

A National Qualitative Study on Catholic Campus Ministry



*A Report Prepared for the
United States Conference of
Catholic Bishops
Secretariat of Catholic Education*

Maureen K. Day, Ph.D.,
Franciscan School of Theology

Linda M. Kawentel, Ph.D.,
University of Notre Dame

A National Qualitative Study on Catholic Campus Ministry

*A Report Prepared for the
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
Secretariat of Catholic Education*



Maureen K. Day, Ph.D.,
Franciscan School of Theology

Linda M. Kawentel, Ph.D.,
University of Notre Dame

Foreword

Building on *A National Study on Catholic Campus Ministry*, 2017, this *Qualitative Study on Catholic Campus Ministry* sought to deepen our understanding of the data previously gathered.

Through interviews, the research team was able to address some questions that emerged in the October 2017 symposium, where participants worked to unpack the quantitative data. For example, the quantitative survey raised questions about how the terms “vocation” or “evangelization” were being interpreted. The interview process offered greater insight into how people were interpreting various questions. The interviews also allowed campus ministers to describe concepts like vocation, evangelization, or their relationship with Jesus, in their own words. As we come to understand their perspective more fully, we recognize a greater unity of purpose within the diversity of campus ministry.

The fruits of the 45 interviews, yielded additional insights on topics like blended ministries and parish bridging. The perspective gained through the qualitative study will help to strengthen campus ministry for the task at hand: the engagement and empowerment of women and men of faith on college campuses. As bishops, we support, encourage and offer our pastoral presence to this essential ministry.

In the spirit of Saint John Henry Newman, may we embrace the definite service God has committed to us. May we recognize that we are a link in a chain, a bond of connection between persons. May each of us be preachers of truth in our own place. May we keep his commandments and serve him through our calling.

Auxiliary Bishop Fernand Cheri
Archdiocese of New Orleans
Catholic Campus Ministry Association, Episcopal Liaison

Bishop John M. Quinn
Diocese of Winona-Rochester
Higher Education Working Group, Chairman

Bishop Michael Barber, SJ
Diocese of Oakland
Committee on Catholic Education, Chairman

Scripture quotes are taken from the New American Bible, Revised Edition, copyright © 2010, 1991, 1986, 1970, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Inc., Washington, DC. All rights reserved.

Quotes from Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis, copyright © Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City State. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2020, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, DC. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Interviews and Demographics..... 3

Section 1. Work: Vocation, Joys, and Challenges 5

Section 2. Campus Ministry Cultures: Ministering to Students,
Relationship with Jesus, Evangelization, and Outreach 14

Section 3. Insights for Campuses Using
Both Professional and Missionary Campus Ministers 24

Section 4. Preparing Students for Parish Life After Graduation 33

Conclusion 38

Acknowledgments 41

Detailed Methods 42

Executive Summary

In 2017 the US bishops commissioned a quantitative survey that examined the state of Catholic campus ministry in the United States, the findings of which have shed light on many aspects of Catholic campus ministry within higher education. However, it has also raised further questions. As is often the case with close-ended instruments like surveys, those examining the data at the 2017 Notre Dame symposium raised questions of underlying meaning, sought nuance, and wanted to better understand unexpected findings. It became clear that a follow-up qualitative study could more closely examine a smaller population of Catholic campus ministers through interviews, which would be extraordinarily helpful for a fuller understanding of the data from the original quantitative survey. Dr. Maureen Day (Principal Investigator, Franciscan School of Theology), Dr. Linda Kawentel (Co-Principal Investigator, University of Notre Dame) and Dr. Brian Starks (Kennesaw State University) formed a research team to interview 45 Catholic campus ministers in their respective geographic regions. The research team believed that open-ended interviews would help to better comprehend the findings from the 2017 quantitative survey, illuminate the deeper meaning within the quantitative survey responses and address the questions raised at the symposium. This qualitative study was financially supported through two funding agencies: the USCCB (Secretariat of Catholic Education) and the Religious Research Association (Constant H. Jacquet Research Award). The pages that follow highlight this study's methodology and some of the major findings as well as propose best practices given these findings.

This report discusses four major findings.

1) Work: Vocation, Joys, and Challenges

The previous 2017 quantitative survey sought to understand job satisfaction among campus ministers. However, the quantitative survey could not describe how campus ministers understand the nature of their work and the various ways they find meaning in what they do. In interviewing campus ministers, the research team sought to understand how campus ministers perceive the significance and meaning of their work. They also wanted to let campus ministers say in their own words what they found most rewarding and most challenging about their work. Interview data collected as part of this qualitative study found that most campus ministers see their work as relating to their vocation, which in turn gives meaning to what they do. The qualitative study also found that campus ministers experience the greatest joy in their work when they are working directly with students and are able to accompany students on their faith journeys. Conversely, the most challenging aspects of campus ministry work involved long and erratic work hours, heavy administrative work and encounters with clericalism. These, and other challenges, are discussed in further detail in this report, along with suggestions to help improve the work lives of campus ministers.

“Cor ad cor loquitur // Heart speaks to heart”

—St. John Newman

2) Campus Ministry Cultures: Ministering to Students, Relationship with Jesus, Evangelization, and Outreach

The 2017 quantitative survey suggested there may be important theological differences

among today's campus ministers. Qualitative studies allow respondents to qualify, reframe or redefine the question in a way that reflects the depth or nuance of their beliefs. While the quantitative survey found much variation, and perhaps division, among some ideas central to campus ministry, these interviews demonstrated that when ministers were able to exercise a greater degree of agency in answering the questions, there was more room for agreement. Differences remained, but these had more to do with specific dimensions of a concept rather than an acceptance or rejection of it. An awareness of the campus ministry culture allows everyone to offer more reflective and responsible ministry.

3) Insights for Campuses Using Both Professional and Missionary Campus Ministers

The previous 2017 survey showed both pastoral differences and similarities among degree-educated and missionary-trained campus ministers.¹ In the survey report, the similarities were discussed as opportunities for cooperation, and the distinctions provided opportunities for coordination (within or across campuses, depending upon staffing contexts). However, in interviewing ministers who are familiar with mixed professional/missionary settings (either through direct experiences or conversations

with colleagues), the reality of collaboration, cooperation or coordination is far more complicated than the survey findings indicated. These interviews illuminated a range of experiences—both successful and challenging—with respect to collaboration and cooperation between missionary and professional campus ministers. This section outlines some of the principles that lead to better ministerial collaboration and provides points for consideration when determining a) whether missionaries would benefit an existing ministry and b) how to facilitate the integration with that ministry staff.

4) Preparing Students for Parish Life After Graduation

The previous quantitative survey did not specifically investigate the preparation of students for parish life following graduation. However, many studies have pointed to the declining presence of young adults in parish life. To what extent does college campus ministry help to mitigate this absence? How can campus ministry be even more effective? This section examines four ideas that emerged from the interviews: 1) challenge the students with greater responsibility and leadership, 2) facilitate students' transitions both into and out of campus ministry, 3) partner with nearby parishes and 4) provide mentor relationships for students and young adults.

¹ Professional campus ministers (71% of quantitative survey respondents) tend to possess academic training and often expect to have a long-term career in campus ministry. Missionaries (24% of quantitative survey respondents) have a 5-6 week initial training, ongoing mentorship, regional training and regular team development; they typically serve Catholic college students for a limited period of time. For more on this distinction, see p. 8 of the quantitative survey report.

Interviews and Demographics

The 45 interviews were semi-structured and open-ended, exploring five main themes that emerged from the symposium: vocation, student concerns, personal formation, language, and mission. The *vocation* section examined the extent to which ministers feel a sense of call to their ministry and, importantly, what exactly does “calling” mean. It also looked at the practical aspects of vocation, such as the types of job duties that fall to campus ministers as well as their job satisfaction; some of these findings are discussed in the first section of this report. The *student concerns* segment of the interview asked campus ministers to weigh in on two issues found in the student survey data of the previous 2017 survey: mental health and student prayer life. The quantitative survey found that students reported a higher concern with mental health issues than anticipated as well as struggles within their prayer life; campus ministers were able to share their experiences on these points, some of which inform the third section to this report. The *personal formation* section asked the ministers to describe the most significant aspects of their formation and the subjective or intangible fruits these bear, such as confidence or proficiency with particular tasks. It also asked what types of continuing education, formation and professional support they would find most helpful; some of these questions informed the first, second, and third sections. The *language* segment looked more deeply at some of the words and phrases used in the quantitative survey that, upon further reflection, were ambiguous, such as evangelization, relationship with Christ, conversion, piety, and holiness; some of these are discussed in the second section. The section on *mission* examined the primary “target audience” of the campus minister, paying special attention

to the ways Catholic campus ministry does or does not reach beyond Catholic students, such as charitable outreach or hosting campus-wide events (i.e., including pastoral care and engagement with university faculty and staff as well as non-Catholic students); some of these findings are discussed in the second and fourth sections.

As is often the case with studies that employ open-ended, semi-structured interview questions, the team provided some direction to the interviews, but also wanted the conversations to be driven by the interviewees themselves. Some unexpected but important topics emerged and comprise the third and fourth sections of this report: discussing mixed ministries and the post-graduation university-to-parish transition, respectively. These sections both generated helpful pastoral insights from those in the field. With the exception of one interview in which the recording device stopped recording unbeknownst to the interviewer, interviews lasted 34-110 minutes, with a mean of 72 minutes. Quotes were not altered unless conventional punctuation indicates otherwise.

This qualitative study was able to closely approximate the national demographics of the previous survey data, indicating that the participants of this study are representative of those who took the 2017 survey (see Table 1). These populations were very similar to one another on measures of gender and ordination/religious status, but more diverse on ethnic identity. Education levels were modestly higher among those interviewed in comparison to the survey population. Ministerial models—discussed as office-based, parish-based, center-based, diocesan and missionary in the survey report—were very similar between these two studies, as well.

Table 1. Comparing Interviewees with Survey Respondents

	Interviewees (N=45)	Survey respondents (N=1,117)
Male	62%	57%
Female	38%	43%
Laypersons	69%	69%
Religious or ordained men	27%	26%
Women religious	4%	5%
Identify as white	73%	86%
Identify solely as white	67%	-
Highest degree —four-year	24%	33%
Highest degree —master’s	66%	47%
Highest degree —doctorate	7%	8%
Some type of graduate degree	73%	65%
Ministry-related degree	69%	60%
On-campus, office-based model	44%	31%
Parish-based model	11%	14%
Center-based model	16%	20%
Diocesan model	9%	6%
Missionary model	20%	24%

As the demographics of the interviewees approximate those who took the quantitative survey, the findings within this report provide elaboration and clarification of many of the themes in the previous survey as well as offering readers additional insights. However, the sample size prevents the research team from making clear comparisons within the groups outlined above. It is not methodologically sound to compare even larger subgroups, such as men and women, due to important differences within those subgroups. For example, in comparing men and women, there is actually a significant difference in religious status within those groups. Among the seventeen women in this qualitative study, two are women religious. However, among the twenty-eight men in this study, twelve are ordained. Therefore, it is difficult to know whether the differences one observes between men and women are truly attributable to gender or if these have more to do with religious status. Whereas comparisons within subgroups are best left to the larger, quantitative survey dataset, interview data is most effective for exploring open-ended themes, experiences and understandings in the lives of Catholic campus ministers broadly. The number of times a specific theme arose is noted in the Quantified Responses, which can be found online at www.usccb.org/qualitativereport.

Before proceeding, it is important to mention a drawback to both the campus ministry quantitative survey and the qualitative interview study, namely the methods utilized in both studies only permit the study of campus ministers' *perceptions* of ministry. This is not the same as the *reality* of ministry. For example, if campus ministers claim that they are finding students more interested in Eucharistic adoration than previously, there is no way to empirically verify this. Even if a campus does keep numbers on these things, this would not provide *national* numbers that would illuminate

the bigger picture. Additionally, campus numbers could not say whether the campus ministry attracts a certain type of Catholic (and not others), nor is there another survey or interview study from a decade back that would allow this project's research team to track national perceptions longitudinally. In short, when campus ministers perceive changes, readers need to take those perceptions for what they are:

Section 1. Work: Vocation, Joys, and Challenges

The previous 2017 survey primarily addressed the issue of work by asking campus ministers about their satisfaction with different aspects of their ministry. Campus ministers were asked to rate how satisfied they were with the following: relationships with students, relationships with colleagues, student participation, opportunities for professional development and ministerial formation, workload, availability of sabbaticals and leaves, physical facilities, compensation package, their program budget, the process of program evaluation, and their reporting and accountability structures. Understanding how satisfied campus ministers are with their work was important for the USCCB and campus ministry organizations to know, as employee satisfaction levels are indicative of the health of an organization. However, the study of work encompasses more than just assessing job satisfaction. This section of the report will discuss what the interview team learned about how campus ministers understand the nature of their work and where they find meaning in it. This section also outlines what campus ministers described as the greatest joys and most pressing challenges of their work. At the end of this section, some best practices for dealing with workplace challenges are presented.

