

Fall 2015

Spiritan Pedagogy and Ethics

Darlene Weaver

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/spiritan-horizons>

 Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weaver, D. (2015). Spiritan Pedagogy and Ethics. *Spiritan Horizons*, 10 (10). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/spiritan-horizons/vol10/iss10/16>

This Education is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Spiritan Horizons by an authorized editor of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

SPIRITAN PEDAGOGY AND ETHICS: CREATING A CONSTRUCTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENTS



Dr. Darlene Weaver

Darlene Fozard Weaver, Ph.D. is Director of the Center for the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and Associate Professor of Theology at Duquesne University. She previously served as Director of the Theology Institute and Associate Professor of Theology at Villanova University, and Visiting Assistant Professor at Georgetown University. Weaver is the author of *The Acting Person and Christian Moral Life* (Georgetown University Press, 2011), *Self Love and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge University Press, 2002) and co-editor and contributor to *The Ethics Embryo Adoption and the Catholic Tradition: Moral Arguments, Economic Reality, and Social Analysis* (2007). Her work has been supported by the Center of Theological Inquiry, the Louisville Institute, and the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion.

...an invitational approach to ethics education, one that meets students where they are.

Formal coursework in ethics is a common feature of contemporary Catholic higher education. Catholic colleges and universities may require ethics courses in their core curriculums and for particular majors (for example, business or nursing), as well as offer a wide array of elective courses on moral issues. Ethics instruction also appears across a curriculum in courses that are not explicitly identified as ethics, for instance through courses that emphasize civic education or promote student learning about other cultures. Catholic colleges and universities also provide ethics education through programs, institutes, and centers devoted specifically to ethics. Moreover, it is now common to see explicit language about ethics appear in the mission statements and promotional materials that Catholic colleges and universities use to identify and promote themselves in the landscape of higher education. This essay considers ethics education in relation to the Spiritan charism. More specifically, it reflects on the import of the Spiritan charism for the task of teaching ethics in a Catholic institution of higher education to a morally diverse student body.

Ethics education is pedagogically challenging, particularly in a context that features both institutional religious affiliation and a morally and religiously diverse student body. One central challenge is to create a learning atmosphere that is welcoming to all while affirming the moral particularity of the institution's religious educational context. A second, closely related challenge, is to navigate student attitudes regarding morality and organized religion in general, and Catholic moral tradition more particularly. An ethics educator could respond to these challenges with a catechetical, apologetic approach or with a more invitational evangelizing style. In this article I argue that Spiritan pedagogy warrants an invitational approach to ethics education, one that meets students where they are.¹ I draw on a discussion of Spiritan education by Rev. Jeff Duaiame, C.S.Sp. et al in concert with several concrete pedagogical practices to develop and support this claim. Specifically, a Spiritan ethos warrants an ethics pedagogy that relishes diversity, honors the indwelling presence of the Transcendent, follows the lead of the Spirit, and forges relationships through practicing the "art and asceticism of dialogue."²

Spiritans Pedagogy

The Congregation of the Holy Spirit, the Spiritans, sponsor educational efforts around the world. Most Spiritan educational endeavors concern primary, secondary, or informal educational contexts. Duquesne University of the Holy Spirit is the oldest institution of higher education founded and sponsored by the Spiritan congregation and the only such institution in the Northern hemisphere. Spiritan pedagogy does not designate a definite pedagogical method articulated by the Congregation of the Holy Spirit. When I speak of a Spiritan pedagogy I mean simply an approach to teaching that is informed by and reflective of a Spiritan charism or ethos. Individual Spiritans would undoubtedly describe the Spiritan charism in a variety of ways. I do not pretend to offer a definitive description of their charism. Rather, I locate myself as a student of the Spiritan tradition, one fortunate enough to work in Spiritan higher education as a mission officer and as a theological ethicist.

When I speak of a Spiritan pedagogy I mean simply an approach to teaching that is informed by and reflective of a Spiritan charism or ethos.

