

7

On to the Twenty-first Century

Never before the present period has the mainstream world of letters and journalism demonstrated such a contrast between its expressions of dismay toward the secular university and its general appreciation for the Christian college. At least since the appearance of Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Soul of Today's Students* (1987)¹ and Page Smith's *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America* (1990),² and with increasing intensity to the present,³ the general modern critique of secular higher education has bemoaned the tendency to replace the character and values education dimension of learning with an intellectual conformity and an anti-religion bias. Even the traditionally elite institutions themselves are becoming aware of their growing barrenness, as noted recently by Columbia University professor Andrew Delbanco: "There is a nervous sense that something basic is missing—a nervousness that may account for the rise of compensatory institutions within the institutions such as the Center for Human Values at Princeton . . . or the Institute of Ethics at Duke. But what can it mean that thinking about ethics has become mostly an extracurricular activity?"⁴

By contrast, the media headlines in essays on faith-based higher education carry such headlines as "Christian Colleges Are Booming" (*Time*), "The Opening of the Evangelical Mind" (*The Atlantic Monthly*), and "Evangelical Colleges Gaining Ground in Secular World" (*Los Angeles Times*). Primarily the attention is upon the orthodox colleges and is inspired in part by the widely publicized enrollment growth statistics distributed by Robert Andringa, President of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU). This data shows an enrollment increase of 67.3 percent for the CCCU institutions and 2.1 percent for all colleges and universities for the 1992–2002 decade. The focus on enrollment increase

has led to a closer study of the growing academic attainments of the intentionally Christian institutions. Also very significant is the growth of religious intentionality by the mainline church-related colleges and universities who are influenced by the broadly based 2004 UCLA Astin Study documenting the interest in the spiritual domain by the large majority of college students.⁵

During the late twentieth century a number of factors converged to contribute to the sharp increase in the quality of the Christian college and the heightened interest in finding an acceptable way to reintroduce a larger role for religion in the academy in general. These developments included (1) the rise of the evangelical churches simultaneous with the decline of the mainline denominations; (2) the emergence of the CCCU to give increasing structure, influence, and recognition to the Christian college movement; (3) the fascinating and highly publicized saga of Baylor University in its effort to become the primary model of a Christian research university; (4) the influential writings of higher education prophets such as Mark Noll (to the Christian colleges), George Marsden (to the secular universities), and Ernest Boyer (to all of higher education); (5) a growing opportunity within secular higher education for the consideration of the spiritual domain because of a declining faith in the worldview of modernism; (6) the sharply growing public interest in spirituality, especially among young people, since the 1980s; (7) the availability of unprecedented foundation monies – especially from the Lilly Endowment and the Pew Charitable Trusts – to stimulate study, discussion, networking, and program development on the role of religion in higher education; and (8) a growing partnership with Catholic colleges and universities in the common effort to preserve and at least partly recover an appropriate emphasis upon the dimension of faith in the study of the human condition.

In addition to enjoying the growing prosperity of its traditional campus-based programs, the turn-of-the-century Christian college has encouraged its regular students to study and engage in service projects abroad, and it has provided instruction in new forms (especially electronic courses) to new groups (primarily working adults) in new locations (almost anywhere). Also it has established linkages with and provided encouragement to the growing number of similar institutions worldwide. Meanwhile the Christian college has continued to carefully observe the federal and state governments with an eye both appreciative (especially for the significant student financial aid) and wary (because of the uncertain pattern of legislative and judicial actions).

The Recovery Continues

The United States Department of Education identifies approximately nine hundred religiously affiliated colleges and universities.⁶ The tradi-

tional way of further distinguishing such institutions is to classify them by denominational connection, and while such categorizing continues to be helpful, it is less meaningful now than is a system of identification that focuses upon the degree to which the Christian worldview is the central organizing principle of a college's intellectual program. Perhaps the best-developed such typology is that offered by Robert Benne in his fine study, *Quality with Soul*; the summary chart of his schema appears as appendix B at the end of the book.⁷ Benne's typology identifies two categories of Christian colleges, namely the "orthodox" and "critical-mass" institutions. A third type of church-related college, the intentionally pluralist, provides the Christian worldview an assumed but not a privileged voice, while the fourth type, ironically, does not even do that. It is the orthodox college, with its most distinguishing feature being that of employing only confessing Christians as scholars, that has been the most dynamic model in recent decades, and it is the Council of Christian Colleges & Universities that serves as the umbrella organization for the orthodox/evangelical Protestant institutions.⁸

