaders who are interested in undergraduate education and student development, as well as one leader from the area of student affairs, such as the dean of students or vice president of student affairs.

The purpose of the Institute is twofold. First, we want to share our research findings in greater depth with each institutional representative and discuss the importance and nature of holistic education and the role of liberal arts in student development around questions of meaning and purpose. Second, we want to work with you in finding creative ways to encourage the development of curricula and co-curricula around these issues at your institution. The Institute staff will include the research team as well as other notable scholars and practitioners in the field who will serve as resource persons.

All expenses for yourself and your three colleagues will be paid by the Institute.

In the coming weeks, a member of our research team will be following up with you by telephone to answer any questions you may have about the Institute. At this time, we would also like to receive the names of your colleagues who you think will be appropriate participants for such an Institute. We thank you for your continued support of this project and look forward to ongoing participation from your institution in the future.

Respectfully,
Alexander "Sandy" Astin
Helen "Lena" Astin
Jennifer Lindholm

Update to Institute Team Consultants

Dear _____:

We are delighted that you have agreed to serve as a team consultant for the UCLA National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education. As you know, we have invited each of ten colleges and universities to nominate four-member teams to participate.

Thus far, four of the institutions have identified all four team members, two other institutions have sent us partial lists, and we are awaiting lists from the remaining four. As soon as we have all the names, we will send you complete lists containing each institutional participant and their titles. As we mentioned in our letter of invitation, the Institute will begin with dinner at 6:00pm on Tuesday, November 14 and conclude on Thursday, November 16 at 3:30pm.

On Wednesday we plan to meet as a group of the whole. The day will be designed to explore questions such as:

- What do we know (from research and practice) about students' and faculty's spirituality in higher education?
- In attempting to facilitate students' existential/spiritual quest, what should higher education's response be?
- What are some of the possible programmatic efforts that would incorporate spiritual perspectives into the curriculum and co-curriculum?
- Who are other key players in these efforts at the campus level?
- What change strategies are likely to work best?

For our deliberations on Wednesday morning we are also going to ask three or four of the consultants to prepare some remarks of about 10-12 minutes that can stimulate the discussion for the rest of the day. Our hope is that participants will leave the Institute with a proposal about possible efforts they can undertake on their campuses to introduce the topic of spiritual exploration in the curriculum and/or co-curriculum. To accomplish this we would like to ask each one of you to work with one of the teams during the morning of the third day (Thursday). You will know ahead of time your assigned team.

After lunch on Thursday we shall return to a plenary session to review the proposed plans from each of the ten institutions.

In preparation for the Institute we would like to ask each of you to send us references of relevant readings that can be shared with all participants. For example, we would like to receive readings that will help the participants think creatively about this work; examples of institutions that have been engaged in such work; course syllabi; etc. We appreciate your guidance and wisdom.

Also, please make your travel arrangements and complete and return the attached travel information form at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions regarding travel or accommodations, please contact Leslie Schwartz at LSchwartz@gseis.ucla.edu.

All of your travel expenses to attend the Institute will be covered by the project and an honorarium will be offered in appreciation of your involvement in the Institute.

Again, we are most appreciative of your interest in this work and look forward to hearing from you and seeing you in November.

Best regards,

Lena Astin
Sandy Astin
Jennifer Lindholm

Update to Institute Participants

September 14, 2006

Dear _____:

We are delighted that you will be participating in the National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education at UCLA. Your institutional team is one of ten such four-member teams that have been invited. (The names of the ten colleges and universities are included below). The purposes of the Institute are to examine what we know from scholarship and practice about spirituality in higher education and to generate ideas and proposals for curricular and co-curricular strategies that will offer students expanded opportunities for exploring questions of meaning and purpose during their undergraduate years.