A Spiritan ethos can inform teaching at a number of points along an educational scale. It nourishes an institutional culture that emphasizes concern for the poor and cultural sensitivity. It warrants curricular commitments such as requiring courses that acquaint students with social justice and diverse cultures. It provides a normative mission that can guide institutional decisions to develop specific programs of study and eschew others. A Spiritan ethos can underscore the value of certain teaching strategies. In several conversations about Spiritan pedagogy that have occurred at Duquesne, for example, many faculty have shared pedagogical strategies in which they intentionally position themselves in relation to their students as co-learners. A Spiritan ethos also bears on student support services, situating federally mandated accommodations for disabilities in a context of care for vulnerable populations and dedication to cultivating the integral liberation of persons. It can inform co-curricular learning opportunities such as experiential learning. Such practices occur elsewhere in higher education—at other religiously affiliated, secular, and Catholic institutions—but at Duquesne they find an institutional rationale and coherence in the specific history of the University (which was founded to educate poor, immigrant children), in the Spiritan appreciation for the importance of lived experience, and in the congregation’s approach to mission and evangelization.

Rev. Jeff Duaine, C.S.Sp. et al identify several “marks of Spiritan education”: openness to the Spirit, global vision, a sense of community, concern for the poor, a commitment to service, high academic standards, and academic freedom.³ These marks express

They also affirm the value of education in service of the “integral liberation” of persons.

Teaching is an inherently ethical enterprise because it is teleologically oriented to the good of education.

the Spiritans’ character as a global missionary Congregation committed to serving the poor through a relationship-centered, Spirit-led approach to evangelization. They also affirm the value of education in service of the “integral liberation” of persons.⁴ Each of these marks is relevant to teaching and learning ethics, but I wish to focus on a second set of characteristics which Duaine et al identify as distinctively Spiritan. They describe the theological “elements” that manifest themselves in all aspects of Spiritan educational ministry: indwelling presence of the Transcendent; following the lead of the Spirit in life; relational and communitarian living; self-transcendence in sacrificial love; relishing diversity; focus on freedom; masters of dialogue; solidarity, subsidiarity and discernment; preferential love for and outreach to the poor.⁵ My argument enlists several of these elements to support my claim that a Spiritan pedagogy warrants an invitational approach to ethics education in a Catholic institutional context.

Teaching Ethics in Catholic Higher Education

Whether or not one is teaching ethics, education is itself a moral good in which human persons acquire knowledge that is essential for their development. It cultivates their skills and talents, empowering them to meet their needs and to contribute to the common good. Education is crucially important for human participation in social, economic, and political life.⁶ For these reasons education promotes a manner of life consistent with human dignity. Teaching is an inherently ethical enterprise because it is teleologically oriented to the good of education. Spiritans George Boran and John Assey articulate this point with regard to Spiritan education when they argue that Spiritan education should promote “the *personal, academic and integral development*” of students and form students “as citizens to build a better society.”⁷ Theologically understood, education is inherently good because it develops human knowledge of the truth; in a Catholic educational context the inquiry into truth that is specific to particular academic disciplines is enriched by explicit integration in relation to God who is the Truth.⁸

Another reason (there are many more) that education is morally freighted is because the enterprise itself requires teachers to make choices about the sort of learning environment they endeavor to cultivate. Is their classroom a hierarchical environment in which the scholar-expert dispenses a body of information to a passive student body or are students engaged as active learners? Are the perspectives of marginal populations shared and culturally entrenched perspectives interrogated? How does the instructor handle occasions when students question

In a Catholic context, how are criticism of Church teaching and alternative moral traditions handled?

One of my tasks as an ethics instructor is to tease apart salutary forms of tolerance and well-founded resistance to dogmatism from full-blown relativism and subjectivism.

One can recognize that there may be multiple morally acceptable courses of action, or a variety of moral assessments...

claims he or she makes? In a Catholic context, how are criticism of Church teaching and alternative moral traditions handled? What is the tenor of class discussion? As practitioners of the craft of teaching, faculty members necessarily reflect their moral choices about learning environments in the pedagogical practices they use. Pedagogical strategies are practices in the MacIntyrean sense of a socially established, coherent human activity that entails internal goods that are ordered to standards of excellence in the performance of that activity.⁹ Good pedagogy exercises human capacities for realizing the goods internal to education, thereby promoting human flourishing.

