Called to *Civitas:* From Burning Bush to Jerusalem
A Discussion Draft
Joan Griffin
18 August 2003

Some time after Moses chatted with the burning bush, he gathered the Israelites and led them to the wilderness, where they spent forty years and several Old Testament books compiling their policy manual. When they finally reached the promised land, they spent a few more generations encountering diversity, since this "land flowing with milk and honey" was also "the place of the Canaanite and the Hittite and the Amorite and the Perizzite and the Hivite and the Jebusite." Unfortunately, these encounters did not exactly produce a model of a diverse community that Åugsburg would wish to emulate, consisting, as they did, of brutally slaughtering the Canaanite, and the Hittite and the Amorite and the Perizzite, and the Hivite and the Jebusite. But the Israelites eventually accomplished something more congenial to Augsburg's mission when they established Jerusalem as the center of the promised land. Ultimately, one might say, the Israelites were called to a city. Their vocation was Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, of course, was, and still is, a temporal city—and as such was, and is, necessarily concerned with matters of the *polis*—policy, politics, governance.

But in western Christian tradition Jerusalem is also a type—a vision of an ideal community where law is superseded by *caritas*, justice by mercy, and where human differences and divisions are gathered up into and resolved by the unity of God.

In short the city, literal and metaphoric, is a place where the kingdoms of the right and left, the City of God and the City of Man, the ideal and the real, justice and mercy, law and Gospel, civility and the Great Commission both mingle and contend with each other. [1]

Like the Israelites, Augsburg also has been called to a city—both the temporal city of Minneapolis and also a metaphoric city—the ideal community that we aspire to create on campus, and the "city"—or world—that we hope our graduates will create as they enact their Augsburg education within the communities to which they will be called.

When we completed *Augsburg 2004* four years ago, we identified its three controlling themes as Vocation, *Caritas,* and community. In this paper I would like to take up the theme of community—but enlarge it by re-naming it *civitas*—a Latin word for city. However, *civitas* does not simply refer to the city as a

---

[1] See William V. Frame, "Christianity, Civility, and the Great Commission." Baccalaureate Homily Augsburg College, May 4, 2003.

concrete place.[2] Rather, it carries the more abstract meanings of citizenship, the commonwealth, and the state.

As such, I would submit, *civitas* includes both *communitas*, community, and *civilis*, politics and civility. *Civitas* is more inclusive than "community" since it must comprehend many communities, and seek the center, as it were, that can accommodate the diversity of those communities. And insofar as it seeks the common wealth or good, *civitas* implies the political processes and conventions of civility through which we attempt to negotiate our political, social, and ideological transactions.

Under the rubric of *civitas*, then, this paper will take up a complex of themes-- citizenship (and civic engagement), community, and civility—all derived from the College's mission and vision. As it explores how these themes have been realized, complicated, extended, and perhaps at times challenged by experience of last four years since completion of *Augsburg 2004,* the paper examines the implications of *civitas* in four areas:

> 1)   The curriculum.
>
> I begin with the curriculum—the academic programs approved through formal faculty processes—because this is the center of the College's mission. Moreover, given the complexity of the College's programs (weekday, weekend, branch campus, off-site partnerships), the College creates a campus-wide community most profoundly in the curriculum.[3]
>
> The co-curriculum--the learning opportunities offered through Student Services and Academic and Learning support services—is also essential to an Augsburg education, although, depending on their program (ie. weekend, weekday), students will experience it differently.
>
> 2)   The para-curriculum.
>
> These include the initiatives beyond the formal curriculum and co-curriculum through which we extend our educational mission into communities beyond Augsburg: workshops, charter schools, some partnerships, etc.
>
> 3)   The shape and identity of the academic community to which Augsburg might aspire.

---

[2] *Urbs* would be the more common translation for a specific city or walled town. *Augsburg 2004* expanded the notion of the city to suggest that Augsburg is not a "walled campus"—the boundaries of an Augsburg education reach beyond Riverside Avenue.
[3] This is why introducing core elements to the Augsburg Core was so important. And this is also why it's imperative not to lose *Augsburg 2004*'s call to making the mission and vision evident throughout the curriculum, not simply in the Core.

4.   Augsburg as a microcosmic political, economic, and social universe—the community that we create in our working relationships.

Before embarking on this discussion, I would like to acknowledge the help of the people with whom I had the chance to talk and the people whose work appears throughout the text and footnotes in the paper. But this paper is not finished. Unfortunately, I did not get to talk with everyone whose voice is essential to this discussion. And I expect that the content of this paper will be modified by our conversations on August 27 into the 2003-2004 academic term.

I want to say too that I think there is something extraordinary about a college president who invites a faculty member to write a "provocative" essay about the vocation of the college as a community. Vocation calls us to a different place than we presently are. It may lead to a wilderness before it arrives in a promised land. Indeed the wilderness is essential to the journey.

Augsburg 2040 asked us to leave Egypt. The "provocation" or "calling forth" (*pro-vocare)* of this paper and of the discussion that it will encourage is intended to acknowledge the wilderness, but also to remind us of the Jerusalem to which we aspire.

I.   The Curriculum: Education for Citizenship

Civic Engagement

In July 1999, President Frame joined several hundred colleagues at a Presidents' Leadership Colloquium convened by Campus Compact and the American Council on Education in endorsing the Presidents' Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education.[4]

The declaration challenged "higher education to reexamine its public purposes and its commitments to the democratic ideal" and "to become engaged through actions and teaching, with its [higher education's] communities."   Citing civic dis-engagement among many Americans, especially the young, the document challenged colleges and universities to show how "knowledge can benefit society" and "influence democratic decision making;" to understand the histories and contours" of our present challenges as a diverse democracy;" and to seek "the promise of justice and dignity for all" both here and abroad; to see how every sector—"corporate, government and nonprofit"—might "be mobilized to address community needs and reinvigorate our democracy;" and to seek the community

---

[4] Aspen Institute on June 29-July 1, 1999.
For text see http://www.compact.org/presidential/plc/declaration.html

partnerships that will both "improve the quality of community life and the quality of the education we provide."

The Declaration is not an isolated piece of rhetoric. At least since Fall 1997, when Alexander Astin published "The Case for Pragmatism," [5] civic engagement has become an increasingly important theme of higher education. If you pick up almost any recent AAC&U publication—*Liberal Education, Peer Review,* "The Academy in Transition" series, AAC&U's position paper "Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College"—you will find at least one article and even entire issues devoted to education for citizenship. [6]

Education for citizenship may be trendy now, but as many of us discovered during the 1997-1998 vision process, it's been in the bones of this college at least since September 1874, when the faculty approved a science division that would provide "a practical general education" to prepare Norwegian immigrants to flourish as citizens of their new world. [7] Since then Augsburg "giants of the College"—the Christensens, the Torstensens, [8] the Hessers—have made sure that *civitas*—the city and citizenship—remains a distinctive focus of an Augsburg education. [9] Indeed, Augsburg's tradition of civic engagement has been taken up and advanced by many people on campus—by the Center for Service, Work, and Learning; by the Aug Sem and other faculty who have incorporated service learning into their courses; by the Regents' Committee on Government and Community Relations, by the Center on Global Education; by "Engaged Departments" like the PA. Program, Nursing, Social Work, Education, and Music Therapy, by the resident hall staff who plan service projects for students on their floors; by Campus Ministry; and the list goes on. [10]

---

[5] Alexander Astin, "Liberal Education and Democracy: The Case for Pragmatism" in *Liberal Education* Fall 1997, 4-15.

[6] For instance, see the Fall 2002 of *Liberal Education*—"Civic Engagement" or the Spring 2003 issue of *Peer Review*—"Educating for Citizenship."

[7] Augsburg 2004, p. 14. See also footnote 18, p. 41.

[8] In particular, see Joel Torstensen's "The liberal Arts College in the Modern Metropolis: A Paper Presented to the Augsburg College Faculty" January 12, 1967. In the paper, Torstensen lays the theoretical foundations for the 1968 curricular reforms that led most immediately to allowing students to apply four internships toward credit for graduation, and ultimately the Metro-Urban Studies major and the City requirement, which has persisted in some form in Augsburg general education since the '70s. It is worthwhile too to compare Torstensen's vision of a civically engaged Augsburg to the visions that appeared in the Gordon Nelson and Chris Kimball position papers of 1996 (right date?)

[9] It is important to note the recent work of a 2002-2003 Civic Engagement Task Force whose work to date is recorded in several documents:
- Rich Cairn, "Augsburg College Renewal of Commitment to Civic Engagement: June 2003 Summary Report."
- Augsburg College: A Path to Greater Civic Engagement." July 31, 2003
- Erin Bowley, "Civic Engagement Recommendations for Augsburg College." July, 2003.

These documents are available in the Center for Service, Work, and Learning folder on Augnet.