The Institute begins on Tuesday, November 14th at 6:00 pm with a reception and dinner and concludes on November 16 (Thursday) at 3:30 pm. On Wednesday we plan to meet as a group of the whole. The day will be designed to explore questions such as:

- What do we know (from research and practice) about students' and faculty's spirituality in higher education?
- In attempting to facilitate students' existential/spiritual quest, what should higher education's response be?
- What are some of the possible programmatic efforts that would incorporate spiritual perspectives into the curriculum and co-curriculum?
- Who are other key players in these efforts at the campus level?
- What change strategies are likely to work best?

We have invited nine very knowledgeable scholars in the field to help us with the discussion on Wednesday and to serve as consultants with each of the teams (see the appended list of team consultants below).

Our hope is that each team will leave the Institute with a draft proposal outlining possible new efforts that could be undertaken on their campuses that would focus on the topic of spiritual exploration in the curriculum and/or co-curriculum.

The final plenary session on Thursday will be devoted to presenting and discussing the proposals from each of the ten institutional teams. We plan to mail you a more detailed agenda and a workbook by mid-October.

In the meantime, please make your travel arrangements and complete and return the attached travel information form at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions regarding travel or accommodations, please contact Leslie Schwartz at LSchwartz@gseis.ucla.edu. All of your travel expenses to attend the Institute will be covered by the project.

Looking forward to meeting you and working with you.

Best regards,
Alexander "Sandy" Astin
Helen "Lena" Astin
Jennifer Lindholm

Participating Institutions:

Bates College
Carnegie Mellon University
Florida State University
Furman University
Grinnell College
Miami University of Ohio
Spelman College
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
Wellesley College

Team Consultants:

Larry Braskamp
Arthur Chickering
Cheryl Keen
Peter Laurence
William "Scotty" McLennan
Eugene Rice
David Scott
Joseph Subbiondo
Arthur Zajonc

Post-Institute Thank You Email

Hello again everyone!

On behalf of the entire spirituality project team, we would like to extend a warm "thank you" for your active and engaged participation in this past week's *National Institute on Spirituality in Higher Education.* We feel that the Institute was an essential opportunity to start fostering an intellectual dialogue around issues relating to spirituality that are central to our Higher Education communities, and will continue to be pressing matters that we all must personally explore so we can be positive agents of institutional change. We hope that you found the conversation at the Institute to be as inspiring and personally impacting as we did, and we were so delighted to have the opportunity to share such a collaborative and productive time with you all. A special thanks also to our wonderful team consultants who served as leaders and guides as we explored so many interesting topics.

In an effort to continue the important conversations and share ideas within our knowledge communities, I want to pass along our Spirituality List Serv address which you all are a part of: *spiritualityinstitute-posts@lists.gseis.ucla.edu.* I also have attached a document that details specific contact information for all of the Institute team consultants, participants, and project team to help cultivate inter-campus networks related to conversations that began at our Institute. You are also always welcome to contact me or any of the project team if we can ever assist you with anything.

<u>In the future...</u>

In the coming week, I will be sending out specific information detailing the reimbursement procedures and process for the Institute. In the meantime, save all your travel and Institute-related receipts.

In the coming months we will also be sorting through our various notes and documents to compile a complete set of official Institute proceedings (authored by yours truly and my colleague and friend, Alyssa Bryant). We will be mailing each of you a copy when they are completed sometime this coming spring. If your contact information changes (especially your preferred mailing address), please let me know so we can make sure the proceedings reach you. I will also be contacting you all before they are sent out.

Also, your assigned institutional team consultant may be contacting you to coordinate a site visit in the future to follow-up with the action proposals you developed and presented at the Institute.

Our project team at HERI will also share with you any updates relating to our *Spiritual Life of College Students* longitudinal research study as they transpire. As mentioned at the Institute, we are in the process of conducting our Follow-Up CSBV survey and are eagerly anticipating the results.

Again, it has been my extreme pleasure to work closely and correspond with you all, and I look forward to the work you all implement in your campus communities in the coming months and years. You are truly change-agents for the future of Higher Education.

Respectfully,

Leslie M. Schwartz
Research Analyst
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI)
University of California, Los Angeles

www.spirituality.ucla.edu