The moral freight that inevitably attends teaching and learning becomes even more complex when the subject matter is ethics and the institutional context is Catholic higher education in the United States. First, in American Catholic higher education the task of teaching ethics involves creating a learning atmosphere that is welcoming to all while affirming the moral particularity of the institution's religious educational context. Throughout my years of teaching, my traditionally aged undergraduate students have displayed an appreciation for tolerance and a distaste for moral dogmatism. In my experience these attitudes signify a generational disposition of openness. All too often, however, incoherent forms of cultural relativism and moral subjectivism inflect this openness. One of my tasks as an ethics instructor is to tease apart salutary forms of tolerance and well-founded resistance to dogmatism from full-blown relativism and subjectivism. Cultural relativism is the position that right and wrong are entirely culturally determined; it denies that cross-cultural moral judgments can be shown to be valid. Subjectivism is the position that right and wrong are simply matters of personal opinion. One cannot validate one's own moral judgments in a manner that shows them to be correct or the judgments of others to be inferior or wrong. Neither tolerance nor a robust pluralism necessitates relativism or subjectivism. One can recognize that there may be multiple morally acceptable courses of action, or a variety of moral assessments, each of which contributes to a truthful understanding of a complex situation, while also affirming that certain sorts of actions are always morally wrong and that reasoned moral argument can validate some moral convictions over others.¹⁰

In my experience very few if any of my students are deeply relativist or subjectivist. A more apt description is that the relativistic and subjectivist claims they make ("Everyone is entitled to their own opinion," "I don't want to impose my opinion," etc.) often reflect a struggle with moral and religious inarticulacy. As

I gently suggest to my students that their relativism reflects a deeper struggle to discern how to validate their moral convictions in a pluralistic society...

I note to my students, we cannot live as deep subjectivists or relativists because we really do think that our own convictions are preferable to alternatives. We experience the difference between uncertainty and conviction, and the latter affirms that at least some times we think there are better reasons for believing, valuing, or acting one way rather than another. When I gently suggest to my students that their relativism reflects a deeper struggle to discern how to validate their moral convictions in a pluralistic society they typically affirm this diagnosis. Sociologist Christian Smith makes the same point with regard to his study of adolescent religious socialization. According to Smith, U.S. teenagers are largely unable to distinguish the following forms of religious speech:

1. serious, articulate confident personal and congregational discourse of faith, versus
2. respectful, civil discourse in the pluralistic public sphere, versus
3. obnoxious, offensive talk that merely offends other people.¹¹

Smith goes on to say that, “given the dominance of the culture’s emphasis on diversity and tolerance...serious, confident, articulate expressions of faith” are difficult to identify and practice.¹² So the pedagogical challenge in my ethics classes is to introduce students to such serious, confident expressions of Catholic moral tradition and to nurture their own capacities for articulating their moral convictions while also cultivating a genuinely hospitable learning environment.

While our students are religiously and morally diverse, they also exhibit generational commonalities.

Student attitudes regarding religion in general and Catholic Christianity more particularly pose a second, related, pedagogical challenge. While our students are religiously and morally diverse, they also exhibit generational commonalities. Smith captures them well. The current generation of adolescents and young adults exhibit what he calls Moralistic Therapeutic Deism (MTD). MTD includes belief in a creator God who “wants people to be good, nice, and fair to each other, as taught in the Bible and most world religions,” but who “does not need to be particularly involved in one’s life except when he is needed to resolve a problem.” Moreover, MTD includes the belief that “the central goal of life is to be happy and to feel good about oneself.”¹³ The moral life as understood in MTD is far from demanding, has little to do with justice or conversion, does not acknowledge the reality of sin, and elides differences among world religions. Importantly, MTD is not “an amusingly pathetic

*...many students I
encounter are wary
of or hostile towards
organized religion.*

*Teaching students
about the diversity of
traditions within the
tradition...*

*My own teaching style
is more invitational
than catechetical.*

version of Christianity” but rather “its own, distinct faith,... a rival religion.”¹⁴ It feeds parasitically on Christianity and other world religions and contributes to their demise by evacuating them of distinctive belief and practice, substituting a therapeutic approach, and exacerbating the problem of inarticulacy just described.