[10] A new Augsburg brochure "Experience the rewards of Civic Engagement at Augsburg" lists some recent initiatives

As one reads through the material now being written about civic education, it is gratifying to see just how much *Augsburg 2004*—and more important the Augsburg traditions and current programs which it reflected—anticipated many of the trends—real and recommended—that characterize education for citizenship in the twenty-first century: service learning;[11] emphasis on leadership as well as service; a renewed commitment to engaging the community as a resource for learning; challenging false distinctions between liberal and practical knowledge by emphasizing the Renaissance humanist tradition of education for public service and leadership;[12] opening the curriculum to students with a broad range of academic experience;[13] and encouraging more international study.

---

[11] Thanks to some of those giants to whom I've referred, Augsburg has been a leader here. However service learning and volunteerism are no longer distinctive—"seventy-eight percent of students participate in some sort of service experience before they graduate."[11] And civic engagement movement challenges whether prevalent models help students understand larger political contexts for what they experience—and motivate them to more extensive civic action. Augsburg is a leader in trying to link service learning to civic engagement.

[12] See *Augsburg 2004, pp.*

Consider this passage from AAC&U, *Greater Expectations*: *A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College,* 2002, 26-27,

Reinvigorating liberal education by making it practical

> Liberal education for the new century looks beyond the campus to the issues of society and the workplace. It aims to produce global thinkers. Quality liberal education prepares students for active participate in the private and public sectors, in a diverse democracy, and in an even more diverse b local community. It has the strongest impact when students reach beyond the classroom to the larger community, asking students to apply their developing analytical skills and ethical judgment to concrete problems in the world around them, and to connect theory with the insights gained from practice.
>
> This approach to liberal education . . . erases the artificial distinctions between studies deemed liberal (interpreted to mean that they are not related to job training) and those called practical (which are assumed to be). A liberal education is a practical education because it develops just those capacities needed by every thinking adult: analytical skills, effective communication, practical intelligence, ethical judgment, and social responsibility. By expecting students to collaborate productively with people who are unlike them, a liberal education strengthens interpersonal skills useful in the workplace and community life.   . . . [L]iberal education must reclaim this pragmatism and become consciously, intentionally pragmatic, while it remains conceptually rigorous; its test will be in the effectiveness of graduates to use knowledge thoughtfully in the wider world.

Compare this to the section on liberal arts in 2004.

[13] Again compare to *Greater Expectations,* p. 27

Reinvigorating Liberal Education by making it more inclusive

Liberal or liberating education has traditionally been the country's way of preparing its leaders. By developing their capacities to reason and critically evaluate, a liberal education readies them to decide important questions. By fostering a sense of social responsibility, it builds capacities to reach decisions that are wise and just.

Even more gratifying, the College, if anything, has increased its commitment to civic engagement, both in the curriculum and co-curriculum.[14] Civic engagement can indeed be said to be a "signature" of the College, as evidenced by both local and national recognition. For instance several years ago, AAC&U recognized Augsburg as one of seven outstanding institutions; Augsburg is one of two Minnesota colleges to receive Campus Compact grant; *U.S. News and World Report* cited Augsburg for its exemplary efforts in experiential education.

Many curricular and co-curricular efforts—e.g., the new Augsburg experience requirement, the CIC Community Partnership program, LINK—preceded the new Augsburg Core Curriculum.

But this fall, as we launch the new Augsburg Core Curriculum that emerged from *Augsburg 2004,* we will have an occasion to give more explicit attention to citizenship. Although Vocation—both individual and institutional—organizes and lies at the center of the Augsburg Core curriculum, *civitas*—the learning and actions that flow from vocation and *caritas*—also is central to the new curriculum. To quote the Goals and Objectives statement of the Augsburg Core:

> The new Augsburg Core Curriculum is designed to prepare students to become effective, informed, and ethical citizens through their engagement in a curriculum that:
>
> - Provides a liberal arts foundation and promotes the acquisition of intellectual and professional skills;
> - Calls for common inquiry into questions of Christian faith and the search for meaning; and,
> - Cultivates the transformative discovery of, and appreciation for, one's place of leadership and service in a diverse world -- *vocatio* and *caritas*.

The Signature Curriculum of the Augsburg Core will operationalize and/or give new prominence to practices endorsed in *2004.* Service learning in the Augsburg Seminars and linked paired courses, the Engaging Minneapolis requirement, the Augsburg Experience requirement, and the keystone courses in the major will provide explicit opportunities to address themes related to *civitas.*

Reasoned, wise decision-making continues as an important outcome of collegiate study. However, in this new century, shifting roles and greater collaboration will require all people at times to be leaders and at other times to be skilled followers. As leadership matures into a more nuanced, dynamic concept, the benefits of a liberal education will be valuable—even invaluable00for everyone.

[14] See Richard Cairn, "Augsburg College Renewal of Commitment to Civic Engagement: June 2003 Summary Report.

In surveying Augsburg's curricular accomplishments of the last four years, it is easy—and appropriate—to be self-congratulatory. But it's even easier to see the opportunities and challenges that await us as we actually implement the Augsburg Core, build on and improve what we already are doing, and think beyond the Core to what we might expect of majors. What curricular initiatives should we be thinking about during the next few years?

1.   Continue and improve our commitment to experiential learning.

In his seminal paper on pragmatic education, Alexander Astin suggested that the liberal arts must recover some of their Renaissance humanist origins by linking theory and practice to prepare students for the *vita activa.* Astin particularly recommends service learning as a way of accomplishing this goal.[15] Taking up the theme in its recent report *Greater Expectations*…., AAC&U recommends that "every student deserves a liberal education, one redefined to embrace and address the way knowledge is actually used in the world, including the world of work and civil society." [16]

Augsburg already has incorporated experiential learning into many of its courses, particularly those linked to Augsburg Seminar. And the new Augsburg Experience requirement should provide additional impetus for majors to seek connections between the practice and theory, as it were, in their curricula. But of course the challenge will be both to sustain and to improve what we already do. Augsburg needs to continue to identify and cultivate the faculty who will take up carry on, and expand Augsburg's civic vision.

2.   Hire, support, and reward faculty who are committed to pedagogies
that promote civic engagement: (experiential learning, interdisciplinarity, etc.)

Beyond offering necessary support—financial, consultative, etc.—for faculty who incorporate experiential learning into their courses, it may be necessary to review and, if necessary, revise TPL criteria to more greatly value incorporating experiential learning and other practices related to civic engagement (e.g. learning communities).

Ironically, at a time when national wisdom, (at least as endorsed by organizations like AAC&U), stresses the importance of rewarding faculty for innovative teaching, anecdotal evidence suggests that newer, untenured Augsburg faculty feel pressured to emphasize traditional scholarship. Moreover—and again, this

---

[15] However, some researchers have noted that service learning does not always meet the goals of civic engagement because it is either "conspicuously apolitical in nature or at least not explicitly designed to promote active forms of political participation on the part of students." Students may not connect what they've experienced to political policy and their ability to affect political processes. See K. Edward Spiezio, "Pedagogy and Political (Dis)Engagement" in *Liberal Education* 88 (Fall 2002), 16-17.
[16] Summary Carol Geary Schneider, "President's Message: Silent Spring? *Liberal Education* 29:2, Spring 2003 (Liberal Education in the 21st Century)

is anecdotal—some may even avoid the risks associated with incorporating service learning and similar innovations into their teaching.

3.   Ask the Liberal Arts Foundation Learning Collaboratives (and departments offering courses in this Augsburg Core component) to explicitly address the ways in which they "prepare students to become effective, informed, and ethical citizens."

In "Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College," AAC&U suggests that many colleges are going about education in a way more appropriate to 1950 than to 2003. Specifically, it charges that too much of the curriculum is "owned" by departments and individual instructors, who may not look beyond their discipline to "collectively owned [learning] goals;" that a disciplinary emphasis leads to the fragmentation of knowledge and disconnection from what that knowledge might mean for effective action in the world.[17]

The Liberal Arts Foundation requirement in the new Augsburg Core emphasizes traditional bodies of knowledge and ways of knowing—but to what end? The Augsburg Core itself provides the answer: "to prepare students to become effective, informed, and ethical citizens."

Ultimately, the final implementation of the liberal arts foundation courses will need to be accompanied by the larger discussion: how do these domains serve civic purposes? How can we link liberal knowledge to its purposes in the world? These are not new questions. And indeed Augsburg's curriculum has responded to them. For example, members of the chemistry and biology departments have developed SENCER (Scientific education for new civic engagement and responsibility) courses that address in scientific curriculum. Members of Humanities have discussed Martha Nussbaum—and perhaps have incorporated some of her ideas into their teaching.[18]   Many first year faculty have adopted service learning components in their Augsburg Seminars

However, while *Augsburg 2004* stressed the public and civic purposes of the liberal arts,[19] it did not go far enough in challenging the liberal arts programs to transform their curricula to incorporate—or perhaps simply make apparent—the public and civic purposes of liberal knowledge. As we fully implement the Liberal Arts Foundation of the Augsburg Core, we should ask the liberal arts domains to explicitly take up the question. As we think about assessment, how do we make courses responsive to our collective and communal education purposes, the goal of preparing citizens.

