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Abstract

In recent years, American higher education institutions (HEIs) have begun or expanded academic, co-curricular, and operational initiatives addressing sustainability. Business schools are increasingly preparing students for their future responsibilities in a business world and society increasingly attuned to sustainability issues. While sustainability is widely described as having three dimensions – economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability – the latter has received far less emphasis and attention within higher education. This is not surprising given the intensifying financial pressure faced by HEIs and the increasing concern across the world regarding the impact of human activity on climate and ecosystems. Despite financial constraints and increasing competition, relatively few American HEIs have strived to addressed social sustainability on their campuses through the adoption of living wage policies or just employment policies (in this paper, these terms are used interchangeably). Within this small subset of American colleges and universities, Jesuit colleges and universities are over-represented, however, thirteen years after Georgetown University introduced the first such policy, three fourths of Jesuit schools have yet to follow suit. This paper explores this dichotomy beginning with a description an analysis of issues and assumptions surrounding living wage policies. Next, the paper explores of a cross-section of data from the Living Wage Policy Study (Author(s)) and the extent to which Jesuit institutions have enacted their Catholic identity and Jesuit heritage through a just employment policy. The paper concludes with a discussion of the moral imperative for treatment of workers in American higher education.
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In recent years, American higher education institutions (HEIs) have begun or expanded academic, co-curricular, and operational initiatives addressing sustainability through both top-down and bottom-up efforts. Whether based upon the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2018) or prompted by the UN Global Compact’s Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) initiative – with whom AACSB has developed a partnership – or upon its own initiative, business schools are increasingly preparing students for careers and their future responsibilities in a business world and society increasingly attuned to – and concerned about – sustainability issues (O’Neill et al., 2018).

While sustainability is generally understood to consist of three dimensions – economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability (United Nations, 2017) – the latter has received far less emphasis and attention within higher education. On one hand, this is not surprising given the intensifying financial pressure faced by higher education (both in general, and individually by the vast majority of institutions) and the increasing concern across the world regarding the impact of human activity on climate and ecosystems. In this context, employees in HEIs may not want to appear self-serving by advocating for their own economic interests, and also may be disinclined to advocate for their colleagues in ways that might increase their employer’s cost structure.

Over six years after Occupy Wall Street (Levitin, 2015), income inequality is now discussed around the world and, within academia, across almost every discipline. Wealth concentration and lack of socio-economic opportunity have brought into sharper focus the needs
of more and more people who are earning, in real terms, less and less. Aside from changes in laws by governments, businesses play an outsize role in setting wage rates, establishing labor markets, and contributing to the distribution of income within a firm. Faculty at many business schools – and in particular, at Jesuit business schools – have a history in the modern era of teaching about business with an explicit concern for and attention to issues of business ethics, fairness, and the relationship between business and its many stakeholders, including society at large.

Despite financial constraints and increasing competition within higher education, a small number of American HEIs have strived to addressed social sustainability on their campuses through the adoption of *living wage policies* or *just employment policies* (these two terms are used interchangeably throughout this paper), including a large state university system, top research public and private non-profit institutions, and private non-profit institutions, of which about half have an affiliation with a religious affiliation. Within this small subset of American colleges and universities with just employment policies, Jesuit colleges and universities are over-represented, however, thirteen years after Georgetown University introduced the first such policy, three fourths of Jesuit schools have yet to follow suit. This paper explores this dichotomy. First, the paper provides an analysis of issues and assumptions surrounding living wage policies, focusing on some of the potential effects of dissonance between espoused values and institutional practices. Next, the paper examines a selective cross-section of data from the Living Wage Policy Study *(Author(s), 2018)* and the extent to which Jesuit institutions have enacted their Catholic identity and Jesuit heritage and affirmed the dignity and rights of all their direct employees and subcontracted workers. The paper concludes with a discussion reconciling
consideration of a compelling moral imperative for treatment of workers in the face of ever-increasing financial pressures faced by modern higher education.

**Just Employment, Catholic Identity, and the Jesuit Heritage**

Calls for a living wage, just employment (or fair trade) have arisen within a context of increasing concern about income inequality, both within and outside the United States. The United Nations has played a facilitative and leadership role in bringing countries and companies together to commit to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948) the RIO+20 outcome document (United Nations, 2017) and, more comprehensively, the UN’s 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (see United Nations, 2015, 2017). Social sustainability is prominent throughout the SDGs, specifically Sustainable Development Goal 1 “End poverty in all its forms”, Sustainable Development Goal 8 “Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all” and Sustainable Development Goal 10 “Reduce inequality within and between countries.” The SDGs are increasingly important to business educators in no small part because AACSB (see Weybrecht, 2015) has formed a partnership with the UN Global Compact’s Principles of Responsible Management Education (PRME) initiative.

