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Introduction: The Enduring Popularity of Faith-Learning Integration

The language of faith-learning integration first appeared more than five decades ago in Frank Gaebelein’s *The Pattern of God’s Truth* (Gaebelein, 1954). The discussion of faith and reason, of which evangelical interest in integration of faith and learning is but a contemporary expression, reaches back through the reformers and medieval theologians to the founding generations of the Christian church. For example, in his *Prescription Against Heretics* (1914, Chapters 7, 9), Tertullian famously glossed St. Paul (in II Corinthians 6:15) by asking, “What does Athens have in common with Jerusalem?” Much has changed in Christian education since Tertullian posed his question and even since Gaebelein coined his phrase, but the faith-reason struggle continues and faith-learning integration has endured into its sixth decade. The longevity and popularity of this language indicate something about the importance of a specific educational ideal held by many Christians in both K-12 and higher education.

Popularity offers no guarantees of a problem-free existence, however, and faith-learning integration has achieved and maintained its popularity while beset by several kinds of ambiguity. When this phrase was about half its current age, I began a still-incomplete scholarly project to understand and clarify what people who use it mean by it (for example, Badley, 1986, 2009). Others have given attention to clarifying integration language as well (including Hasker, 1992; Joldersma, 1996; Matthias, 2007). Despite these efforts, ambiguities persist. In part because of such ambiguities and, of course, for substantive theological and epistemological reasons, some Christian higher educators have begun to question the utility of faith-learning integration language (Glanzer, 2008; Jacobsen & Jacobsen, 2004). Glanzer, for example, calls for a distinction between academic research done by believing professors—for which he prefers the phrase Christian scholarship—and what we, as professors, hope our students take from our courses. One might raise a number of legitimate questions like Glanzer’s. Does faith imply an outline of Christian doctrine such as one might find in a booklet given to new believers or in a systematic theology text? Or does faith imply one’s whole life journey as a Christian, an articulated Christian worldview, belief in God or relationship with God? Does integration imply an ongoing or a completed process? Learning also works in several ways. Does it imply a body of theory such as one finds in the canons of economics, psychology or chemistry? Or perhaps it implies the activities in which teachers and students engage in class (developed at greater length in Badley, 1994).
More recently, those who would offer education characterized by faith-learning integration have faced new challenges, among them assessment and changing student populations. If faith-learning integration is, in fact, the hallmark of Christian colleges, then those who ask how Christian educators might assess—dare I say measure—faith-learning integration are not off track. A growing cadre of researchers have already begun to ask about assessment of spiritual formation, with some arguing that seminaries (Aleshire, 2003) or Christian colleges (Birkholz, 1997; Cureton, 1989) ought to be able to demonstrate that they do what they claim to do. Some have lamented the lack of research into how well Christian colleges deliver on their promises, and several have responded by researching the question, using both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Birkholz, 1994; Cureton, 1989; Hoffman, 1994; Railsback, 2006). Some scholars have begun to explore assessment of faith-learning integration specifically (Mathias, 2007; Miller, 2006), with a few researchers attempting to understand how students understand it (Lawrence, 2010; Sites, Garzon, Milacci, & Booth, 2009). Adjacent and large bodies of research into faith development, spiritual development, and religious experience also inform the faith-learning assessment question, albeit from a distance (examples include Bryant, 2009; Bryant, Wickliffe, Mayhew, & Behringer, 2009; Farnsworth, 1990; Kosek, 2000; Love & Talbot, 1999).

At the same time that Christian colleges have recognized the need to discern the degree to which we actually offer the education we advertise, many of our number have begun to admit an increased percentage of students who do not identify themselves as Christian, especially in graduate and professional programs. Many Christian higher educators have found themselves working in different settings with students who bring different assumptions than we are used to. Whether these new constraints are real or only perceived, or self-imposed or not, are not my questions here, but many faculty now feel situationally constrained. Depending on God and many other resources, we continue to seek ways to teach faithfully in classes that may now include students who say, in effect, “Please keep faith out of the picture; I just need my professional degree,” while others still tell us that they came to our college specifically because they wanted to learn in a context energized by Christian faith. Professors in these circumstances are currently searching for new understandings of how to realize faith learning integration in courses where half or more of the students do not name Christ.