---

[17] See pp. 15-16.

[18]   Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity : A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997.

[19]   See pp.14-18.

4	*Continue to create a "pedagogy" of civic engagement in the co-curriculum and wider campus culture.*

Considerable work already has been done here by the Civic Engagement Task Force that began its work in 2002. However, it is important for the work of this group to become better known. Its recommendations should be considered in a long range planning process, both in the curriculum and the "para-curriculum."

5.	M*ore deliberately address the advantages inherent in being the only Lutheran college to be located in a city as we develop new programs, review present programs, and continue to develop a long-range plan.*

6.	*Review and, as appropriate, act on the initiatives proposed by Erin Bowley, consultant to the Center for Service, Work, and Learning, in the course of her work related to Augsburg's Campus Compact Engaged Campus Grant.*

These recommendations involve both the curriculum and "para-curriculum." The paper is available from the Center for Service, Work, and Learning.

Diversity: The Infusion Model

A curriculum that prepares students for citizenship must necessarily attend to what it means to live and work in a diverse world, and to cultivate students' awareness of and sense of responsibility for the global community.

One of the greatest risks—and opportunities—in the new Augsburg Core curriculum—will be to replace the one-course "inoculation" model of the old general education's "intercultural awareness" requirement with what we called an "imprint" model—but which we more properly might call an "infusion model"--in which attention to diversity and global awareness becomes the responsibility of the entire curriculum.

Part of the design team's reluctance to propose a one course requirement was that we had not yet arrived at a college-wide understanding of the essential learning outcomes of either a "diversity" or "global awareness" requirement—and we still haven't. For some, the emphasis was on understanding a non-western culture; for others, the study of any non-American culture would suffice. Yet others would argue the importance of understanding the effects of race, gender, and ethnicity on American society; and many, if not all, might agree that the development of character—at least of civility, if not a more profound moral disposition—is an important goal of "diversity education." In truth—there might be more consensus than there appeared to be last fall. I suspect that most of us would agree that all of the above are important, and that one or two or three or more courses might not be adequate for all the learning goals we want for our students—the learning and competence in the world that we ourselves might aspire to.

Because of these multiple educational goals and because there was at least some feeling that the "one-course" requirement may have the paradoxical effect of diminishing rather than reinforcing our educational commitment to diversity, a majority of faculty took a risk and voted for the infusion model. But I think that many who did so still had reservations. Our challenge is to make this work well.

In adopting an imprint—or what we might better call an infusion—model, Augsburg actually is in the vanguard of general education revision regarding diversity.

Earlier this summer, a group of six Augsburg faculty had the chance to attend the Asheville Institute on General Education.[20] There we had the chance to hear and, better yet, meet with some of the national general education experts, notably J. Herman Blake and Jack Meachum. What we heard from the Institute faculty was that a one-course diversity requirement, as it were, is better than none at all—and probably it was the best model ten to fifteen years ago, when intentional attention to diversity became the vogue in general education revision. Generally, though, it was clear that the experts had little enthusiasm for this model, at least in present times. In fact, we heard some pretty strong words to the effect that the one-course model may suggest a lack of institutional commitment to or thoughtfulness about diversity in the curriculum.

Why? For one thing, the inoculation model does not take into account the trends of the last decade. As Jack Meachum pointed out to us,

1. Students are different than they were a decade ago. Most, Meachum observed, are better traveled—although this may not be as true of Augsburg students. More important, high school curricula have changed. Students will have encountered at least some "diversity education" before coming to college.

2. Second, the Academy itself has changed. If you are in the social sciences, arts, or humanities, you probably have fallen behind rather seriously in your field if you are not incorporating "diversity" in some way into the curriculum. It may be a matter of expanding the canon of your field; it may be a matter of applying a feminist, or post-colonial, or Marxist critical stance to a canonic text. Even the Natural Sciences and Mathematics, which we might superficially (and wrongly) think of as being less capable of including diversity and global awareness can expand students' conception of what is normatively human. To cite an example by Jack Meachum, a math textbook that includes a bibliography with works by women mathematicians or a photo of a non-white male mathematician may challenge stereotypes (e.g. all mathematicians are white males who look like Einstein). So even in subtle ways, the curriculum is susceptible to infusion.

---

[20]   Others included Nora Braun, Nick Coult, Doug Green, Russell Kleckley, Diane Pike, and I.

3.   Perhaps more important, however, is the argument that the one-course model suggests that an institution finally is not really serious about diversity in the curriculum.   A serious institution ought to attend to diversity across the curriculum. In the **infusion model**, learning outcomes are cumulative. They must be addressed in many places in the **curriculum and co-curriculum,** in both **the Augsburg Core** and **the major.**

And if an institution is really serious about diversity, it won't stop with the curriculum. J. Herman Blake, who made that argument, also suggested that effectively implementing diversity and global awareness across the curriculum originates in an **institutional commitment to diversity as evidenced by the mission of the College** and supported throughout the institution by the administration, faculty, and staff.   Effective diversity education—of any sort—is based in the institutional ethos. A commitment to diversity and global awareness must exist in "the lifeblood of the institution." The reason for incorporating diversity into the curriculum must not be simply a response to external pressures, but must be a concomitant of institutional identity and history.

Moreover, the effective execution of the model requires effective **pedagogy—by both faculty and staff.**[21]

For the faculty, this might mean:

- Engaging the individual learner. Diversity across the curriculum "combines origin and opportunity." That is, it recognizes the unique identity of every student and connects that to the student's educational opportunity.
- Making the classroom a welcoming place for every student. This is not to be confused with making the classroom a comfortable place, however.
- Employing "subversive" pedagogies that broaden "normative" human experience. (i.e. critical theories that challenge conventional interpretations of human experience;;; the mathematician, to swipe a Jack Meachum example, might rework math problems to expand the repertoire of "what's normal"—e.g. Sally, Jane, and their three children are driving down the highway at 55 mph . . .)

The pedagogy that the staff may be asked to employ is similar. It may be as simple as simple acts of civility—courtesy, respect for others. It might include hospitality.   Ultimately it involves broad thinking about what kind of "civic community"—a community of communities—we are.

---

[21]   The idea of pedagogy should be attributed to J. Herman Blake. This definition is informed by my notes on his presentation at the Asheville Institute on General Education, June 2003. Credit for the good ideas belong to Blake; the weaknesses are mine.

The implementation of the "infusion model" of diversity and global awareness should be a major academic initiative of 2003-2004—and probably the term after. It will involve at least the following work:

1. *Continue the implementation of the infusion model in the Augsburg Core.*

    a. Complete inventory of majors.

    It seemed clear last fall that this campus needs much more discussion about what it sees as the learning outcomes of "diversity education." Accordingly, the General Education Implementation Team at the end of March asked academic department chairs to convene discussions within their departments of the following questions:

    *   What learning outcomes relevant to diversity and global awareness do you deem most appropriate to your majors?
    *   How does your present curriculum achieve those outcomes? (Courses, internships, etc.
    *   Where else do students presently encounter themes of diversity/global awareness in your major curriculum?

    Many—probably most—departments have not yet completed those discussions. The completion of these discussions should give us a more complete picture of what our curriculum already looks like and prompt initial departmental conversations about the infusion model in the major.

    b. Attempt to identify learning outcomes relating to diversity that we can agree upon across the curriculum and co-curriculum.

    Based on the responses of at least some departments to the questions above (giving us a disciplinary range from the humanities to the sciences, to professional studies) and particularly the Fall 2002 discussions of General Education, the Asheville team constructed a working taxonomy of learning objectives relevant to diversity and global awareness. This, as well as models discussed by the Diversity Committee, will be shared with colleagues this fall as we seek consensus about our educational goals and ways in which we might realize them in the Augsburg Core, majors, and the co-curriculum.

    c. Ask Augsburg Core learning collaboratives to take up these questions as they further develop the components of the new curriculum.

2. *Convene a discussion of what the infusion model implies for the review/revision of majors. What faculty development efforts can the institution support?*

3.   Convene a discussion of what the infusion model—and what the "pedagogy" of the co-curriculum and campus culture might look like.

II.   The Para-Curriculum: The Engaged College

Augsburg students of 2004, at least as imagined in the vision document, "have learned to examine and appreciate the significant contributions of cities . . . as areas of civilization and high culture and as key areas for successfully navigating the future. As the rebuilt and revitalized neighborhood around Augsburg has become part of an emerging education/health care/research corridor for the Twin Cities, Augsburg's location has increasingly linked it to the city's centers of power and innovation as well as its centers of need."[22]

As *Augsburg 2004* anticipated, Augsburg 2003 has indeed made fresh use of its location, particularly in seeking partnerships in the Cities: with Mayo Clinic in Rochester, with Fairview/Riverside with the Clinical Lab Science major, with Hazelden with the Chemical Dependency Counseling major. The Engaging Minneapolis courses in the new Augsburg Core should expand Augsburg's vision of the city by asking many departments, not primarily the social sciences, to offer Engaging Minneapolis courses.