**Just employment concepts**

Despite increasing concern about income and wealth inequality in America, raising the minimum wage (Meredith, 1996) or establishing a living wage have not garnered sustained traction at the federal level (see U.S. Department of Labor, 2018). For the former, minimum wage increases have not kept pace with increases in the cost of living, while the latter have only been adopted as law at the municipal, county, or state level (Weed, 2017; Gabriel, 2013). Despite
the lack of laws or regulations compelling corporations to pay a living wage in America, an increasing number of firms have adopted living wage policies voluntarily (Hsu, 2017).

A “living wage” as defined by Glasman (2018) is the “hourly rate that an individual must earn to support their family…”; a living wage differs from federal/national standards for poverty in that it accounts for the required to meet basic living needs locally, while a metric such as the federal government’s poverty rate does not consider costs such as child care or health care. The MIT “Living Wage Calculator” (see Glasman, 2018) – used by many municipalities and organizations as foundation to their laws/policies – includes costs for food, child care, health, housing, transportation, other necessities, and taxes. The MIT Living Wage calculator accounts for geographic – more to the point, market – differences by using data from various reliable sources and tying those costs to a specific zip code or county. For instance, the MIT Living Wage Calculator for 1 adult and 1 child in the author’s home county (redacted) is $24.90 per hour; in Lancaster County, PA the same wage is calculated to be $23.15; in Pittsburgh, $22.35; in Seattle, $27.35.

A higher rate of pay alone is necessary but insufficient to ensure that one is able to meet the costs of their living needs. For instance, an employee in Lancaster County, PA paid $27.35 per hours working full time (40 hours/week) will be paid enough to meet their basic needs. However, if that same employee works only 20 hours per week, their pay will clearly not be adequate to meet the essentials of life.

Just employment history

A long and rich history of improving employment conditions for people is beyond the scope of this paper, but the modern living wage movement can be traced to Baltimore (Luce,
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2002; also see Gartner, 2006), where a coalition of community groups organized to address the inadequacy of prevailing wages. Currently, the just employment movement can be described as consisting of several interconnected threads. One is the efforts to increase workers’ wages through legislation law at the federal, state, or local (county/municipal) level; some of these campaigns have pursued increasing the minimum wage (e.g., “Fight for 15”), and some have taken into account costs of living (e.g., Oregon, see Oregon.gov, 2018a, 2018b) while others have explicitly been termed a living wage (Gertner, 2006). Some municipalities have not passed laws or ordinances, but instead have adopted living wage policies covering treatment of their own employees; some municipalities have adopted policies that require private contractors to pay a living wage to all of the contractors’ workers (e.g., Los Angeles, see lacity.org, 2018). As one might expect, a patchwork of different local and state wage laws are more complex for employers to navigate and manage, particularly employers with workers in many locations.

Some efforts to increase the pay of low-wage workers have targeted specific and/or prominent employers (e.g., Wal-Mart, McDonald’s), attempting to change wage practices, which have met with limited success (CITE). In part, the increase in wages by large retail companies (e.g., Wal-Mart, Target) could be explained as responses to a tightening labor supply as the American economy has approached full employment. In some cases, such as Baltimore, community groups have led such efforts, in others, labor unions have been leading and organizing public events and pressure on employers.

In higher education, just employment initiatives have come about through both top-down and bottom-up initiatives, fueled in some cases by a combination of student activism, leadership by senior management, unions’ attempts to organize employees (e.g., graduate students) and, in some cases, by contingent (i.e., adjunct) faculty acting on their own behalf (Smith, 2017). Still
other efforts have been pursued internally through existing governance and policy-making mechanisms (Loyola University Chicago, 2017).

There are several groups of workers in American HEIs employed in a manner than cannot credibly be characterized as “socially sustainable.” While the past several decades have seen greater awareness on American campuses of working conditions and the need for protection of workers’ rights regarding say, in the supply chain of an institution’s licensed apparel, other protests have concerned vulnerable employees hiding in plain sight (Harvard Living Wage Campaign, n.d., Harvard Progressive Student Labor Movement, n.d.). One need not travel to a developing country to find workers paid a less-than-living wage; an American college or university’s supply chain is on campus following the outsourcing of “non-core” functions such as foodservice, housekeeping, security, information technology, bookstores, and more. In academia, adjunct faculty (Smith, 2017), graduate assistants (Eligon & Pérez-Peña, 2015), and others have raised their voices regarding working conditions, pay, benefits, and continuity of employment.