The Vocation of Campus Ministry

Campus ministers work in a variety of ministerial settings. Some work on large university

perceptions. This does not mean that they are irrelevant, but perceptions are more helpful in understanding attitudes about reality than reality itself. This qualitative study, coupled with the 2017 quantitative survey, provides readers with a clear snapshot of the concerns, strategies and theological moorings of Catholic campus ministers in the United States today.

campuses, others are employed at small liberal arts colleges. Some are employed by institutions of higher learning, while others work for a diocese, parish, or missionary group. Some work as part of large teams, while others work alone. There are campus ministry directors responsible for leading large campus ministry teams while other campus ministers follow the direction of their supervisors. Because of the variety of contexts in which they work, campus ministers do not all perform the same types of tasks at work. Interviews with campus ministers revealed a variety of work tasks. Most common, campus ministers said that they performed administrative tasks, led Bible studies, engaged in pastoral accompaniment, mentored students, and planned/led retreats. However, some campus ministers performed a variety of other duties. These included fundraising, directing the community service department at their institution, and teaching theology courses. When asked what types of tasks she did at her institution, one interviewee responded, "Everything! This is not a joke." She then went on to describe how she leads public prayer at her institution, hires the priests to preside at Mass, leads all the social justice programming on the campus, and sits on a variety of college committees. Another interviewee with similar responsibilities described her job as a "catch-all." On top of increasing administrative work, she planned all liturgies at her Catholic college,

led multiple student groups, and served on several college committees.

Despite the varied tasks of campus ministry work, a common theme throughout the interviews was that campus ministers largely understood their work as a vocation, or a call from God. While the 2017 quantitative survey found that about 40% of campus ministers identified “a sense of call” as one of their two most influential factors in their decision to become a campus minister, linking a sense of call or vocation to campus ministry work was nearly universal among interview participants. Nearly all interviewees understood the word “vocation” to mean a call from God, and most believed that they had a calling to work in ministry. However, their sense of calling manifested in different ways. Some campus ministers believed that God had called them to work specifically with college students in a campus ministry context.

“Your vocation is something more: it is a path guiding your many efforts and actions towards service to others.”

—Pope Francis,
Christus Vivit no. 225

Others saw themselves called to ministry more broadly, with campus ministry being one particular way that they were able to live out their vocational call.

While most interview participants held a broad understanding of vocation as a calling from

God, many simultaneously connected it to one’s state in life. Over half of interview participants made a distinction between a calling or vocation to a state in life (e.g., vocations to marriage, priesthood and religious life) and a

calling to ministry or discipleship. One campus minister working in a Newman Center described this distinction in terms of vocation as a big “V” and vocation as a little “v”:

I think that obviously when people use the word “vocation” it’s like the capital V thing, in terms of priests or religious life, married life, single life, whatever it might be. I think I definitely do consider the work that I’m in a vocation, in and of itself... the small v. I think that vocation, it’s grounded in God-given purpose, I think, so when I think of small v vocation it can be in a way synonymous with career, it can be in a way synonymous with the work that you do, but I think the difference between career and vocation lies in the purpose for which you do it, or the purpose for which you chose it. I would say both of those aspects, so I think that lowercase v vocation is what your relationship with the Lord has led you to spend your time doing.²

Most campus ministers saw both understandings of vocation as valid and important. Moreover, the two understandings of vocation sometimes overlapped, as was often seen in interviews with priests and vowed religious. One chaplain described this well, saying, “My primary vocation would be priesthood. And I would say the university chaplaincy is a vocation within that. In other words, it’s a call... in the course of my priestly ministry, it was a call from the Lord, led by the Spirit within it.”

This discussion of vocation is important in that it shows that campus ministers feel called to their work and see what they do as not simply a job or career. Notably, academic studies have found that people who view their work as a

2 All quotes of 100 words or more will appear as block quotes for readability.

calling are more likely to be satisfied with their work than those who see it as a job or career.³ Researchers have found that this is because those who view their work as a vocation impart greater meaning and purpose to what they do, which is linked to high levels of well-being at work. Thus, campus ministers will find more meaning and fulfillment in their work when they are part of ministries and organizations that help them to live out their call from God.

The Joys of Campus Ministry Work

In addition to understanding how campus ministers perceive their work, the research team also wanted to determine what in their work is generative. As mentioned above, the previous quantitative survey asked campus ministers to assess their satisfaction with a number of job-related conditions and found that campus ministers expressed the highest levels of job satisfaction in the area of student relationships. One limitation to the quantitative methodological approach is that it does not allow campus ministers to say in their own words what they find most rewarding or challenging about their work, instead only giving them a limited number of options to assess. This subsection reveals what campus ministers themselves described as most important and rewarding about their work.

The interviews revealed varying rewards associated with campus ministry work, some of which were certainly subjective. Some campus ministers expressed joy at being able to work in an intellectual or academic setting. Others enjoyed working for an institution that

emphasized community. Still others appreciated being able to work with and assist marginalized populations (determined by race, class, etc.) and having a job that allowed them to also live out their faith. However, for those interviewed as part of the qualitative study, being able to see students grow or stay connected to their faith was a particularly rewarding aspect of campus ministry work. In fact, it was the most commonly mentioned joy of being a campus minister. As one interviewee put it, “The rewarding piece for me is, honestly, it’s getting to be a part of a student’s life in the time in their life where they’re making decisions that affect the rest of their lives... I feel very privileged to be a part of that and it’s very rewarding. To see somebody coming in as a freshman and how much they’ve changed graduating as a senior, it’s very rewarding.” This sentiment was echoed in many other interviews. Another interviewee, a priest ministering at a large public university, spoke of the joy that comes with being able to see a transformation year after year, “Well, every day when you receive you know, the students

come, whether they discuss spiritually or they discuss their problems or they come for the sacrament. Like the Sacrament of Reconciliation and all of that... It’s always some kind of invitation to be able to be transformed, and not just that, to see a newness of something in a person. If you see that day by day and then year by year and suddenly you know, wow. What are you going to say? I’m just grateful.” That campus ministers enjoy witnessing and experiencing student growth corroborates findings from the 2017 survey. Campus ministers interviewed

My soul
proclaims the
greatness of the
Lord; / my spirit
rejoices in God
my savior.”

– Luke 1:46-47

3 For a review of research on callings and work outcomes, see Wrzesniewski, A. (2012). “Callings,” in *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, eds K. Cameron and G. Spreitzer (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

as part of the qualitative study experienced the most joy in their work with students. However, it was not just working with young people that made their work worthwhile. Key here was the accompaniment aspect of their work, and the results that followed. Professional campus ministers and missionaries felt great joy in accompanying students on their faith journeys and seeing the fruit of their labor in the conversion and growth experiences of their students. This gave meaning and significance to the work they did. In fact, interviews demonstrated that when campus ministers felt like they had made a difference in the lives of students, they felt confirmed that they had a vocation to campus ministry work. This confirmation gave them strength to continue on in their ministry work.

The importance of seeing results was particularly exemplified in one interview. This interviewee, a lay woman working at a Catholic institution, was able to witness a transformation in one of her former students that was due, in part, to her ministry work. This experience helped confirm for the interviewee that she did have a vocation as a campus minister. Recalling the experience, she said, “There was a young woman... who was a part of our intern program and I watched over the course of the year, someone who came in very hesitant... to her relationship with God, but said, ‘Yes.’ And watched her dive into what we offered... in terms of challenging her to go deeper with her faith, of asking her to trust in God and to trust in the gifts that she’s been given to lead others. And seeing her transform completely to the point where she actually has ended up.” The young woman now works in campus ministry. Seeing this transformation was reaffirming to the interviewee, who went on to say:

She would have never been doing that and I’m not saying that was me, but those moments, those transformational

moments, those moments of conversion, not of faith but of heart and mind, I can’t help but say that those are fruits that mean to me that we’re doing something right. And I don’t know that, again, that’s not just on me, ‘cause there’s so many staff members and students around her that helped with that but that does give me, it gives me hope and it gives me a little bit more energy to get up and do that again next year with the next students that I encounter.

This case illustrates that experiencing student growth is not only a rewarding aspect of campus ministry work but also helps campus ministers feel confirmed in their vocations, which in turn, sustains them in their ministry work.

Challenges of Campus Ministry Work

In addition to investigating the rewards of campus ministry work, the qualitative study also sought to better understand the challenges faced by those working in campus ministry today. As noted above, campus ministers work in a variety of contexts, and each context can bring unique challenges. However, some common challenges were seen across different ministry settings. Among those most commonly mentioned in the qualitative study were long work hours, the burden of administrative work, and the issue of clericalism within campus ministry.

“First of all, remember that [in] every good work you undertake, you must pray to him most earnestly to bring it to perfection.”

—Rule of Benedict

1. Long and Erratic Work Hours

One common challenge facing campus ministers is long and irregular work hours. While work-to-family spillover has been an on-going concern within studies of clergy wellbeing,⁴ little research has focused on the work hours of campus ministers. Many campus ministers reported working not only long hours, but also very irregular hours, which sometimes affected their personal and family life. When asked to describe what most challenged her about campus ministry work, one interviewee answered “the crazy hours.” She went on to describe her upcoming schedule to her interviewer, “I work frequent weekends. I’m off this weekend, but then I have to work every weekend for the next two and a half months. I don’t have two days off in a row. I work a couple nights a week at least. Sometimes three. I’m still expected to be here most of the day, eight to five. The hours are really challenging, and it’s just hard to have much of a life outside of this other than what I have to do for my family. Those two things combined made me think about leaving.”

In cases where campus ministers reported feeling burnt out, long work hours, such as those described above, were often an issue. It is unclear what the root causes of this near-universal experience of burnout are; it could be a result of understaffing, ineffective coordination, poor organization, or something else entirely. Exploring what might be depleting the energy of their campus ministers would offer valuable insights for campuses and dioceses.

2. Heavy Administrative Work

Another frequently mentioned challenge of

working in campus ministry was the amount of administrative work. That campus ministers dislike administrative tasks is certainly not a new finding. The 2017 Survey found that administrative tasks, such as program evaluation and budget work, were among the least satisfying aspects of campus ministry work. One campus minister, who worked at a Catholic institution, described his administrative work as consisting of paper and meetings. However, the interview findings nuance what was found in the survey about administrative work. Although campus ministers generally did not like having to do administrative work, many did recognize it as important and necessary. Campus ministers grew frustrated, however, when administrative tasks began overshadowing those parts of their work that they most enjoyed, such as accompanying students in spiritual direction. One campus minister described this aptly, “Last year, I came to the realization that I have to avoid too much administering and not enough ministering. So I had a conversation with my boss, ‘I love college students. But I’m starting to not like that other side of my job that keeps me from being with the students.’” Similar to the effect of long and erratic work hours, an overabundance of administrative tasks also led campus ministers to feel burnt out and question their decision to work in campus ministry.

3. Clericalism in Campus Ministry Work

A third challenge to campus ministry work that emerged from the qualitative study was the issue of clericalism. As Pope Francis wrote in a March 2016 letter, “Clericalism forgets that the visibility and sacramentality of the Church belong to all the People of God (cf. *Lumen*

4 Wells, C., Probst, R., McKeown, J., Mitchem, R., & Whiejong, S. (2012). The Relationship Between Work-Related Stress and Boundary-Related Stress Within the Clerical Profession. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 51(1), 215-230; Wells, C. (2013). The Effects of Work-Related and Boundary-Related Stress on the Emotional and Physical Health Status of Ordained Clergy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62(1), 101-114; Wilson, Alan. (2015). Nigel Peyton and Caroline Gattrell, *Managing Clergy Lives: Obedience, Sacrifice, Intimacy*. Theology. 118. 225-226.

Gentium, nn. 9-14), not only to the few chosen and enlightened.”⁵ He also cautions against a clericalism that is concerned with “dominating spaces” and encourages lay people to see themselves as “part of the faithful Holy People of God and thus are protagonists of the Church and of the world.” The lay campus ministers who were interviewed as part of this qualitative study found clericalism to be especially challenging. Several spoke of witnessing clericalism in decision-making around who was selected to make ministerial decisions on campus, who was asked to lead non-Eucharistic liturgies, and who had opportunities for advancement within their campus ministries.

Both male and female lay professional campus ministers described clericalism as a challenging aspect of being in campus ministry. Despite their educational backgrounds and experience working with young adults in ministry settings, several professional campus ministers described instances of clericalism on their campuses in which lay campus ministers were excluded or subjugated in the decision-making processes. Further, those at Catholic institutions described situations in which lay campus ministers with comparable formation were not perceived as having the same legitimacy to provide advice as priest campus ministers. This issue was highlighted in the experiences of a senior female campus minister, who described the frustration of being passed over in favor of a junior priest on staff to give input about student affairs, “The higher up, the college administration, still defers to the priest campus minister who, within the structure of the college, is a rung below me, but he’s the one who is called upon, asked for input, asked to represent the department... That is all due to being a lay woman and not an ordained man.” In assessing the issue, she identified both her gender and her status as a laywoman as not

as important to her administration as that of an ordained male priest.

Other professional campus ministers spoke of experiencing clericalism in the types of tasks they were assigned. While recognizing the role of the priest in Eucharistic liturgies, some lay campus ministers expressed frustration over the lack of opportunity to minister to students in non-Eucharistic liturgical contexts. Instead, these ministers reported being assigned the bulk of the administrative work over their priest-counterparts. One lay campus minister described a situation in which the lay ministers were largely assigned administrative tasks, which were not expected of the ordained staff, “Lay ministers on staff, a lot of times talk about [how] we get the grunt work. We run all the programs. And I know other ministries run things differently. But here, the priests do the sacraments and show up to things but we do all the administrative stuff and make things happen. Then they pop in for reconciliation on a retreat or something like that. We see that in staff meetings a lot too.” This sentiment was echoed by several other interviewees.