Faith-learning integration has remained popular even in the face of difficulties of clarification, calls for reduced or discontinued use, and challenges such as assessment and new student constituencies. For many Christian educators, it still expresses better than any other language the mission of evangelical Christian higher education. From Gaebelin’s first use in 1954 to today, it has served as shorthand—however imprecise—for a whole vision of education. For some evangelical educators, that vision catches the sentiments of II Corinthians 10:5 where Paul speaks of taking every thought captive to Christ. Faith-learning integration seems disinclined to retire anytime soon. Yet its usage continues to be plagued by imprecision and ambiguity, creating a tension for evangelical educators who have not yet found language adequate to catch all the nuances of a specific educational vision. In what follows, I explore one kind of imprecision that contributes to this tension … an ambiguity related to the question of the locus of faith-learning integration, where it is presumed to happen. My motives for doing so are simply to help clarify this popular phrase, not to advocate for either its continued use or its soon retirement.

Whether we use or retire faith-learning integration, we owe ourselves and our students this much: If we are going to use integrative language so often, we should be clear about where we think integration happens (recognizing the metaphorical character of the location language in use here). The locus question is important. For example, if we determine that the integration of faith and learning occurs in students’ hearts and minds as opposed, say, to it happening in curriculum, then the share of responsibility for its happening may fall more on students and teachers and less on those who designed the curriculum. In this picture, hallway conversations and the comments professors write while grading essays may trump curriculum committee work in importance. Residence life will become more important and course construction perhaps less so. On the other hand, if we believe that faith-learning integration is more a matter of epistemology and curriculum than it is a matter of existential questions and character, we will likely focus more on curriculum and course planning. That course of action assumes that students learn what was intended by the curriculum committee and their instructors regardless of pedagogy or other factors. In fact, each of the possible loci of integration implies different emphases, responsibilities, and structures for the induction and development of professors, for curriculum design, for instruction, for student services and co-curricular activities, for churches and campus fellowship groups, and, obviously, for students’ own responsibility in their development.

If we believe that faith-learning integration is realized somewhere, we should try to identify where so that we can apportion those responsibilities appropriately. To what extent do we believe that it happens in the curriculum? In the whole institutional ethos? In the instructional moment and character or behavior of the professor? In the student’s character or
understanding? In the community of faith? Obviously, to the degree that faith learning integration happens somewhere, it does not happen in just one of these locations. For simplicity, I will treat these five possible answers to the locus question separately in what follows, noting some of their interconnections as I proceed.

A Catalogue of Possible Loci for Faith-learning Integration

The Student

For some, the obvious answer to the locus of integration question is the student, both in the integration discussion generally (for example, St. Clair & Hough, 1992) and in the faith-learning discussion. One educator wrote the following with reference to seminary education: “... the locus of integration is ... the student's own consciousness. He or she becomes aware of a fitting of the disparate elements ... [which] will include both the cohering of subject matter and [finding] a method for achieving coherence” (Bridger, 1992, p. 25). More recently, we find these words, “... the nexus of this integrative activity happens to be within the learners themselves, the actual people who comprise the college” (Davis, 2010, p. 322). These paired citations point to a near-truism: Regardless of the roles played by institutions, professors, churches, curriculum committees, and any other individuals, forces, or agencies, ultimately we want our students to achieve integration in their own beings (a view also held by Sites et al., 2009). This early conclusion does not trump other possible answers to the locus question so much as it points to the necessity of our recognizing the overlaps between whatever answers we might suggest.

Interestingly, none of the researchers I quoted above dealt with faith-learning integration language specifically. St. Clair and Hough studied ethical development and behavior in the college years, a topic of concern to many writers (Arthur, 2010; Astin & Antonio, 2000; Holmes, 1991; Stauffer, 2004). Bridger and Davis both explored what we commonly call spiritual formation in seminary and college respectively, also a matter of concern to many. Readers who find themselves resisting the idea that faith-learning integration implies ethical reflection and practice or that it implies spiritual formation may have unearthed their personal answers to the locus question: that integration happens first or primarily in curriculum or somewhere else, but not in students' lives.

