

2017

# Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics: Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools

Kenneth Goodpaster

University of St. Thomas, kegoodpaster@stthomas.edu

Dean Maines

University of St. Thomas, Minnesota, tdmaines@stthomas.edu

Michael Naughton

University Of St. Thomas - Minnesota, mjnaughton@stthomas.edu

Brian Shapiro

BPSHAPIRO@stthomas.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.stthomas.edu/ocbeblpub>



Part of the [Business Law, Public Responsibility, and Ethics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Goodpaster, Kenneth; Maines, Dean; Naughton, Michael; and Shapiro, Brian, "Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics: Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools" (2017). *Ethics and Business Law Faculty Publications*. 71.

<https://ir.stthomas.edu/ocbeblpub/71>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ethics and Business Law at UST Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ethics and Business Law Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UST Research Online. For more information, please contact [libroadmin@stthomas.edu](mailto:libroadmin@stthomas.edu).

# Journal of Business Ethics

## Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics: Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	
<b>Article Type:</b>	S. I. : IVBEC New York 2015
<b>Full Title:</b>	Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics: Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools
<b>Keywords:</b>	Baldrige Performance Excellence Program; Catholic Identity Matrix; Catholic social teaching; ethics assessment, mission integration; United Nations Global Compact; United Nations Principles for Management Education
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Brian P. Shapiro, Ph.D University of St. Thomas St. Paul, MN UNITED STATES
<b>Corresponding Author E-Mail:</b>	BPSHAPIRO@stthomas.edu
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Kenneth E. Goodpaster, Ph.D. T. Dean Maines, Ph.D Michael J. Naughton, Ph.D Brian P. Shapiro, Ph.D
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	We address how the leaders of a Catholic business school can articulate and assess how well their schools implement the following six principles drawn from Catholic social teaching (CST): (1) Produce goods and services that are authentically good; (2) Foster solidarity with the poor by serving deprived and marginalized populations; (3) Advance the dignity of human work as a calling; (4) Exercise subsidiarity; (5) Promote responsible stewardship over resources; and (6) Acquire and allocate resources justly. We first discuss how the CST principles relate to the Good Goods, Good Work, and Good Wealth framework in <i>The Vocation of the Business Leader</i> (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2012), and then discuss their congruencies and tensions with the UNGC and UNPRME principles. Next, we describe the Catholic Identity Matrix (CIM), an assessment tool that provides a quantitative and qualitative portrait of how well a Catholic business school integrates, within the scope of its mission and capacities, the six CST principles in its strategies, policies, activities, and processes. The concluding section summarizes our analysis and discusses its implications for ongoing UNGC and UNPRME assessment, reporting, and development efforts.
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Is the manuscript currently submitted anywhere else?	No.

**Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics:  
Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools**

Kenneth E. Goodpaster  
Emeritus Koch Endowed Chair of Business Ethics  
Opus College of Business, University of St. Thomas  
1000 LaSalle Avenue, Mail # TMH 344  
Minneapolis, MN 55403, USA  
Phone: 1-651-962-4087  
[kegoodpaster@stthomas.edu](mailto:kegoodpaster@stthomas.edu)

T. Dean Maines  
Director, Veritas Institute  
Opus College of Business, University of St. Thomas  
1000 LaSalle Avenue, Mail # TMH 337  
Minneapolis, MN 55403, USA  
Phone: 1-651-962-4261  
[tdmaines@stthomas.edu](mailto:tdmaines@stthomas.edu)

Michael Naughton  
Director and Koch Endowed Chair, Center for Catholic Studies  
University of St. Thomas  
2115 Summit Ave, Mail # 55S  
St. Paul, MN 55105, USA  
Phone: 1-651-962-5712  
[mjnaughton@stthomas.edu](mailto:mjnaughton@stthomas.edu)

Brian Shapiro  
David A. and Barbara Koch Distinguished Professor of Accounting and Business Ethics  
Opus College of Business, University of St. Thomas  
2115 Summit Avenue, Mail # MCH 316  
St. Paul, MN 55105, USA  
Phone: 1-651-962-5086  
[bpshapiro@stthomas.edu](mailto:bpshapiro@stthomas.edu)

**Acknowledgements:** The authors thank Arnold M. Weimerskirch and participants at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual International Vincentian Business Ethics Conference (IVBEC) (October 22-24, 2015, New York) for their helpful comments and suggestions, and Naomi Sack for her able administrative assistance. Summer research grants to Brian Shapiro from the University of St. Thomas Opus College of Business and the Veritas Institute are gratefully acknowledged.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Using UNPRME to Teach, Research, and Enact Business Ethics:**  
5 **Insights from the Catholic Identity Matrix for Business Schools**  
6

7  
8 The United Nations Global Compact's (UNGC) ten principles for socially and  
9  
10 environmentally responsible business practices (UN, 2010) and the related United Nations  
11  
12 Principles for Responsible Management Education (UNPRME) build upon the United Nations  
13  
14 Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1948) and other UN development goals concerning labor, the  
15  
16 environment, and anti-corruption. Altogether, these principles promote what Mele (2003, p. 3)  
17  
18 described as "humanizing organizational cultures," inasmuch as they respect human dignity,  
19  
20 advance human rights, support personal growth, promote care and service for others, and  
21  
22 improve an organization's ability to serve the common good rather than only narrow special  
23  
24 interests. Catholic social teaching (CST) similarly emphasizes such themes as human dignity, the  
25  
26 dignity of human work, promotion of the common good, subsidiarity (employee participation),  
27  
28 responsible stewardship over resources, and solidarity with the poor and other marginalized  
29  
30 members of society.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 We examine how the UNGC and UNPRME initiatives can help Catholic business schools  
38  
39 deepen their mission and participate in a broader conversation among institutions of higher  
40  
41 learning about how to educate socially and environmentally responsible global business leaders.  
42  
43 Our discussion and analysis are guided by two primary questions about how the UNGC and  
44  
45 UNPRME principles might inform the teaching, research, and enactment of ethical business  
46  
47 practices in Catholic business schools. First, how do principles drawn from Catholic social  
48  
49 teaching (CST) enable Catholic business schools to enact their Catholic identity and mission in  
50  
51 their teaching, research, service, and operational activities, in a manner that also advances the  
52  
53 UNGC and UNPRME principles? Specific applications of UNGC and UNPRME are expected to  
54  
55 vary depending on the nature of the business organization. Indeed, the UNGC specifically asks  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 its signatory companies to support and enact, “within their sphere of influence,” the ten UNGC  
5  
6 principles.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the preamble to the six UNPRME principles asks its signatory institutions  
7  
8 of higher business education to declare their willingness to make progress toward implementing  
9  
10 the principles, and to start with those principles that are more relevant to their “capacities and  
11  
12 mission.”<sup>2</sup>  
13  
14

15  
16 While every business school arguably communicates moral values and engages in moral  
17  
18 education, whether by default or by design, Catholic business schools have the potential to be  
19  
20 distinguished by their mission-guided nature, one that involves preparing students to become  
21  
22 highly principled and effective business leaders through an education that provides appropriate  
23  
24 theoretical material, skill-based training, and integration of Catholic social teaching with  
25  
26 professional practices (cf. Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2012, §85-86). To further  
27  
28 explore these ideas, we advance six principles drawn from CST: (1) Produce goods and services  
29  
30 that are authentically good; (2) Foster solidarity with the poor by serving deprived and  
31  
32 marginalized populations; (3) Advance the dignity of human work as a calling; (4) Exercise  
33  
34 subsidiarity; (5) Promote responsible stewardship over resources; and (6) Acquire and allocate  
35  
36 resources justly. Catholic business schools that take their missions seriously and wish to  
37  
38 participate in a broader discussion about the role of business ethics education need to consider  
39  
40 how these CST principles relate to the UNGC and UNPRME principles.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The second research question that guides our discussion and analysis asks how the  
49  
50 leaders and faculty of Catholic business schools might systematically and effectively articulate,  
51  
52 assess, and report on how well they implement CST principles within their activities and  
53  
54 processes. The answer is not obvious, for the quality of existing assessment practices for  
55  
56  
57

---

58 <sup>1</sup> See <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html>.

59 <sup>2</sup> See <http://www.unprme.org/about-prme/the-six-principles.php>.