A third manifestation of clericalism pertained to career opportunities. Some professional lay campus ministers felt frustrated that either they or colleagues at other institutions were passed over for leadership positions in favor of a less experienced priest. As indicative that “we’re living in a time of increased dysfunctional or unhealthy clericalism,” one lay campus minister described what he perceived as a common scenario of the newly ordained, despite their lack of experience with young adults, being elevated to leadership positions over senior professional campus ministers:

I’ve been in situations where there’s been a staff full of campus ministers, it’s not

5 https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/letters/2016/documents/papa-francesco_20160319_pont-comm-america-latina.html

happened to me, but many of my colleagues, who have 10, 12, 15, 20 years of experience and they'll be passed over for a directorship position because, this young priest who is two years ordained wanted to be the director... In our church, our church is deeply entrenched in this clericalism. So, long story short, if I had a collar, all doors would be open to me in ministry. I would be a voice at the table, no matter where I was sitting. As a layperson, I don't have that. I never will have that, even though, I will say, I have the credentials and the experience.

These experiences of perceived clericalism greatly bothered these campus ministers. Professional lay campus ministers, like this interviewee, saw themselves as qualified professionals, specifically with respect to education, training and work experience in campus ministry. However, they felt they or their colleagues were passed over for leadership positions because of an assumption that ordained clergy, without these campus competencies, were more qualified to hold those positions. Creating written policies that clearly outline procedures for hiring, advancement, and key occupational responsibilities would help mitigate clericalism.

Suggestions for Thriving in Campus Ministry

The above issues certainly presented challenges for campus ministers. However, the research team also heard valuable insights as to how campus ministers have sought to ameliorate problems associated with long working hours, administrative workload, and clericalism. These campus ministers' common sense practices—such as personal retreats, spiritual direction, and time with friends—helped campus ministers counter burnout, which could result from the three aforementioned challenges. In the paragraphs below, four suggestions are

offered to help campus ministers better thrive in their ministry work.

1. Tending to One's Call

This qualitative study found that campus ministers who tended to their vocational call experienced positive benefits. In addition to finding that most campus ministers connected their work to their vocation, the interviews highlighted that feeling affirmed and renewed in one's vocation was important to campus ministers' personal well-being. Questioning or doubting one's call

“Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, ‘Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?’ ‘Here I am,’ I said; ‘send me!’”

– Isaiah 6:8

was associated with thoughts of leaving campus ministry. One lay minister described how she was considering leaving campus ministry for parish ministry because, as she put it, “I'm unable to do some of the things that I really do feel called to do. And that my gifts are suited for, I think.” Other interviewees, when asked about whether they had ever considered leaving campus ministry, spoke of times in which they doubted they had correctly interpreted God's call and wondered whether God was potentially calling them to do something different.

Although professional campus ministers and missionaries can certainly be called to new types of ministry or to leave ministry altogether, those who feel called to ministry still need to tend to their vocations. Those interview participants who were happy in their work spoke of the importance of both taking time for vocational renewal as well as having experiences of vocational affirmation, even after their initial discernment into campus ministry. Two ways in which campus ministers tended to their

vocations were by participating in regular spiritual direction and regularly going on personal retreats. Both practices helped campus ministers reaffirm their call to ministry. Moreover, spiritual direction and retreats had the added benefit of helping campus ministers cope with or prevent ministry burnout. One lay professional campus minister spoke of the importance of annual retreats, and her appreciation that her campus ministry department included staff retreats in its budget, "I think something that we do here at the [campus ministry center] that has helped me is there's annual retreats given to all campus ministers. We choose where we want to go. There's a budget for that. All campus ministers are able to go on retreat. That's very rare. That doesn't exist in campus ministries typically. I go to a spiritual director also." For campus ministers who are able to attend retreats, there were clear vocational benefits.

In addition to retreats and spiritual direction, campus ministers also tended to their vocations by paying attention to feedback about their work and regularly retesting God's call. Positive affirmations are certainly an important tool in the discernment processes. However, positive affirmation was not only important in initial discernment into campus ministry, but also throughout one's tenure in this ministry. When long-term campus ministers discussed why, in spite of its challenges, they stayed in campus ministry, many told stories of continuing to be reaffirmed in their campus ministry by their students. One laywoman working at a Catholic college described a recent experience of this, "One of my students five years ago called me up and said, 'Hey. I know I haven't kept in contact, but I think you made a difference in my life.' I was like, 'I don't remember this kid. Who are you? Tell me again.' And so on and so forth. It's being reaffirmed with the students... that you're good at this." Many

interviewees noted paying attention to these affirming experiences and continuing to reflect on them. Such experiences provided them with sustenance during the stressful times of working in campus ministry.

2. Practicing Self-Care

In addition to tending to one's vocation, self-care is also important to thriving in campus ministry work. While many campus minister interviewees spoke of experiencing burnout from a heavy workload with long hours, a significant number of others did not experience burnout. When the interviewers asked why, campus ministers gave a number of answers, many of which connected back to the practice of self-care. Self-care entails tending to one's own well-being, and in the case of campus ministers, can take on many forms. Campus ministers often reported having several self-care practices, such as this Catholic sister working in campus ministry:

I definitely need my days where I am in my cocoon. Whether I'm reading, or I am just going to the beach for a walk. I love to go to a particular place where I can just look out into the horizon. Where I know I have a prolonged time just to be able to, perhaps, journal. Where I'm able to read a good book. Where I can disconnect intentionally, and it's not always easy, from technology. And other ways of self-care would be just sitting around a table, or on our patio with my community members, having a glass of wine and just debriefing. Chatting. Talking about life. Sharing a good movie together. Eating ice cream. Definitely exercise, that would also be a very important way for me to be able to just be in the moment of things other than always having to carry something or other about ministry.

Many of the self-care practices mentioned above are the same as those utilized by secular professionals: leisure reading, walking, disconnecting from technology, relaxing with friends, having deep conversations, sharing meals, and, of course, exercise. However, they are also important for those in ministry work. For lay campus ministers with families, self-care also meant prioritizing family time when they are not working, and setting boundaries between their work and home life. For vowed religious, this looked similar, as they too recognized the importance of community and making time for meaningful relationships.

Importantly, for professional campus ministers and missionaries alike, self-care also meant taking time for daily prayer and not neglecting their own personal faith practices. Scheduling prayer was an important practice for many campus ministers, with some prioritizing it during the work day. One interviewee shared her practice of integrating time in her college's chapel into her work day, "I have started being more forceful about setting times on my calendar where I'm not allowing meetings so that I can have even just a little bit of time to go sit in the chapel because, honestly, sometimes it's those small breaks. I run these busy-persons retreats with students. A lot of it's about a way to find God in your day and how do you take time out. Those end up being very helpful for me because then I institute that practice for myself. I can't really mentor someone if I'm not preparing." Being able to spend time in prayer during the day helped campus ministers like this one not only alleviate burnout but also set an example for their students to follow.

3. Transforming Mindsets around Administrative Tasks

Mindset was also crucial for how campus ministers handled the challenges of their work.

While administrative work was seen as a common frustration among campus ministers, some dealt with this workload better than others.

"We should be shining lamps, giving light to all around us."

—Catherine McAuley

The research team found that ministers who were able to connect their administrative work with a sense of mission reported less frustration around these tasks. For example, one interviewee working at a large Catholic university, spoke of trying to have a different mindset around email:

I think email can be the bane of everyone's existence in the modern world. If you're responding to an email from a freshman who's interested in becoming Catholic, you have to still get the email done, but you see it as... that it is a stepping stone on this person's journey in relationship with the Lord. So, it brings new importance to even the mundane work of responding to emails... To the extent that all of that is about furthering the Kingdom of God, then it's kind of one of those things where we can take inspiration from St. Therese of Lisieux about like doing even the smallest things with love. Even when you're mindlessly running copies, you see it as advancing an end there.

As evidenced by the above quote, this interviewee connected administrative work such as responding to emails with a sense of evangelization. He also strived to connect the mundane elements of administrative work with advancing the Kingdom of God. When campus ministers were able to have this kind of mindset, they generally reported experiencing less burnout and greater workplace well-being.

“Rejoice in the Lord always. I shall say it again: rejoice! Your kindness should be known to all. The Lord is near. . . . Then the peace of God that surpasses all understanding will guard your hearts and minds in Christ.”

– Philippians 4:4-5, 7

4. Maintaining Supportive and Open Relationships

Lastly, the qualitative study identified the importance of maintaining supportive and open relationships for thriving in campus ministry. Such relationships could include one’s spouse, children, religious community, friends, colleagues, and supervisors. However, the latter two—supervisors and colleagues—were especially important in the interview data. In the case of one campus minister who was struggling with dif-

ferent aspects of her position, positive change came only with greater honesty and communication with her supervisor about her struggles. Having previously worked in a job where “the only time you saw your boss is if you’re in trouble,” she had a difficulty communicating her struggles with her campus ministry supervisor. However, once this campus minister developed a more open relationship with her supervisor,

her struggles at work began to lessen. “Once I made that paradigm shift,” she said, “things fell into place and then it worked out for both of us.” Having good communication with her supervisor helped this interviewee better handle some of the issues she was struggling with, particularly the heavy administrative work that can come with campus ministry. Together, both she and her supervisor developed a plan of action to help her better manage her administrative workload.

The above case is just one example of the fruits of having open and supportive relationships. Yet, while having a good relationship with one’s supervisor is ideal, not all campus ministers were fortunate in this area. Nonetheless, many campus ministers reported the value of having a support network of fellow campus ministers to help them deal with the stresses of ministry work, such as feelings of isolation, frustrations with student involvement, and issues of clericalism. Finding community with other campus ministers—both at their own institutions and in their local communities—helped interviewees to alleviate some of their struggles. These support people provided a refuge and safe place where campus ministers could share their struggles, as in the case of lay ministers dealing with issues of clericalism on their campuses or solo campus ministers experiencing isolation.

Section 2. Campus Ministry Cultures: Ministering to Students, Relationship with Jesus, Evangelization, and Outreach

To understand the culture of today’s ministers more clearly, this section will examine the perception of ministry within four themes: ministering to students, relationship with Jesus, evangelization, and outreach. Many of the questions that gave rise to these four

subsections have their roots in findings from the 2017 quantitative survey. First, there was a very positive perception of “accompaniment” among the ministers, along with less enthusiasm for, or even rejection of “programming”; some nuance and an alternative perspective is

provided here. Second, the survey found that particular ministerial contexts emphasized the student's relationship with Jesus more than others; discovering what may be driving that was a primary question. Third, "evangelization" was likewise favored among certain ministers; understanding this better was a priority. Finally, ministers' formation affected the importance they placed on outreach; this subsection examines outreach projects on today's campuses in greater depth along with other themes common among the ministers. Together these highlight the similarities and distinctions in culture among campus ministers. Some differences are more deep-seated and can lead to difficulties in collaboration. Others are more superficial and point to opportunities for cooperation between ministers or among teams that have complementary emphases. This section offers glimpses of these differences, providing points of discernment for campus ministries to better understand their own culture and the ways it shapes their ministry.

Fostering Student Growth

Campus ministers discussed two main approaches to ministry: accompaniment and programs. Accompaniment occurs on the one-on-one level and the ministers consistently present this ministerial approach as a positive and believe this is where the most profound student growth happens. The importance of accompaniment is noted in recent papal documents, such as *Evangelii Gaudium*. Programs are designed for larger groups and—perhaps because they lack the more intimate, relational dimension of accompaniment—are sometimes discussed in a negative light by the ministers. To be clear, all respondents indicated that they provided both programs (e.g., retreats, "win events" [a missionary organization term], Bible studies, service projects) and relational ministry (e.g., pastoral accompaniment, spiritual

direction, mentoring). The consensus, however, was that student growth happens and is sustained in these more intimate encounters. This is seen most clearly in the near universal importance of "accompaniment" among the ministers. Before moving to the other findings in this section, the authors will pause here to explore this accompaniment/program dualism, as this juxtaposition misses some important truths.

First, there are real practical limits to eliminating programs from the campus ministry toolkit. Specifically, there are simply not enough campus ministers (nor resources to hire many more) to provide spiritual accompaniment to all the students and employees of a university; programs help more students have faith-filled experiences given the obvious resource constraints. Second, there are human reasons to have programs. The intensely personal qualities that accompaniment entails, indeed what makes it so powerful for those who choose this, could be very intimidating for those who are less comfortable with their faith or consider themselves seekers; these may prefer to ease into campus ministry through the relative anonymity of programs. Thirdly, programs create opportunities for invitation. Students inviting other students to programmatic events affords them opportunities to evangelize others. And related, having fellow students to journey with at a retreat or Bible study builds community and helps connect them to other students who want to grow in their faith. Fourth, there are theological and liturgical reasons to have programs. Programs gather. Mass gathers. Prayer vigils for

"You have made us for yourself, O Lord, and our heart is restless until it rests in you."

— St. Augustine

immigrants gather. Liturgy of the hours gathers. Benediction gathers. Retreats gather. Outreach to vulnerable populations gathers. Christ gathered and continues to gather today through these “programs”; the relevance of these should not be dismissed. Fifth, accompaniment should not be romanticized. Ministers, especially when they are not meeting their own relational needs elsewhere, can come to use the pastoral relationship to fulfill their own needs for importance and human connection. Ministers are there to foster a relationship between the person they are serving and God, not to cultivate a person’s dependence upon them. Given these reminders of a more thorough appreciation of both accompaniment and programs, we return to the findings.