Developing from its parent organization, the fourteen-member Christian College Consortium (which still exists) and changing from its previous name (the Christian College Coalition) in 1999, the CCCU developed at a rate that largely coincided with the growing prominence of the evangelical movement in general. Prospering especially during the presidential tenures of John Dellenback (1977–88) and Robert Andringa (1994–2006), the member institutions grew in number from 38 in 1977 to 77 in 1988 to 105 representing 27 denominations (plus 69 affiliate members) in 2004.⁹

Presently CCCU membership (see appendix C) is limited to North American, primarily undergraduate, liberal arts colleges, although a variety of other institutions – for example, Bible colleges, graduate seminaries, and universities, and especially overseas institutions (see section titled "New Constituencies and Extended Borders" in this chapter) – have become affiliate members. By the 1990s, the CCCU had gained recognition in the world of private higher education in general and in the Washington, DC, government-education network in particular, comparable to that of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. Among the denominations with colleges joining the CCCU for the first time (or in much larger numbers) since 1984 are the Southern Baptists, the Christian Church and Churches of Christ (Independent), the Churches of Christ, the General Association of Regular Baptists, the Seventh-Day Adventists, and the Pentecostals. Additionally, many independent colleges and some former Bible colleges have joined the organization. The 2005 CCCU comprehensive institutional membership of 174 when identified by denominational affiliation includes sixty-one independent, twenty-two Southern Baptist, twelve

Nazarene, nine Presbyterian (six PCUSA), six Christian Church or Churches of Christ, five Assemblies of God, five Christian and Missionary Alliance, five Free Methodist, five Mennonite, four Wesleyan Church, three American Baptist, and three Christian Reformed. One Catholic university (Franciscan of Steubenville) and one Russian Orthodox institution (St. Petersburg School of Religion and Philosophy) are also members, but there are no institutions from the United Methodist, United Church of Christ, Episcopal, or Lutheran (some Missouri Synod Lutheran colleges have made inquiry) traditions. Of the evangelical denominations, the Nazarenes, the Seventh-Day Adventists, and the Christian Reformed have maintained close relationships with their denominations. Nevertheless, in general the evangelical denominations, like their mainstream counterparts, have loosened their formal organization connections with their colleges.¹⁰

The sharp growth in the number of independent CCCU colleges is noteworthy. It reflects both the general decline of denominational loyalty and the rise of the independent church movement in the late twentieth century. The Hartford Institute for Religion Research estimates that there are 35,000 independent or nondenominational congregations with a membership of ten million, thus making the movement larger than any Protestant denomination except for the Southern Baptists. Almost all (82 percent) of these independent congregations describe themselves as evangelical, fundamentalist, charismatic, or Pentecostal. Thus, the two largest Protestant groups of churches are also the two groups most represented in the CCCU institutions.¹¹

In addition to the CCCU, the second major organization of orthodox colleges is the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE), which until 2004 was known as the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges. The change in name reflects a change in organization to better serve a changing constituency. While some Bible colleges continue to evolve into liberal arts colleges – for example, Crown (MN), Simpson (CA), Southeastern (FL), and Vanguard (CA) – others have added graduate programs. Meanwhile, hundreds of new institutions have come into existence since 1980, bringing the total of Bible schools and colleges to more than 1,200. The expanded ABHE organization has added to its traditional role of providing institution-wide, undergraduate theological accreditation, as it now also reviews graduate education for its members, offers church vocation and program evaluation for comprehensive institutions that hold general accreditation with another recognized accreditation organization, and provides general development services for its affiliate institutions. By 2005 the ABHE claimed 88 members and 45 affiliate members (see appendix D).¹²