1  
2  
3  
4 evaluating and then reporting on progress toward implementing the UNGC and UNPRME  
5  
6 principles is highly contested and still much in flux (e.g., see Rasche and Waddock, 2014; Sethi  
7  
8 and Schepers, 2014). We examine how Catholic business schools may assess and improve their  
9  
10 programs in a manner consistent with the UNGC and UNPRME projects as well as the missions  
11  
12 of their own universities. We illustrate how this may be accomplished via a *Catholic Identity*  
13  
14 *Matrix* (CIM), an assessment tool that provides a quantitative and qualitative portrait of the  
15  
16 current state of a Catholic business school's academic, curricular, and administrative activities.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21           The CIM is patterned after the assessment process pioneered by the Baldrige  
22  
23 Performance Excellence Program and is based on a previously developed tool that has been used  
24  
25 successfully by senior executives of Catholic health care organizations to assess how well they  
26  
27 deploy Catholic moral principles within their institutions. The CIM framework identifies five  
28  
29 tasks a business school must undertake to enact principles effectively within their operations: (1)  
30  
31 planning, (2) alignment of critical leaders, (3) the deployment of systematic processes, (4)  
32  
33 training, and (5) the measurement of impact. Given our focus on how the mission of Catholic  
34  
35 business schools relates to the teaching, research, and enactment of ethical business practices, we  
36  
37 systematically relate each of the five CIM tasks to the six CST principles. Application of the  
38  
39 CIM involves evidence-based assessment and pursuit of continuous improvement opportunities.  
40  
41 We discuss how these activities can advance the annual assessment, reporting, and continuous  
42  
43 improvement goals of UNGC and UNPRME.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50           The remainder of this paper consists of three sections. The first section advances the six  
51  
52 CST principles and relates them to the UNGC principles. The second section describes the CIM  
53  
54 and its relation to the UNGC and UNPRME principles. The concluding section summarizes our  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 analysis and discusses how CST principles and the CIM contribute to ongoing UNGC and  
5  
6 UNPRME assessment, reporting, and development efforts.  
7  
8

### 9 **CST Principles and their Relation to UNGC Principles**

10  
11 This section addresses our first research question, namely, how do principles drawn from  
12  
13 Catholic social teaching (CST) enable Catholic business schools to enact their Catholic identity  
14  
15 and mission in their teaching, research, service, and operational activities, in a manner that also  
16  
17 advances the UNGC and UNPRME principles? Below we first advance six principles drawn  
18  
19 from CST and discuss their relation to three goods (Good Goods, Good Work, and Good Wealth)  
20  
21 set forth in *Vocation of the Business Leader* (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2012). We  
22  
23 then describe linkages between the CST principles and the UNGC principles, highlighting their  
24  
25 congruencies and differences.  
26  
27  
28  
29

#### 30 ***Six CST Principles Underlying Good Goods, Good Work, and Good Wealth***

31  
32 Table 1 lists six CST principles organized by the “three goods” (Good Goods, Good  
33  
34 Work, and Good Wealth) set forth in Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (2012).<sup>3</sup> The six  
35  
36 principles are based on a CST-inspired view of the human person and human flourishing, and  
37  
38 may be considered core convictions and principles for Catholic business schools. The three  
39  
40 goods, their corresponding CST principles, and their implications for business ethics education  
41  
42 and research are described in detail below.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 [Insert Table 1 about here]  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>3</sup> The three interrelated goods also map onto what MacIntyre (2011, p. 323) described as three goods that make  
56  
57 work meaningful: “...that the work that we do has a point and purpose, is productive of genuine goods” [Good  
58  
59 Goods]; “that the work that we do is and is recognized to be *our* work, *our* contribution, in which we are given and  
60  
61 take responsibility for doing it and for doing it well” [Good Work]; “and that we are rewarded for doing it in a way  
62  
63 that enables us to achieve the goods of family and community” [Good Wealth]” (cf. Kennedy, 2006; Specht and  
64  
65 Broholm, 2009).

1  
2  
3  
4           **Good Goods.** The first of the three central goods of business aims to produce goods that  
5  
6 are truly good and services that truly serve. In conventional business language, goods and  
7  
8 services are understood as objects or actions that have market value, in the sense that someone is  
9  
10 willing to exchange money for them. But sometimes markets can be unreliable metrics for value.  
11  
12 The fact that nobody will buy at a given time and price, or the fact that a particular good or  
13  
14 service sells, may indicate the existence of Good Goods, or it may mean that people’s priorities  
15  
16 are askew. A normative theory of the good is needed to determine whether goods and services  
17  
18 truly advance the health and well-being of individuals and their respective communities (cf.  
19  
20 Sandel, 1982; Taylor, 1989, pp. 274-279; MacIntyre, 1990, p. 60).<sup>4</sup>  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26           Two principles address the normative value of goods and services. The first principle of  
27  
28 Good Goods is that a business produces goods or services that are authentically good, in the  
29  
30 sense that they meet the needs of the human community. It takes a wide range of products and  
31  
32 services, from the life-saving to the mundane, to maintain a good society. Business also must  
33  
34 strive to create sustainable goods and services, and has an ongoing responsibility to identify and  
35  
36 address negative externalities.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41           The second principle of Good Goods is that businesses must foster solidarity with the  
42  
43 poor by serving deprived and marginalized populations. Meeting the needs of the human  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

---

49           <sup>4</sup> Pope John Paul II (1991, §36) wrote the following about the phenomenon of consumerism: “In singling out new  
50 needs and new means to meet them, one must be guided by a comprehensive picture of the person which respects all  
51 the dimensions of his being and which subordinates his material and instinctive dimensions to his interior and  
52 spiritual ones. If, on the contrary, a direct appeal is made to human instincts--while ignoring in various ways the  
53 reality of the person as intelligent and free--then consumer attitudes and lifestyles can be created which are  
54 objectively improper and often damaging to the person's physical and spiritual health. Of itself, an economic system  
55 does not possess criteria for correctly distinguishing new and higher forms of satisfying human needs from artificial  
56 new needs which hinder the formation of a mature personality. Thus a great deal of educational and cultural work is  
57 urgently needed, including the education of consumers in the responsible use of their power of choice, the formation  
58 of a strong sense of responsibility among producers and among people in the mass media in particular, as well as the  
59 necessary intervention by public authorities.”  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 community extends to the needs of all, not simply the needs of a few. This principle requires a  
5  
6 sense of fraternal charity toward others (Benedict XVI, 2009, §9).  
7  
8

9 ***Implications of Good Goods for Business Education.*** The two principles underlying Good  
10 Goods can (and should) guide thoughtful classroom dialogues and faculty research about such  
11  
12 issues as a culture of consumerism; the dominance of market logic in the public square; the non-  
13  
14 equivalence of legality and morality; the relationship between needs, wants, and human  
15  
16 fulfillment; the assumptions about human motivation that often go unexamined in disciplines like  
17  
18 marketing, finance, accounting, organizational behavior; tensions among market dynamics, law,  
19  
20 and public policy in relation to controversial products and services; and the extent to which the  
21  
22 poor and other marginalized populations have access to employment and good goods and good  
23  
24 services.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 ***Good Work.*** Another central good of business is bringing into existence good working  
32  
33 conditions for employees. At a minimum, this requires that the working conditions be safe and  
34  
35 not debilitating, that employees are treated respectfully, and that employees be given sufficient  
36  
37 opportunity to honor their work/life balance commitments. A highly principled business leader  
38  
39 would aim, however, to go beyond the minimum. Two principles of Good Work can guide such  
40  
41 a leader.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 The first principle of Good Work focuses on advancing the dignity of work as a calling.  
47  
48 The Ancient Greeks saw work and in particular manual work as undignified, as beneath them.  
49  
50 But while the Greeks saw the “work of one’s hands” as slave or non-citizen work, Jews and  
51  
52 Christians saw work as a dignified participation in the ongoing work of creation. At the heart of  
53  
54 good work is the fundamental call to use our talents, abilities, knowledge and skills to serve the  
55  
56 good of others. As a principle, it distinguishes between a careerism focused on having and doing  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 and a vocation that addresses the meaning of our work and our lives. Without a sense of being  
5  
6 called, the competitive and complex difficulties of business can erode a leader’s sense of the  
7  
8 human significance of their actions and decisions and reduce them to technical functions and  
9  
10 financial formulae (cf. Yuengert, 2011).<sup>5</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14 The second principle of Good Work focuses on the structure of work within the  
15  
16 organization, and in particular calls the business leader to exercise subsidiarity by drawing upon  
17  
18 and developing the diverse gifts, talents, abilities, and skills of all employees.<sup>6</sup> Subsidiarity  
19  
20 demands that organizations and their leaders fulfill three important tasks:  
21  
22

- 23 1. Design the work of employees in a way that taps their gifts, talents, and skills. Such  
24  
25 design fosters initiative among employees and gives voice to all people in the  
26  
27 organization.  
28  
29
- 30 2. Develop the people in the organization through effective education, skill development,  
31  
32 mentoring, evaluation, and adequate resources to perform their work well.  
33  
34
- 35 3. Establish strong relationships with employees, not only by delegating work but also by  
36  
37 trusting employees. While employees must earn trust through competence, initiative and  
38  
39 hard work, leaders must in turn have the courage to assume some risk when relying on  
40  
41 the work of their employees.  
42  
43  
44

45 ***Implications of Good Work for business education.*** The conditions for human work and  
46  
47 the way it is designed and managed have a significant impact on how well a business can  
48  
49 compete in the marketplace and the extent to which its people can flourish through their work.  
50  
51  
52

---

53  
54 <sup>5</sup> As Pope Francis (2013, §203) put it, “Business is a vocation, and a noble vocation, provided that those engaged in  
55 it see themselves challenged by a greater meaning in life; this will enable them truly to serve the common good by  
56 striving to increase the goods of this world and to make them more accessible to all.”