Ways of Relating to Jesus

The 2017 quantitative survey found differences in the ways ministers evaluated the students’ relationship with Jesus, differences both according to institution type and ministry model. The survey found that Catholic campuses were least likely to strongly agree that their ministry prepared them for a relationship with Jesus and public campuses were most likely to strongly agree with this. Likewise, office-based ministers were least likely to strongly agree with this and missionaries were most likely to. However, these interviewees universally believed their own relationship with Jesus was central to their faith and ministerial approach; this was present even while the campus ministers themselves had diverse senses of their call to campus ministry. This unity within diversity was possible because of the different emphases campus ministers placed on the person and ministry of Jesus Christ. In their discussions, the interviewees identified four ideas or experiences that fostered their relationship with Jesus: the notion of Jesus as a friend, parish life, sacraments, and prayer. In addition they talked about two ways

of viewing that relationship: as a window into the Trinity and as something to which one gives witness.

The most common theme among the interviewees was that this relationship was a true friendship associated with authentic intimacy, with language such as friend, brother, or spouse being typical, “I think that’s a big part of our job, is to introduce people to Jesus in a living, vibrant way. Not as—I think, too often, students tend to have their development, like Jesus as a father figure rather than as a companion, or even as a friend.” Not surprising given the American context of these interviewees, power differentials can be perceived as a barrier to intimacy; one layman at a Catholic university encouraged a peer-based approach to Jesus. Likewise, a diocesan-based layman shares, “We had our team retreat last week, and the whole retreat was focused on friendship with Jesus, and I have an icon. I’d never seen this before. A friend gave this to me as a tribute of friendship, but it’s an ancient, it’s a fourth century Egyptian icon of Jesus with his arm around a monk. I’ve never seen anything like this, but we spent the whole morning meditating on friendship in general, but friendship with Jesus.” We can experience intimacy with God in the tender embrace of Jesus. Taking all of the above into account, having a relationship with Jesus allows for vulnerability and authenticity before a loving and transformative God.

Parish life is a place in which students cultivate this relationship with Jesus. A concern voiced by the ministers here and elsewhere in the interviews is that campus ministry is almost too good (elaborated in the section examining the campus-parish transition). This sentiment reflects the disconnect in students transitioning to parish life after graduation. The campus community holds a shared context that allows campus ministers to more easily meet the

various needs. Campus ministers know exactly what is going on in the students' lives and can craft retreats, homilies and other events in a way that is extremely vivid and relevant for them. For example, at the start of the school year, the idea of welcome and new beginnings are highlighted. Come finals week, the notion of determination in the homestretch is amplified. For juniors, there are retreats for discerning one's vocation. It is this perpetual relevance of Christ in one's life that helps campus ministry facilitate a relationship with Jesus. However, when the students graduate and move into an ordinary parish, the parish's generalist message may not resonate with them. As one campus minister put it, "I feel like we might give them a great four years but if at the end of it when they go back home, even if they're—let's say their parish life, or whatever, it's a little bit of a dead atmosphere. If they, because of that, choose not to go to Mass then I think we failed, even if they had a great four years. Okay, maybe down the line the seed will have been planted and they'll develop that later on, but if that's just it, then all we are is fun and great events, then it's for naught." Campus ministers want to ensure that this relationship with Jesus is cultivated through liturgy and the life of the Church, which is more than the "fun and great events" they enjoy in campus ministry. Many of the campus ministers deepened their relationship with Jesus during their college years. They want to make sure that students' campus ministry experience helps develop them in a way that grounds them in Jesus through the broader Church.

Ideas to facilitate this transition to parish life are discussed in the fourth section of this report.

Similar to this is the belief that a relationship with Jesus is experienced through the sacraments. When asked how they cultivate their own relationship with Jesus, one lay minister on a Catholic campus responded, "Daily prayer and daily reception of the sacraments. Especially the Eucharist." Others noted that the sacraments should likewise be important for the students' faith. The Church and the sacraments share an obvious connection and many of the respondents who mentioned one of these also mentioned the other.

Campus ministers underscored the importance of prayer in different parts of the interview and some spontaneously mentioned that prayer was central to the relationship they and their stu-

dents have with Jesus, as this laywoman minister at a Catholic campus discussed, "I desire the students to be able to sit and reflect and discern at every moment as they're moving forward and through their prayer of sitting, at times, in silence before we even start with words. And that it's okay to have ups and downs in regards to your relationship with God." Other campus ministers reported specific prayer practices, such as Ignatian retreats, were fundamental to tethering themselves to Christ.

Some campus ministers viewed this relationship to Jesus as a window into the Trinity or as a way to give witness to one's faith. One's relationship with Jesus was also important because

"Take, Lord,
and receive all
my liberty, my
memory, my
understanding,
and my entire
will, all I have
and call my own.
You have given
all to me. To you,
Lord, I return
it. Everything is
yours; do with it
what you will.
Give me only
your love and
your grace, that is
enough for me."

— St. Ignatius of Loyola

Jesus, as fully human and fully divine, provides believers with a tangible way to understand God. A center-based priest emphasized that the person of Jesus gives us a window to the divine, “The relationship with Jesus is not merely the sacrament, or merely a historical person, but the Alpha-Omega. Our relationship with Jesus is ultimately not really a relationship with Jesus, it’s a relationship with...the one who Jesus comes from, or the one who Jesus shares partnership and Trinity.” Recognizing the finiteness of the human mind, this campus minister claims that the earthly life of Jesus grants us access to understanding a God that we cannot fully understand without a relationship to Christ. But the divine and human nature of Jesus goes both ways. In the act of choosing to become human, God expresses love toward creation, as a lay minister with her doctorate elaborated as she recalled conversations with her students:

We’re the only people that I know of whose God thought it was important enough to come see what it was like to be one of us... And that’s how Jesus got here... So we now have a God who knows how you feel, when a loved one dies. It’s evident in the story of Lazarus. We have a God who had parents, we had a God who was not always—[he] disappeared from them, and his parents were searching for him... There isn’t anything that you haven’t experienced now that you know for sure that you have a God who’s experienced that with you.

Through the Incarnation, Jesus is a revelation that we were created by a God who loves us deeply and demonstrates this by living alongside us and experiencing the highs and lows that earthly life entails. And because of this, we can have a relationship with a God who understands us intimately.

Although many campus ministers discussed the various ways they gave witness to their faith, tying this to one’s relationship to Jesus through witnessing was common among the missionary campus ministers, as one said, “[O]ur relationship with Christ is not just an ‘I-thou’ thing, it’s something that’s meant to pour out and to gather in others as well.” And another shared, “If I’m doing that [being a strong Catholic], then I can also live that out as an example to other people who may not totally understand that, or who may struggle with seeing that.” If done well, these missionaries contend, a relationship with Jesus will affect the way one acts in the world and attract others. Our relationship with Jesus should bring others to us.

Examining this section in light of the quantitative survey data is illuminating. It was clear that the vast majority of the campus ministers interviewed believed that a relationship with Jesus was very important. Yet, as discussed above, the survey data indicated that campus ministers on Catholic campuses do not believe their ministries are as effective in cultivating this among their students (just under half strongly agree that students are effectively prepared for a lifelong relationship with Jesus) as the campus ministers at public universities claim they are (roughly two-thirds say this). At first blush, this may seem counterintuitive. Should not a Catholic campus that is steeped in Catholic identity do a better job of facilitating a relationship with Jesus among its students? Two explanations are possible here.

The first is that Catholic campuses take their identity for granted and that a secular campus—that may be indifferent or even hostile to religion—provides a more stark (and therefore more contrasting) context, allowing students to be more conscious of their Catholic identity. This could foster a sense of embattlement between Catholics and the campus. The

interviews do find that campus ministers at public universities are more likely to use combative language when discussing “the world.” But this may have more to do with the higher proportion of missionaries on public campuses; of the six campus ministers who drew upon language of embattlement, five were missionaries.⁶ Although the idea of strong in-group/out-group boundaries could contribute to an emphasis on a relationship with Jesus in a strongly sacred/secular binary, a second explanation is stronger.

More likely it is due to the very different scopes of ministry on Catholic and public campuses. For Catholic universities, most often the ministers are expected—often explicitly stated in their job description—to minister to the whole campus. Campus ministers on Catholic campuses take the lead on ministering to the entire campus: students, staff, faculty and sometimes the neighboring community beyond the university, as well. This means that they partner with non-Catholic student groups, including Muslim, Jewish, Protestant and other faith traditions. They also offer pastoral accompaniment, retreats and other spiritual programming on the students’ terms. For example, when asked if this interfaith context requires avoiding “God” or “Jesus” language, this office-based minister on a Catholic campus responds, “I wouldn’t say we avoid, but we make intentional decisions about when we’re going to focus our prayer, our language on ‘God’ or on ‘Jesus.’” The campus minister goes on to describe the various retreats that are offered to different student

“Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit.”

– Matthew 28:19

audiences throughout the academic year. Retreats that are for students of all faiths, such as a retreat for discerning one’s vocation (in the broad sense), will use “God.” Other retreats that are meant for a Christian audience will rely heavily on “Jesus” and “Christ.” Being sensitive to the variety of faiths they are called to serve requires ministers at Catholic campuses to take a more generally theistic approach with their students at times; they know their audiences and are intentional in their use of language. In contrast, ministers at public universities are often called explicitly to serve the Catholic students and (sometimes) the Catholic staff and faculty; public campuses are perpetually able to make Jesus central. Context matters for public ministry, even while relationship with Jesus matters for all the ministers privately. And an important takeaway here is that ministers of all institution and model types find a relationship with Jesus to be personally meaningful, even while this relationship might manifest in different ways due to their pastoral contexts.

Evangelization

The quantitative survey found a significant difference between missionary-trained ministers and degree-formed campus ministers in the importance they placed on evangelization for students’ growth in faith. Specifically, 90 percent of missionary-trained ministers believed that evangelization was somewhat or very important for students’ faith development compared to only 62 percent of degree-formed campus ministers. At the Notre Dame symposium, one of the participants was confused by

6 The appendix lists seven instances of language of “battle,” but two of these mentions were from the same campus minister. This contrast between campus ministry and the wider society may be a characteristic of the language of missionary organizations or merely a coincidence owing to our small sample.

this finding: “Given the wide array of ways the Church brings Good News to the world, how could any minister not see this as important?”

The interviews indicated that many of the campus ministers answered the survey through a more narrow sense of “evangelization,” as this degree-formed campus minister stated, “I think a lot of people think of evangelization as someone going out and maybe being a little bit in-your-face in a way that’s not very desirable... ‘These are our beliefs, and this is what you need to believe, too, and this is why you should think this.’” Perhaps in their haste to complete an anonymous survey, respondents did not reflect as deeply on the word as they would normally, as she continued, “I do think that [evangelization] is sharing the joy and the love of our gospel and of our faith, but I think there are a number of ways that you can do that... by your action, by the programs that you run, in your conversation, and just your everyday relationships with people, too.” This is a good reminder that methods have an impact on findings, underscoring the value of mixed methods in sociological research.

The vast majority of interviewees found importance in evangelization, even while there were some differences in the details. None of the interviewees advocated a catechism-thumping, “in-your-face” idea of evangelization. Some of them emphasized simply bringing students the goodness of God’s abiding presence, as this lay woman at a private college does, “I’m hoping [they will] be able to turn to God... the moments of joy and the moments of sadness and consolation, to spend and to be able to—yeah—to find community, to find purpose. So there is goodness there but I think yeah, that word [‘evangelization’] can be tricky.” Some emphasized invitation through a more indirect availability, welcome and visibility, like the priest who bakes cookies and practices “intentional

loitering,” meaning he wears religious garb in high-traffic campus areas. Others advocated for a more direct style, approaching strangers, such as this professional minister, “I’m not going to just sit here in my office and wait for people to come to me. I was out all day today with the students and in their place telling them to come and going to them. I see that as key.” And yet they still want to be invitational, not aggressive, as this missionary shares, “Being on campus, making our presence known, but also not trying to be forceful. Because a lot of student organizations on campus come off as very forceful, standing in the middle of the aisle, like here take this pamphlet... We would have a table on campus a couple times a week. So we’d set up a table with our tablecloth and a cut-out pope, and a couple other things, and just be available.” All ministers wanted to bring good news to their campus and they did so in ways that they believed made sense for their gifts and their contexts.

Another major theme among the ministers was relationship, as this priest at a Catholic campus stated, “The mistake in my mind of evangelization is to think that evangelization is the first move. That ultimately it starts with encounter. It starts with encounter where people find themselves. And then it moves to—before you even get to evangelization—to helping people and developing trust. And you do so by listening, by helping them integrate what they’ve got going on in their own lives. And then if you’ve proven through your encounter and your ability to accompany them, then you [are] set up to be able to have a conversation around evangelization.” This priest highlighted not only the priority he gives relational ministry, but also refers to an apprehension discussed above: That evangelization, as a way of teaching the faith, can become pontificating if not coupled with relationship. Evangelization, literally meaning spreading “good news,” must be

experienced as good news by the hearer as well as the speaker; relationship helps ensure this shared understanding.