In addition to the pervasive presence of MTD among self-identified believers, many students I encounter are wary of or hostile towards organized religion. Christianity, and Catholic Christianity in particular, evokes their skepticism or ire insofar as they perceive it as antiquated, dogmatic, and hypocritical. My students often also take religious demographics of the United States as basis for global claims about the need for the Church to bring itself in line with contemporary times. I witness considerable religious mis-education and ignorance when it comes to Catholicism, and even greater ignorance concerning non-Christian religions. With these students the pedagogical challenge is to show them gently that their impressions about religions, religious demographics, and Catholicism more particularly, are sometimes mistaken or only partly true. Teaching students about the diversity of traditions within the tradition, and being honest with them about Christian complicity in injustice and occasions of institutional dysfunction is a necessary dimension of advocating for the riches and relevance of Catholic moral tradition. Other students know more about Catholic tradition and some readily locate themselves in the tradition. They can bring their own worries and biases into the classroom. Some may be concerned that the faculty member or fellow students will import a liberal bias to the course. Others may approach specific moral issues in ways that are personally freighted given their own history and experiences. Their attitudes also need to be negotiated in order to create a constructive learning environment for the entire class population.

Ethics faculty could respond to these challenges in diverse ways. One model might be to teach ethics in a catechetical style, endeavoring to supply the knowledge base that many students lack, and to deploy that knowledge to develop their capacities for moral articulation. A catechetical style of ethics education could welcome students with other religious and moral convictions but the approach would emphasize an apologetic style for presenting Catholic moral education. My own teaching style is more invitational than catechetical. It endeavors to honor the moral particularity of my Catholic institutional context while also seeking to invite students into a constructive learning environment where they can consider

*An invitational
approach to ethics
education centers
on meeting students
where they are.*

the riches of Catholic moral tradition, develop skills of moral reasoning, and—I hope—experience our time together as an instantiation of Duquesne’s Spiritan ethos. An invitational approach to ethics education centers on meeting students where they are. A Spiritan ethos warrants such an approach; consider the Maynooth General Chapter statement that Spiritans “go to people not primarily to accomplish a task, but rather to be with them, live with them, walk beside them, listen to them and share our faith with them.”¹⁵ Let me depict such an approach and support my claim by sharing some teaching strategies.

Spiritan Pedagogy and a Constructive Learning Environment for Ethics Education

We can make several fruitful connections between the theological elements that Rev. Duaine et al identified in their discussion of Spiritan education and specific classroom strategies. I do not pretend that these strategies are particularly innovative, but in my experience they work together to create a constructive learning environment that embodies many of the elements of Spiritan education that Rev. Duaine et al described.¹⁶ I focus on those elements that are most relevant to the pedagogical challenges of student diversity and institutional moral particularity in ethics education: indwelling presence of the Transcendent, following the lead of the Spirit, relational and communitarian living, relishing diversity, focus on freedom, and masters of dialogue.

Capacity building

Navigating the pedagogical challenges described above requires substantial capacity building, the cultivation of a rapport with students that is characterized by mutual respect, trust, intellectual rigor, and enthusiastic co-learning. What I call capacity building is really an endeavor to forge relationships, build community, and create a classroom environment that is both conducive to learning the discipline of ethics and, at least for the duration of our course, allows me to support students in their respective processes of moral formation. The work of capacity building is most intense during the first month of a given semester, though it requires ongoing efforts to sustain and deepen those capacities. I employ several strategies toward this end:

- a) *Modeling.* I endeavor to model academic rigor. I come to class prepared, and try to manage time effectively. I listen attentively and think alongside my students. I share concrete techniques for critical thinking, reading, and for writing well. An emphasis on academic rigor helps me to distinguish

Academic rigor underscores a Catholic conviction in the unity of truth, and therefore affirms the viability of multiple and diverse pathways to moral insight.