57 <sup>6</sup> At the heart of “subsidiarity” as a principle of leadership is a *respect in action* that assists leaders to take another  
58 look (*re-spect* from the Latin *respectare* to re-look) at their employees (Naughton, Buckeye, Goodpaster, and  
59 Maines, 2015). This *relooking* calls leaders to move beyond first impressions, and to recognize the unrepeatable,  
60 irreplaceable personal reality of each employee.  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 The two principles underlying Good Work can (and should) guide thoughtful classroom  
5 dialogues and faculty research about such issues as the value of employee participation that  
6 includes not only financial considerations; assumptions about human motivation that may often  
7 go unexamined in human resources, operations, organizational behavior, and the management  
8 disciplines; a culture of careerism where leaders are more concerned about what they achieve  
9 than who they become; the dominance of “instrumental rationality” over moral rationality; the  
10 difference between work as a career and work as a vocation; and how job design impacts people.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 *Good Wealth.* CST maintains that capital and other property should be privately held, but  
22 nevertheless used in a manner that is sustainable and advances the common good (John Paul II,  
23 1987, §42). Synergies and conflicts among the private and common uses of property urge  
24 business leaders to consider the distributive consequences of how they set prices, allocate wages,  
25 share ownership, distribute dividends, and support their communities. A profitable business  
26 creates wealth, well-paying jobs, opportunities for employee development, satisfied customers,  
27 and potentially the good of all stakeholders. Human needs can be better satisfied if the resulting  
28 wealth is shared not only with investors but also invested in labor, infrastructure, and research  
29 and development. Good Wealth includes a just but not necessarily equal distribution of wealth  
30 that rewards individual contributions as well as advances society’s well-being. It also aims for  
31 just wealth creation through business practices that promote Good Goods and Good Work.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

7

1  
2  
3  
4 The following two principles can guide a Good Wealth approach to business activities.  
5

6 The first principle requires business leaders to promote responsible stewardship over resources.  
7

8  
9 Good stewards are creative and productive with the resources placed in their care (MT 25:14-  
10

11 30); they do not only take from creation's abundance, but also use their talents and skills to  
12

13  
14 produce more from what has been given to them. One manifestation of the good stewardship  
15

16 principle within the business context is financial profit sufficient to sustain the organization.  
17

18  
19 Effective business leaders sustain their organizations when they use their resources effectively,  
20

21 drive out waste, establish and maintain efficient processes, and maintain healthy profit margins.  
22

23  
24 Just as financial resources are vital for the long-run survival of business organizations and the  
25

26 societies in which they operate, so too is stewardship of the physical and the inherited (and not  
27

28 solely humanly created) resources it provides. As the creation stories in the first two chapters of  
29

30  
31 Genesis suggest, we are called to exercise both dominion and good stewardship over the world's  
32

33  
34 resources in order to advance our well-being and the well-being of others (Francis, 2015,  
35

36 Benedict XVI, 2009, §48; Soloveitchik, 1965).  
37

38  
39 The second principle of Good Wealth requires business leaders to acquire and allocate  
40  
41 resources justly. A just acquisition of wealth avoids corrupt means and should not be achieved at  
42

43 the expense of Good Work and Good Goods. A just distribution of wealth renders to others what  
44

45 they are due. As wealth creators, for example, business leaders must seek ways to justly and  
46

47  
48 sustainably distribute their organization's wealth to employees (just wages), customers (just  
49

50 prices), owners (just returns), suppliers (just prices), and the community (just tax payments). Just  
51

52  
53 allocation of wealth also exercises the preferential option for the poor. Leviticus 19:9-10, for  
54

55  
56 example, enjoins farmers to leave the gleanings of their fields (part of their "profit") for the poor  
57

58 and disadvantaged members of society (Shapiro, Cohen, and Naughton, 2013).  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4                   ***Implications of Good Wealth for business education.*** The two principles underlying  
5  
6 Good Wealth can (and should) guide thoughtful classroom dialogues and faculty research about  
7  
8 such issues as how well organizations monitor, evaluate, and create wealth through just means  
9  
10 (Good Work and Good Goods) and avoid creating wealth through unjust means; steps  
11  
12 organizations may take to exercise good stewardship over all of their resources and to promote  
13  
14 sustainable wealth creation and distribution; how a purely financially focused cost-benefit  
15  
16 analysis may hinder the creation and distribution of good wealth; how organizations handle the  
17  
18 non-equivalence of human and financial resources when they use cost-benefit analyses to reach  
19  
20 their decisions; how a shareholder wealth maximization logic may help or hinder the creation  
21  
22 and distribution of Good Wealth; and how organizations manage tensions among their wealth  
23  
24 creation practices, wealth distribution practices, and investment activities to promote the well-  
25  
26 being of individuals, sustain and grow the organization, and advance the good of society as a  
27  
28 whole.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36                   ***Relation between the Six CST and Ten UNGC Principles: Congruencies and Tensions***  
37

38                   Table 2 lists the ten UNGC principles and their relation to the six CST principles. The  
39  
40 UNGC principles covering human rights, labor, the environment, and anti-corruption are derived  
41  
42 from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR) (UN, 1948), the International Labour  
43  
44 Organization’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Rio Declaration on  
45  
46 Environment and Development, and the United Nations Convention Against Corruption. The  
47  
48 historical development of the 1948 UNDHR can help us understand both the congruence and  
49  
50 difference between the UNGC and CST principles. Jacques Maritain, a French Thomist  
51  
52 philosopher, participated in formulating the contents of UNDHR. The UN’s agenda included the  
53  
54 difficult task of persuading the members of an international body, many of whom professed  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 inconsistent and even contradictory first principles, to agree on a common list of fundamental  
5  
6 human rights. Maritain believed that notwithstanding the members' differences, their common  
7  
8 human experience could lead them to agreement on practical matters regarding their life in  
9  
10 common. For Maritain, this achievement represented no small step toward human development  
11  
12 across diverse societies. Yet, to have insisted on a clear philosophical or theological statement of  
13  
14 the *basis* of human rights in the UNDHR would have derailed this progress toward a genuinely  
15  
16 common good. Maritain credited the "neutral" language of practical truths, which we might call the  
17  
18 common sense of human action, with enabling the participants to find a measure of unity and  
19  
20 agreement, even though they might not agree on why they agreed. As Maritain explained, "We  
21  
22 agree on these rights, *providing we are not asked why*. With the 'why' the dispute begins"  
23  
24 (Maritain, 1951, 77). Maritain further explained that while the extent of such practical  
25  
26 agreements "is doubtless very little, it is the last refuge of intellectual agreement among men. It  
27  
28 is . . . enough to undertake a great work; and it would mean a great deal to become aware of this  
29  
30 body of common practical convictions" (Maritain, 1951, 77-78; see also Alford and Naughton,  
31  
32 Chapter 1).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 [Insert Table 2 about here]

41  
42  
43 Maritain's pragmatic approach has the advantage of advancing agreement within a  
44  
45 pluralistic setting. At the UN this approach makes a lot of sense, and the UNGC project in  
46  
47 particular is an important vehicle for aligning diverse companies around a common set of  
48  
49 principles. But this practical consensus-driven approach should not be the sole approach within a  
50  
51 Catholic mission-driven university whose important task includes engaging students in first  
52  
53 principles. Indeed, while Maritain saw the great benefit of coming to a pragmatic agreement on  
54  
55 *what* human rights people have, he did not think that we should keep the *why* behind our actions  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 obscure. Specifically, the *why* of our actions represents their motivations, influences their moral  
5  
6 quality, and can foster a deeper commitment to human rights and the other UNGC principles.  
7

8  
9 Vaclav Havel, former president of the Czech Republic, well appreciated the issue here. He  
10  
11 perceived how a campaign for human rights, without a connectedness to a deeper *why*, was in  
12  
13 danger of becoming a slogan:  
14