Outreach: Immersion and Service

The quantitative survey also found distinctions between degree-formed and missionary-trained ministers in their attitudes toward the importance of service activities and their role in student growth. For example, 79 percent of degree-formed ministers identified service or

“You have been told, O mortal, what is good, and what the LORD requires of you: Only to do justice and to love goodness, and to walk humbly with your God”

– Micah 6:8

charitable work as very or moderately important for students’ faith growth compared to 56 percent of missionaries. This study sought to explore that difference in perception, but unearthed important qualitative differences in the ways ministers understand

two forms of outreach: immersion experiences and service projects. These distinctions have ethical and spiritual implications. This subsection will also discuss outreach as an on-ramp into campus ministry, the importance of theological reflection and the ways outreach opportunities facilitate student transformation.

Before discussing the various ways these campus ministers understand service and immersion experiences, we must first define these terms. Here “service” or “service projects” refer to events that gather students to perform some sort of work of mercy, such as a house-build,

for a marginalized group. These often include a time for reflection or debrief, but not always. “Immersions” or “immersion experiences” are relational encounters in which no services are provided, but students instead listen to the stories of a marginalized person or group and observe their way of life, such as eating (but not serving) a meal with residents of a homeless shelter. Immersion experiences will always incorporate reflection or processing.

The Scriptures repeatedly state that those who are in need deserve help from those who are able to assist (e.g., Mt 25); Church teaching underscores that this is a matter of not simply charity, but of justice (e.g., CCC, no. 2446). However, charity and justice work in the US context is complicated. More often than not, power inequalities—including wealth, race and education—are exacerbated in service projects.⁷ Many, but not all, campus ministers voice their concerns over service projects, contrasting these to their own more immersive and relational style, with this laywoman from a Catholic campus sharing:

We don’t do house-building and we don’t dig dirt anymore. There’s no service component, which is probably big for some students. But I think that for me, we need to both dismantle artificial othering but also really have conversations about—we can have a conversation about immigration there because everyone has some kind of—right? And that’s real and it’s not—so probably, it’s interesting because it’s a meta thing. But I took my student leaders down to [Tijuana] and their student leaders met up with us and then we visited a family in the neighborhood and then came back and did a reflection

7 Nina Eliasoph, *The Politics of Volunteering* (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2013). Jerome Baggett, *Habitat for Humanity: Building Private Homes, Building Public Religion* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000).

altogether... I think it would be easier to go down and build a house and have one of the youth group's moms cook us dinner and be like, "Oh... they're so fun." And then, "They're so poor and they're so happy." And then you go home. And that makes me really uncomfortable.

Immersion experiences attempt to emphasize the personhood of someone living in poverty by removing the service component, facilitating an encounter. Although this prevents the students from engaging in works of mercy, it has the benefit of creating a "culture of encounter" that is based on relationship and mutuality, with this laywoman from a different Catholic campus saying, "We advertise it and prepare the students not to do mission or service, but to go and accompany the people and just to meet Christ in the people. That's our way into kind of what we consider some of the dimensions of Catholic social teaching, or helping people see the poor as companions on the journey. More than just people that we are called to [serve]." This paradigm shift reflects an emerging awareness of the need to avoid service projects that obscure the human dignity of the marginalized. Although many campus ministers strive for a more relational and immersive type of community engagement, a significant minority still run traditional service projects. Campuses, centers and dioceses would benefit from a critical examination of the assets and liabilities of service projects, in light of a culture of encounter.

Yet, the inequality that characterizes the typical ways we organize service projects within the

American context can be responsibly managed if one is aware of the common pitfalls. Concerns like othering, romanticizing poverty, another's scarcity causing one to feel grateful for all one has, and charity as a way to quell guilt should not be a part of either service or immersions. Although eliminating service is one way to ensure that these negative aspects do not creep into campus ministry, this is not the only way. This encounter-or-service dilemma poses a false binary. In fact, providing both relationship and material well-being characterize the life and ministry of Jesus. Campus ministers should feel invited to consider the ways they can integrate the separated strands of encounter and service. By recognizing the power dynamics that organize the benefactor/beneficiary relationship, campus ministers might endeavor to create service projects informed by solidarity, projects that happen in deliberation with the host community. Rather than students implementing projects for the host community, these are projects

that students implement *under the leadership* of the host community, with both groups growing in affection and appreciation of the other; the ways the campus and students benefit from this encounter must be recognized. There is a strong argument to be made that it is better for young adults to cross social boundaries in personalist ways than to perpetuate social distance by engaging in projects that

amplify inequalities. However, once a campus feels that they have eliminated the pernicious aspects of service projects, it should consider the ways that carefully incorporating elements of service might enhance the spiritual and human development of both the students and the host groups in a spirit of true community.

"The eye of faith discerns campus ministry where commitment to Christ and care for the academic world meet in purposeful activity to serve and realize the kingdom of God."

— *Empowered by the Spirit*, no. 21

Nine of the forty-five campus ministers spontaneously described service as a valuable entry-point for students. One of the ministers said that she was not especially interested in faith when she was an undergraduate, but was drawn to the service, justice and immersion opportunities that campus ministry offered. Those activities led to friendships and invitations to retreats and prayer events, widening contact with campus ministry and her Catholic faith. Another minister recalled data from the outcomes she tracks at her parish-based ministry, “A cool stat I don’t [precisely] know off the top of my head, but I think it was 40 percent of students that went on the Spring Break trips were involved in our ministries. Then, after they got back, 80 percent were more involved in our ministries. [Outreach opportunities are] a definite on-ramp.”

Something that can frustrate campus ministry outreach is having a separate office on campus that coordinates community engagement, as this minister at a Catholic campus experiences:

We have a separate service office on our campus. I find this dissatisfactory. Even though we’re in the same division and we collaborate. It’s not like, “We don’t talk to you and you don’t talk to us.” However, I think that split inhibits us from doing the kind of deeper engagement with faith and service, and faith and justice that we would like to do. On the other hand, we know that a lot of students want to do service, but they don’t want to have anything to do with campus ministry or faith. They will more likely go to an office like that.

But, what this minister did not highlight is that in having ready access to a service office not embedded in campus ministry, outreach cannot attract students who may be disengaged from

the faith, disaffiliated or uninterested in religion. Of the seven ministers who voiced this challenge, five were on Catholic campuses and two were missionaries at public campuses (for one, a separate Catholic student group did outreach and, for the second, the university held its own “mission trips”). In situations where another group or office handles outreach, collaboration in planning and implementation could mitigate the disconnect between faith and outreach.

But outreach cannot be a springboard into campus ministry more broadly if the theological significance to what and whom the students encountered is not unpacked. Therefore, it is critical that campus ministers engage in theological reflection with the students. Ten of the eleven ministers (91%) who identified theological reflection as an important aspect of ministry had graduate degrees in ministry or a related field; this is disproportionately high compared to those with ministry degrees in the sample broadly (69%). This could indicate that formal theological education heightens the ability of ministers to see the presence of God in their world. Remember, graduate programs do not simply dispense knowledge, they also form their students to see the ways God acts in the everyday world. This lengthy formation process—which also raises theological acumen—helps future ministers practice theological reflection, a tool that they then use in their campus settings.

A laywoman at a Catholic campus illustrated the way that theological reflection can help expand students’ imagination, helping them see the theological significance to an issue they previously saw only as political:

[For] example, the issue of immigration. They were so involved in wanting to do the walks and everything for the issue

without realizing the spiritual components and the Catholic social teaching connected with it. So they were just like, “Well, how can Jesus be involved with this? This is a social justice thing.” I was like, “Jesus is social justice.” And so just even talking about how they’re so... wanting to speak out and to understand these issues. But introducing Catholic social teaching is important and allowing them to see that you cannot disconnect Jesus from any issue, and that he has to be the center of that.

Just as service can be an on-ramp to campus ministry, Catholic social teaching can enhance the moral, spiritual and human dimensions of a political issue. The work of justice is a constitutive element of preaching the Gospel, as *Empowered by the Spirit* reminds us, “[T]he Church on campus should remember that the goal is not learning alone, but constructive action to eradicate injustice and to transform society” (no. 76).

Finally, because of the inherently experiential

aspects of service opportunities, these provide a fertile venue for student transformation. Some of these transformations are a change in perspective, a sort of scales-falling-from-the-eyes experience. Others have vocational consequences, as this woman religious at a non-Catholic college discussed, “Not just in terms of the activism part of that, but how does that integrate with faith. So seeing that not just as a project in terms of a one-time mission trip, but a project of life. How that has shaped, has educated, has raised the awareness. And makes life-changing options for them, whether in terms of their career paths. One particular student, because of her interactions, her involvement with several different mission trips, she’s changing her major now, and she’s working towards wanting to be an immigration lawyer.” Seeing outreach as a way of manifesting one’s faith in the world can have a profound impact on vocational choices. College is an important time for questions, identity formation and discernment. Because of its explicitly formative expectations, campus ministry is uniquely poised to accompany young adults in this critical period.

Section 3. Insights for Campuses Using Both Professional and Missionary Campus Ministers

The 2017 quantitative survey examined the similarities and differences between two main types of campus ministers in today’s landscape: professional campus ministers and limited-term missionaries. The survey found both similarities and differences between these two groups (examined indirectly through institutional type [e.g., Catholic university], ministerial model [e.g., center-based] and formation type [degree or missionary training]). The quantitative survey report described common ground as opportunities for cooperation and different emphases as opportunities for coordination. As that survey report outlined, office-based,

parish-based, center-based and diocesan ministerial models are historical features of the campus ministry landscape (see survey pages 7 and 8). Missionary organizations are relative newcomers but are currently a significant percentage of the campus ministry landscape. Just as professional ministers often share some visionary overlap with one another due to their graduate education, these missionary organizations also form their missionaries with a particular vision of Catholic campus ministry. As historical models sometimes also collaborate with missionaries, they may need to negotiate disparate elements of their respective visions.

However, this qualitative study revealed a more complicated and nuanced landscape beyond the notion of overlap in vision as an opportunity for cooperation or the disparate elements as opportunities for coordination. Even while this section of the qualitative report discusses serious difficulties when this shared vision is absent, it aims to illuminate better practices for blended ministries through lessons learned from both poorly-integrated and well-integrated ministries. Because this portion on blended ministries comes from fewer interviewees,⁸ we will omit most identifying factors (e.g., ordination status, type of campus, gender) to further ensure the privacy of the interviewees; only distinctions of missionary or professional will be given.

A word on methodology is in order here. As this is a qualitative study, the findings here describe events and experiences in depth from the perspective of those interviewed. However, as this is not a quantitative study—and because there were no questions on the experiences of mixed ministries in the survey—this report is unable to determine the frequency with which negative or positive experiences of ministry occur (in addition to the varying degrees of success that lie between these). In other words, it describes real problems and possibilities without being able to speak to how many mixed ministries are characterized by these problems or possibilities. Also, if a participant reported regular collaboration across these models, we asked, “In what ways has collaboration been fruitful? What are the challenges in collaborating with someone with very different training from yourself?” This gave us insights into the problems even in well-integrated contexts and also shed light on the positive aspects in poorly-integrated ministries. Given assets and

limitations of qualitative methods, this section of the report effectively capitalizes on its methodological strengths, highlighting the joys and concerns of those in mixed settings.

As mentioned above, “accompaniment” was universally important among the campus ministers; likewise, they used “accompaniment” in a very similar way. Even when the research team for this qualitative study decided to add a question asking the interviewees to explain what accompaniment looks like to them, the responses were all very similar. This minister recalled campus ministers from his or her undergraduate experience, “I try to be as accessible as I can be. I felt like [my campus ministers as an undergraduate] were very strong in accompaniment. Not always having all the answers, which was great, but walking with me through the answers, or at least saying, ‘I’m here with you, even though we don’t know what to do.’” Later this minister noted that this has shaped his or her own pastoral style, “Understanding that nobody has all of the answers, but regardless, being able to sit with somebody and be there in communion with them, whether something’s really joyful or something’s really challenging and just trying to constantly remind that person that I see and that I am with you and who knows what’s going to happen, but I’ll be here regardless.” This sort of emphasis on accompaniment is common to campus ministers in a variety of contexts.

Beyond this significant commonality, which can be a unifying element for hybrid ministries, there

“Faith is the realization of what is hoped for and evidence of things not seen.”

– Hebrews 11:1

8 Most of the interviewees here have direct experience in a mixed professional and ministerial settings, but a handful are describing the experiences of colleagues.

are important principles that are essential for a successful blending of ministry models. These include:

- 1) a shared vision,
- 2) regular communication and, related, cultivating a sense of team,
- 3) fully understanding the various ministers' roles and competencies, and
- 4) utilizing professional ministers' leadership effectively.

As these three latter features may be more particular manifestations of the first feature, shared vision will be addressed first. These four features constitute the “needs” for successful mixed ministries. When these are attended to, ministry teams experience gratitude and integration. When not addressed, teams experience more difficulties. The research team spoke with ministry staffs that were enjoying strong and positive experiences in this mixed context as well as staffs that were currently facing or had previously faced challenges. This report will both highlight the practices that facilitate a more successful integration of these ministerial models as well as outline the challenges when attempting to integrate ministry models.