As important as civic engagement is to the curriculum, it increasingly has become equally essential to the role that some are asking the Academy to "play in strengthening a democratic way of life in the twenty-first century."[23]

As defined by the Humphrey Institute, a "engaged university" interacts substantially with communities beyond the campus. Some of the characteristics of the engaged university include:

- Civic engagement is emphasized explicitly and regularly by university officials, including the president, provost, and deans, and members of the board of regents in communicating with the public and within the University.
- The University is part of a national movement that recognizes the importance of civic engagement in order to maintain and increase public support
- With increased support from state governments and foundations, more community-based clinical and educational centers have been established through a variety of colleges
- All colleges have established stronger ties with K-12

---

[22] *Augsburg 2004, pp. 18-19.*
[23] Liberal Eduation Fall 2002: Robert Corrigan, "Presidential Leadership: Moral Leadership in the New Millennium." *Liberal Education.* Fall 2002, p. 12

13

and with minority groups so as to provide all segments of the population with first-quality higher education

- New programs have been launched with enthusiasm but then tracked with realism and careful assessment to assure their effectiveness
- University Relations has developed regular ways of working with faculty to develop and promulgate stories about civically related research, teaching, and partnership
- Consciousness of the importance of civic engagement , and the new programs that result has extended through the state, expanding the University's presence
- Through aspects of civic engagement that focus on strengthening democracy, the University has instilled greater civic-minded in students, helped empower communities, and provided the public with greater capacity for effective citizenship.[24]

---

[24] Material quoted from "An Engaged University: Renewing the Land-Grant Mission." Civic Engagement Task Force Report from the Center for Democracy and Citizenship, Hubert H Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, May 2002.Quoted in Liberal Education Fall 2002: Robert Corrigan, "Presidential Leadership: Moral Leadership in the New Millennium" (pp. 12-13)

In addition to the characteristics provided in the main text, others suggest curricular and faculty personnel policy initiatives that Augsburg might consider. These include:

- Civic activities are considered in a discipline-appropriate manner in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions.
- Civic engagement is an integral part of the University's grassroots culture, so that scholarly work is viewed in a broad social context as well as a focused disciplinary context
- Researchers and service providers working in communities have established appropriate connections with people in these communities as partners in co-learning experiences
- With input from people outside the University, more inter-disciplinary programs have been developed—both within and between colleges— that focus on broad social issues
- Cooperatively taught courses have been developed that bring teachers and students together on problem-centered rather than discipline-centered learning. Faculty help foster engaged teaching and create diverse learning opportunities for students and colleagues

In addition, consider the criteria proposed by Campus Compact:

1) **Mission and purpose** that explicitly articulates a commitment to the public purposes of higher education.
2) **Administrative and academic leadership** (president, trustees, provost) that is in the forefront of institutional transformation that supports civic engagement.
3) **External resource allocation** made available for community partners to create richer learning environments for students and for community-building efforts in local neighborhoods.

As one browses through these criteria, one is struck by how familiar some of these items sound: partnerships with charter schools like El Colegio, the Cedar-Riverside School, and the new Augsburg Academy for Health Careers; or Augsburg's sponsorship of programs like Campus Kitchens; sharing campus facilities with community groups like the Community Development Council or the Somalia Town Hall.[25]

Certainly Augsburg can claim to be a civically "engaged college." In citing Augsburg's strengths as an engaged campus, Bowley noted the following virtues:

- Faculty, staff and students are encouraged to be active in the community (voting, volunteerism, activism, etc.)

- Controversy is handled as teachable moment.

- Civic engagement is connected to other institutional priorities.

- Involvement in the community was recently added as a general education requirement at Augsburg, making it one of only two institutions in Minnesota that require experiential learning of all students.

- Multiculturalism is valued as part of the campus identity.

---

4) **Disciplines, departments, and interdisciplinary work** have incorporated community-based education allowing it to penetrate all disciplines and reach the institutions academic core.
5) **Faculty roles and rewards** reflect a reconsideration of scholarship that embraces a scholarship of engagement that is incorporated into promotion and tenure guidelines and review.
6) **Internal resource allocation** is adequate for establishing, enhancing, and deepening community-based work on campus – for faculty, students, and programs that involve community partners.
7) **Community voice** that deepens the role of community partners in contributing to community-based education and shaping outcomes that benefit the community.
8) **Enabling mechanisms** in the form of visible and easily accessible structures (i.e., centers, offices) on campus to assist faculty with community-based teaching and to broker community partnerships.
9) **Faculty development** opportunities are available for faculty to retool their teaching and redesign their curricula to incorporate community-based activities and reflection on those activities within the context of the course.
10) **Integrated and complementary community service activities** that weave together student service, service-learning and other community engagement activities on campus.
11) **Forums for fostering public dialogue** are created that include multiple stakeholders in public problem-solving.
12) **Pedagogy and epistemology** incorporate a community-based, public problem-solving approach to teaching and learning.

[25] For a more complete list, see the list of operational and possible collaborations presented to the Board of Regents in January 200. See also the report of the task force on civic engagement as well as the new brochure on Civic Engagement at Augsburg.

- Adequate professional staff and/or coordination effectively supports engagement.

- Faculty development opportunities support engagement.

- The Center for Service, Work and Learning, and more specifically the office of Community Service-Learning at Augsburg coordinates a significant number of opportunities for faculty development, including: offering a service-learning faculty handbook; new faculty orientation includes a presentation on service-learning; faculty retreats and breakfasts focused on service-learning; a luncheon for faculty and community partners each spring; and the faculty professional development office sends a newsletter including service-learning opportunities.

- Resources are adequate for internal mechanisms, structures and incentives.

- Resources are shared in partnerships and joint community development efforts.

- Augsburg has a unique focus on the geographic area most closely surrounding the campus. The college created a scholarship program for a neighborhood partner school, where children will receive $1,000 in scholarship money to Augsburg for each year they complete at their K-8 school. Augsburg also offers a $5,000 scholarship for AmeriCorps members who choose to attend the college.

- Service-learning and other community-based forms of education exist throughout departments/disciplines.

- Augsburg has determined its own standards for high quality service-learning after a year of deliberation, and service-learning is used as a pedagogy by an estimated 25% of the Augsburg faculty.

- Multiple forms of engagement are offered -- not just one or a few are promoted.

- Communications/PR/publications promote visibility of civic engagement programs and partners.

- The Augsburg alumni magazine included a prominent cover article in 2001 on the importance of community involvement at Augsburg.[26]

However, Augsburg has challenges. As identified in the Bowley report, Augsburg may be deficient in the following areas:

- Endowment policy (how the endowment is invested) considers local, regional or global impact.

- Purchasing/procurement considers public impact -- including local or regional community impact.

- Academic offerings are accessible to community.

- Campus is active and visible in community development efforts.[27]

Beyond these strengths and weaknesses, civic engagement may pose additional problems as we consider how best to commit the resources of the College.

First, what principles should guide partnerships? *Augsburg 2004* was fairly silent on the subject, although it did provide some implicit principles (e.g. Augsburg should not compromise its Lutheran identity) as well as the suggestions that " the emerging education/health care/research corridor" (mostly located in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood) might provide natural partnerships.[28] The first draft of Chris Kimball's academic master plan expanded this to include the arts and outlined some broad principles that might govern curricular partnerships.[29] But at this point, we lack clear explicit parameters.

Second, given limited resources—of money, energy, administrative personnel, staff and faculty—how do we determine our priorities, even within the list of actions that might fit our mission and vision?

---

[26] In Cairn, Civic Engagement Report June 2003, p. 16.

[27] Ibid. p. 16

[28] p. 19

[29] Christopher W. Kimball, *The Augsburg Academic Plan*: Draft Version 1. April 2001, 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 :

At the present time, the University of Minnesota is developing its West Bank "Arts Quarter" and West Franklin Avenue is emerging as a community arts center. Augsburg's programs and facilities (including an excellent recital hall, ensemble rehearsal spaces, galleries, and a state-of-the-art theater) place the college in a strong position to be a partner in this developing center of arts activity. (3.2.4)

There are numerous opportunities for partnerships with other institutions, some of which are already being explored. Of particular interest are those that offer specialized skills building on our liberal arts foundation, those that link us with other church-related (particularly Lutheran) institutions, and those that promote partnerships with other private colleges. (3.2.5)

A third area of concern involves integrating partners more thoroughly into the College (and, one would assume, vice versa). Sometimes this has occurred well—e.g. service learning examples abound. But Augsburg's history with at least some kinds of partnerships (e.g. the Center for Global Education earlier in its history, the Richard Green Institute, the Family Youth & Ministry) often has been governed by idealism and good intentions—but sometimes these partners have remained peripheral to the Augsburg community—and both the College and, often enough, the partner have lost the educational opportunities that might have resulted from closer integration, the fuller participation of the partner at the center of the College.