15  
16           Politicians at international forums may reiterate a thousand times that the basis of the new  
17  
18 world order must be universal respect for human rights, but it will mean nothing as long  
19  
20 as this imperative does not derive from the respect for the miracle of Being, the miracle  
21  
22 of the universe, the miracle of nature, the miracle of our own existence. Only someone  
23  
24 who submits to the authority of the universal order and of creation, who values the right  
25  
26 to be a part of it and a participant in it, can genuinely value himself and his neighbors,  
27  
28 and thus honor their rights as well (Havel, 1994).  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 In the absence of a moral and spiritual tradition, or other traditions based on first principles, the  
35  
36 UNGC principles can devolve into a corporate checklist and foster an instrumental approach to  
37  
38 corporate policy. For example, some companies publicly assert that if they are good corporate  
39  
40 citizens, they will make more money. Taken to its logical conclusion, this instrumentalism could  
41  
42 be invoked to justify violating the UNGC principles whenever enacting the principles would  
43  
44 reduce a company's profit. CST principles can provide a deeper foundation and commitment to  
45  
46 the intent and purpose behind the UNGC principles. For example, within CST the foundation of  
47  
48 human rights lies in the conviction that human beings are made in the image and likeness of the  
49  
50 Creator. The rich narrative traditions that support and elaborate upon this conviction can anchor  
51  
52 human rights in a firmer foundation than convention, proclamation, or international law, and  
53  
54 provide a normative guide for economic and political institutions.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Finally, while UNGC and CST often converge on practical expressions of human rights,  
5  
6 labor rights, and environmental responsibility, the two sets of principles may sometimes be in  
7  
8 tension or conflict. For example, both CST and UNGC recognize the importance of unions and  
9  
10 the right of workers to organize. Both also condemn forced, compulsory, and child labor. But  
11  
12 there is less agreement both within and between the two sets of principles in other areas such as  
13  
14 gay marriage, employer-provision of health benefits, and the religious rights of employers.  
15  
16 Catholic mission-driven business education should be committed to thoughtful classroom  
17  
18 dialogues and faculty research on both the congruence and the differences between CST and  
19  
20 UNGC principles. The more general point in comparing the UNGC and CST principles is that  
21  
22 they both *as collections* offer an interpretation of “global corporate responsibility.” Both attend  
23  
24 to human rights as well as other social and environmental concerns (authentic goods and  
25  
26 services, the dignity of work, environmental sustainability, and social justice).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **A Catholic Identity Matrix for Assessing Catholic Mission-Driven Enactment of UNGC** 34 **and UNPRME Principles** 35 36 37

38 We now address our second research question, namely, how might the leaders of Catholic  
39  
40 business schools systematically and effectively articulate, assess, and report on how well they  
41  
42 implement CST principles within their activities and processes? We first explain how the CIM  
43  
44 integrates the six CST principles and a maturity framework that illuminates the institutional  
45  
46 implications of the CST principles. Next, we describe linkages between the CIM and the UNGC  
47  
48 and UNPRME principles—highlighting both the congruencies and differences between these two  
49  
50 ways to implement mission-driven business education.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 ***A Catholic Identity Matrix for Catholic Business Schools***  
5

6           Founded in 2007 as a center within the Opus College of Business at the University of St.  
7  
8 Thomas (Minnesota), the Veritas Institute promotes ethically responsible organizational conduct  
9  
10 by developing assessment tools that help organizations place moral aspirations into action. The  
11  
12 Institute’s tools employ a method known as the Self-Assessment and Improvement Process  
13  
14 (SAIP). The SAIP is modeled upon the organizational assessment approach pioneered within the  
15  
16 Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, and facilitates the creation of assessment frameworks  
17  
18 that help leaders determine how well specific moral principles have been deployed throughout  
19  
20 their organization.<sup>7</sup>  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26           More specifically, the SAIP translates a set of moral principles into a systematic array of  
27  
28 questions concerning an organization’s management system. By answering the questions on the  
29  
30 basis of empirical evidence, and then evaluating the responses using a set of scoring guidelines,  
31  
32 leaders can determine the degree to which the principles have been institutionalized with their  
33  
34 organizations – that is, the degree to which they have been embedded within the policies,  
35  
36 processes, and practices that shape how the organization operates. The assessment’s outcomes  
37  
38 highlight improvement opportunities. They also provide information that supports the  
39  
40 formulation of initiatives intended to address these opportunities (Maines, 2011, p. 361).  
41  
42  
43  
44

45           The assessment questions are generated through a process of *progressive articulation*  
46  
47 (Maines and Naughton, 2010, p. 674). Progressive articulation resolves a moral principle into  
48  
49 more specific moral directives, expressing these directives as questions. However, developing  
50  
51

---

52  
53 <sup>7</sup> The SAIP uses the Baldrige approach to extend a longstanding moral practice, the examination of conscience, from  
54 individuals to organizations. An examination of conscience is a periodic, systematic review of one’s thoughts,  
55 decisions, words, and deeds for the purpose of evaluating their alignment with or departure from a set of moral  
56 precepts. An individual typically performs an examination of conscience by reflecting upon a structured inventory of  
57 questions that are rooted in a set of moral precepts. Such reflection helps moral agents identify opportunities to  
58 conform their conduct more closely to the precepts and assimilate the moral standards more deeply within their  
59 character (Maines, 2011, p. 360).  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 assessment questions is not a matter of simple deduction. Rather, it involves the elaboration of a  
5  
6 moral principle's requirements in light of two factors: (1) a maturity framework, and (2) the  
7  
8 challenges faced by an organization operating within a particular industry.  
9

10  
11 The maturity framework identifies five implementation tasks an organization must  
12  
13 undertake to integrate a moral principle within its management system. As an organization  
14  
15 matures, it increasingly will address the implementation tasks systematically – that is, through  
16  
17 systems that include defined, effective, repeatable processes or procedures, rather than *ad hoc*  
18  
19 activity. The implementation tasks include reflecting the principle within mission, vision, and  
20  
21 values statements, strategies, operating plans, and critical policies (planning); reinforcing the  
22  
23 principle through reporting, performance management, incentive, and selection systems  
24  
25 (alignment); establishing documented processes that incorporate the principle within relevant  
26  
27 work practices (process); and ensuring that employees have the requisite knowledge, skills,  
28  
29 abilities, and resources to execute and improve these processes (training). The maturity  
30  
31 framework also considers the outputs and outcomes attained through the management system,  
32  
33 i.e., metrics that indicate whether work processes are functioning correctly and yielding desired  
34  
35 results (measurement) (Maines, 2014, p. 426).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The questions for a given moral principle address all five implementation tasks. This  
44  
45 enables an organization to determine whether it is taking all the steps necessary to enable the  
46  
47 principle to effectively influence decisions and actions. Furthermore, the assessment questions  
48  
49 addressing a given implementation task should target critical organizational challenges related to  
50  
51 the principle in question.<sup>8</sup>  
52  
53

---

54  
55  
56  
57 <sup>8</sup> Such challenges cannot necessarily be inferred from the principle's content alone; rather, their identification  
58 frequently requires the moral insight that comes only with extensive professional experience within a particular  
59 industry or organizational setting – e.g., a manufacturing firm, an acute care hospital, a long-term care facility for  
60 the elderly, a college of business, etc. Consequently, progressive articulation relies heavily upon the practical  
61

1  
2  
3  
4           *The Catholic Identity Matrix: previous applications in health care.* The SAIP method is  
5  
6 flexible, inasmuch as it can be used in conjunction with different sets of moral principles.  
7  
8 Consequently, the Veritas Institute has employed the SAIP method to develop several  
9  
10 proprietary assessment tools. One of these is especially relevant to a concern for Catholic  
11  
12 business schools. In 2007 the Institute collaborated with the largest Catholic health system in the  
13  
14 United States, Ascension Health, to develop a CIM for Catholic health care organizations. This  
15  
16 tool enables leaders within Catholic health care to address the challenge of strengthening or  
17  
18 renewing the Catholic identity of their organizations. The CIM uses the SAIP method to help  
19  
20 Catholic hospitals evaluate the degree to which six principles drawn from the Catholic moral  
21  
22 tradition have been integrated within their management systems. The principles include  
23  
24 maintaining solidarity with the poor, providing holistic care, demonstrating a profound respect  
25  
26 for human life, creating a participatory community of work, stewarding resources effectively,  
27  
28 and acting in communion with the broader Church.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36           The CIM for health care has become a recognized best practice among Catholic hospitals  
37  
38 in the United States. To date, nearly 60 acute care hospitals in nine Catholic health systems have  
39  
40 applied the CIM to their operations, and the tool's use continues to expand. The health care CIM  
41  
42 also is being employed within Germany and Mexico. All of these applications have fostered a  
43  
44 practical awareness of the actions organizations must take to intentionally cultivate and sustain  
45  
46 their vocation as Catholic health ministries.<sup>9</sup>  
47  
48  
49  
50

---

51  
52 wisdom of executives and managers (Maines and Naughton, 2010, p. 675). Their experience is critical to creating  
53  
54 incisive queries that will help decision makers determine both how well a particular moral principle has been  
55  
56 institutionalized and what must be done to integrate the standard deeper within the organization's management  
57  
58 system, such that the principle will be embodied more fully within the firm's decisions and actions.