The orthodox and critical-mass colleges worked cooperatively during the past decade in a number of Christian scholarship endeavors. These in-

clude the *Christian Scholars Review* (CSR), which is currently sponsored by 47 colleges (up from 26 in 1984), including Baylor, Grove City, Hope, Pepperdine, Saint Olaf, and Samford as well as 41 CCCU institutions.¹³ Also Lutheran, Catholic, and evangelical scholars work together as editors, contributors, or readers for *Cresset*, published at Valparaiso as one of the older collegiate-based periodicals of religious thought in the United States, and *First Things*, published by the Institute on Religion and Public Life. The Lilly Fellows Program (LFP), also based at Valparaiso and designed to facilitate dialogue on the relationship between Christianity and the academic vocation, has involved, since 1991, a network of approximately 70 institutions led by Lutheran, Catholic, and evangelical colleges and universities, plus a few others (five Presbyterian, five United Methodist, two traditionally African American, one Disciples of Christ, and one Episcopalian). Influenced by the LFP, the most significant new common endeavor of the twenty-first century is the Lilly Endowment-funded Programs for the Theological Exploration of Vocation (PTEV) initiative, involving approximately 20 each of Catholic and evangelical colleges and 10 each of Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Methodist colleges out of a total of 88 institutions. For a complete list of the LFP and PTEV institutions, including those that have operated as pluralist colleges, see appendices E and F. In addition to the 88 PTEV grant recipients, more than three times as many other colleges applied for the grants. Never in the history of Christian higher education in America had so many colleges (375) applied for so much aid from a single program for the purpose of assisting in a campus-wide effort to enhance the faith domain (in this case the relationship between faith and vocational purpose).¹⁴

It is possible that the Lilly PTEV program may do as much in the early twenty-first century to stimulate thoughtful spirituality in church-related higher education—and beyond—as the Carnegie Pension Fund did to discourage the same in the early twentieth century (see page 99). The results to date are encouraging even if preliminary. Nearly all of the earliest colleges to receive grants are now planning to make their programs permanent.

In general among the mainline PTEV institutions, those which have secularized the least and the most recently (e.g., such Midwestern Lutheran colleges as Luther, Concordia-Moorhead, and Augsburg) are the ones that have most easily developed broad-based programs. Yet no less significant are the efforts to reintroduce religious discourse into the academic arena in institutions where it had largely disappeared. “Some schools have taken steps that may appear small to an outsider, but signal a major opening internally to engage, in fresh ways, questions about their religious heritage,” notes Christopher Coble, Lilly PTEV director.

College leaders comment how the program has given them a natural

vehicle by which to “break the culture of silence” regarding the spiritual domain. For example, at Hendrix, the recent alumni are astonished by the freedom and naturalness with which the current students and faculty talk and think about religion in a reflective way. By contrast, some of the PTEV institutions that have never been silent about religion simply use their grants to strengthen existing programs, such as Howard’s cooperative endeavor between the chaplain’s office and the faculty to enhance the discipline-specific programs in ethics and spirituality.

Some of the PTEV colleges (e.g., Butler, Wake Forest, and Sewanee or University of the South) that have become independent of their founding denomination and have increasingly admitted students and hired faculty of other faith and non-faith traditions are using their grant in significant part to access how in this new environment of independence and pluralism they can best facilitate religious inquiry. As the president of Butler, Bobby Fong, asked in the immediate context of the national tragedy of September 11, 2001, “How can you serve a community well without a religious dimension?” Essentially such colleges are seeking both to communicate the idea that faith is and always has been a vital part of being human, and then to develop systems that best encourage individual religious inquiry without institutionally advocating a specific outcome.