What is implied by the conclusion that faith-learning happens at least partly in the student? This conclusion implies, first, that as professors we will take steps to deepen our understanding of our students as individuals. To be blunt, their interests, background circumstances, strengths, weaknesses, and even learning styles will matter to us. Second, we will recognize that our students come to our classes as members of generational cohorts possessing cohort characteristics. Of course, many students will test that generalization, and I do not suggest that cohort membership indicates some professorial obligation to find a new radio station or follow certain blogs to keep up with popular culture. However, I believe that the generalization may indicate our need for new habits of thought and, possibly, for retaining field correspondents to help us detect patterns in the cultural noise. Third, when we recognize that faith and learning ultimately need to cohere not only in students' heads, but in their heads, hearts, and hands (to echo a motto from John Brown University), we may be inclined to focus slightly less on the disciplinary and epistemic structures to which we may have given our academic lives to understanding and focus a little more on how to teach well, using methods appropriate to our students' ages and developmental levels. We also may take more seriously hallway conversations with students and the comments we write in the margins of their papers, the importance of which we may previously have undervalued.

The Curriculum

Anyone suggesting that faith-learning integration does not involve curriculum would be irresponsible. Clearly, a hundred Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committees, and thousands of professors in Christian colleges do careful work in part to realize the ideal that the curriculum would become instrumental in our students' gaining a faith-shaped education, that they would emerge from individual courses and from whole programs, recognizing the difference that faith makes to understanding. Even with the best planning, we obviously cannot guarantee that result. But that caveat should not stop institutions, committees, or individuals from aiming at the right goal.

The shape and sheer mass of the discussion of curriculum integration in general have inevitably influenced the shape of our own discussion of faith-learning integration. The curriculum integration discussion—which truly functions like an international convention happening in the next room over from our own quiet conversation—has focused on how to help students see or make connections between different subject areas (horizontal integration) or similar subject matter studied in different years (vertical integration). Less so, it has dealt with what some call practical integration where students are able to make connections between what
they study in class and their own lives. Educators have probed these questions for nearly two centuries, with the K-12 discussion focused more on integrative units (Lederman & Niess, 1997) and much of the higher education conversation focused on interdisciplinarity (Campbell, 1969; Hayes Jacobs, 1989; Klein, 1990; Sherif & Sherif, 1971).

The longevity and volume of this neighboring discussion have resulted in some inevitable immigration of ideas to the faith-learning discussion. This immigration might typically express itself in a curriculum committee meeting for a new program in a college or university connected to the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). My own university is (at the time of writing) developing a school of physical therapy where conversation has presumably begun about how our physical therapy curriculum ought to differ—because we name Christ—from a similar program offered at a publicly funded institution. That we expect such conversation, perhaps, indicates that the curriculum answer has trumped all other answers to the locus question. But we should ask ourselves why we would not expect the conversation to be about the character of professors or students. And why would we consider the program’s planners off-track if they considered requiring regular church attendance of all incoming students? That questions about character and church attendance are nearly unaskable indicates that curricular approaches to integration do exercise a kind of cognitive hegemony in the faith-learning conversation, despite research that indicates that courses and professors are not among the heaviest influences on students’ development of spirituality and faith during their college years (Ma, 2003).

Still, we do want the planners of a new program to design a good curriculum. After all, we would not want to hinder students from linking their learning to faith, life, or the faith-full life. We would not intentionally design a program that hid the connections between different courses or that ignored the moral, theological, or spiritual dimensions of an academic or professional discipline. In other words, the curriculum committee and teaching faculty share a responsibility to develop and teach a curriculum that coheres epistemologically and theologically and that connects with practice. But we need to recall an important educational principle as a codicil: We must remember the role of dissonance in learning. Students will engage in learning much more readily if everything is not portrayed beforehand as fitting together perfectly. Philosopher of education, Maxine Greene, argued for the role of dissonance in learning reminding educators that we cannot do the integrating for our students (to gloss the words of Algren, 1967) and that not all responsibility for faith-learning integration falls on the shoulders of faculty serving on committees or teaching in classrooms. Nevertheless, we should do all we can in curriculum design and course delivery to induce and then assist students to make sense of the materials themselves.

Clearly, the curriculum-as-locus and student-as-locus answers to the integration question do not separate so neatly, and others have wrestled with the relationship before now. In the 1800s, Herbart expressed his conviction that the student is the locus of understanding (not of faith learning integration but of curriculum integration):

In the most favorable case . . . a foundation of elementary knowledge is gradually laid sufficiently solid for later years to build upon; in other words, out of the elementary knowledge an apperceiving mass is created in the mind of the pupil which will aid him in his future studies. (Herbart, 1835/1901, p. 70)

Seventy years later, Dewey addressed the same tension between curriculum and student, noting the human tendency to see an opposition where none in fact exists, “It is the failure to keep in mind the double aspect of subject matter which causes the curriculum and child to be set over against each other” (Dewey, 1902, p. 30). A few years later, in Democracy and Education, he distinguished what he called the psychological method, or “chronological method [which] begins with the experience of the learner and develops from that the proper modes of scientific treatment” from the logical method (Dewey, 1916, pp. 257-258). Since Dewey, educators have resolved the so-called logical-psychological debate, recognizing that we must attend to both students and to content, yielding an insight for anyone wishing to determine a single location for faith-learning integration: Epistemological, theological, and logical categories are no more adequate by themselves than are personal, existential, and spiritual categories.