Need One: A Shared Vision

As many books on leadership or organizational theory highlight, having a shared vision that unifies members is critical to any institution. Some professional ministers discussed challenges in their mixed

setting with the arrival of new members, “How that dialogue of, the presence of [missionary organization] assimilating—in a good way... that they can learn that their [organizational] identity is almost needing a process of being grafted. When you graft something into something which has already been established, it takes time... It doesn't come to colonize the tree. It comes to be grafted.” This minister contends that missionaries should be more flexible in the way that they bring their apostolate to a given campus, respecting the unique context and gifts that each campus provides. Likewise, a missionary reported that a group of missionaries at another campus was continually undermined by the professional minister at the campus' Newman Center, resulting in parallel ministries that avoided one another. Several of the ministers pointed to shared vision as the non-negotiable basis for collaboration, as this missionary does:

Yeah, I think that more than anything it is the [missionary organization] team and the chaplain on the same page. Do they have the same vision? And are they collaborating together to work towards whatever goal that is? Because if they are, then I think then more times than not they do thrive and they're very successful... [A professional minister might say,] “I'm supposed to be spiritually responsible for these students. Why would we bring in a lay organization who's going to do spiritual stuff with them?” Whatever the case... teams that seem to be a little bit more dysfunctional... sometimes that comes from internal conflict. [Missionary organization] placement isn't perfect,

“Campus ministry gathers the Catholics on campus... that they might bring the light of the Gospel to illumine the concerns and hopes of the academic community.”

— *Empowered by the Spirit*, no. 21

and sometimes there's just not great life on the team that causes the ministry to be affected.

As missionaries come reflecting the unique charisms and pastoral sensibilities of the organizations that formed them, conflict may occur when these are different from the established ways of doing ministry. Some professional ministers have felt “colonized,” some missionaries have felt “undermined.”

In promoting a shared vision, two considerations are beneficial. First, whether the charisms of the missionary organization complement the ministry of the host campus. And second, if so, what thoughtful considerations are necessary to pair individual missionaries to a campus team. Some of the interviewees said they were told—and not consulted—by their diocese that missionaries would be added to their existing ministerial team. This can be very difficult for professional ministers, first, because they provide the primary pastoral care for the campus and appreciate consultation. And second, because some professionals believe that missionaries will undermine their pastoral work due to differences in theological orientations and pastoral practices. Likewise, missionaries sense when they are not wanted by the professional ministry team and may simply default to the activities learned in their training, forming two parallel—rather than integrated—ministries. Listening well to the experiences of the existing campus ministry team affords prayerful discernment about ministerial direction. If mixing these models is deemed appropriate, the diocese can actively facilitate the integration of these two models. Integration calls for diocesan leaders to exercise pastoral sensitivity, humility and reflection. Poorly integrated teams bring down the morale of everyone involved as well as the vitality of the ministry. Both professionals and missionaries need the support, respect

and accompaniment of their leadership as they strive to live their call.

Need Two: Regular Communication, a Sense of Team

A professional minister was told by the bishop to integrate missionaries into the existing campus ministry; that minister highlighted the importance of communication (and indirectly, transparency and trust) in this endeavor, lifting up a specific quote here, “We’re in our [number] year with [missionary organization]. The first two years... the communication was poor. A lot of it was very secretive. I didn’t know what was going on; even though I was asking questions it felt sales pitch-ish. But that relationship has grown.” This minister reports a rough start that has become much better through regular and intentional communication, which has fostered greater trust.

A challenge related to communication when integrating professional and missionary campus ministers was rooted in the campus reporting structure. Missionaries typically report to a designated “chaplain”—most often a deacon or priest—and this works well when missionaries are the only Catholic ministry presence on a campus. However, if there is, for example, a Newman Center with student leaders or additional professional ministers there can be a disconnect between the two ministries that can lead to parallel, rather than integrated ministries, as a professional minister wonders, “How do they [missionaries] work with the leadership of the community? And that does not go to centralize to one particular person, but how do they work with the [professional] team?” When the chaplain does not bring the entire ministerial staff together in a complementary or collaborative way, it can breed confusion, suspicion, and even a sense of fracture. Directors of blended ministries will see a more vibrant team when

they prioritize trust and communication; each team member plays a role in this responsibility.

Regardless of the way a professional and missionary partnership began, it seemed that if both parties wanted to make it work, communication was key. As one professional minister who oversaw both established ministers and the incoming missionaries put it:

First year was, I didn't think it was an instant success, because the students had this preconceived notion about [the missionaries]. It's like, "What are they here for?" Especially my core leaders. My core leaders were like, "We're doing all this ministry. Are we competing with [missionary organization]?" And that's what happened... [missionary organization] was actually coming in as [missionary organization], not as the campus ministry... So in the second year, I told [the bishop], I said, "[Bishop], we'll keep them for a second year, but I deserve the decision whether we really want them." I said, "Because the first year was not a success." I didn't say it was a total failure and everything... So when we got into the second year, before the semester started... I said, "Listen. This is what we need to do, because this is what actually happened." And so the [missionary organization] missionaries were so sorry, because "This is how we've always been doing it." I said, "But this is what happened." So they changed it. They deferred everything. They realized they're there to support the Catholic ministry. They're not there to go do their [separate] missionary [work]. 'Cause they have their [missionary organization] program... And so, they thought... that was what they were supposed to do in each and every campus. I said, "But you kinda alienated a partner

here, 'cause there's a portion of students that's, my student leaders are like, 'You're competing [with] me.' And it's like, why are we competing [with] each other? I thought you were here to help us to go bring students in and everything." So, that changed. So from then on, they were tabling on campus to go bring people in. They were doing their Bible studies to go bring people in. So their focus was, "We're doing this to go bring them into the campus ministry. To go bring them to church, to go bring them to all the activities of campus ministry." Rather than to bring them to their own activity.

As difficult as hearing that must have been for young, enthusiastic missionaries, the ministry is far more collaborative now. These conversations can go the other way, too, when a missionary had to level with the professional minister that the student meetings "were the exact opposite of life-giving. Three hours long, there was always cold pizza, some middle school icebreakers, some poor formation, and a lot of maybe socially awkward crowd... What would happen is new students would come, and they would never come back." After more of these candid conversations and some participation in missionary-sponsored programs, the missionaries were able to help revitalize the Catholic campus ministry.

Although these types of candid conversations are difficult, they are critical to the health of any ministry organization. They require intentionality, regularity, goodwill and commitment, as this minister said, "I firmly believe that tough conversations are things that

"Send your light and your fidelity, / that they may be my guide."

– Psalm 43:3

are a little harder to talk about. You don't know how the other people are going to take it. [Tough conversations] are very, very good if they're done well." Christian charity and a commitment to stay in the conversation is key as they gradually build trust, reflected in the vulnerability and humility of this missionary, "I told [my chaplain] in our first meeting, over the summer, I was like, [Chaplain], I've learned a lot of what I didn't do well last year and I want to do better for you this year.' And so it's really on [the chaplain] and myself to be in good communication so that [the chaplain] can help [their university Catholic organization] be a home for the Catholics on this campus and we, as [missionary organization], can help it grow and help it be fed into shape." The staff interviewed here are very proud of the collaboration that has come to fruition even after the rough start.

The professional minister from an earlier quote also alludes to a less prominent feature among those interviewed, but worth elevating here: clear authority. To lift up a quote, "So they changed it. They deferred everything. They realized they're there to support the Catholic ministry." Another chaplain benefited from hearing that chaplains have been entrusted to form, direct and supervise the missionaries, "To me [the ambiguity of authority is] a source—figure out—tension, like who's really the boss. Is it [missionary organization]? Is it campus ministry? When [the founder of a missionary organization] said that [it was the chaplains], it gave me more freedom to tell them, 'This is what you need to do and this is how you need to do it.' I think it's more empowering, honestly, because our needs are different than what another campus' needs might be." The collaboration significantly improved on this campus once ministerial authority was established. Where integrated ministries find gratitude, bifurcated ministries find avoidance or worse. Communication must be intentional, fostered and regular.

Need Three: Clarifying the Roles of Degree-Trained Ministers and Missionaries

Very few missionaries have a degree in ministry or a related field. However, the missionaries do not consider this to be a problem because they, according to their interviews, are there not to bring academic knowledge to the students, but to inspire the students and disciple them into a relationship with Christ. When they encounter questions that are beyond their education, the missionaries can go to their chaplain. Although this lack of knowledge is not problematic for the missionaries, several of the professional ministers expressed concern with their lack of formation in Scripture, Church teaching and the pastoral applications of these. It is important to note that the concern about missionaries' lack of knowledge is not just a problem in and of itself for most of the professional ministers; the problem is the potential for unintended damage due to this relative absence of theological education, as a minister explained why their campus does not partner with missionaries, "Skepticism about leading people astray by virtue of poor theological, or no theological training, but a lot of enthusiasm."

This minister was concerned that the lack of formal theological training coupled with tremendous zeal was potentially dangerous.

"When we are whom we are called to be; we will set the world ablaze."

– St. Catherine of Siena

It should be noted here that both Catholic missionary organizations in the United States, in addition to the brief initial training, provide regional training, team development, and mentorship throughout the missionaries' term of service.

One professional minister shared a story of a time when a difficult situation was averted,

“One of our missionaries two years ago came to me just sobbing. And she’s like, ‘I’m in so far over my head.’ She goes, ‘Students are coming to me with things that I have no idea what to do.’ And I was like—so I’m working with her on, ‘You need to refer them to us.’ And actually the situation she was talking about... I would refer that on. But that’s not what they’re taught. They’re taught, ‘You can handle this.’ And that’s a problem. So, I mean, very grateful to her that she could recognize when she was in over her head, but I wonder how many times that hasn’t happened.”

Before this quote is inappropriately used to conclude that all missionaries lack a sense of when to refer a student, it should be contrasted with both missionary organizations’ training and with these findings. First, one of the missionary organizations shared their curriculum with this project and noted several sessions covering mental health, handling a crisis, and distinguishing between spiritual direction (done by someone with special training) and pastoral care.⁹ These sessions help the missionaries understand the limits of their competencies and when they should refer a student to someone with more appropriate training. Additionally, this missionary organization has established protocols for dealing with mental health issues and emotional boundaries.

Second, the findings indicate that unless a minister had formal training in counseling or a related field, all spontaneously brought up that they would refer a student whose needs seemed to be beyond their training. A missionary explains, “I know that I am not a counselor, and it is not my job to be a counselor. So I know enough to keep someone grounded and point them in the right direction.” The missionaries in this sample were aware of the counseling

resources available to students, as well. The missionary above who was described as “in over [her] head” may have deviated from her training or this organization might now include more on ministerial boundaries. The previous two quotes from professional ministers reveal a concern that brief training can lend a greater subjective sense of preparedness than it warrants, ultimately risking a ministerial misstep.

Need Four: Utilizing the Leadership of Professional Ministers in a Blended Context

Given the very different training these two groups of campus ministers have, it would be very helpful for a professional minister to put time into the ongoing formation and support of the missionaries, as well as helping them translate their missionary

formation in a way that is sensitive to the needs of a specific campus, as one professional said, “From our side of it, my dream would be that there would be basically one staff member that almost their full-time thing is

helping [the missionaries], of being that liaison to them and making—how are we helping to form them versus, we’re just all so super busy and no one has time to do it well.” The challenges of missionaries with limited formal education and experience could be mitigated by having someone whose primary role is to support, form, train and theologically reflect with the missionaries, much as a mentor in a field education placement would

“Be who you are and be that well in order to give honor to the master craftsman whose work of art you are.”

– St. Francis de Sales

⁹ Personal email correspondence. September 20, 2019.

do. This would also help to bring these two models together. However, as alluded to at the end of the quote, this would likewise require a significant amount of resources. Thinking about ways dioceses could cover or subsidize the salary of this staff person would be enormously beneficial for collaboration.

A missionary points out how much better campus ministry is with both present, “I think there should be, if possible, we should have both. ‘Cause campus ministers, I think, are great at the macro-view, so, taking the general view, ‘What events are we doing? How can we make this community grow?’ And then missionaries can kind of take the micro-view of like, ‘Let’s go invest our lives in students, Bible studies, and bring people into this community.’ I think having both is super important.” Although this study found that ministers of all models prefer the one-on-one forms of ministry, this quote highlights the longer-term, more campus- and vision-embedded work of professionals and the more immediate and short-term projects of the missionaries. Bearing in mind the relative lack of enthusiasm professionals have for the more administrative components of their job, this dichotomy should not be applied rigidly, lest the professionals lose the more generative parts of their job. Still, recognizing some of the particular gifts that the professionals bring can help mixed ministries allocate tasks and build collaboration in vocationally significant ways.

Several professional campus ministers were also worried that they would be replaced by younger, more available and less expensive missionaries, as this minister explained after describing what he or she has observed, “My issue with it is, many dioceses have decided that it is much more cost-effective to bring in four [missionary organization] missionaries to a college than it is to pay a professional campus minister... My issue with church for years and years is, if we can get

somebody to do this voluntarily, let’s just get ‘em ‘cause it doesn’t cost anything and don’t really scrutinize what it is that they do.” A major concern among campus ministers is that missionaries do not simply fill in gaps where there are no campus ministers, but they provide a cheaper alternative to professional ministers. Needless to say, the professional ministers find this deplorable. Amplifying the distinct gifts of professional ministers in mixed contexts can help to reassure the professional that he or she is essential to the ministry and is not going to be replaced.