Other major emphases in the PTEV colleges include new courses, faculty-development programs, and student service-learning programs. For example, Willamette and Macalaster are offering innovative academic experiences for interested students, while Furman and Davidson are introducing seminars to enhance the theological and vocational understanding of new and existing faculty. While nearly all of the colleges give major emphasis to student ministry programs, these become more nearly the sole focus at some of the more secular institutions. In most institutions the students have embraced the PTEV programs more eagerly than have the faculty, the denominations associated with the colleges appreciate the emphasis upon mentoring more and better-qualified ministerial candidates, and the institutional leaders appreciate the large degree of freedom that the program gives each individual institution to develop programs that best fit its environment.¹⁵

The number of liberal arts institutions that applied for the PTEV grants (375) is one indicator of the number of intentionally Christian colleges in the United States that now have a serious interest in facilitating the faith development of their students. That number compares closely, albeit on the high side, with the estimate of the Robert Andringa chart (see appendix A), which identifies approximately 250 Protestant liberal arts colleges that are “more or less intentional about integrating their faith with their mission.” The Andringa chart also suggests that there are 150 other tradi-

tionally Protestant institutions “who have pretty much neglected their faith tradition.” Perhaps the PTEV program will help to reduce the number of institutions in the latter category.

If the Christian colleges are becoming more prosperous, more focused on their traditional Christian worldview, and more ecumenical in working with similar institutions, are they also becoming more scholarly? The consensus answer is yes, but the commentators on this subject differ considerably in how they present their affirmative responses. George Marsden notes that since the 1980s the Christian colleges have accelerated their pace of recovery with better-qualified faculty, more academically strong colleges, more study centers, and more scholarly activity. Also, Richard Gathro, the executive vice president of the CCCU, observes that now in the early twenty-first century, “The overall quality of faculty on our campuses is the best that it has ever been.” One further mark of academic development is a growing capacity to engage in self-criticism when writing authorized institutional history (note, for example, the recent histories of Point Loma and John Brown). As the evangelical academic community has become more scholarly, the general academy has joined the evangelical scholars in increasingly focusing upon American evangelicalism as a subject for study. Larry Eskridge of the Institute for the Study of American evangelism reports that since the early 1990s, the number of scholarly books appearing yearly on evangelicalism has increased three-fold.¹⁶

Within the evangelical colleges the single most significant vehicle for promoting the expansion of scholarly writing has been the faith and learning integration concept (see pp. 193–94). This integration idea, stemming especially from such centers as Calvin (led by Nicholas Wolterstorff and others), Wheaton (led by Arthur Holmes), and, more recently, Baylor (led by Michael Beatty and Douglas Henry) and affecting especially the humanities, sciences, and social sciences (led by philosophy and history), became widely influential within the orthodox institutions (such as those in the CCCU). The central concepts of this system are that “all truth is God’s truth” and that humans should seek to apply God’s truth to every area of learning and every social system.

The influence of the faith and learning integration model can be measured by its impact on the development of new professional organizations and college courses. The discipline-specific faith and learning integration organizations numbered approximately fifty by the early twenty-first century; and with their membership drawn largely but not exclusively from the orthodox colleges and their emphasis upon integration scholarship (and fellowship and mutual encouragement), they were in large part an application of the integration system of thought. Also, in our 2004 study of the curriculum of the church-related institutions, research assistant

Christopher Burns and I found that 50 percent of the CCCU member colleges offer a required faith and learning integration course (usually at the freshman or senior level).¹⁷

A second major recent system for bringing together faith and learning was the Christian vocation model. Developed at Valparaiso University and most commonly associated with Mark Schwehn and his book *Exiles from Eden* (1993), this vocational emphasis was a central principle of the Lilly Fellows Program. It has been especially influential in the critical-mass institutions (and the would-be critical-mass institutions), increasingly so in the twenty-first century as such thinking is at the center of the major Lilly Endowment Theological Exploration of Vocation (PTEV) Program. The vocation model of Christian scholarship places less emphasis upon the development of well-reasoned compelling arguments than upon a deep personal quest to find the best basis for practicing scholarship (or any other calling). Doing follows being. With a mature sense of being, then, the Christian scholar works at the scholarly task humbly, communally, and with a sense of intellectual openness.¹⁸