I find this notion of "centrality" particularly important to defining what kind of community we want to be. In a two-part Commentary entitled "The Metropolis: Centralizing and Inclusive" and "The Strange and the Familiar in the Metropolis"[30] theologian Paul Tillich explores the city as a spiritual metaphor. The metaphor, however, might be applied in an admittedly less profound way to the character of an Augsburg community, a microcosm of a "city." Tillich suggests that cities have more vitality (which he also calls "power of being") to the extent that they are centered or that there is a clear metropolis, or mother city in which all communities find their origins and sense of belonging. He further proposes that a city's vitality "increases in proportion to the degree of diversity which is united at a center."

Interestingly, claims Tillich, "there is no necessary conflict between the metropolis or countryside," which we might metaphorically take here as the "mother campus and its curriculum" and the "satellite" programs. Tillich continues: "The metropolis is present in the remotest hamlet as a focal point to which rural life is partly directed. And the reverse is also true, since the remotest hamlet is present in the metropolis as an element constituting its center." Thus the city—the ideal community—"serves in a centralizing capacity and also in an including capacity, and each is dependent upon the other."

The metaphor may be instructive as we consider Augsburg's programs and partnerships beyond the "mother campus." The variety of Augsburg's educational efforts probably contributes to the College's vitality. But as we explore and implement various kinds of community partnerships, offer programs off-campus, create a "para-curriculum" through continuing education, charter schools and other ventures, how do we unite all these efforts at the center? More basic, how do we even connect them to the center? How do we make sure that Augsburg and its ethos remain the focal point of our "satellite" programs, as I shall call them for want of a better term—and that these programs, in turn, in some way are present and visible in our microcosmic metropolis?

---

[30] in *The Metropolis in Modern Life*, ed. Robert Moore Fisher (New York : Doubleday, 1955),346-347

It is telling, I think, that even those of us who occasionally have the illusion that we know a lot about what the College is up to are surprised by everything that it is, in fact, up to. It is telling too that some of these efforts seem much more at the periphery of the college than at the center—resulting in the perception that the College's programs lack coherence, that our reigning metaphor might be the amoeba, not the metropolis or civitas.

How do we center the satellites? From a faculty point of view at least—and I recognize the limitations of that view—programs become centered in the collegium—the guild or corporation of colleagues—through our review and governance processes—AAC, Faculty Senate, and the Faculty as a whole.

But how do we govern and manage the para-curriculum? Who reviews it? Who decides which ideas we develop?   What comprehensive long-range plan determines what we do? And perhaps most important: how do our processes help these initiatives arrive at—or prevent them from arriving at—the center of the college consciousness, as it were, and thus gain a truly "Augsburg identity." And how do these processes ensure that there is a distinctive Augsburg presence in the satellite programs? To the extent that satellite programs are perceived as peripheral to the true work of the college, we lose some of their benefit and some of the coherence of an Augsburg community, an Augsburg *civitas.*

III.   Paradigms of Academic Community

College or University

In the course of writing *Augsburg 2004*, Mark Engebretson observed more than once that without quite noticing what it is up to, Augsburg has become a "small university." For a college of 3,000 students, Augsburg is remarkably complex—so complex that, as I implied in the section above, it may be in danger of losing its "center." One of the significant omissions of the vision document was that it did not take on this question. Although *Augsburg 2004* had much to say about the week-day program, it did not offer a vision for graduate programs, academic partnerships within the college curriculum, off-campus programs, civic partnerships, academic partnerships outside of the college curriculum, continuing education, and Weekend College.

The challenge, then, that *Augsburg 2004* neglected is this: should Augsburg remain a college or just go ahead and declare itself a university. What's the difference, and which is preferable?

I would suggest that a college—a collegium—suggests collegiality, that is, collaboration, involvement, and widespread participation in the governance of the

community. The center of a college comes from within—it is centrifugal. It pulls many different constituencies into its core activities—a collaborative curriculum and co-curriculum.

The university too aspires to bring unity out of diversity.   But it remains more compartmentalized. The unity occurs hierarchically. The university is held together or coordinated, as it were, from the top. This has advantages. Its hierarchical structure of decision making makes the university more "nimble." It can accommodate more diverse interests and activities with less tension (because it segregates them into schools, programs, and colleges.) But at what point does this diversity—of programs, not of people—create "suburban sprawl"—a lot of little communities—but also a lot outsiders to the city, the **metro**-polis (the mother-city), who care little about the "civic community" (the "community of communities") except so far as it serves their own interests?

The New American College

A civically engaged college must attend to the ways in which students enact—practice—their knowledge in the world. As *Augsburg 2004* suggests, a college that's serious about civic responsibilities must offer its students both a liberal and practical education.

Yet there lingers in Augsburg's culture a kind of nostalgia for a mythological past, a kind of liberal arts golden age. [31] However, Augsburg never was a purely liberal arts college. It has always taken the *vita activa* seriously by offering professional programs. *Augsburg 2004* suggested that Augsburg should stop being a wanna-be liberal arts college and embrace its role as a "comprehensive college" uniting liberal and practical study to produce a "liberal arts education." [32]

---

[31]   For example, see Kari Lucin, "On Christian Faith, Vocation, and Community: K. Lucin Identifies Many Things Augsburg Must Fix if It Wants To Survive. Editorial. *The Echo.* 25 April 2003: 2.

[32]   For a helpful distinction between "the liberal arts" and "a liberal arts education," see Barbara A. Edwards, "Augsburg 2004: Forging Connections Between the Liberal Arts and Professional Studies." Paper presented to the Professional Studies Division. November 17, 2000.   It is helpful I think, to think of a liberal arts education in broader terms,: "When I read that list of seven understandings of the liberal arts tradition, I find it helpful to substitute the phrase, "the liberal arts" with the phrase, "a liberal arts education" because the latter phrase emphasizes the entire academic program and educational experience. It is through this lens that I frame connections between the liberal arts and professional studies. A strong and vital general education program is the foundation of an undergraduate liberal arts education and it is the traditional liberal arts disciplines that are at the center of a general education program. The undergraduate general education program serves as a unifying link between liberal arts disciplines and professional studies, but the overarching goals of a liberal arts education are not achieved in any one discipline or division." p. 5.

However the term "comprehensive college," borrowed from the Carnegie classification system, lacks inspiration. It is hardly a rallying point for institutional identity. It conveys the dreary image of a college whose buildings look like airplane hangers. Happily, however, Augsburg might consider the more dignified term—and identity-- already adopted by two of our sister schools, Valparaiso and Pacific Lutheran University—and become a New American College.

As described on its website:

> The Associated New American Colleges (ANAC) are small to mid-sized comprehensive colleges and universities dedicated to the integration of liberal and professional studies.
>
> These institutions are committed to teaching and learning, a collegial ethos that is student and value centered, a flexible professional model that emphasizes the faculty teacher scholar, and an integrative institutional model that blends the highly personalized qualities of liberal arts colleges with the diversity of large universities.
>
> ANAC supports a national dialogue on educational issues and cooperative projects among New American Colleges, while enabling these institutions to serve as laboratories for models of excellence that have implications for all of higher education.[33]

IV.   Augsburg as Civil Society

"Augsburg," said *Augsburg 2004*, "will maintain a work community that enables faculty and staff to effectively contribute to the College's mission and that models the sort of world that the College's education vision is intended to create."[34]

Augsburg thus is a little universe, a microcosmic metropolis. But, like Jerusalem, Augsburg is two "cities." One city aspires to the ideals defined in its mission and vision. This city finds unity in its quest for truth, a truth that produces "university," as it were, out of diversity. This city is like Lake Woebegone—every employee is above average, and better yet, is paid that way. The interests of each part are unanimously acknowledged to be identical to the welfare of the whole. All decisions are based on "Right Reason" and are always correct. There is no need to attend to "rights," since justice always prevails. Employees ascribe to the philosophy of Dr. Pangloss—this is the best of all possible worlds. And when human frailty occurs—which is seldom does—it is overcome by *caritas.*

---

[33] See website: http://anac.vir.org/
[34] p. 25

Then there's the other city. That's the one that struggles with the political, social, and economic dynamics that are inherent in any temporal institution. This is the Augsburg governed by "policy, not law," [35] where we need to be attentive to rights, since we can't count on justice or *caritas*, [36] where the parts sometimes don't care about the welfare of the whole, where cynicism is a spectator sport, where employees feel overworked for too little pay, where human frailty ends up in litigation, where we must have representation because we sometimes find ourselves unable to trust deliberation.

Augsburg is both cities, and as such, it is a miniature "civil society."