Creating a shared awareness of the diversity represented in our classroom...

our model of ethics education from catechesis. Academic rigor underscores a Catholic conviction in the unity of truth, and therefore affirms the viability of multiple and diverse pathways to moral insight. It allows me to construe the academic discipline of ethics as an exercise of moral reasoning in dialogue with others, a collaborative inquiry in the service of discerning moral insight, articulating it as well as possible, and deploying that insight to promote the human and common good. In this regard modeling the habits of academic rigor manifests Spiritan educational elements of following the lead of the Spirit, cultivating relationships and community, relishing diversity, supporting freedom through education, and being in dialogue.

b) *Introductory index cards.* On the first day of class I provide students with blank index cards. They are asked anonymously to indicate what sort of religious education, if any, they have received and to identify a question or topic they hope will be addressed during the semester. The anonymity encourages student candor, which in turn provides me with a sense of the particular mix of students in a given class. They are also asked to describe either their best hope or worst fear for the class. In my recent class on sexual ethics, for instance, about 1/6 of students used their index cards to indicate a concern that the course would not represent a conservative sexual ethic sympathetically. About 1/3 of the class indicated an opposite concern, namely that the course would present only a conservative sexual ethic. Other students mentioned a desire to see specific topics addressed, like homosexuality, sometimes indicating that they hoped they would come to a better understanding of Catholic teaching about it, sometimes expressing a hope that the topic would be addressed in a non-judgmental manner. In subsequent class meetings I noted the fact that the class included groups of students with these diverse concerns. Creating a shared awareness of the diversity represented in our classroom was an important ingredient for the other strategies I employed. While some of the student remarks typify insights and worries I often see featured among my students, the cards sometimes reveal information

*...intellectual rigor
includes hermeneutic
charity toward others'
positions and readiness
to examine one's own
positions critically.*

early on that might not come to light until later if at all. This information can concern a student's social location or identity, academic concerns, past experiences, and so forth. Electing to hear from students what their own hopes and worries are manifests a respect for their dignity and value, the indwelling presence of the Transcendent. Because the information can prompt changes in course readings or shifts in pedagogical practice, it is also an exercise in following the lead of the Spirit.

c) *Decentering*. I rarely disclose my own moral positions on particular contested questions. I do express concerns, show appreciation for insights, and share my own open questions or confusion about moral issues. But I generally avoid identifying my convictions about controversial issues. I want to underscore for students that doing poorly or well in the class involves developing skills of moral reasoning rather than agreeing or disagreeing with my moral convictions. Here, too, I want to model for students that intellectual rigor includes hermeneutic charity toward others' positions and readiness to examine one's own positions critically. By articulating divergent moral perspectives with charity and vigor, or by pointing to alternative, mediating moral positions I endeavor to show students the sort of "serious, articulate, confident personal and congregational discourse of faith" that Smith says they have trouble recognizing or believing is possible.¹⁷

Other ethicists might argue that students ought to know where I stand, that asking them to state and support their own positions while being evasive about mine is problematic. I reflect on this possibility regularly, though my lived experience does not support it. Here we get to the heart of the first pedagogical challenge I described, the challenge of identifying and rejecting problematic forms of cultural relativism and moral subjectivism, welcoming a diverse student population, and honoring the moral particularity of our Catholic institutional context. To be clear, this practice of decentering is not a false attempt to construct a neutral classroom space or a denial of the moral

By making the telos of our ethics courses explicit and modeling academic rigor, I celebrate Catholic moral tradition even as I critically engage specific resources in it.

It instantiates a Spiritan focus on freedom by crafting an inductive pursuit of truthful moral insight rather than relying on a didactic and hierarchical model...

When students make original observations I seize that opportunity to indicate that I am learning from them.

telos of education.¹⁸ By making the telos of our ethics courses explicit and modeling academic rigor, I celebrate Catholic moral tradition even as I critically engage specific resources in it. The practice of decentering I am describing thereby avoids devolving into relativism or subjectivism. The practice of decentering is grounded in a recognition of the indwelling presence of the Transcendent in my students and in our work together, and a readiness to follow the lead of the Spirit. It instantiates a Spiritan focus on freedom by crafting an inductive pursuit of truthful moral insight rather than relying on a didactic and hierarchical model that could run roughshod over student questions, concerns, and insights.