Another minister argued that as a matter of best practices, missionaries should be used to complement professional ministry or fill in gaps for campuses without a campus ministry:

I guess when I think about [missionary organization] being on a campus on their own, the first thing I would say is it’s better than nobody being on that campus. Because [missionary organization] does a really good job at what they do. But at the same time, I do have concerns that the students on that campus are really only seeing one piece of the Church... Because, I think, we’re a more integrated campus ministry, we’re able to show [students a] more full scope of the Church, plus have that guidance that I feel is necessary. So kind of the both/and. I feel like [a missionary organization presence only is] better than not having any presence of the Church on campus, but I do have concerns.

This minister believes complementarity is best when considering missionary placement because it provides students with greater access to the breadth of the Catholic experience and can help guide the missionaries in their outreach. Still, using missionaries to minister on a campus without a Catholic presence is understandable if resources are scarce.

This emphasis on professional leadership also highlights some of the ways greater collaboration in ministry can help staffs meet the other three needs of communication, clear roles and shared vision. First, when the students and campus ministry staff recognize a particular professional minister as a leader and chaplain, he or she can facilitate authentic and productive dialogue and understanding. Second, when professional leaders recognize the distinct training that they and missionaries have they can identify clear roles and tasks for each that are appropriate for their training and gifts. Finally, as blended ministries become more integrated and collaboration becomes more natural, this professional, long-term, campus-embedded leadership can begin to articulate what a shared vision in a blended ministry context could look like.

Insights for Going Forward

Typically, campus ministry teams that involved both professionals and missionaries could identify what was going well and what needed further improvement. Briefly revisiting the findings in light of how to maximize the potential of these blended-model ministries is in order.

Beginning with the leadership of professional ministers, their long-term dedication and experience with the campus culture should be recognized as a valuable asset. Diocesan leaders should assure the professional ministers that missionaries will not take their place. Explicitly stating that their long tenure is necessary not only for creating a thriving ministry but also that it will be invaluable in quickly onboarding the new missionaries and in helping them best discern how their gifts might most benefit the campus community. When the gifts of both missionaries and professional ministers are recognized and utilized effectively, true collaboration can come to fruition.

Second, appreciating the different training and competencies that both professionals and missionaries bring is critical. Many professionals have graduate degrees in ministry; recognizing their knowledge, their ability to pastorally apply this, and their sense of campus culture will ensure that the missionary charisms appropriately translate to the host campus. Recently graduated missionaries easily connect to undergraduates and can bring new students to the existing campus ministry. Those who would exclude missionaries from a campus simply because they lack theological education forget that enthusiastic volunteers—including those without graduate degrees in theology—are critical to the majority of Church ministries.

Third, regular communication is key and fosters a sense of team. Even while recognizing distinct gifts is important, both professionals and missionaries want to see the campus thrive. Care should be taken to have honest conversations not only when beginning to integrate missionaries, but also as a regular practice. Similarly, do not discount socializing; having casual, yet intentional time together builds trust and charity.

Finally, a professional minister will close this section with sage advice when discerning whether or not to blend the professional ministers with missionaries, “I think there’d have to be an openness to this particular kind of ministry. Yes, I think it can [work], but if there’s resistance from the beginning, it’s not going to work. It can’t be forced.” This brings us back to the importance of shared vision; coercion can force

a new ministerial model, but only with an openness to a vision shared by all involved will it succeed.

“I came so that they might have life, and have it more abundantly.”

– John 10:10

Section 4. Preparing Students for Parish Life After Graduation

One final finding that was especially important is the transition to parish life after graduation. None of the campus ministers volunteered that they had data that tracked the extent to which students continue to practice their faith or otherwise develop spiritually after graduation. But most believed that generally students' faith lives would decline after leaving campus ministry; only seven said that they thought that most of those who attended Mass would continue to do so upon graduating. Unlike the other sections above, in which the most common themes were the ones that shaped the analysis, this section will lift up insights that sometimes only a handful of respondents provided. Instead, the hope of this section is not to discover the broadest trends, but to raise up creative and innovative ideas that may help recent graduates to continue to grow in their faith once they no longer have the benefit of campus ministry.

Nineteen of the forty-five interviewed pointed to the parish as the problem. This was expressed either as parishes not being a very life-giving experience generally or that parishes are not good at meeting the needs of young adults in particular. Beginning with the former, a good number described parish life as an anemic experience—liturgically, communally, relevance-wise and in other ways, “They’re not welcoming. They’re not giving good homilies. They don’t have good music. They don’t have good community. We’re both on the losing end of this because, we’re missing, we’re losing a generation.” Parish life needs to be reinvigorated.

Second, some said that parishes are just not good at meeting the needs of young adults specifically. Some interviewees pointed to practical needs that drive this, “Maybe that’s not fair

to the parish, because people care, but maybe the orientation is more towards families, with children, or older adults, because that’s where the power and money is. It supports the parish.” Parishes might be more geared toward families because that is where most of the financial resources come from. Additionally, there may be a lack of familiarity with the world of young adults, “Instead, our students are going in and not being welcomed and hearing not such great music and homilies that really don’t pertain to them as a young adult. So, they’re not seeing people their age. They’re not going to Mass.”

As mentioned above, part of the problem that both the interviewees as well as the practitioners at the 2017 symposium at Notre Dame identified is that campus ministry is almost too good for those who participate. Students become accustomed to Catholic experiences that resonate deeply with their undergraduate and young adult experiences, “At least the students are, that I’m aware of, talk about [the campus chapel], which is so easy because they’re constantly invited and their friends are going, and it’s right here on campus. It’s built into the rhythm of their week. Now that they’re not a college student all those things are different and they’re not in the habit of doing it themselves.” For undergrads, Mass is both convenient and a place to socialize. Likewise, it is actually easier in many ways to minister to a more homogenous group like undergrads. When you walk into a Mass for a campus community, even if you don’t see familiar faces, you see people who have some experiences in common with you. At the start of the school year, the homily discusses beginnings, reunions and anticipation. The finals’ week homily is about strong finishes and the reprieve that awaits;

meals, coffee and snacks might also be provided throughout this week. Academic life is appreciated. Social events are carefully planned and a fun and fulfilling time is nearly guaranteed. While this is fantastic in many ways, a downside to this “perfect fit” is that students are often unprepared to do the spiritually mature work of navigating a general parish experience. Students have the luxury to become spoon-fed consumers of their faith. In contrast, when a priest or deacon must preach to children, singles, elderly, the unemployed and countless other populations, his message must necessarily be broad. Catholics in the pews need to find the nuggets of the homily—or the handful of ministries—that are relevant for them; they need to actively contemplate and discern the particular significance of a message or event for them. This takes work. Recent grads, however, are accustomed to ministries that cater to a very specialized population. Helping students learn how to do the spiritually mature work of sifting out what is relevant for them within a more generalist parish experience could be very beneficial for their post-college faith journey.

Thirteen of the interviewees said that they recognize that campus ministry life is amazing, but they were disconnected from parish life or diocesan activity. These interviewees admit that they do not do anything in particular to help students in this transition to parish life, as one said, “Is that a trick question, [researcher’s name]? Honestly, it is the question that’s been the bane of our existence in campus ministry for as long as I’ve been in campus ministry.” Tellingly, none of the interviewees spontaneously mentioned regular and integrated activities, such as partnerships, that would facilitate this. They might mention, for example, having the diocesan head of young adult ministry come to do an evening talk about the area parishes that are more

active in young adult ministry. But this same interviewee laughed that his alums asked him why the school never helped connect them to young adult parishes in the diocese. When he reminded them of the speaking event, they seemed to vaguely recall it. Clearly, things need to be more ongoing and intentional to make an impact on the students.

Ideas to Increase Parish Preparedness

There were four important ideas that campus ministers proposed for improving students’ preparedness for parish life: 1) challenge the students with greater responsibility and leadership, 2) facilitate students’ transitions both into and out of campus ministry, 3) partner with nearby parishes and 4) provide mentor relationships for students and young adults.

Beginning with the first idea, campus ministry would do well to ensure that leadership and responsibility are a part of the students’ formation. By helping students to become leaders and co-creators of the campus ministry experience, they help them realize that Catholicism, and discipleship more broadly, is not a spectator

“The world offers you comfort. But you were not made for comfort. You were made from greatness.”

Pope Benedict XVI

sport. In realizing their own ministerial gifts, when it comes time to graduate, move and attend a parish where they know few, if any, parishioners, they will have the confidence and know-how to seek out the ministries they can assist or be fed by. Additionally, if

a young adult ministry does not already exist, these alums should feel comfortable approaching the lay and ordained leadership to see how they might get this off the ground.

The second idea was to consider how campus ministry might make the transition from high school youth ministry into campus ministry and then into young adult ministry and parish life more seamless. As Bishops Fernand Cheri and John M. Quinn imply in the “Pastoral Synthesis” of the survey report, we tend to treat these as three discrete ministries; it would be much better to see the ways these are interrelated. One simple way this could be done is simply through better communication with the ministers involved, as this layman at a Catholic university explains, “We’ve done different things in the past. We could try that parish, or that parish, but it’s really a cold handoff. We could

“Our goal is to foster a closer relationship and a greater spirit of cooperation between campus ministry and the rest of the local Church. Campus Ministry is an integral part of the Church’s mission to the world and must be seen in that light.”

– *Empowered by the Spirit*, no. 6

Assuming she has the students’ permission (and parents’ permission if these are minors),

do a warm handoff. I’m getting that language from Chris Lowney’s book, *Everyone Leads*. He talks about that as a Catholic Church we should work together and we don’t. We have these different stages and it’s like when you leave here you’re on your own.” What could a “warm handoff” look like?

A high school minister finds out from her graduating seniors where they will be going for college. She finds the contact information for the campus ministries of those campuses (or young adult ministers of nearby parishes when there is no campus ministry).

she gives their names and contact information to the campus ministers. When they leave she reminds them to get connected with the campus ministry right away. When the students arrive and introduce themselves, the campus ministry team greets them warmly, “Yes, we’ve been expecting you!” The high school youth minister remains in touch with the students as well as their ministers for the first few months and has a fun Christmas break event planned for the former youth group members to reconnect and swap stories over the Christmas holiday. When the students are undergraduate seniors, the campus minister finds out where they’ll be moving to. Whether it be through diocesan networks, “the Sister Network” as a woman religious called it, or alumni networks, students meet one-on-one with their minister to see which parish might best help them to continue to grow in their new location. A process similar to the high school youth ministers is implemented, and the welcoming parish is excited to bring the alumni into their community. Would this require more time and resources? Definitely. But it is safe to say that far fewer would fall through these transitional cracks if we took the warm handoff seriously.

The third idea is that campus ministries could partner with a local parish. Campus ministries, due to the various models that exist, provide students with various degrees of “parish” as an experience. The statistics on models here come from the previous survey report. Most office-based campus ministries (31% of survey respondents came from this model) are very insular; there may be a Sunday Mass that attracts large numbers of outsiders, but the Catholic campus ministry experience is typically for the campus (students, staff and faculty). Some campus ministry centers (20%) provide a quasi-parish experience; often Newman centers attract a large number of worshipers who have nothing to do with the campus. However, these settings are

different from true parishes because the bulk of these centers focus their ministerial efforts on the students, with other populations taking a more peripheral position within the organization. Diocesan ministries (6%) can oversee the campus ministries of multiple campuses but have little parish contact. Parish-based models (14%) are canonical parishes that have allocated parish resources to ensure that the students of a nearby campus have their pastoral needs met. Because parishes also have the pastoral responsibility for anyone in their boundaries, this model often cannot make the campus primary; campus ministry will be one ministry among many. Missionaries (24%) could be affiliated with any of the above models or could be freestanding. In sum, although these statistics illustrate the percentages of *respondents* and not the percentages of *students* served through each model, because the statistics are so low for respondents from a parish context (14%), we can imagine that contact with a typical parish is minimal for many students involved with campus ministry. This could contribute to a sense of cultural unfamiliarity when students begin attending a parish shortly after graduation.

If non-parish models cooperated with formal parishes, this would help ease the cultural transition for many students. First, it would give them a sense that parish life requires initiative and participation, “Immersion experiences, encouragement of students being able to participate in off-campus parishes as catechists, as which they are

encouraged already, but I think [intentionally making] those connections. The liturgy here, the liturgy teams, the choirs, being able to have trips out to Masses out in the community and see how it’s actually really being done outside of [our university] would be great.” These trips off campus are even more meaningful when they are treated as part of a partnership, not a field trip. This collaboration does not mean that the specialized strength of the typical campus ministry should be minimized. But the student-centered and student-led arrangement of campus ministry would benefit from meeting their parish counterparts from time to time. Perhaps the students who attend weekly Adoration at the campus chapel could attend this on a monthly basis with the nearby parish. The service events of campus ministry might want to include a twice-a-semester project that is implemented in collaboration with a parish’s outreach group.

Maybe this parish has special events (like ethnic or religious order feast days) that would warrant moving Mass to the parish that day. A shared young adult Bible study for Advent could help both ministries. The details on *how* the collaboration manifests is less important than that it does, in fact, happen. Ultimately, this regular parish contact in their undergraduate formation will help students to feel more belonging and familiarity in their new parish.

The final idea proposed was that recent alums, and young adults generally, may benefit from the presence of a mentor when they join a new parish. One minister who has adult children of her own highlights

“I give thanks to my God at every remembrance of you, praying always with joy in my every prayer for all of you, because of your partnership for the gospel from the first day until now. I am confident of this, that the one who began a good work in you will continue to complete it until the day of Christ Jesus.”