"The modern notion of 'civil society,' suggest Michael W. Foley and Bob Edwards, "arose at the dawn of the liberal state in efforts to establish a direct relation between state and citizenry, free of the multiple intermediaries of the late medieval, corporate order." They continue: "What makes the notion of civil society so attractive to such a diverse array of thinkers, as Adam Seligman notes, 'is its assumed synthesis of private and public 'good' and of individual and social desiderata. The idea of civil society thus embodies for many an ethical idea of the social order, one that, if not overcomes, at least harmonizes the conflicting demands of individual interest and social good.' . . . Civil society is, on the one hand, the expression of alienation of individuals from one another into competing firms, religious sects, clubs, and institutions. On the other hand, it is where the mores and morals of a society are grounded, where the interests and views of individuals take shape and gain expression, and where, anticipating Tocqueville, individuals are socialized as citizens." [37]

As a civil society, Augsburg experiences the tensions resulting from the multiple and often competing interests of its citizenry—both of individuals and of groups. The way in which it negotiates these tensions—the competing interests of various individuals and groups, the unavoidable disagreements that occur in a temporal city—constitutes "civility."

This final section of the paper will take up various themes relevant to civility that have concerned the Augsburg community since the completion of *Augsburg 2004.*

Hierarchy and Equality

[35] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene,* I:4106. Interestingly the word "pollicie" can be translated as "political cunning."

[36] C.S. Lewis, *That Hideous Strength*. (New York: Macmillan, 1946), p. 148. Lewis sees "rights" as a concomitant the fall: " . . . we must all be guarded by equal rights from one another's greed, because we are fallen. . . Equality before the law, equality of incomes—that is very well. Equality guards life; it doesn't make it. It is medicine, not food.

[37] Michael W. Foley and Bob Edwards, "Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and Social Capital in Comparative Perspective. *American Behavioral Scientists 42, 2 (September 1998),* 1.

In its very making, *Augsburg 2004* modeled something that was much more like a collegium than a university. Relatively silent though it might have been about the place of alumni and Regents in the community—an omission that a revision should address—the document resulted from remarkable collaboration across many groups on and off campus—faculty, staff, students—and also regents and alumni. As Mark Engebretson notes in his paper, considerable energy and vitality resulted from process. Yet both the process and the paper that it produced created expectations and hopes that we have not yet adequately fulfilled.

Augsburg 2004 called for the College to "increase the collaboration between faculty and staff in their joint enterprise to 'educate the whole student.'" While not naive enough to suppose that Augsburg would be able to "obliterate all hierarchical distinctions,"[38] it insisted on recognizing the importance of everyone's work, bringing more people into decision making processes, and providing professional opportunities for staff as well as faculty. It particularly noted the opportunities for greater collaboration in the Academic and Learning Services Division, suggesting that the College give symbolic as well as administrative identity to this joint efforts of people in this division by inviting greater participation in the ceremonial moments of the College (e.g. opening convocation and graduation).

The latter recommendation, arguably, turned out to be somewhat of a Pandora's box, but the discussion about who gets to march in graduation—which really might have been about who gets to participate in the symbolic center of the College—forced us to more openly acknowledge, painfully to be sure, some underlying realities of Augsburg's political or civil dynamics: Augsburg is not as egalitarian as some had thought. We have not yet determined what it means to be a "citizen" of the College and to participate fully in an Augsburg community.

We have not yet resolved the conflicts and hard feelings that resulted from those discussions—and we may be unable to do so unless we arrive at a shared understanding of what they really were about.   Understanding might be hard to come by—particularly since we found, I think, that attempts at rational argumentation did not produce reasoned discourse—they rather fanned more flames and stirred some deep-seated feelings that, as a community, we perhaps don't yet have a handle on.

Analysis is always easier than remediation, but perhaps an extended historical metaphor might help us glimpse some of the underlying sensibilities—and thus some broader concerns—that found expression in the "marching issue" and that should concern us still. I should add that I offer this analysis with a full quota of "militant modesty" (a phrase which we should consider retiring from our lexicon) and with the intent of quickly resorting to the mantra of 1998, "I may be wrong."

---

[38] p.26.

The university, the college, was born in the Middle Ages, and continues to bear its heritage in its social organization. The faculty, particularly traditional liberal arts faculty, are the nobles. They owe their status to tradition. Their strong sense of vocation is akin to the medieval aristocrat's notion that social station is ordained by God. They have gone through a rigorous hierarchical process of achieving their jobs, beginning as pages, squires, and finally knights—knighthood being a religious investiture as well as career promotion. Along the way they've had to pass an ordeal or two—prelims, the dissertation defense, the job search in a tight market, tenure. They regard their students as fledgling knights, even though many students are more likely to identify with the emerging urban middle class. The nobles, of course, are bound by loyalty to each other and to the king, but if they're English, they have the Magna Charta. They have a fair degree of autonomy; they have their fiefs. They may cooperate with the king—or not. For that matter, they may cooperate with each other, or not.

Faculty can also be compared to monks. They have entered the profession through the alternate career path, whereby those of lower social station can enter a monastery, study, the liberating arts that free them from their birth station, and gain status in the parallel medieval hierarchical track, the church. For them, study is truly a calling—indeed the only form of vocation recognized by the medieval church. They too, or especially, have sacrificed for the sake of their vocation.

Both monks and nobles have "high church" sensibilities. They respect the authority of tradition. Their ceremonies are sacraments which require ordination for participation. Indeed their monastic robes proclaim their admission to a cloistered community.

The king is one of them. He may now have different administrative tasks—and his base of support is in the emerging cities (provided that he can appoint the bishops that he wishes). But the king relies on the consent and help of the nobles. The nobles may rely on political favors from the king—but often they value the welfare of their fiefs more than the welfare of the kingdom. They are as likely to attack each other for political advantage as they are to unite for the welfare of the kingdom.

Only now it's the early seventeenth century. And things have changed. For one thing, there are newcomers to the aristocracy—the squires who have made their money in the emerging cities and towns and have been able to purchase their estates. Although they have joined a medieval upper class, there is tension between them and the "old" gentry. The "old gentry" sometimes looks down on them because they lack the legitimacy of tradition—a tradition, remember that is rooted in notions about divine intentions of the social order. They are richer than the "old" gentry, who have their titles and land, but not much money. The new squires get "market factor" and have more economic versatility—because the

market has changed. The economic future is in the towns, the markets, and in money, not land.

In those towns, there's a rising professional middle class. They're talented, energetic, and impatient with tradition. They too have undergone their ordeals in their guilds (the masterpiece, law school—for purposes of the analogy the professional preparation which often enough involves master and doctoral degrees).

While the aristocrats hang on to an order ordained by sacrament, members the new class are the protestants or puritans who believe in "the priesthood of all believers", a belief which some will translate into a social vision of economic and social leveling, or at least equality. They have fewer "rights" than their aristocratic counterparts, but no king or kingdom will be successful without their cooperation—as Charles I was to discover.   This emerging middle class will be most interested in creating that new "civil society" that Foley and Edwards describe.

Similarly, the contemporary academy finds that it has its "new" professionals, who are not faculty, but who may have equivalent credentials and who are equally invested in professional identity. They do the work that the faculty may have done at an earlier time,[39] but bring a new sophistication, expertise, and often a specialized scholarship to this work.

Of course here are other classes too—the peasants and serfs, some of whom are quite prosperous; some are not. They too are political players, as the revolts of the late middle ages were to show.

At this point, this analogy breaks down. The staff at Augsburg is quite heterogeneous; its members do not have the same interests. Some are unionized; others are not. Some are employed by Augsburg; others work for the companies to whom the College has outsourced work. Some are "on-scale," others not. Some have considerable academic and professional preparation for their jobs; others do not. Some have made long-term commitments to working at the College; others will make Augsburg just one stop on their career paths. All, however, are at-will employees, [40] and thus some insecurity is a permanent part of their working conditions.

The dynamics of the tensions which we've experienced may be at least partially rooted in dislocations. On one hand there is the emergence of a new academic professional class, as it were, that doesn't fit into the medieval traditions of

---

[39] E.g. academic advising, the work of the Registrar's Office, many student services jobs. The faculty dissolved two of its committees, the Student Affairs Committee and Educational Resources committee several years ago when it realized that the work of those committees had long since been replaced by other professionals in the College.
[40] Except for those who also enjoy tenured faculty status.

college governance, even at Augsburg with its egalitarian heritage, at least among the faculty. And on the other hand, there's a more established "class" which nevertheless sees its traditional authority dwindling. Arguably, neither class feels that it receives the professional respect that it is entitled to.

Admittedly this analogy oversimplifies the social dynamics both of the middle ages (and the 17th century transition to a modern world) and of Augsburg. But it may at least hint at the basis of the conflict, what Tzvetan Todorov calls one of the more difficult challenges of contemporary western civilization: the tension between equality and hierarchy:

> On the ideological level, at least, we [western civilization at present] are trying to combine what we regard as the better parts of both terms of the alternative; we want *equality* without its compelling identity; but also *difference* without its degenerating into superiority/inferiority. We aspire to reap the benefits of the egalitarian model *and* of the hierarchic model; we aspire to rediscover the meaning of the social without losing the quality of the individual.[41]

If Augsburg is to become a community "that models the sort of world that the college's education vision is intended to create," how do we find a way for each employee to realize his or her vocation, while at the same time honoring each vocation as God must—both equally and differently (since each individual's vocation is unique).   Or, since that Jerusalem may be impossible, how do we create a "city" that honors and values the contributions of all of its citizens (equality) while acknowledging that not everyone plays the same role within the institution (hierarchy)? How can Augsburg fully engage the talents and loyalty of its citizens? And how can Augsburg meet its obligations to its citizens while still making the common social/political/economic good the priority of the institution? These questions compel the recognition that we have multiple work cultures on campus. Some misunderstandings about the differences between and among these cultures, I think, can provoke invidious comparisons that undermine our collective purpose of providing a transformative education. There are differences between faculty and staff work cultures, and among various staff work cultures. They are not the same cultures, but civility might mean finding reasonable equities among them.   What might some of these look like?