Indirect Dialogue Strategies

Ethics is an inherently dialogical discipline. It is crucial to be in conversation with others in order to come to a shared understanding of a moral issue, inform conscience by consulting the wisdom of moral traditions and relevant experts, and discern a morally appropriate course of action. I encourage student participation in dialogical forms of learning by using a variety of what I call “indirect dialogue strategies.” The dialogue is indirect in the sense that the strategies invite students to enter into a topic in a manner that does not make participation depend upon claiming and defending a particular moral stance or require fluency in the discourse of Catholic moral tradition. I use several strategies:

a) *Shared interpretation of selected quotes or definitions.* I provide students with one or more short passages of text, usually from our assigned reading for the day, either by writing it on the board or distributing it as a hand-out. I invite students to point out particular words or phrases they think are significant and explain their import. Not only does this strategy encourage critical reading, students will notice different aspects of the texts and contribute to our shared understanding of it. When students make original observations I seize that opportunity to indicate that I am learning from them. Starting with an interpretive exercise like this initiates a conversation that can include students who feel more comfortable discussing a text than their own beliefs, along with those who did not complete the assigned reading but

This strategy exemplifies Spiritan concern to develop the “art and asceticism” of dialogue.

...my students often are surprised at the number of women who obtain abortions who are already parenting one or more children.

can thereby begin to engage it. Carefully selected quotes provide an opportunity to frame the terms of the ensuing discussion, as well as anticipate and disarm mis-readings of the text or reductive approaches. This strategy exemplifies Spiritan concern to develop the “art and asceticism” of dialogue. It serves Spiritan relish for diversity insofar as the shared work of parsing the text involves listening and responding to one another’s interpretations.

b) *Relevant demographic information.* If we are discussing a given practical moral issue, such as abortion, I will share demographic information with students. I ask students to reflect on the demographics and indicate what, if anything surprises them. Regarding abortion for example, my students often are surprised at the number of women who obtain abortions who are already parenting one or more children. Their surprise (or lack thereof) becomes a springboard to discussing assumptions we bring to moral consideration of that issue, the important contributions other academic disciplines bring to ethics. Demographic information opens the door to reflection on social structures that shape the moral reality of our lives and the experiences of others who differ from us. Attentiveness to demographic aspects of moral behaviors or issues does not suffice for ethnographic or community engaged dimensions of ethics education, but it is a modest step towards encouraging students to be attentive to social and structural dimensions of moral issues and to take the perspective of others. In this regard it fosters a Spiritan relish for diversity.

c) *The “sharing bowl.”* I distribute blank index cards and invite students to answer questions on them anonymously. The questions might be about their own moral practices or convictions or might invite them to reflect on a particular moral experience and describe it with a word or short phrase. I collect the index cards in a bowl that I jokingly call the sharing bowl and then pass it among the students, asking them to take one of the index cards. The students then read whatever is written on the index card they have selected.

This strategy embodies Spiritan relish for diversity and requires following the lead of the Spirit since none of us can know in advance what our sharing exercise will reveal.

It also meets students in their diverse attitudes toward organized religion and Catholicism while inviting them into an appreciation for the riches and resources of Catholic moral tradition.

This strategy allows us to hear from students in their own words about sensitive moral issues but protects student anonymity. The collective experience of hearing everyone's (indirectly) shared replies is often revelatory. We then discuss what students noticed about the replies, what might be missing, and how their replies connect with or correct claims in our course material. This strategy embodies Spiritan relish for diversity and requires following the lead of the Spirit since none of us can know in advance what our sharing exercise will reveal. By seriously attending to the experience of students we also affirm the indwelling presence of the Transcendent and foster community in our classroom. Through another pedagogical practice, strategic self-disclosure, I can foster relationships with my students by making myself vulnerable while taking care (hence, employing self-disclosure *strategically*) to avoid having my sharing shut down or otherwise appear to "trump" theirs.