Such treatment of the most vulnerable workers in higher education doesn’t hold up well under scrutiny during a time when tuition outpaced inflation by 3.2% (2007-2018), compared with annual increases of 4.0% and 4.4% in preceding two decades (1987-1998, 1997-2008, respectively, see College Board, 2018) and when income inequality has been increasing visible in society and in public discourse (Chetty et al., 2018). At a time when social sustainability – including social sustainability – is receiving increased attention in business, higher education institutions in aggregate appear to be lagging industry on this basic human rights issue. While businesses have had to address labor conditions in their supply chains for over two decades, the conditions of onshore contractors within higher education has, by and large, gone unaddressed,
as the following data will demonstrate. Finally, it should be noted that we live in a time of increased expectations by all stakeholders for greater transparency from all types of institutions.

**Catholic identity and Jesuit heritage**

As one would expect, Catholic social teaching and Jesuit ideals have a great deal in common. Catholic social teaching has long held that a just work environment is essential to the affirmation of human dignity, and Catholic leaders have historically been at the forefront of the pursuit of labor rights for workers, concern for social justice, and the “preferential option for the poor and vulnerable.” Catholic social teaching emphasizes that workers have their own responsibilities, including the obligation to treat co-workers with respect. Several Jesuit ideals, including *cura personalis* – a concern for the whole person – echo elements of Catholic social teaching; the Jesuits’ centuries long work in human rights, social justice, and in higher education are among its most prominent ministries.

Jesuit HEIs in America feature “Ignatian values” and the “Jesuit” character of their institutions in in both word and deed, from printed matter to websites, to speeches and to tours given to prospective students. Business ethics has been particularly prominent in the mission of business schools within Jesuit institutions, manifested in an array of publications including the *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* and the *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, plus the Santa Clara University’s (2018) Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, and website Ignited.Global, to name but a few. The prominence of business scholars at Jesuit institutions within their areas of specialization and their leadership roles in their respective professional societies speaks to the quality of business faculty at Jesuit institutions.
Georgetown University has been a leader in the just employment movement; Georgetown’s Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor counts the Just Employment Policy initiative among its portfolio of projects. Based upon Georgetown’s own just employment policy (Georgetown University, 2018), the Kalmanovitz Initiative’s Just Employment Policy Project, developed with the Harrison Institute for Public Law (which includes a model just employment policy and explanatory documentation) is an attempt to share lessons learned by way of a template policy that can be used by other institutions (Harrison Institute for Public Law & Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Work Poor, 2018).

According to the Kalmanovitz Initiative’s website, the model policy has been presented at the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) Justice in Jesuit Higher Education Conference and the annual Family Teach-in for Justice of the Ignatian Solidarity Network’s (ISN).

**Method**

This paper examines a selective cross-section of data from the Living Wage Policy Study and the extent to which Jesuit institutions have enacted their Catholic identity and Jesuit heritage and affirmed the dignity and rights of their employees and subcontracted workers.

The Living Wage Policy Study (Author(s)) is a multi-phase study of the prevalence and nature of living wage policies and practices in American higher education. The study is limited to 2,103 public and private-non-profit institutions that offer four-year degrees included in the publicly available IPEDS 2015 dataset of American HEIs (enrollment and other figures are based on Fall 2014 data). From the original IPEDS list of 4,665 institutions, 686 private for-profit
schools, 1,579 two-year schools, and 297 graduate-only institutions were excluded from the research sample.

The remaining 2,103 institutions reflect the landscape of four-year undergraduate institutions outside the for-profit sector. Private institutions are more than double the number of public institutions (1,405 to 698), but public institutions enroll more than twice as many students (8.3 million) as private non-profit institutions (4.0 million). The 698 public institutions (25.0%) and 1,405 private non-profit institutions (50.4%) account for 75.4% of all four year institutions and 90.6% of the undergraduate 4-year enrolled students (Fall 2014 enrollment data was used for the 2015 IPEDS data). While the public institutions make up 33.1% of the institutions in the sample, they account for 67.4% of the enrolled students, while the private non-profit institutions account for 66.81% of the institutions but 32.6% of enrolled students, The mean public institution enrolled 11,901 students and the mean private non-profit institution enrolled 2,855 students.