In many respects Schwehn's vocation model overlaps with the ideas of other major recent theorists of Christian scholarship: Douglas and Rhonda Jacobsen, Parker Palmer, and Ernest Boyer. The Jacobsens, while appreciative of the contributions of the Reformed model of integration especially in stimulating the renaissance in evangelical scholarship after 1975, argue that there are other viable approaches to doing Christian scholarship. Reflecting the Arminian and Anabaptist traditions of their institution, Messiah, the Jacobsens favor an approach to learning which values humility and dialogue more than apologetics, debate, and "waging war for the faith through the means of heavily footnoted books and rapier-like essays." Palmer offers that the best Christian scholarship is "transformational learning" in which the scholar continually seeks to develop personally by that which he or she learns and teaches. Boyer, a graduate of two CCCU institutions, Messiah and Greenville, rose to become one of the most respected voices in American education during the late twentieth century while serving as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and as Jimmy Carter's Commissioner of Education. His widely discussed book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), emphasized how American higher education had placed undue emphasis upon one form of scholarship, namely research and publishing, and too little emphasis upon another form of scholarship, namely classroom instruction. Thus the Schwehn-Jacobsens-Palmer-Boyer model of scholarship values research and publication (the leaders of this model all are masters of the craft) but never to the neglect of one's best effort in the classroom and never to the exclusion of the development of lived-out truth in the totality of one's life.¹⁹

Amidst all of the discussion of the recent progress of Christian scholarship, one voice, Mark Noll, stands out as a reminder of the degree to which evangelical scholarship and the evangelical movement in general still falls short. While acknowledging the recent improvement since the appearance of his *Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (1994), Noll wonders why a group that can so readily voice the scriptural command to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy mind fails to seek to practice the latter as much as the former. Essentially Noll is calling for a greater balance in the values and allocation of resources by evangelicals in their total sense and practice of mission. Not a scold by nature, Noll is in fact a very generous and kind-hearted man. Arguably the premier evangelical scholar of the current generation, few scholars of any type are as erudite, productive, and irenic in combination as is he.²⁰

Noll and the other major contributors to the enhanced reputation of evangelical scholarship received significant funding for their labors from mainline Protestant foundations much more than from the evangelical foundations, the latter of which remained largely focused on evangelism, youth ministry, and missions. Beginning in the late 1970s, the Lilly Endowment and the Pew Charitable Trusts became major funders of not only the projects of individual evangelical scholars but also evangelical academic conferences (e.g., “The Bible in American History” and “Reforming the Center: Beyond the Two-Party System in American Protestantism”) and study centers (the Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals); of course, especially the Lilly Endowment was funding similar efforts in the critical-mass colleges and universities (see section titled “Enlarging the Faith and Learning Dialogue” in this chapter).²¹

In general, the state of Christian scholarship appears much better than it did in the 1980s because (1) the Christian academicians are producing more significant works of scholarship; (2) the Christian academic communities are less isolated, more readily identifying with the contributions of one another, and thus perceiving themselves as a part of a larger – and more significant – whole; and (3) there is a broadening definition of scholarship that allows the Christian colleges to better realize how well they had been doing all along in certain aspects of spiritually informed intellectual activity, namely collegiality and caring, incarnational teaching.

If the turn-of-the-century Christian colleges have continued to progress in reputation, resources, campus environment, and scholarship, which of them are exemplary in this development? Within the CCCU, among the generally recognized leaders are Calvin, Wheaton, and Gordon in scholarship; Taylor, Westmont, Calvin, Whitworth, John Brown, Azusa, and Seattle Pacific in campus community; Belhaven and Nyack in diversity development; and Union, Lee, Palm Beach Atlantic, Biola, Point Loma, Dordt, Northwestern (MN), Houghton, Oklahoma Christian, Bethel (MN),