59  
60 <sup>9</sup> Application of the tool spawned the following examples Of improvement: Expanding planning efforts to include  
61  
62 the stewardship of natural resources, to ensure the organization intentionally addresses this aspect of its  
63  
64 responsibilities; enhancing the metrics used to evaluate programs targeting the health needs of the poor and  
65  
66 marginalized, to better assess their clinical effectiveness and ensure they are delivered in a manner that honors the  
67  
68 dignity of participants; working with public officials to modify public bus routes, to enhance access to a behavioral

1  
2  
3  
4 *An Assessment tool for Catholic business schools.* The success of the CIM within  
5  
6 Catholic healthcare suggests that a similar tool could be crafted for Catholic higher education –  
7  
8 and, more specifically, for Catholic business schools. The heart of this tool is an assessment  
9  
10 matrix formed by juxtaposing the six CST principles identified in Table 1 with the maturity  
11  
12 framework’s five implementation tasks. This juxtaposition creates a framework for  
13  
14 systematically examining how the six principles inform the operations of a Catholic business  
15  
16 school (Table 3).  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 [Insert Table 3 about here]  
22

23  
24 With the six principles and the implementation tasks arrayed in a matrix, the assessment  
25  
26 framework is completed by formulating one or more assessment questions for each cell. Before  
27  
28 undertaking this effort, however, it is important to recognize that the six principles hold multiple  
29  
30 implications for a business school’s activities. For example, the principles suggest directions and  
31  
32 orientations for the school’s curriculum, what and how it teaches; for faculty research and  
33  
34 service; and for extracurricular activities. A Catholic business school also must “mirror” the six  
35  
36 principles within its own administration and operational infrastructure. For example, a school  
37  
38 that teaches and engages in research about subsidiarity also should exercise subsidiarity in its  
39  
40 relations with employees; similarly, a school that teaches and engages in research about  
41  
42 environmentally sustainable business practices also should implement such practices within its  
43  
44 facility management processes (cf. Sabbaghi and Cavanagh, 2015). In short, a Catholic business  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50  
51  
52  
53 health treatment center by those who are most in need of its services; establishing forums and processes to more  
54  
55 effectively educate physicians and nurses on the bio-medical teachings of the Catholic moral tradition, to provide  
56  
57 them with a broader context for understanding the specific norms articulated within the *Ethical and Religious*  
58  
59 *Directives for Catholic Health Care Services* (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2012); and identifying  
60  
61 and addressing barriers to nurses’ participation in wellness offerings and other support services, to help ensure  
62  
63 caregivers themselves are “whole,” flourishing persons, and thus capable of promoting patients’ healing in body,  
64  
65 mind, and spirit.



1  
2  
3  
4 The questions in both tables share a specific concern, namely, the degree to which the  
5 school has incorporated the principle of subsidiarity within its processes and procedures – that is,  
6 within the systematic approaches that shape how work is performed within the school. The first  
7 question in Table 4 prompts the organization to examine the processes its follows to develop  
8 courses, extracurricular offerings, and school-sponsored publications, as well as processes that  
9 guide faculty research and service. The goal of this examination is to ascertain the extent to  
10 which exercising subsidiarity is integrated within such procedures. In other words, do these  
11 processes systematically draw attention to this principle? Do they consistently and methodically  
12 encourage faculty members to consider subsidiarity as they develop class syllabi, extracurricular  
13 forums, or articles for school-sponsored journals or magazines? Or is the principle’s inclusion  
14 within the curriculum, the extracurriculum, and publications a matter of happenstance? The  
15 second question in Table 4 prompts the school to consider how it improves these processes over  
16 time. In other words, how does the school systematically review these procedures to identify and  
17 address opportunities to enhance their effectiveness in promoting subsidiarity, as well as their  
18 efficiency and ease of use?  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In contrast, the assessment questions in Table 5 lead the school to consider the extent to  
42 which subsidiarity is embedded within its administrative infrastructure – that is, the policies,  
43 procedures, and practices that envelop and support the curriculum and extracurriculum. The first  
44 question in Table 5 offers multiple examples of processes germane to this principle. The list of  
45 examples is not exhaustive, but it provides the school with a starting point for considering  
46 whether subsidiarity is enacted within its operations. Workflows to be considered include the  
47 process used within the school to design jobs, as well as the processes that afford employees the  
48 opportunity to enhance their knowledge, skills, and abilities via training and other developmental  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 pathways. Also relevant are processes the school has established to catalyze employee  
5  
6 participation – for example, processes that involve employees in decisions concerning critical  
7  
8 school functions, in a manner that encourages them to exercise initiative and accept  
9  
10 accountability, and that also calls upon leaders to take risks associated with shared authority.  
11  
12 Similar to Table 4, the second question in Table 5 recognizes the need for ongoing improvement  
13  
14 of processes that support subsidiarity.  
15  
16

17  
18 Responses to the questions in Tables 4 and 5 would be articulated in empirical terms.  
19  
20 Business schools could draw upon a number of data sources for this purpose. For example, the  
21  
22 first question in Table 4 might be addressed by referring to policies, procedures, or other  
23  
24 guidelines issued by the school concerning course development, as well as other resources  
25  
26 available to faculty to support this task. Similarly, policies, procedures, or guidelines related to  
27  
28 extracurricular activities or school-sponsored publications also could be cited. Answers to the  
29  
30 first question in Table 5 might be constructed by consulting human resource policies and  
31  
32 processes, in addition to specific school programs and initiatives that support employee  
33  
34 participation. With both questions, it would be important to note any informal practices that have  
35  
36 emerged in these areas. Such practices frequently represent “the way things are done here,”  
37  
38 especially when formal processes are absent. Passed from employee to employee over time,  
39  
40 these routines can exert a significant influence over how work is performed within the  
41  
42 institution. The questions in Tables 4 and 5 concerning process enhancements might be  
43  
44 addressed by describing continuous process improvement efforts within the business school. For  
45  
46 example, such enhancements might be sought through the application of total management  
47  
48 quality tools, including techniques such as Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA), a four-step method for  
49  
50 control and continuous improvement of processes and products.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65





1  
2  
3  
4 examine and improve in light of the six CST principles – that is, in light of the core moral  
5 convictions that should animate these institutions. The assessment is *comprehensive* insofar as it  
6 encompasses all facets of a school’s activities – the curriculum, the extracurriculum, faculty  
7 research, service, and administration. It is *systematic* in that it methodically scrutinizes the  
8 degree to which each element of the school’s management system addresses each of the six  
9 principles, to ensure that all of these moral standards are positioned to influence the  
10 organization’s performance. The assessment also is *data-based* and *improvement-oriented*: It  
11 utilizes evidence about the present state of the school’s operations – information about its  
12 policies, procedures, and practices, as well as the metrics employed to monitor its performance –  
13 to determine how well the school conforms today to the principles’ requirements, and to indicate  
14 how it might enhance this alignment in the future.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 In summary, the CIM for Catholic business schools offers several benefits to the leaders  
32 of these institutions. It creates enhanced *awareness*: It provides an improved understanding of  
33 where the institution stands in light of six principles intimately linked to their Catholic identity. It  
34 offers enhanced *control*: It offers leaders a practical way to intentionally shape their school’s  
35 operation in light of the principles. Finally, it supports *transparency*: It yields information that  
36 helps a school to thoroughly and accurately report the degree to which it places its critical moral  
37 aspirations into action.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 ***Integrating the CIM and UNPRME***

49

50 We now address the relation between the CIM and the UNPRME principles. As  
51 suggested by its Preamble, Catholic business schools are called to implement UNPRME  
52 principles in a manner that is distinctly relevant to their mission. The UNPRME principles are  
53 organized into six categories: Purpose, Values, Method, Research, Partnership, and Dialogue.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Each category incorporates various aspects of the ten UNGC principles and other international  
5 initiatives, and applies them more specifically to the scope of goods, services, and constituents  
6 that are most closely associated with management education.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 [Insert Table 7 about here]  
12  
13