The websites of all 2,103 websites were searched manually in Fall 2016 and again in Fall 2017 for a variety of keywords that would return a variation on a living wage (or just employment) policy or practice. Special attention was given to any institution reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Ed (insidehighered.com), Ebsco Host’s Newspaper Source, or through the websites of organizations working on worker rights or minimum wage and/or living wage laws, including over 120 institutions who had submitted data regarding a wage policy to the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education’s (AASHE) Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) by September 2016.
Any institution with some form of greater-than-minimum wage policy or statement on its website was credited with having a “policy”, whether or not it was based on or derived from the Kalmanovitz model policy (most were not so derived). A total of 32 institutions were assessed to possess a policy of some kind, which were collected for retention and analysis. The ten institutions in the University of California system, which has a system-wide living wage policy, was counted as 10 separate institutions in the IPEDS methodology, so they are counted similarly in this study. Summary characteristics regarding the 32 institutions are included in Table 1.

The author(s) developed a 20-item rubric based on the Kalmanovitz Initiative’s model Just Employment Policy, assigning 5 points to each item, realizing a maximum score of 100 points; the rubric is available from the author(s). Any institution with some form of publicly available greater-than-minimum wage policy was considered as having a policy and its policy was scored, no matter how low its score on the rubric.

Results of scoring available policies or institutional documents are displayed in Table 2.
**Results**

Overall, about 1.5% (32 of 2,103) four year institutions had some form of living wage policy document available on their site. Although the sample sizes limit the utility of comparisons, public institutions are slightly overrepresented if one counts the University of California system as 10 institutions (as does IPEDS). Interestingly, 1.21 percent of private non-profit schools had policies or related documents on their website, while less than 1 percent of private schools with a religious affiliation or control had posted such a document. 2.83 percent of U.S. Catholic colleges and universities had posted policies or related documents on their websites – almost twice as frequently as the rate for all colleges, and more than twice the rate of private non-profit colleges. Six of the 28 (over 21 percent) Jesuit colleges and universities in the U.S. had some form of policy or related document. Said another way, while accounting for 1.33 percent of all four year institutions in the US, Jesuit institutions accounted for 18.75 percent of the institutions with a policy or related document posted to their website.

**Discussion**

The data reported here are preliminary, and a third screening of all 2,103 four-year institutions’ website is being completed in advance of submission for publication. However, the data observed between 2016 and 2017 did not change substantially; in fact, a couple of documents available on websites in fall of 2016 were not retrievable in fall of 2017.

The frequency with which Jesuit institutions have addressed just employment issues is on one hand remarkable and on the other hand not so unexpected. Georgetown University has led the way for the higher education nationally on living wage policy, and the Kalmanovitz Initiative
has been focused in its outreach on Jesuit institutions, initially, and then Catholic institutions more broadly.

The median score on the Living Wage Rubric was 40 (again, reflecting a small sample and the fact that University of California accounts for 10 of the 32 institutions), and that score – or any score for any policy captured in this study – should not be taken out of context. None of the institutions were asked whether their policy was designed with the rubric in mind, and it can be inferred that for many institutions that it was not a consideration. In the internet era, public and societal expectations for transparency on the part of institutions are higher than many institutions have realized. This phase of the Living Wage Policy Study only captured policies and/or policy-related documents that were publicly available. Future research underway at this writing will include soliciting living wage/just employment policies from the Chief Human Resources Officer of each of the 2,103 four-year institutions; institutions that have adopted living wage practices but not policies will be invited to be interviewed to understand how and why practices were developed in lieu of an institutional policy.

What these data do provide an early snapshot of living wage practices, and demonstrate that such policies can be implemented in large public institutions (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 42,598 undergraduate enrollment), large public state-wide systems (University of California system), and private non-profit institutions both secular (Clarkson University, 1,221, to Boston University, 32,112) and religious (Agnes Scott College, 873 to Georgetown University, 17,858); with five schools reported fewer than 2,000 undergraduates enrolled all figures are Fall 2014, based on IPEDS 2015 dataset).
In a separate study, the author(s) found that implementing a living wage policy did not, on average, have a material effect on institutions’ financial operating margins, bond ratings, or U.S. News & World Report rankings. One institution, American University, had its bond rating raised one level not long after its living wage policy was implemented. It is an open question whether all of American higher education could implement such a policy, but the schools on this list vary greatly in terms of endowment-per-student, and public institutions have been buffeted by declining or erratic levels of state funding. The diversity of institutions reflected in this list suggest that adopting a living wage policy is an issue of choice amongst an institution’s leadership, and of setting priorities that bring social sustainability to life on their own campuses.

Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States are justifiably proud of their ongoing efforts to fulfill their multi-faceted missions which encompass, among other tenets, an education through which students develop their capacity to make ethical decisions, the creation of knowledge for the common good, a commitment to social justice, a concern for the whole person including their spiritual development, a commitment to the health of our world, and concern for and solidarity with those people who are most vulnerable in society. On one hand, these missions build upon a set of shared beliefs and powerful principles, but each of the above facets of an institution can be and are interpreted variously by institutions and individuals, as manifested in the diversity of thought and action taken by members of Jesuit campus communities.

Jesuit colleges and universities share a concern for and commitment to the most vulnerable people in our society and in the world. This is operationalized in a variety of ways; one example among many is my institution’s annual Spring Break service trip to Appalachia that sells out its capacity of 500 students in under 10 minutes. Concern for and solidarity communities and individuals living in the poorest areas in the country is, without doubt, a noble
concern. The concern for the vulnerable often reaches outside our country; many Jesuit HEIs have increased their commitment to “fair trade” ensuring the respect for human dignity throughout their supply chains, everything from coffee to licensed apparel (Rockhurst University, 2016; also see Ignatian Solidarity Network, 2017).

Like modern corporations, American colleges and universities have outsourced many “non-core” functions; unlike their corporate counterparts, academic institutions often have their “outsource partners” still working on campus. As described earlier, Jesuit institutions have often been outwardly focused and progressive about labor and human rights around the world, this selective cross-section of the larger Living Wage Policy Study (Author(s)) examines the extent to which Jesuit institutions have been at the vanguard of the living wage movement in the United States with regard to their own employees and contractors. This progress is uneven; a supermajority of Jesuit institutions do not have a publicly available living wage policy, although they may engage in living wage practices. A study is presently being undertaken by the author(s) to explore living wage practices in American higher education. Living wage practices notwithstanding, the unevenness of enacted policies creates a discussion of the dissonance between Jesuit HEIs’ stated missions and compensation policies, and also between Jesuit HEIs. While that dissonance may both be precipitating a tipping point, the underlying issues and opportunities for Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States.

At a time when our current, prospective, and future students are increasingly socially aware, our institutions’ commitment “environmentally responsibility” is becoming increasingly visible, whether or not our institutions are fully invested in those responsibilities. One can foresee a time when social sustainability becomes one of the considerations for prospective students’ application or deposit decisions – a serious business issue for any college or university.
Given our schools’ Jesuit mission and Catholic Social Teaching on workers’ rights, our institutions have “stakes in the ground” around these issues but, too often, our practice does not reflect our shared individual and institutional beliefs. Through its recently published *Gaudium et Spes* Labor Report, 2018, the Catholic Labor Network (2018) continues to illuminate this dissonance, listing over 500 Catholic institutions in the United States that affirming the rights of employees of Catholic institutions to unionize.¹

The purpose of this paper is to help Jesuit business schools to consider their potential contributions to this discussion on and across our Jesuit institutions. Jesuit business faculty are uniquely positioned to speak with credibility to both the moral and business issues related to living wage policies and other aspects of just employment. The Guide to the model Just Employment Policy (Harrison Institute for Public Law, and Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor, 2018) states that”

> “Whether colleges and universities will continue to profit from and exacerbate inequality or contribute to its solution is an urgent moral question for the nation—a question that is inescapable for Catholic and Jesuit colleges and universities. Catholic institutions are rooted in social teaching that promotes solidarity and social justice, but they are at risk of becoming instruments of growing inequality when they ignore the rights of workers and pay less than a living wage.”

¹ Note: *Gaudium et Spes*, “the joys and hopes” was one of four constitutions resulting from the Second Vatican Council in 1965. The preface begins: “The joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the people of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted, are the joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well.” See [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html)
However, a religious affiliation is not necessary to make ethical decisions and enact fair employment practices. The model Just Employment Policy, ostensibly prepared by a Catholic Jesuit institution for use by other Catholic schools, contains references to Catholic social teaching only in its preamble, presented here in its entirety (Harrison Institute for Public Law and Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor, 2018):

“b. Just Employment and the Living Wage at Colleges and Universities

With this policy, [institution’s name] recognizes the connection between its Catholic faith and its moral commitment to promote a just work environment. In the words of Pope Francis, “it is through free, creative, participatory and mutually supportive labour that human beings express and enhance their lives.” Consistent with this vision and the Ignatian value of cura personalis, [institution’s name] adopts this Just Employment Policy to fulfill an important dimension of its religious mission and strengthen an essential element of its Catholic identity.”