The Professor and the Classroom Ethos

A number of educators have concluded that the integrative task falls onto the shoulders of the professor both in the integration-in-general discussion (Bok, 1982; Werner, 1999) and in the discussion of church-related education (Billington, 1984). This view has obvious connections to the curriculum discussion just above. On this account, the professor’s job is to plan courses and instruction so that students are able to see or make connections between faith and their studies. See and make are key verbs in this discussion. Should students encounter ready-made faith-learning
integration (so to speak) in which they study purpose-written books by Christian authors and publishers? Or should we force them to wrestle with raw materials and construct their own integrative understanding of how faith connects with their studies, presumably in a sympathetic but still critical environment? Professors have a range of understandings of what are appropriate levels of dissonance and of how best to untangle questions of critical engagement, and I will not explore them further here.

That possible range indicates the interactive character of faith-learning integration and, again, the naivete of attempting to identify a single locus. One author, after stating specifically that the student is the locus of integration, adds the codicil that “... the crux of the matter depends on the lived beliefs of each teacher, to be certain” (Davis, 2010, p. 323). This view accords with the work of other researchers who have attempted to understand how various factors in the faith-learning process interact with each other (such as Ripley, Garzon, Hall, Mangis, & Murphy, 2009).

The professor-as-locus answer to the faith-learning integration question has several possible implications, including our personal character and integrity, our interactions with students, and how we understand and express before students our vocation of teaching and researching in specific academic disciplines.

In my own teaching, I have worked to identify possible places and ways to realize faith-learning integration within the cycle of the core components of teaching—curriculum, planning, instruction, and assessment. When developing curriculum, I deliberately incorporate problems that will require students to think Biblically and theologically to deal with the material. Thus, I tip the materials toward questions of human nature, the meaning of life, ethics, and the basis for hope. Admittedly, for one who teaches philosophy of education and ethics in a church-related setting, that task presents fewer challenges than it might for some. Nevertheless, I believe that professors in all subject areas can develop curriculum that contains such openings. Likewise, in my planning and instruction, I deliberately create or look for spaces that allow Biblical/theological questions to surface. I try to do this invitationaly, so that students can raise these questions naturally in context, rather than my raising them with an apologetic or evangelistic agenda in plain view. In assessment, I seek the point where communication of high expectations—“I want your best work”—overlaps with my high view of the person, reminding myself in C. S. Lewis’ famous words that I do not teach “mere mortals” (Lewis, 1949, p. 15). After grading several thousand essays, I have accepted as true my students' comments that the words I write on their papers move them toward either the integration or disintegration of faith and learning.

They take those words, which I might consider marginal in both senses, very seriously.

These comments about the four elements in the core cycle—curriculum, planning, instruction, assessment—obviously warrant much more attention by those concerned with the integration of faith and learning than I can give here. In summary, as we work in and through the components of this core cycle of the activities of teaching, we create or do not create, word by word and moment by moment, an ethos characterized either by the qualities and attitudes that we ideally want or by some other qualities and attitudes. To help keep my own teaching focused, I regularly review and update my list of the ideals which I want to characterize the ethos in which my students and I work. Of course I will not in a lifetime fully realize the 10 clusters of ideals below, but I list and relist them to remind myself of the kind of space in which I want to work with my students:

- kindness, caring, love, respect, mutual authorization of teacher and students;
- excellence, challenge, critical thinking, persistence, hard work;
- honesty, truth-telling, intellectual accountability;
- wonder, amazement, awe, sense of adventure;
- joy, grace, gratitude, humility;
- innovation, creativity, flexibility;
- recognition of differences in circumstances, background, weaknesses, strengths, interests;
- community, trust, space, and place;
- awareness of the creation order and God’s sustaining role in it;
- happiness, humor, fun.