– Philippians 1:3-6

the necessity of this, recounting a conversation with her son:

“Have you gone to Mass this week?” “No mom.” One day he says to me, “Mom, I’m the most faithful person you’ve ever met, but I need my space.” “Okay, I’ll give you your space.” But that’s where I need the parish to pick up on that for me. Because I get that he doesn’t want to hear from me anymore, but he needs the grandma and grandpa from this church to do it. And it’s just like we don’t, we don’t help, we don’t—I say mentor, “mentor” probably’s the best word. They need mentors. They need people who want to take a vested interest in their life who aren’t their parents. And it’s not because they disrespect their parents. It’s just that they want to get away from their parents.

With families more geographically dispersed and adult children wanting a bit more freedom from their parents, parish mentors can help form young adults without seeming overbearing.

Hospitality committees may want to create a subgroup that would attend especially to integrating young adults into the wider

community. Importantly, this is different from a peer mentorship, as well. The challenge of offering a similarly-aged mentor is that while it could more deeply embed the recent grad into young adult ministry, it could further isolate him or her from the rest of the parish; the

siloeing of young adults is exactly what the Church should try to avoid. The mentors ideally would have other things in common with their young adults. Perhaps they both play the guitar, they enjoy hiking, both love college football, or they are in a similar line of work; in the best case scenario they would have a common faith as well as “something else” that they could also enjoy together, forming the basis of a richer and more personalist friendship. Mentors would touch base with young adults to ensure that all was going well, especially that they were connecting to ministries that were helping them to grow as well as considering how they might likewise serve the parish. Note that having a specific ministry for young adults is critical for a sense of belonging *as a young adult*, but this alone can leave young adults isolated from the parish as a whole. Mentors would be an easy and available point of contact for young adults entering wider parish life.

Dioceses, priests, campus ministers and related organizations should

consider the extent to which these four ideas might help them better prepare their graduates for parish life.

“And this is my prayer: that your love may increase ever more and more in knowledge and every kind of perception, to discern what is of value, so that you may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ, filled with the fruit of righteousness that comes through Jesus Christ for the glory and praise of God.”
– Philippians 1:9-11

Conclusion

There are four important findings from this report:

“Wherever there is life, fervor and a desire to bring Christ to others, genuine vocations will arise.”

– Pope Francis,
*Evangelii
Gaudium*, no. 107

sense as a calling from God, including the call to life, the call to friendship with him, the call to holiness, and so forth.”¹⁰ Variations also exist in how campus ministers understand and live out their vocational call. While some feel called to campus ministry in particular, others connect their perceived calling to lay ministry, young adult ministry, missionary discipleship, or their state as vowed religious to their work with college students in the context of campus ministry. Regardless of how their call manifests, campus ministers experience much joy in their work, such as being able to accompany students and witness their religious and spiritual transformations. Such moments confirm for them that they are doing the work God has meant them to do. However, campus ministry work is not without its challenges. Campus ministers frequently wrestle with heavy workloads, as well as long and non-traditional work hours.

1) While the quantitative survey found differences in job satisfaction among campus ministers, it was limited in its scope. The qualitative study was able to explore how campus ministers understand their calling or vocation, as well as where they experience both joy and challenge. In his post-synodal apostolic exhortation, *Christus Vivit*, Pope Francis wrote that “vocation” can be “understood in a broad

Increasing administrative work takes them away from time spent with students. Hurtful experiences of clericalism come from their institutional administrators and colleagues. Disagreements with colleagues and supervisors over how to best engage and minister to students takes a toll.

The interviews point to some important ways campus ministers are sustained in their vocations. Campus ministers feel at their best when they have healthy spiritual lives, practice self-care, and have positive support networks. Diocesan leaders and campus supervisors can help campus ministers feel renewed in their vocations by sponsoring opportunities for campus ministers to participate in personal spiritual direction, as well as take private retreats and sabbaticals. Diocesan leaders and campus supervisors can also help foster a healthier approach to dealing with administrative tasks and other challenges specific to campus ministry by connecting campus ministers with mentors who successfully manage such challenges. This is especially true for solo campus ministers, who may lack the supportive relationships found in a large campus ministry team.

2) The cultural differences between campuses and among campus ministers themselves are real, but they represent nuances and opportunities for learning.

- Evaluative differences between “accompaniment” and “programming”—with the former seen as positive and the latter as negative—is not wholly accurate and even does a disservice to important ways of gathering; each plays a role in cultivating student growth.

¹⁰ http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20190325_christus-vivit.html

- The differences found in the previous survey among attitudes on relationship with Jesus and evangelization make much more sense given these interviews. Within the quantitative survey findings, campus ministers on Catholic campuses seemed to find less interest in relationship with Jesus and evangelization. However, the ecumenical ministerial responsibilities and an aversion to “evangelization” as aggressive preaching or pontificating explain those findings; this qualitative study reveals that ministers of all kinds appreciate evangelization and relationship with Jesus when they can define them on their own terms.
- Outreach seems to be shifting from service and the work we do to immersion and relationship for many (but not all) ministers. The life and ministry of Jesus included both service and encounter. Considering the ways we can authentically bring the strengths of both works and relationship together could be very fruitful.

In sum, the quantitative survey found differences in emphases and programmatic offerings among degree-trained campus ministers and missionaries. However, these interviews show that some of the disparity in attitudes is a difference in quality (e.g., different understandings of evangelization), not an outright rejection. As campus ministry teams become aware of their own theological leanings and limits of their training, they can better understand what types of students, staff and faculty they attract as well as those who could be missed. Through choices stemming from this self-awareness, campus ministries can create more inclusive ministries that will bring growth to a wide variety of campus members,

rather than only those most like the ministers themselves.

3) The varying degrees of success that professional and missionary campus ministers have had in ministry settings provide important lessons for considering whether a blended model would work for a particular campus or how to better integrate a mixed model ministry. Four best practices were distilled through the interviews. First, ensure that the professional and missionary teams have a shared vision that informs their cooperation in ministry; profes-

“All those officially appointed to lead the Church on campus have a great responsibility to form vibrant communities of faith and an exciting challenge to bring forth the gifts of individual believers.”

– *Empowered by the Spirit*,
no. 25

sional/missionary hybrids should not be forced. Second, charitable communication should happen regularly; having a clear, shared authority (not a remote supervisor) who has the interest of both the professionals and missionaries in mind helps facilitate this. Third, mis-

sionaries and professionals have unique strengths; seeing how to build upon these can magnify a shared vision. Finally, professional ministers, with their formal education, longer tenure and more long-term vision for a campus, are uniquely poised to facilitate collaboration. They should be explicitly assured of their continued employment. Professional ministers are key in helping the missionaries translate their missionary training to their particular campus. More broadly, this section identified the most common pitfalls and sources of tension in integrating professional ministers and missionaries. As Bishops Cheri

and Quinn state in their Pastoral Synthesis that concludes the survey report, “Catholic campus ministry needs to develop innovative pastoral and missionary methodologies sensitive to each campus’ context while rooted in the cooperation and ongoing formation of campus ministers” (17). Dioceses and their leaders are instrumental in integrating blended models. This begins at the outset, consulting the existing ministry and learning their thoughts on incorporating missionaries into the team. It continues through active conversations that ensure the particular missionaries who arrive are welcomed and understand the cultural nuances and sensitivities of the host campus. It is especially important once the missionaries arrive, with diocesan leaders accompanying this integration by helping the team build trust, enjoy a shared spirituality, and articulate a vision that guides and inspires all involved.

4) Helping students transition from campus ministry to a parish context poses some formidable challenges. Four practices might be considered in facilitating this. First, campus ministry should take every opportunity to form the students into leaders; this pastoral responsibility will cultivate ministerial initiative within the students, ideally helping them identify the ways they can serve and be served by their parish after graduation. Second, campus ministry should be put into a larger context of faith formation; youth ministry, campus ministry and young adult ministry should work on having a “warm handoff” at these transition points. Third, campus ministry should reach out to nearby parishes and think about creative ways they can partner with one another. Lastly, parishes may wish to consider how they might mentor the newly-minted graduates in their new parish. These interviewees suggest ideas for youth, campus, and young adult ministries,

but dioceses can offer critical support in these areas. Dioceses are more aware of their various institutions, be they retreat centers, community colleges, parishes and others. Knowing the gifts of the personnel can facilitate connections and collaboration across institutions, creating diocesan infrastructures and increasing ministerial efficacy. Religious communities, with their tight networks and national reach, can help relocating graduates find parish homes. Diocesan directors of young adult ministry have a clear sense of their parishes’ gifts and needs so that they might direct young adults of secular educational institutions to parishes as well as connect priests to appropriate campuses, such as a priest familiar with black Catholic liturgy to a historically black college for weekly Mass. Dioceses have a unique vantage point that allows them to connect gifts with needs more quickly than those working within a particular institution can. Embracing this responsibility will result in much fruit.

The preceding pages provided the readers with a brief but intimate glimpse into the lives of Catholic campus ministers today. Their ministerial lives are complicated, fruitful, busy, challenging, beautiful, frustrating, and transformative. Amid department meetings, retreat planning, liturgy coordinating and more, they tenderly accompany those to whom they minister in a spirit of faithful presence. The stories they shared are neither those of naive optimism nor of doom and gloom; they reflect genuine human experience. Contemplating these stories may remind one of the opening paragraph of *Gaudium et Spes*:

The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ.

Indeed, nothing genuinely human fails to raise an echo in their hearts. For theirs is a community composed of men. United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the Kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man. That is why this community realizes that it is truly linked with mankind and its history by the deepest of bonds.

These ministers support young adults at a critical moment in their lives. Every struggle or victory of these students is held or celebrated

Acknowledgements

The research team, Drs. Maureen K. Day, Linda M. Kawentel, and Brian Starks, are very grateful to the USCCB (Secretariat for Education) and the Religious Research Association for their generous financial support of this project. The Secretariat for Education also provided lists for potential interviewees and helpful guidance for the sorts of concerns that were most pressing following the survey data analysis and Notre Dame symposium. Thank you to the pre-publication readers, both anonymous and identified, who offered feedback to initial drafts of this document. We are, of course, incredibly thankful for the 45 very busy and incredibly devoted campus ministers who gave so generously of their time and insight so that this analysis was possible.

The Authors

Dr. Maureen K. Day is Assistant Professor of Religion and Society at the Franciscan School of Theology, Research Fellow at the University of Notre Dame's Center for the Study of Religion and Society and Research Fellow at the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) at Georgetown

University. Her writings on American Catholic life appear in both Catholic and academic publications, including her edited collection *Young Adult American Catholics* (Paulist Press 2018) as well as her authored *Catholic Activism Today* (NYU Press 2020). She co-authored *A National Study on Catholic Campus Ministry*, the 2017 survey report. Her current work includes a diocesan-wide study of Latino Catholic stewardship (funded by Villanova University's Center for Church Management) and a national study of American attitudes on abortion (funded by the University of Notre Dame's McGrath Institute for Church Life).

Dr. Linda M. Kawentel is a Research Affiliate with the Wellbeing at Work Program at the University of Notre Dame. She received her Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Notre Dame with a focus in the sociology of religion, and before that an M.A. in religious studies from John Carroll University. She specializes in using quantitative and qualitative methods to understand the factors that impact the mental health and well-being of employees in the caregiving professions, particularly clergy. Her current research examines how spiritual

practices, relationship dynamics, and understandings of vocational identity are associated

with happiness and human flourishing among religious professionals.

Detailed Methods

The research team was geographically dispersed in a way that lent convenient access to multiple models of campus ministry as well as regions of the country. The requirements for qualifying as a “campus minister” were that interview subjects must be 1) Catholic, 2) consider themselves campus ministers, 3) ministering at colleges or universities in the U.S., and 4) 18 years of age or older. Initially the team was planning to recruit interviewees from the pool of ministers who at the close of the 2017 survey agreed to be contacted for further questions. However, this posed several important limitations. First, many of the missionary-trained campus ministers would not be available as their two-year term would have ended by the time the team began recruiting ministers. Second, a significant number of survey respondents had relocated or were no longer working as campus ministers. Finally, the team discovered that after it eliminated the respondents who were no longer in campus ministry or were no longer local, it had lost many of our potential recruits (the team wanted to have face-to-face interviews whenever possible). Recognizing these limitations, the team began reaching out to the campus ministers in the researchers’ respective regions: Southern California (Day); South Bend,

Indiana and Cleveland, Ohio (Kawentel); and Atlanta, Georgia (Starks).

This direct solicitation was successful. The research team interviewed nineteen campus ministers from the Indiana/Ohio region (from twelve campuses), seventeen in Southern California (seven campuses) and nine in Georgia (five campuses). Forty-four of the forty-five interviews were face-to-face; the remaining interview took place via phone. All interviews were recorded and professionally transcribed. As the principal investigator, Day kept detailed memos on each code (see “Quantified Responses” in Appendix) and coded all of the interviews using ATLAS.ti.

All interviewees were given a consent form that reminded them that they freely participate in the interviews, that the interview would be recorded for use in projects, that they may be quoted in publications, that their statements are confidential (identifying biographical details would be omitted), and that they may terminate the interview at any time. This study was approved by the institutional review boards of the Franciscan School of Theology and the University of Notre Dame.