14 Table 7 illustrates how the CIM and UNPRME correlate. The CIM addresses the  
15 UNPRME categories through the contents of the cells within its assessment framework;  
16 specifically, the CIM’s assessment questions prompt a Catholic business school to examine how  
17 well it addresses UNPRME, as well as the six CST principles. Many UNPRME requirements are  
18 addressed via questions in the *process* stage of the CIM framework, through the questions  
19 contained in cells 1.3 through 6.3 of the CIM assessment matrix for the curriculum, research,  
20 service, and extracurriculum. For example, assessment questions in the process stage focus a  
21 business school on concerns raised by the Values and Method categories. They require the  
22 school to consider how “values of global social responsibility” (the six CST principles, in the  
23 case of a Catholic business school) are incorporated within the curriculum, educational  
24 frameworks, processes, and infrastructure. Furthermore, when taken together, the assessment  
25 questions in the process stage for three CST principles (fostering solidarity with the poor,  
26 promoting responsible stewardship over resources, and acquiring and allocating resources justly)  
27 call a Catholic business school to articulate how its curriculum and educational processes help  
28 students develop into leaders who will generate sustainable value for business and society in an  
29 inclusive manner. We believe this addresses the primary concerns of UNPRME’s Purpose  
30 category. The process-stage questions also address UNPRME’s Research category, by asking  
31 how a Catholic business school promotes the integration of the CST principles within its  
32 faculty’s research agendas. Finally, by attending to the extracurriculum, including public events  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 and other college-sponsored forums, the process-stage questions address requirements related to  
5  
6 the UNPRME Dialogue category.  
7  
8

9           Assessment questions in the CIM's *alignment* stage speak to requirements of the  
10 Partnership category. Alignment-stage questions drawn from the CIM assessment matrix for  
11 administration ask a Catholic business school to examine how it recognizes leaders in the  
12 business community whose work reflects a genuine commitment to one or more of the six CST  
13 principles. Here, recognition is not limited to the granting of an award. It also may include  
14 participating in classes as a guest speaker, supporting the development of case studies, or  
15 offering advice concerning the school's research agenda – all activities that help students and  
16 faculty better understand the challenges of acting as a responsible business leader.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28           Table 7 illustrates how the CIM reinforces other critical aspects of UNPRME. For  
29 example, questions in the *measurement* stage ask a Catholic business school to provide evidence  
30 to substantiate that the six CST principles are included within its curriculum, extracurriculum,  
31 faculty research, and service. Examples of relevant data might include course syllabi, faculty  
32 publications, and proceedings from school-sponsored conferences. Measurement questions also  
33 request evidence to demonstrate that students and alumni have internalized the six principles.  
34 Responses might cite course evaluations, postgraduate assessment of degree programs, student  
35 research projects, and awards received by alumni that are relevant to the principles. In this  
36 manner, questions in the CIM's measurement stage support UNPRME reporting goal of  
37 providing evidence that a school is progressing in its implementation of UNPRME's  
38 requirements.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55           More broadly, Table 7 suggests that what the CIM offers Catholic business schools is  
56 more than a way to examine themselves and improve in light of the six CST principles. We  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 believe that it also provides these institutions a way to accomplish these goals in the operational  
5  
6 spirit of UNPRME. The CIM’s approach to UNPRME is comprehensive and systematic  
7  
8 inasmuch as its assessment questions systematically examine the extent to which the school’s  
9  
10 management system addresses requirements within each UNPRME category. The CIM’s  
11  
12 approach to UNPRME also is improvement-oriented, inasmuch as the resulting qualitative report  
13  
14 and quantitative scores from a CIM assessment highlight improvement opportunities that can  
15  
16 help a Catholic business school more fully embody the CST and UNPRME principles. Finally,  
17  
18 the CIM facilitates transparency inasmuch as the information generated through the assessment  
19  
20 will help a Catholic business school construct a progress report that accurately reflects its efforts  
21  
22 to put UNPRME principles into practice. Altogether, then, application of the CIM supports the  
23  
24 UNGC and UNPRME assessment, continuous improvement, and reporting initiatives.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 What the CIM for Catholic business schools contributes to UNPRME is a robust  
32  
33 examination of institutional commitment through a systematic set of critical questions that can  
34  
35 support the UNPRME goals of self-evaluation, sustained improvement, and transparency. In  
36  
37 pursuit of these goals, the assessment questions contained within the CIM’s two assessment  
38  
39 matrices shed light on both the school’s academic and scholarly activities and its administrative  
40  
41 and operational infrastructure. In this manner, the CIM promotes one of UNPRME’s chief  
42  
43 concerns, namely, institutional integrity, i.e., congruence between what a Catholic business  
44  
45 school advocates in its classrooms and how it operates each day.  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 **3. Summary and Looking Ahead** 52

53 Two primary research questions guided our discussion and analysis of how Catholic  
54  
55 business schools might teach, research, and enact business ethics in a manner that is consistent  
56  
57 with, but also can enhance, the UNGC and UNPRME principles. First, how do principles drawn  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 from Catholic social teaching (CST) enable Catholic business schools to realize their Catholic  
5  
6 identity and mission in their teaching, research, service, and operational activities -- and in a  
7  
8 manner that advances the UNGC and UNPRME principles? Second, how might the leaders of  
9  
10 Catholic business schools systematically and effectively articulate, assess, and report on how  
11  
12 well they implement CST principles within their activities and processes?  
13  
14

15  
16 We first developed six CST principles and related them to the “Good Goods, Good Work,  
17  
18 and Good Wealth” framework in *The Vocation of the Business Leader* (Pontifical Council for  
19  
20 Justice and Peace, 2012). We then discussed how the CST principles correlate with the UNGC  
21  
22 principles, noting both congruencies and tensions. Next, we explained how the CIM assessment  
23  
24 tool integrates the six CST principles and a maturity framework that illuminates the institutional  
25  
26 implications of the CST principles. Finally, we described correlations between cells in the CIM  
27  
28 and the UNPRME principles—highlighting the parallels between these two ways of  
29  
30 implementing mission-driven business education.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Looking forward to future developments, we wish to mention two questions that relate to  
37  
38 the contribution of our project to the research, teaching, and enactment of ethical business  
39  
40 practices within business schools. First, in what manner do CST principles and the CIM  
41  
42 assessment methodology contribute to ongoing UNGC and UNPRME assessment, reporting, and  
43  
44 development efforts? Second, how might the CIM approach be adapted to fit business schools  
45  
46 whose missions are inspired by other religious or secular traditions?  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 *CIM’s contribution to UNGC and UNPRME.* We believe that the CIM assessment  
52  
53 methodology contributes meaningfully to ongoing UNGC and UNPRME assessment, reporting,  
54  
55 and improvement efforts. The lack of consensus about the role and quality of existing  
56  
57 UNGC/UNPRME assessment approaches (Rasche and Waddock, 2014; Sethi and Schepers,  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 2014) impedes the verifiability and reliability of self-reports aimed at implementing the  
5  
6 principles, putting at risk the credibility of the UNGC/UNPRME project. The CIM approach can  
7  
8 help Catholic business schools assess and explicitly articulate the strengths and weaknesses in  
9  
10 their existing approaches toward integrating CST principles, transparently report the basis for  
11  
12 their conclusions in their self-reports, and identify opportunities for continuous improvement.  
13  
14

15  
16 Given the correspondences indicated in Table 2 and Table 7, substantive content for the  
17  
18 UNMPRME self-reports can be extracted from the CIM matrices. For Catholic business schools,  
19  
20 the CIM approach adds value in two principal ways: (1) an account of the *roots* of the UN  
21  
22 principles in a rich narrative tradition (specifically Catholic social teaching about human dignity  
23  
24 and the common good), which in turn enable us to better discern answers to “Why” questions  
25  
26 about the authority of the principles beyond mere voluntary consent or assent,<sup>10</sup> and (2) a  
27  
28 progressive articulation of normative principles toward institutionalization, which can enable  
29  
30 Catholic business schools better manage their continuous progress toward implementing the CST  
31  
32 and UNPRME principles.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 *Adapting the CIM to fit business schools outside of the Catholic tradition. Ex Corde*  
39  
40 *Ecclesiae* (John Paul II, 1990) is respectful in its discussion of non-Catholic students and faculty  
41  
42 in Catholic universities.<sup>11</sup> It is also clear that tolerance and receptivity to learn from other  
43  
44 traditions besides one’s own is in fact part of the Catholic intellectual tradition.<sup>12</sup>  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52 <sup>10</sup> Insofar as the central elements of a tradition can be formulated as a set of normative principles, the discipline of  
53 the CIM methodology is generalizable across organizations in different societal sectors (political, economic, civic)  
54 and different religious backgrounds.

55 <sup>11</sup> For examples of different religious and secular perspectives on CST, a special issue of the *Journal of Business*  
56 *Ethics* included Protestant (Armstrong, 1993), Jewish (Green, 1993), Theravada Buddhist (Piker, 1993), and  
57 communitarian democratic (Williams, 1993) perspectives on *Centesimus Annus* (John Paul II, 1991) and modern  
58 capitalism.