First, non-unionized staff may need their own Magna Charta or at least a more predictable process for participating in decisions that affect them. Faculty have some control over their work conditions through the Constitution that they have secured from the Regents and the Faculty Handbook. Likewise unionized employees can affect their union agreements. But that still leaves out a significant segment of Augsburg employees. It is an improvement to have an employee

---

[41] Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other.*
Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1984, p 249,

policy manual, but through what processes can non-unionized staff modify the manual? Does the new manual give staff adequate "rights?"

About a decade ago, several years before *Augsburg 2004*, Augsburg staff had a policy manual and grievance procedure that gave them more rights than the current manual does, particularly in areas affecting separation from the college, This manual disappeared well before the Frame administration entered office, but ironically it may have conferred more benefits of citizenship than the post-*2004* manual. [42]

In any case, a policy manual that recognizes the complexity of staff work cultures might ameliorate some of the tensions that arise from insecurity. For instance, is it desirable and equitable to have different types of separation policies (perhaps one requiring written notice based on performance reviews) to recognize the different kinds roles that staff play in the institution? In short, do we presently have a policy manual that does as much as it can to serve the interests both of the "private and public 'good' and of individual and social desirderata?" Does the present manual contribute to the "friendly and supportive" work culture called for in *2004?*[43]

Second, Augsburg should review the ways in which it makes decisions. *Augsburg 2004* recommended that the college invest "authority, responsibility, and accountability at the lowest possible level" so that employees might "become invested in their jobs and contribute more to the college community."[44] The College has improved its demand for accountability, but it's not clear that employees enjoy more authority. Not every administrative decision should be a voting matter; indeed most decisions need to be hierarchically made. But civility recognizes that people who are affected by decisions very likely have information and experience that are necessary to arriving at good decisions. It is to the College's benefit to include more people, albeit in a consultative role, in its decisions.   And civility would seem to require that people who are affected by decisions are consulted (or at least informed) before decisions are finalized.

Third, we should identify the projects on which administration, faculty, and staff can and should meaningfully and effectively collaborate. Real power comes from accomplishment.   The best moments of the last few years have come when groups with different interests have been able to achieve mutual agreement through collaborative processes (e.g., the Senate and College Council with the Rochester initiative and the calendar proposal; the discussions between administration and employees about health insurance) or have pooled their diverse talents in developing new college initiatives. Collaboration should never be merely decorative. Collaboration for the sake of collaboration is contemptuous of vocation—the unique set of talents that individuals might bring to a task. But

---

[42] I owe this observation to Mary Kingsley, former Staff Advocate.

[43] P. 25.

[44] P. 25.

work that truly requires diverse talents might at least facilitate the relationships that are important for a harmonious and productive work environment.

The second and third recommendations lead to a fourth: clarify the purpose and authority of campus-wide committees. Faculty standing committees gain their authority from the Faculty Constitution and By-Laws, which, in turn, is authorized by the Augsburg College Corporation and Board of Regents through the Articles of Incorporation. However, some campus policies, decisions, and initiatives go beyond the boundaries of faculty authority. In the past, at least, campus-wide committees—the Parking Committee, the Retention Committee, the Budget Committee, the Space Committee, and the Diversity Committee—have dealt with some of these decisions or at least have acted as advisory bodies in decision making processes. Their membership has included a representative group of staff and faculty.

In recent years, however, some of these committees appear to have disappeared, and others (e.g. the Diversity Committee) are in search of a clear mandate and authority.

One way of both increasing participation in decision making by and promoting meaningful collaboration between faculty and staff would be to identify the areas where collaboration would be most helpful, and charter the committees that would work in these areas. These committees may be constituted by the President or divisions of the College; as such their function primarily might be deliberative and advisory. But having a formal charter and clear areas of responsibility would help legitimize the work of such committees. The faculty, moreover, should consider weighing service on these committees as heavily as it does service on standing committees of the faculty in tenure and promotion decisions.

Fifth, staff cite the need for professional development opportunities. Although hampered by the realities of its resources, the College should continue to look for ways in which to support employee development activities that will contribute to employees' ability to contribute to the transformative education of its students.

Finally, it may be helpful for the College to review and, if necessary, create the processes through which its citizens, individually or collectively, can resolve their most bitter complaints. Some avenues do exist (e.g. the faculty's Equity Committee, the Staff Resolution Assistance Process), but the College should determine whether its present processes are adequate for protecting both the rights of the individual and the welfare of the institution; and whether they give the College sufficient guidance for addressing the variety of grievances that can occur in a complex community.

Diversity as Pedagogy

Augsburg in 2003 continues to grapple with defining what it means to be intentionally committed to diversity. It does not disagree, however, about the commitment itself as an important component of *civitas.* The civically, academically, and, as Tillich would argue, spiritually robust city, or college community, must be centralizing, but also inclusive; it must embrace both the "strange and familiar."[45]

Tillich's argument is worth quoting at some length:

> Meeting the strange can have two consequences.
> It can produce hate against the strange, and usually
> against the stranger, because is existence threatens
> the self-certainty of the familiar. Or it can afford the
> courage to question the familiar. . . . [Although in
> the metropolis, it is hard to avoid the strange, it is
> possible to 'shun" it]: All forms of totalitarianism try to
> avoid the strange, the problematic, the critical, the rational.
> To do so, they must deny the metropolitan spirit, equalize
> everything in city and country, and retain a center which
> is not the center of anything because everything else is
> swallowed up by it. Nothing strange—neither questions,
> criticism, nor competition—is left to the spiritual life,
> and so it dies
>
> Since the strange leads to questions and undermines
> familiar tradition, it serves to elevate reason to ultimate
> significance. If all traditions are questionable, nothing
> but reason is left as the way to new spiritual content.
> There lies the connection between the metropolis and
> critical rationality—between the metropolis and the
> intelligentsia as a social group. The importance of the
> encounter with the strange for all forms of the spiritual
> life cannot be overestimated. There is no better proof
> of this fact than the attempts of all totalitarian authority
> to keep the strange from their subjects. Books are forbidden
> and meaningful encounters are prohibited. The big city
> is sliced into pieces, each of which is observed, purged,
> and equalized. The mystery of the strange and
> the critical rationality of men are both removed from the
> city. . . .Without priestly tradition and prophetic attach,
> the critical activity of the intelligentsia paves the way to
> a situation in which criticism is prohibited, the strange
> is excluded, and the freedom of the metropolis is lost.
> The metropolis must preserve the priestly spirit and

---

[45] Paul Tillich, "Commentary: The Strange and Familiar in the Metropolis." *The Metropolis in Modern Life*, ed. Robert Moore Fisher (New York : Doubleday, 1955), 347.

its traditions, and it must attract the prophetic spirits and its threats. Then alone is its freedom safe. [46]

As noted earlier, J. Herman Blake argues that an institution's commitment to diversity must result in a "pedagogy," the community's modeling of that commitment. Earlier this paper recommended that the development and definition of that pedagogy is important to the infusion model of diversity in Augsburg's curriculum.

But what should Augsburg's "pedagogy" look like?   It might be useful to note that College Council embarked on such a discussion last fall. In an October 14, 2002 memo to the Diversity Committee, President Frame sketched the outline of that discussion. Again, I will quote at length:

Pluralism vs. Hospitality

Plato makes Socrates, in the Parmenides, argue that
while both "one-ness" and "many-ness" may co-exist in,
for example, a human being, they are distinct nonetheless.
Hence, the thing that makes for unity in an entity
comprising both is "one-ness", not "many-ness", and
the thing that makes for diversity is "many-ness".
This suggests that the unity of a diverse community
is created by its "one-ness" rather than its diversity.
The problematic notion that the unity of such a community
is constituted of diversity makes of it an example of
"the pluralist community" idea widely represented in
the arguments for multi-culturalism.

Hospitality (from the Latin "to receive as a guest") is,
for the community conscious of its defining character,
the initial and invitational act in a process leading from
initiation through orientation to inclusion. On this basis,
it does not constitute the provision of a "home away from
home", not an accommodation in a strange place of a
familiar domicile.

"Inclusion" in some communities might mean total
fusion—but only if the community is totalitarian and l
acks private as well as public zones. (The boundary
between these two zones among us is formed of the
elements defining diversity. In the public zone,
differences of age, race, etc., are irrelevant, whereas
 the assets contributing to the development of the learning
community are decisive.)