Messiah, Goshen, Abilene Christian, Lipscomb, and Asbury in overall quality.²²

CCCU schools that have repeatedly (since 1990) ranked high in the *U.S. News and World Report (USNWR)* "Best Colleges" rankings include Wheaton, Westmont, Erskine, Gordon, Goshen, Houghton, Whitworth, Seattle Pacific, Calvin, Taylor, Oklahoma Baptist, (Messiah) John Brown, Asbury, Dordt, Covenant, Oklahoma Christian, Master's, George Fox, North Park, Northwest Nazarene, LeTourneau, Eastern Mennonite, College of the Ozarks, Bethel (MN), and Western Baptist. Also listed regularly in the recent *USNWR* rankings are (1) *Christian Scholars Review (CSR)* institutions: Pepperdine and Baylor, among the national universities, and also Saint Olaf, Hope, Samford, and Grove City; (2) PTEV or LFP institutions: Duke, Wake Forest, and Howard among the national universities, and also Davidson, Grinnell, Macalester, Sewanee, Furman, Occidental, Rhodes, Denison, Willamette, Wooster, Spelman, Wofford, Austin, Earlham, Hendrix, Gustavus Adolphus, Transylvania, Augustana (IL), Luther, Wittenberg, Alma, Concordia Moorhead, Georgetown, Guilford, Hastings, Westminster (PA), Roanoke, Mercer, Valparaiso, Butler, Hamline, Pacific Lutheran, Berea, Maryville, Elmhurst, and Augsburg; and (3) Southern Baptist, Lutheran, and independent institutions not already mentioned: Stetson, Belmont, Ouachita Baptist, Texas Lutheran, and Berry.²³

Among the colleges enrolling high numbers of freshmen National Merit Scholars are CCCU or CSR institutions Wheaton, Baylor, Saint Olaf, (Furman), Calvin; and PTEV institutions Duke, Macalester, and Grinnell. Those with high endowments include CCCU or CSR institutions Baylor, Pepperdine, College of the Ozarks, Regent, Wheaton, Samford, Saint Olaf, Abilene Christian, Loma Linda; and PTEV or LFP institutions Duke, Grinnell, Wake Forest, Berea, Macalester, Howard, Earlham, Davidson, Furman, Occidental, Spelman, Sewanee, Rhodes, Willamette, and Mercer; and independent Berry. Those identified on the Carnegie Foundation listing of major doctoral-granting institutions in the mid-1990s include CCCU or CSR institutions Andrews, Baylor, Biola, Loma Linda, Pepperdine; and PTEV universities Duke, Howard, and Wake Forest. Institutions producing significant numbers of undergraduates who proceed to complete doctoral programs include CCCU or CSR institutions Baylor, Saint Olaf, Wheaton, Calvin, Hope, Abilene Christian, Mississippi, Oklahoma Baptist, Samford, Goshen, Grove City, Houghton; and PTEV or LFP institutions Duke, Wake Forest, Valparaiso, Wooster, Grinnell, Occidental, Macalester, Furman, Davidson, Earlham, Luther, Wittenberg, Gustavus Adolphus, Denison, Rhodes, Augustana (IL), Spelman, Pacific Lutheran, Concordia at Moorhead, Hendrix, Butler, and Berea; and Harding and Juniata. Among the institutions with high graduation rates are CCCU or

CSR institutions Wheaton, Saint Olaf, Pepperdine, Taylor, Grove City, Hope, Houghton, Calvin, Messiah, Westmont, Baylor, Franciscan of Steubenville; and PTEV or LFP institutions Duke, Wake Forest, Davidson, Grinnell, Furman, Sewanee, Macalester, Luther, Occidental, Augustana, Wofford, Spelman, Trinity, Austin, Rhodes, Valparaiso, Presbyterian, Wittenberg, Elmhurst, Wartburg, and Earlham.²⁴

New Constituencies and Extended Borders

Since the decline of the nineteenth-century pre-collegiate academies (see pp. 60, 70–71, 132), the Christian college had educated primarily young undergraduate students within the confines of the campus boundaries. This changed sharply in the late twentieth century as the Christian colleges moved increasingly into graduate training, adult degree-completion programs (often at off-campus sites), and distance learning and other forms of electronic instruction, and also encouraged their traditional students to study and serve abroad for periods ranging from a month (e.g., January term) to a year. Furthermore, the Christian colleges of this country developed networks with similar institutions around the world.