Continuing (Harrison Institute for Public Law and Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor, 2018):

“[institution’s name] adopts this policy in order to ensure our treatment of workers is consistent with our moral obligation to preserve life and promote the virtue of industriousness. For over a century, Church doctrine has recognized that employers fulfill their
obligation to support life when they provide workers with a wage sufficient to fulfill their material, social, and spiritual needs. Similarly, Church doctrine recognizes that industriousness is a virtue; labor should be spiritually fulfilling, not spiritually degrading. Employers promote this virtue when they provide workplaces that protect workers’ dignity and respect workers’ unions, which “help workers to share in a fully human way in the life of their place of employment.”

As much as such a grounding in Catholic social teaching or the words of the Pope might motivate institutional change within Catholic institutions, a just employment policy could just as easily be justified as a moral choice in secular terms.

As reported above, almost as many public and private institutions have adopted living wage policies, and one would imagine that the mission statements of the vast majority of HEIs do explicitly address their relationship with their employees, for example (University of Michigan, 2018):

“We strive to be an exemplary employer and a positive influence in our community. We provide an environment where all employees can deploy and develop their skills to the fullest potential.”

As another example, the University of New Hampshire’s 2017 Sustainability Survey Report states (p. 2):
“As a land- sea- and space-grant university, sustainability is rooted in the University of New Hampshire's 150-year history. Sustainability is a core value of UNH and is based upon a holistic framework that integrates the principles of environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and economic vitality to meet our present needs while ensuring the ability of future generations to meet their needs. At its core, sustainability is a collective commitment to human dignity for all people and ecological integrity in all places.”

Returning to the Model Just Employment Policy, the Kalmanovitz Initiative frames the need for a just employment policy as a moral imperative, understandably, grounded in Catholic social teaching and the Jesuit tradition (Kalmanovitz Initiative):

Colleges and universities have the potential to act as model employers, recognizing the rights of their workers and committing to pay them living wages. As colleges and universities have successfully promoted environmental sustainability, so too must they promote social sustainability, workers’ rights, and social justice. For Catholic and Jesuit colleges and universities, this is a moral imperative.

The only other place where the model Just Employment Policy references Catholicism is in its description of the structure to provide oversight for implementation of the policy (Kalmanovitz Initiative):
“Structure

The university must appoint the following [institution name] community members to the oversight committee, each of whom should serve at least a one-year term:

1. three faculty members chosen by the faculty governing body, at least one of whom has expertise in Catholic Social Teaching,

2. one member of the human resources department chosen by the university administration,

3. one member of the [institution name] Jesuit Community chosen by the Jesuit Community, and

4. two students, one direct employee, and one contract worker, all chosen by the student government.”

Given the adoption of principles of shared governance across American higher education, it is not difficult to imagine the structure of an oversight committee that would fit the culture and structure of secular or public institutions.

Conclusion

With varying degrees of commitment and institutional support, faculty in Jesuit business schools have incorporated sustainability into their curricula in imaginative ways. This may or may not be a precursor to wider adoption of just employment policies by Jesuit higher education institutions; given Jesuit institutions’ leadership on this issue, business faculty in Jesuit colleges
and universities may soon have influence on whether our institutions practice what we teach regarding social sustainability and justice in the workplace.
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### Table 1.
**Four-year Total Institutions and Institutions with Publicly Available Living Wage Policies†**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type†</th>
<th>All institutions</th>
<th>Institutions with policies‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>33.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private non-profit</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>66.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/affiliated</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>43.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


‡ Consistent with IPEDS methodology, University of California system is counted as 10 institutions; if University of California were counted as one institution, the number of public institutions would be 6, or .86% of all public institutions.
Table 2.
Institutional Policies Scored Using Living Wage Policy Rubric†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Jesuit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California (system)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Scott College</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling Jesuit University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartburg College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
† Scoring using the Living Wage Policy Rubric (Author(s)); Living Wage Policy Study, justwage.org.