---

[46] Ibid., 347.

The "Melting Pot" vs. the New Citizen

The notion that communities are melded exclusively of
the diverse elements that enter them is a form of the
pluralist concept. It differs profoundly from the notion
that the diverse elements which originally constitute
a society issue in a new kind of person, largely by means
of a process of interaction with a founding vision or
constitutional act. "The whole is greater than the sum
of the parts." This view seemed to us a more accurate
explanation of the "American experiment" than the former.

Are there elements in the contemporary circumstance—
of changing immigration and other demographic trends—
that require a new understanding? What are they?

We don't hold a conclusive answer. We suspect,
however, that each diversity experiences differently the
hospitality of the society to which it seeks entry, even
if the offer of hospitality is extended on a perfectly
equitable basis. That varying experience is one of
the elements of diversity that cannot be expunged;
to seek to do so will require a policy of such profound
inequity as to corrupt the "equal protection" ethic that is
foundational to the community itself.

What's needed now is a more general discussion of "a pedagogy of diversity."
The Diversity Committee would appear to be a natural group to convene the
conversation—but discussion needs to go beyond "preaching to the choir."

Communication: Civility, Congeniality, and the Freedom of Speech

Although the primary obligation of the College is the
education of its students, faculty and staff try to model
the ideals of Augsburg academic community in their
interactions with each other. . .

Behind the activities, guidelines, and job expectations of the
Augsburg work culture lies an assumed, and often unstated, code
of ethics. Such a code at Augsburg include . . . respect for civil
discussion of diverse opinions as a means of sustaining a sense of
community . . .
--*Augsburg 2004*, p. 25

In Book I of *The Faerie Queene*, Edmund Spenser sends the Red Cross Knight
on a quest to release the parents of Una, or Truth, from a dragon who's holding

them captive. His travels take him through "the wandring wood" where the vile monster Errour has her den. They meet, of course, and fight. Just as he is about to be defeated, the Red Cross Knight grabs Errour around the neck, and chokes her.

There follows the most wonderfully disgusting verse in English literature:

> Therewith she spewd out out of her filthy maw
> A floud of poyson horrible, and blacke,
> Full of great lumpes of flesh and gobbets raw
> Which stunck so vildly, that it forst him slacke
> His grasping hold, and from her turne him backe:
> Her vomit full of bookes and papers, was,
> With loathly frogs, and toades, which eyes did lacke,
> And creeping sought way in the weedy gras:
> Her filthy parbreak (vomit) all the place defiled has.
> (I:20:172-180)

Two stanzas later, the monster vomits again. This time:

> She poured forth out of her hellish sinke
> Her fruitfull cursed spawne of serpents small,
> Deformèd monsters, fowle, and blacke as inke . . .
> (I:22:194-196)

In other words, the second time around, Errour relieves herself of the letters that make up the words in all those bookes and papers on which Errour has gorged herself.

For a Renaissance humanist like Spenser, divine language creates the world. It brings order out of chaos. It replaces the void with substance.
The world was created and perhaps continues to be created with language. But empty language, falsehood is not merely unpleasant; it can also be destructive. The language of the monster can un-create the world.

Two generations after Spenser wrote these words, another Renaissance humanist, John Milton addressed a speech, "Areopagitica," to the Parliament of England, in which he argues for freedom of speech: "as good kill a man as kill a good book; who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book kills reason itself; kills the image of God, as it were, in the eye." [47]   Freedom of speech is an easy case to make for the good books. But what about those written by the monster Errour? Milton would still allow them. Claiming first that one cannot censor books without preventing learning, he continues,   "And again, if it be true that a wise man, like a good refiner, can

---

[47] John Milton, "Areopagitica" in *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose,*ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Macmillan, 1957.   720.

gather gold out of the drossiest volume, and that a fool will be a fool with the bewst book, year or without book, there is no reason that we should deprive a wise man of any advantage to his wisdom, while we seek to restrain from a fool that which being restrained will be no hindrance to his folly."[48]

The lesson of the monster—and of Milton--is clear and especially important to a college community. We are a community of speakers, writers, readers, and critical listeners. As such we may indeed be made in the divine image. Thus through our lectures and discussions, we try to catch the truth with words. In our vision statements and handbooks, we try to coax form from the abyss. And we need the freedom to accomplish this.   At the same time, however, we are capable of the other kinds of words as well.   Thus when we speak or listen, write or read, we are engaged in serious moral action.

Freedom of speech is essential to the academy, but as AAUP makes clear, it also is accompanied by the responsibilities of citizenship and is intended primarily to protect the freedom of thought "in research and the publication of the results," and 'freedom in the classroom in discussing…[the academic] subject."[49]

But much of the speech that is practiced in the academy is governed by other conventions, the conventions of civility. Earlier in this paper I have used the word "civility" to indicate the way in which we negotiate relationships within the College. But all too often the term suffers from and is trivialized by its reduction to "Miss Manners." As Diane Pike has pointed out, it is sometimes easy—and wrong—to equate the "nice and the good" or "the congenial and the civil." Civility is diminished when it is invoked to squelch disagreement. Manners, however, are moral, political, even theological.[50] At the very least they suggest how much or little we think of ourselves and regard other people.

Academic manners, the ways in which we communicate with each other, are essential to maintaining rational discourse—the communal and mutual truth-seeking which is the soul of the academy. We run into our greatest difficulties in maintaining civil speech, I would suggest, when we conflate the public and the private, and especially when we confuse monologue and dialogue.

In the middle of the Spike Lee's *Do the Right Thing*, action stops while several characters recite lists of racial and ethnic invectives—monologues. Action resumes, and by the end of the film, verbal violence gives way to physical violence. The epilogue of the film quotes both Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.   King essentially draws a distinction between the effects of monologue

---

[48] Ibid., p. 730

[49] From Faculty Handbook, 20.2.1

[50]   See Stephen L. Carter, *Civility: Manenrs, Morals, and the Etiquette of Democracy* (New York: Harper Perennial 1998) for a political history of civility. Richard J. Mouw vtakes up the discussion from a theological stance in *Uncommon Decency: Christian Civility in an Uncivil World* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1992).

and dialogue:

> Violence as a way of achieving racial justice is both
> impractical and immoral. It is impractical because it is a
> descending spiral ending in destruction for all. . . . It is
> immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather
> than win his understanding; it seeks to annihilate rather
> than to convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives
> on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and
> makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in
> monologue rather than dialogue.[51]

As an academic community, we are committed to disagreement—but
disagreement is best resolved through speech suited to dialogue, the attempt to
explain, persuade and understand.

Maintaining civil discourse is not without complications, however. Even though
the policies that govern our formal processes of communication might aim at
higher standard than the law requires, censorship poses graver risks than
incivility. Moreover manners and speech are contextual. To return to Diane
Pike's point, civility does not avoid conflict; the refusal to engage other viewpoints
is a form of monologue. And civility isn't always nice. Even Stephen Carter
seems to admire the scathing wit with which members of the British parliament
impale each other. Difficulty may occur when people communicate across
different rhetorical contexts (e.g. what happens when New York meets Minnesota
Nice; when Irony meets Sincerity—or when the different styles of communication,
sometimes a concomitant of hierarchy, collide within the College.)

Nevertheless in our policies and our practice, we should continue to discuss,
define, and come to community agreement about the decorum that prevents our
differences from becoming monologues.

Called to Civitas: "Civility and the Great Commission"

At Augsburg, as in any "city", the kingdoms of the right and the left, the City of
God and the City of Man, the ideal and real community mingle and contend with
each other. We are called to the first, but must inhabit the second. And if we
cannot achieve the first, civility at least can help us navigate and improve the
second:

> [Civility] is a friend of decency but not of Forgiveness. It can diminish
> personal injury only by excusing it as unintentional. But if it knows it as
> wrongdoing, it punishes it --and joins hands for the purpose with its natural

---

[51] Martin Luther King, Jr., "Stride Toward Freedom" in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential
Writi9ngs of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Ed.James M Washington. San Francisco: Harper & Row,
1986, p. 482.

partner, Law (not Gospel). Civility serves the community; it is the language and manner of public conduct. When it senses the presence of unmitigated private interest --or a claim to uncompromising and absolute truth--it turns away. And why should it not? As the guardian of a diverse community, Civility aims at good order and it seeks agreement, not truth; it prays for equity not Perfect Justice. The natural friend and practitioner of Civility is the citizen, not the philosopher, or the Preacher, or the True Believer. The commitment of Civility to such limited objectives as peace and order is a great gift to all of us that are interested in telling a truth, searching for one, or living according to one. It protects us from having to give up our truth for some other—and the cost of this protection is that it is available to every truth, including those we despise.[52]

---

[52] See William V. Frame, "Christianity, Civility, and the Great Commission." Baccalaureate HomilyAugsburg College, May 4, 2003.