59 <sup>12</sup> For further discussion of respectful pluralism, see Hicks (2002, 2003), Shapiro (forthcoming – see especially pp.  
60 15-16), and Ely and Thomas (2001).  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 Finally, the humanizing values embodied in the CST principles as well as in the UNGC  
5  
6 and UNPRME principles have been expressed in other spiritual traditions and traditional  
7  
8 societies around the globe (e.g., MacIntyre, 1984, pp. 33-34; Gallhofer and Haslam, 2011), in  
9  
10 humanistic philosophy (e.g., Buber, 1970; Gallhofer and Haslam, 2011), and in other secular  
11  
12 codes of socially responsible business conduct (e.g., Caux Round Table, 2010; Organization for  
13  
14 Economic Cooperation and Development, 2008). The diversity of these other traditions, as well  
15  
16 as the practical overlap of their substantive values and commitments with those of CST, suggest  
17  
18 that the CIM not only can but should be adapted to fit business schools whose missions are  
19  
20 inspired by other moral traditions.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- Alford, H.J. and Naughton, M.J. (2001). *Managing as if faith mattered: Christian social principles in the modern corporation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Armstrong, J. (1993). One Protestant looks at *Centesimus Annus*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(12), 933-944.
- Benedict XVI. (2009). *Caritas in veritate*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Caux Round Table (CRT). (2010). *Principles for business*. Retrieved September 5, 2011, from <http://www.cauxroundtable.org/index.cfm?&menuid=8>.
- Ely, R.T., and Thomas, D.A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: the effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2), 229-273.
- Francis. (2015). *Laudato si: On care for our common home*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.
- Francis. (2013). *Evangelii Gaudium*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.
- Gallhofer, S., and Haslam, J. (2011). Emancipation, the spiritual and accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 22(5), 500-509.
- Goodpaster, K.E., and Maines, T.D. (2012). The distinctive vocation of business education in Catholic universities. *Journal of Catholic Higher Education*, 31(2), 193-212.
- Green, R.M. (1993). *Centesimus Annus: A critical Jewish perspective*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(12), 945-954.
- Havel, V. (1994). "The miracle of being: Our mysterious interdependence." Reprinted from *Sunrise Magazine*, October/November 1994, Theosophical University Press. Retrieved August 8, 2015, from <http://www.theosophy-nw.org/theosnw/issues/gl-hav1.htm>.



1  
2  
3  
4 Hicks, D.A. (2003). *Religion and the workplace: Pluralism, spirituality, leadership*. New York,  
5  
6  
7 NY: Cambridge University Press.

8  
9 Hicks, D.A. (2002). Spiritual and religious diversity in the workplace: Implications for  
10  
11 leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 379-396.

12  
13  
14 John Paul II. (1991). *Centesimus annus*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.

15  
16 John Paul II. (1990). *Ex corde ecclesiae*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.

17  
18 John Paul II. (1987). *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Rome, Italy: The Vatican.

19  
20  
21 Kennedy, R. (2006). *The good that business does*. Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute.

22  
23 MacIntyre, A. (2011). How Aristotelianism can become revolutionary: Ethics, resistance and  
24  
25 utopia. In P. Blackledge & K. Knight (eds.), *Virtue and Politics* (pp. 11-19). Notre Dame,  
26  
27 IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

28  
29  
30 MacIntyre, A. (1990). *Three rival versions of moral enquiry: Encyclopaedia, genealogy, and*  
31  
32 *tradition*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

33  
34  
35 MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

36  
37  
38 Maines, T.D. (2014). Self-Assessment and Improvement Process. In C.L. Cooper (ed.), *Wiley*  
39  
40 *Encyclopedia of Management*, 3rd edition, Vol. 2 (pp. 425-428). Chichester, UK: John  
41  
42  
43 Wiley & Sons Ltd.

44  
45  
46 Maines, T.D. (2011). Self-Assessment and Improvement Process for organizations. In L.  
47  
48 Bouckaert & L. Zsolnai (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Spirituality and Business* (pp.  
49  
50 359-368). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

51  
52  
53 Maines, T.D., and Naughton, M.J. (2010). Middle level thinking: the cultural mission of business  
54  
55 schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(7/8), 669-677.

56  
57  
58 Maritain, J. (1951) *Man and the State*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Melé, D. (2003). Organizational humanizing cultures: do they generate social capital? *Journal of*  
5  
6 *Business Ethics*, 45(1), 3-14.  
7  
8  
9 Naughton, M., Buckeye, J., Goodpaster, K., Maines, T.D. (2015). *Respect in Action: Applying*  
10  
11 *Subsidiarity to Business*. St. Paul, MN: University of St. Thomas. Retrieved August 22,  
12  
13 2015, from <http://www.stthomas.edu/cathstudies/cst/research/publications/subsidiarity/>.  
14  
15  
16 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2008). *Guidelines for*  
17  
18 *multinational enterprises*.  
19  
20 [http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en\\_2649\\_34889\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_34889_1_1_1_1_1,00.html).  
21  
22  
23 Piker, S. (1993). Theravada Buddhism and Catholicism: a social historical perspective on  
24  
25 religious change, with special reference to *Centesimus Annus*. *Journal of Business Ethics*,  
26  
27 12(12), 965-973.  
28  
29  
30 Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. (2012). *Vocation of the business leader*. Vatican City,  
31  
32 Italy: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.  
33  
34  
35 Rasche, A., and Waddock, S. (2014). Global sustainability governance and the UN Global  
36  
37 Compact: a rejoinder to critics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(2), 209-216.  
38  
39  
40 Sabbaghi, O., and Cavanagh, G. F. (2015). Jesuit, Catholic, and green: evidence from Loyola  
41  
42 University Chicago. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(2), 317-326.  
43  
44  
45 Sandel, M.J. (1982). *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University  
46  
47 Press.  
48  
49  
50 Sethi, S.P., and Schepers, D.H. (2014). United Nations Global Compact: the promise-  
51  
52 performance gap. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(2), 193-208.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Shapiro, B. (Forthcoming). Using traditional narratives and other narrative devices to enact  
5  
6 humanizing business practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-015-  
7  
8 2645-x  
9

10  
11 Shapiro, B., Cohen, N., and Naughton, M. (2013). Leviticus on how to make and distribute  
12  
13 profit. *Society and Business Review*, 8(1), 45-54.  
14

15  
16 Soloveitchik, J. (1965). *The lonely man of faith*. New York, NY: Three Leaves Press.  
17

18  
19 Specht, D. and Broholm, R. (2009). *Three-fold model of organizational life*. Retrieved August 21,  
20  
21 2015, from [http://www.seeingthingswhole.org/uploads/Watermark-Three-Fold-](http://www.seeingthingswhole.org/uploads/Watermark-Three-Fold-Individual_439175.pdf)  
22  
23 [Individual\\_439175.pdf](http://www.seeingthingswhole.org/uploads/Watermark-Three-Fold-Individual_439175.pdf).  
24

25  
26 Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge, MA:  
27  
28 Harvard University Press.  
29

30  
31 United Nations. (2010). *UN Global Compact: The blueprint for corporate sustainability*  
32  
33 *leadership*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from  
34  
35 [www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news\\_events/8.1/Blueprint.pdf](http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news_events/8.1/Blueprint.pdf).  
36  
37

38  
39 United Nations. (1948). *United Nations universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved January  
40  
41 15, 2015, from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>.  
42

43  
44 United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2009). Ethical and religious directives for  
45  
46 Catholic health care services (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of  
47  
48 Catholic Bishops.  
49

50  
51 Williams, O.F. (1993). Catholic social teaching: a communitarian democratic capitalism for the  
52  
53 New World order. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(12), 919-932.  
54

55  
56 Yuengert, A. (2011). Economics and interdisciplinary exchange in Catholic social teaching and  
57  
58 “*Caritas in Veritate*.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(1), 41-54.  
59  
60  
61

**Table 1.** Six principles drawn from Catholic social teaching and their relation to three goods (cf. Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2012).

**Good Goods: Meeting the Needs of the World through the Creation and Development of Goods and Services**

1. Produce goods and services that are authentically good.
2. Foster solidarity with the poor by serving deprived and marginalized populations.

**Good Work: Organizing Good and Productive Work**

3. Advance the dignity of human work as a calling.
4. Exercise subsidiarity.

**Good Wealth: Creating Sustainable Wealth and Acquiring and Distributing it Justly**

5. Promote responsible stewardship over resources.
6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.

**Table 2.** The ten UNGC principles and their relation to six CST principles.

<b>UNGC Principle</b>	<b>Relation to CST Principles</b>
<b>Human Rights</b>	
1. Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights.	2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 3. Advance the dignity of human work . . .
2. Businesses should make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.	2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 3. Advance the dignity of human work . . .
<b>Labor</b>	
3. Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining.	3. Advance the dignity of human work . . . 4. Exercise subsidiarity . . .
4. The elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labor.	2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 3. Advance the dignity of human work . . . 6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.
5. The effective abolition of child labor.	2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 3. Advance the dignity of human work . . . 6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.
6. The elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.	3. Advance the dignity of human work . . . 6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.
<b>Environment</b>	
7. Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges.	1. Produce goods and services that are authentically good. 2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 5. Promote responsible stewardship over resources.
8. Undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility.	1. Produce goods and services that are authentically good. 2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 5. Promote responsible stewardship over resources.
9. Encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.	1. Produce goods and services that are authentically good. 2. Foster solidarity with the poor... 5. Promote responsible stewardship over resources.
<b>Anti-Corruption</b>	
10. Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.	3. Advance the dignity of work . . . 6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.