To differentiate from the list above, I mention here a single cluster of values often sought in the academy that I wish not to characterize the ethos in which my students and I do our work. These are prestige, honor, advancement, and fame—a cluster sometimes in recognizable tension with my desire to authorize students and give honor to those students to whom it is due (from the top two bullets above).

In a landmark article on assessment of spiritual formation in theological education, Aleshire notes the dual-pronged argument that if spiritual growth happens, it must happen somewhere and it must happen in some measurable amount, as foreign as that language may be to some interested in spiritual formation (Aleshire, 2003). We might say the same for faith and learning integration: If integration of faith and learning happens, it must happen somewhere, and we should be able to measure it. Undoubt-
edly, professors’ character, work, words, and behavior help students move toward either integration or its opposite. My readers’ lists of ideals may differ from the list I presented above, but with one list or another in front of us, Christian higher educators should be able to point to moments and venues where naming Christ makes a difference in and to the ethos in which we do our teaching and learning.

The Whole Academic Community

Some have suggested that faith-learning integration involves the whole university community. Holmes certainly voices this broad conception of integration in his enduringly popular *Idea of a Christian College* (Holmes, 1977/1987). More recently, and without using integration language, Dykstra has called for colleges to become communities of conviction (Dykstra, 1999). Also without using faith-learning integration, others have addressed the question of community in classrooms, with Palmer describing what he calls communities of trust (Palmer, 1998) and Orlando proposing that colleges form intentional small communities—collegia—in which students can more easily find their place (Orlando, 2000).

Realizing Holmes’ vision where the whole college or university serves as the locus of faith-learning integration would still—decades after his first publication—imply changes to the thought patterns of many on a typical Christian college campus. A year ago, I listened to the human resources director on our campus thank and farewell a grounds employee on the occasion of his long-overdue retirement. He did maintain the grounds, but to be fair, he really ran a discipleship program for the students he supervised. Whether they realized it or not, he introduced them to the value of good work, to the importance of beauty to human well-being, to the intricacies of one aspect of God’s creation—the biotic dimension. To Holmes’ point and my own, he helped them integrate faith and learning, likely without ever using the phrase. My readers can all think of such people, some of whom literally serve as the first face of our organizations and whose smile, time, and respectful treatment make students feel like their college has given them a place. But we do not immediately think of such people and stories when we hear the phrase faith-learning integration, indicating the grip that curricular understandings have on our collective thought or the distance we have yet to go to realize fully what Holmes envisioned, or both.

In this more comprehensive conception of faith-learning integration, those of us who do the academic work on campus would need to recognize the important work of student life staff, residence staff, senior administrative, and all the staff who serve students in department offices, at the registrar’s and finance offices, at library reference desks and at the IT window. To echo Lewis’ *The Weight of Glory* again, when these staff embody their recognition that students are not mere mortals, they demonstrate faith-learning integration at their desks and in their offices. I noted already that curriculum (an area largely under professorial purview) exercises a kind of hegemonic control over our thinking about faith-learning integration. Perhaps, academic staff need to contain the effect of that near-hegemony in our thinking about other campus staff. When we recognize the key role of nonteaching staff in shaping an institutional ethos that bespeaks Christ’s presence and redemptive work, we not only honor Christ’s varied work on our campus, but we discover that we may carry a little less responsibility for the integration of faith and learning. And if we resist rethinking the role of our nonteaching coworkers for Christ’s sake, we may want to do it in view of a substantial body of research about the role of nonacademic life in students’ spiritual growth during their college years (Jacoby, 1996; Love & Talbot, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schaffer, 2004; Schmalz­bauer, 2010; Terenzini, Pascarella, & Blimling, 1996).

The Community of Faith

While not under the control of the university, the local church congregation becomes the place in which some students make faith-full sense of their learning. For other students, a campus fellowship group has that function, although we might expect this latter pattern on the campus of a secular university more than at a Christian college. I will not repeat here what I have treated at length elsewhere (Badley, 1992) but do wish to point out what often escapes our notice. With our careful attention to curriculum, to our own character or teaching, to any number of in-class and on-campus factors, we may fail to notice that students often grow deeply in faith-full understanding because of the church they attend during their college years. My own undergraduate years were spent in a department full of turmoil at a university experiencing more ideological and institutional upheaval than was typical of the times (Pitsula, 2006). Yet, with the support of thoughtful youth sponsors at my local church and a vibrant Inter­Varsity group on my campus, I emerged from my first degree not only with deepened faith but with a coherent and thoroughly Christian understanding of what I had studied, an understanding that cohered because of my Christian worldview. At my honors oral examination in psychology, the atheist-existentialist member of my examining committee asked me
to explain how being Christian influenced my perspective on psychology. The coherent understanding which I had gained was certainly not the product of prayerful deliberations by a curriculum committee. Nor did it result in general from professorial character (with some delightful, providential exceptions) or from course plans, or teaching meant to help me think as a Christian studying psychology. Doubtless, in my case, the locus of faith-learning integration was the student. But I could not have developed the understanding I did without the support of the community of faith of which I was a part during those years.