The strategies described here under general categories of capacity building and indirect dialogue all aim at creating a learning environment that is constructive for a morally and religiously diverse student body in a Catholic educational context. A Spiritan ethos warrants an invitational approach to ethics education because Spiritan educational ministry, like other concrete manifestations of the Spiritan mission, centers on encountering others where they are. As I have suggested, approaching ethics education invitatively neither devolves into relativism nor forsakes the telos of moral formation. Rather, it negotiates the pedagogical tension between institutional moral particularity (in this case, Catholic identity) and student moral diversity. It also meets students in their diverse attitudes toward organized religion and Catholicism while inviting them into an appreciation for the riches and resources of Catholic moral tradition. By the grace of God and under the influence of the Spirit, an invitational approach to ethics can itself be a work of evangelization in the lives of students and faculty alike.

Conclusion

This essay only begins to explore the import of a Spiritan ethos for ethics education. There are more pedagogical challenges to consider, more facets of the Spiritan charism to marshal, and a greater variety of perspectives to engage. My hope is that this essay invites other educators who work in Spiritan educational

ministry—whether as Spiritans or as their partners—to share their own experience and insight into the complex privilege of teaching ethics.

*Dr. Darlene Fozard Weaver
Duquesne University*

Endnotes

¹Like the essay by Hansen, Margolis, and Quinones in this volume, my essay understands a readiness to meet people where they are as a defining feature of the Spiritan charism.

²Rev. Jeff Duaime, C.S.Sp., “The Heartbeat of Spiritan Education in the US,” *Spiritan Horizons* 8 (Fall, 2013), 101-114, here 109.

³Duaime, “The Heartbeat of Spiritan Education,” 101-114.

⁴Spiritan Rule of Life, 3rd edition, no. 14, available at <http://spiritanroma.org/world/wwwroot/SRL/Our%20Mission%20.html>.

⁵Duaime, “The Heartbeat of Spiritan Education,” 107-110.

⁶Vatican II, Declaration *Gravissimum Educationis*, On Christian Education, no. 5.

⁷George Boran, C.S.Sp., and John Assey, C.S.Sp., “Reflections on the Educational Commitments in the Congregation of the Holy Spirit,” *Spiritan Horizons* 9 (Fall, 2014), 66-72, here 69.

⁸Pope John Paul II, Apostolic Constitution On Catholic Universities, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (August 15, 1990), no. 4.

⁹Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1997), 187.

¹⁰Lois Malcolm, “Mortimer Adler, Paulo Freire, and Teaching Theology in a Democracy,” *Teaching Theology and Religion* 2.2 (June, 1999), 77-88.

¹¹Christian Smith, “Is Moralistic Therapeutic Deism the New Religion of American Youth? Implications for the Challenge of Religious Socialization and Reproduction,” *Passing on the Faith*, ed. James L. Heft (New York: Fordham University Press, 2007), 60. See also Christian Smith and Melissa Lundquist Denton, *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹²Smith, “Is Moralistic Therapeutic Deism the New Religion of American Youth?” 61.

¹³Smith, “Is Moralistic Therapeutic Deism the New Religion of American Youth?” 64.

¹⁴Smith, Smith, “Is Moralistic Therapeutic Deism the New Religion of American Youth?” 67-68.

¹⁵Congregation of the Holy Spirit, *General Chapter 1998 Maynooth – Ireland* (Rome: Generalate, 1999), 99.

¹⁶My aim here is not to document student learning but simply to share several strategies I use to negotiate the pedagogical challenges described here and reflect on their consonance with a Spiritan ethos. Readers who wish to delve more deeply into literature on Catholic higher education and theological pedagogy can find a number of valuable resources in the journals *Teaching Theology and Religion* and the *Journal of Catholic*

Higher Education.

¹⁷My approach resonates with the “spectrum pedagogy” described in Joel Heim and Nelia Beth Scovill, “A Spectrum pedagogy for Christian Ethics: respecting Difference without resorting to Relativism,” *Teaching Theology and Religion* 13.4 (October 2010), 350-70.

¹⁸For an argument against the moral telos of education see Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008). For a defense of teaching as a moral undertaking see bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1994).