**Table 3.** Catholic Identity Matrix for Catholic business schools.

	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Training/ Education</b>	<b>Measurement</b>
<b>Produce goods and services that are authentically good</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>Foster solidarity with the poor</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<b>Advance the dignity of human work and one's calling</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Exercise subsidiarity</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<b>Promote responsible stewardship over resources</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>5.5</b>
<b>Acquire and allocate resources justly</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.5</b>

**Table 4.** Matrix Cell 4.3 (Exercise Subsidiarity/Process): Assessment questions for a Catholic business school’s teaching, research, service, and extracurricular processes.

<p>4.3.1 How is exercising subsidiarity integrated within processes supporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The core curriculum;</li><li>• The extra-curriculum (clubs, speakers, public events, and other student activities);</li><li>• School-sponsored publications; and</li><li>• Research and service?</li></ul>
<p>4.3.2 How does the School identify and address improvement opportunities related to this principle within processes supporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The curriculum;</li><li>• The extra-curriculum;</li><li>• School-sponsored publications; and</li><li>• Research and service?</li></ul>

**Table 5.** Matrix Cell 4.3 (Exercise Subsidiarity/Process): Assessment questions for a Catholic business school’s administrative processes.

4.3.1 How is exercising subsidiarity integrated within the School’s administrative processes (e.g., within processes that address job design; support training and development opportunities for School employees; and promote participation by School employees in organizational decision-making)?
4.3.2 How does the School identify and address improvement opportunities related to this principle within its administrative processes?



**Table 6.** Sample scorecard for Cell 4.3 (Exercise Subsidiarity/Process), applied to a Catholic business school’s administrative processes.

SCORE	PROCESS
0% - 5% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">1</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are defined or documented.</li> </ul>
10% - 25% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">2</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations related to the exercise of subsidiarity are characterized primarily by activities rather than systematic approaches.</li> <li>• Systematic processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are emerging.</li> </ul>
30% - 45% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">3</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are defined, documented, and utilized regularly within <i>some</i> relevant work units.</li> </ul>
50% - 65% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">4</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are defined, documented, and utilized regularly within <i>many</i> relevant work units.</li> <li>• Data-based, systematic methods for evaluating and improving processes are <i>beginning</i> to be applied to processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity.</li> </ul>
70% - 85% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">5</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are defined, documented, and utilized regularly within <i>most</i> relevant work units.</li> <li>• <i>Some</i> processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity that span interdependent work units are defined, documented, and applied within <i>most</i> relevant work units.</li> <li>• Data-based, systematic methods for evaluating and improving processes are <i>applied broadly</i> to processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity.</li> </ul>
90% - 100% <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 10px auto;">6</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity are defined, documented, and utilized regularly within and across <i>all</i> relevant work units.</li> <li>• Data-based, systematic methods for evaluating and improving processes are <i>applied regularly</i> to <i>all</i> processes addressing the exercise of subsidiarity.</li> </ul>

**Table 7.** The UNPRME Principles and their relation to the CST Principles through the CIM Matrix.

UNPRME Principles	Relation to CST Principles through the CIM Matrix
<p><b>Preamble:</b> As institutions of higher education involved in the development of current and future managers we declare our willingness to progress in the implementation, within our institution, of the following Principles, starting with those that are more relevant to our capacities and mission. We will report on progress to all our stakeholders and exchange effective practices related to these principles with other academic institutions.</p>	<p><i>Business Schools in Catholic Universities are called to pursue in their teaching and in their own operations:</i></p> <p><b>Good Goods: Meeting the Needs of the World through the Creation and Development of Goods and Services</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Produce goods and services that are authentically good.</li> <li>2. Foster solidarity with the poor by serving deprived and marginalized populations.</li> </ol> <p><b>Good Work: Organizing Good and Productive Work</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Advance the dignity of human work.</li> <li>4. Exercise subsidiarity.</li> </ol> <p><b>Good Wealth: Creating Sustainable Wealth and Acquiring and Distributing it Justly by</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Promote responsible stewardship over resources.</li> <li>6. Acquire and allocate resources justly.</li> </ol> <p><i>Periodic application of the CIM supports continuous improvement and generates information for reports.</i></p>
<p>1. <b>Purpose:</b> We will develop the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.3, 5.3, and 6.3</b> of the CIM address how fostering solidarity with the poor, promoting responsible stewardship, and acquiring and allocating resources justly is integrated with the core curriculum, the extra-curriculum, and faculty research, and service, and ask how the School identifies and addresses improvement opportunities in this arena. <b>Cells 1.5, 5.5, and 6.5</b> ask the School what evidence it can provide to demonstrate that students and alumni have internalized these three principles.</p>
<p>2. <b>Values:</b> We will incorporate into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.3 through 6.3</b> of the CIM address how well the six CST principles are integrated within the core curriculum, extra-curriculum, and faculty research and service, and ask how the School identifies and addresses improvement opportunities in this arena. <b>Cells 1.4 through 6.4</b> address how the School promotes ongoing reflection on each of the six principles among faculty, e.g., through seminars on the Catholic intellectual tradition, forums addressing management as a vocation or calling, through training related to teaching, research, service, etc.</p>

**Table 7. (Continued).** The UNPRME Principles and their relation to the CST Principles through the CIM Matrix.

<p>3. <b>Method:</b> We will create educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.3 through 6.3</b> of the CIM address how the six CST principles are integrated within the core curriculum, the extra-curriculum, and faculty research and service, and ask how the School identifies and addresses improvement opportunities in these arenas. Also <b>Cells 1.4 through 6.4</b> address how the School promotes ongoing reflection on each of the six principles among faculty, e.g., through seminars on the Catholic intellectual tradition, forums addressing management as a vocation or calling, through training related to teaching, research, service, etc. <b>Cells 1.5 through 6.5</b> ask the School what evidence it can provide to demonstrate that students and alumni have internalized these principles.</p>
<p>4. <b>Research:</b> We will engage in conceptual and empirical research that advances our understanding about the role, dynamics, and impact of corporations in the creation of sustainable social, environmental and economic value.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.2 through 6.2</b> of the CIM ask how the School maintains a faculty commitment to social values (goods, services, attention to the poor, human dignity and subsidiarity), exercises responsible stewardship, and acquires and allocates resources justly (e.g., through hiring, performance evaluation, compensation, and tenure criteria). The cell questions also ask how the School recognizes faculty for their attention to these principles through their teaching, research, or service. <b>Cells 1.3 through 6.3</b> ask how social values (goods, services, attention to the poor, human dignity and subsidiarity) and economic values (responsible stewardship over resources, acquiring and allocating resources justly) are integrated within processes that support faculty research. <b>Cells 1.4 through 6.4</b> asks how the School promotes social values through ongoing reflection on all six principles (e.g., through seminars on the Catholic intellectual tradition, forums addressing management as a vocation or calling, faculty training in relation to teaching, research, service, etc.) <b>Cells 1.5 through 6.5</b> of the CIM ask what evidence the School can provide to demonstrate that all six principles have been integrated in faculty research, service, the curriculum, and extra-curriculum. These cells also ask for evidence that students and alumni have internalized the principles.</p>

**Table 7. (Continued).** The UNPRME Principles and their relation to the CST Principles through the CIM Matrix.

<p><b>5. Partnership:</b> We will interact with managers of business corporations to extend our knowledge of their challenges in meeting social and environmental responsibilities and to explore jointly effective approaches to meeting these challenges.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.2 through 6.2</b> of the CIM ask how the School recognizes staff, students, alumni or others in the business community whose work reflects commitment to authentic goods and services, attention to the poor, human dignity and subsidiarity, and the exercise of responsible and just stewardship over resources.</p>
<p><b>6. Dialogue:</b> We will facilitate and support dialog and debate among educators, students, business, government, consumers, media, civil society organizations and other interested groups and stakeholders on critical issues related to global social responsibility and sustainability.</p>	<p><b>Cells 1.3 through 6.3</b> of the CIM ask how the school integrates the six principles – including exercising responsible stewardship over resources – within the core curriculum and the extra-curriculum, including public events. It also asks how the School identifies and addresses improvement opportunities in these arenas.</p>