Those of us who work in the academy and who wish to see our students become aware of and live in light of the connections between faith and their academic work need to plan good curricula, teach well, and live exemplary lives. But we need to remember that our students’ success at connecting faith and learning depends not only on what transpires inside the campus gates. And we must remember the corollary: A thoughtfully faith-full home church, a local congregation, or a campus group can greatly assist the student achieve the educational ideal of faith-learning integration.

Conclusions

The brief story about my own undergraduate experience opens up some important truths about the locus question. Assume for the sake of argument that most Christian educators wish for students to emerge from a course or a whole degree with some sense that in Christ all things hold together (Colossians 1:17). What conditions must be met for this to occur? We can ask whether well-planned curricula, professorial character, institutional ethos and any number of other factors are necessary or sufficient for students to emerge with a mindset or an education deserving the honorific title integration of faith and learning. I will not explore necessary and sufficient conditions at length, but the fact that I could emerge from an incoherent curriculum in a secular institution with a thoroughly Christian understanding of my studies makes clear that a coherent or cruciform curriculum is not a necessary condition for integration of faith and learning. That some students might emerge from the best-planned, most coherent curriculum at a top Christian college focused only on how to earn the most money and find the most prestigious job illustrates that a coherent curriculum is not a sufficient condition for faith-learning integration either. Based on these examples, do we conclude that the curriculum is neither necessary nor sufficient to produce faith and learning integration? In the usual sense of necessary and sufficient conditions, no, we must conclude that it is not. Yet, we would expect that a thoughtful curriculum, one designed to lead students toward a coherent and faith-full understanding of God’s world, would typically contribute to their graduating with the desired integration of faith and learning. Certainly, such a curriculum is desirable; none of us wants to see students in mental chaos with no coherent understanding. We can assist students in their attempt to develop coherent understanding, as long as we remember that we cannot guarantee our results.

We could work through several of the possible loci I have treated above and eliminate each one in turn with examples similar to those I offered in my brief treatment of curriculum. Institutions, run as they are by fallen humans, will certainly disappoint. Not all students’ encounters and experiences in a given term will bespeak Christ’s presence and redemptive work. All professors have flaws, some more apparent than others. Some classes will be more engaging than others. And so it goes. We wish and pray for excellence in all the aspects and parts of the education we offer at our colleges. But at the end of the term, we admit in humility that a student can and indeed may have to appropriate his or her own integration of faith and learning even when conditions, institutional purposes and ethos, learning materials and pedagogy fall below the desired standard. Also in humility, we must recognize that a student can miss the wholeness offered even when professorial and staff character, institutional purposes and ethos, learning materials and pedagogy all work together to serve as a coherent signpost, pointing to the Reign of Christ.

So who, or what, is on the hook for faith-learning integration? On the account I have offered, we all have responsibilities. Certainly, professors do. Students focus more on professorial character and on how professors treat them than they do on whether our conception of the curriculum has obvious theological, philosophical, or pedagogical coherence. Good curriculum and instruction are important as long as we remember that no combination of curriculum design, brilliant pedagogy, and professorial character can guarantee that our graduates will emerge from our institutions with an education in which faith and learning are integrated to the degree or in the ways that we might wish. Churches matter, as do campus groups. If faith-learning integration is to characterize whole institutions, then we must include the contribution of nonteaching staff in our thinking. Back to where I started, students must expect to do some of the lifting themselves if they are to emerge having made connections between faith and learning. The inclusion of churches, campus groups, students, and nonteaching staff does not finally let us off the hook regarding our
instruction, our curriculum work, or our own character. However, when considered in combination with the student perspective, it might help us rein in our estimates of the importance of our curriculum and wider institutional deliberations while recognizing anew the importance of matters related to character, community, and our treatment of students.
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