A significant part of the enrollment increase in Christian higher education is due to the new programs. Some institutions (e.g., Indiana Wesleyan, Azusa Pacific, Biola, Wayland Baptist, and Dallas Baptist) have grown from small colleges to medium-sized universities by their investment in such ventures. Others who made major commitments to curricular innovation include Liberty, Grand Canyon, Regent, LaTourneau, Belhaven, George Fox, Spring Arbor, Roberts Wesleyan, Bethel (MN), Cornerstone, and several of the Nazarene institutions.²⁵

The quality of the graduate programs in Christian higher education is often undervalued because of the tendency to place in a separate category its most important and best-developed component, namely the theological seminary. By the early twenty-first century, the largest ten (Fuller, Southwestern Baptist, New Orleans Baptist, Southern Baptist, Gordon-Conwell, Dallas, Southeastern Baptist, Asbury, Trinity, and Golden Gate Baptist) and nearly all of the largest twenty-five seminaries in America were evangelical or orthodox in nature, thus further accelerating the trend in place by 1980 (see n. 18 of chapter 6). Most of the recent student enrollment growth has been with women and minorities, and in evangelical, including Southern Baptist, seminaries. Additionally, among graduate institutions of all types, evangelical seminaries Fuller and Trinity have become the leading producers of dissertations on missions.²⁶

Among the intentionally Christian universities, those with the broadest range of major professional and graduate programs are Baylor and Pepperdine. Baylor and Pepperdine both have highly regarded law and busi-

ness schools. The Baylor graduate school lists more than sixty master's-level programs, and the Baylor 2012 Plan (see the end of the section titled "The Mainline Reassesses" in this chapter) intends to steadily increase the number of doctoral programs (fifteen in 2002) as a major component in its plan to become a premier Christian university. Especially noteworthy is the goal of adding doctoral programs in the humanities and social sciences, the thinnest curricular area in Christian higher education. Nearly two-thirds of Pepperdine's eight thousand students are graduate students with most of them enrolled in the schools of business and management, education and psychology, public policy, and law. Besides Baylor and Pepperdine, other institutions with law schools include Wake Forest, Mercer, Howard, Samford, Stetson, Willamette, Campbell, Mississippi, Regent, Valparaiso, and Capital. Samford has a sizable pharmacology program and recently opened one of the most significant new evangelical seminaries. Loma Linda's unusually extensive curriculum within the health sciences reflects the Seventh-Day Adventist holistic approach to human development. Andrews offers fifty master's and ten doctoral (mostly in theology and education) programs.²⁷

Reflective of the recent movement of the CCCU institutions into graduate education is that a majority of them now use the term "university" in their name. Of the 102 United States members, sixty-nine offer master's-level programs while approximately twenty offer doctoral programs. Education at all levels is the most common curriculum, with Azusa Pacific, Baylor, and Regent (VA) offering doctoral programs for those pursuing careers in higher education. Even the Bible colleges have embraced advanced programs, as their constituency is increasingly expectant of a graduate degree for their ministry professionals. The M.A. rather than the M.Div. is the most common Bible college graduate degree with one-third of the Bible colleges now offering postgraduate instruction.²⁸

One of the most significant new Christian universities, Regent University, operates almost totally as a graduate institution. Pat Robertson, televangelist and son of a Virginia senator, sought to found a graduate professional program to train Christian leaders in areas that could have the greatest impact in changing society. He began with communications in 1978 and added education, counseling, psychology, entrepreneur business, law, government, and theology, meanwhile developing a Washington, DC-area campus and an unusually large endowment base for a young institution. Enrolling 3,200 students in 2003-04, Regent operates with an evangelical theology broader than the founder's charismatic views, although the university is largely reflective of Robertson's political conservatism.²⁹

Since 1990 the fastest-growing segment of higher education has been the working adult population, and most of the institutions emerging to

serve this market with user-friendly programs have been small, often urban, evangelical or Catholic colleges with low endowments.

The most popular new curriculum has been the degree-completion program. Approximately one-half of college freshmen fail to earn the baccalaureate degree before assuming careers and/or family responsibilities, and when they discover that colleges would offer them a plan to complete their degree in a relatively short period of time (e.g., eighteen to twenty continuous months for the last two undergraduate years) in convenient locations with sometimes reduced formal classtime demands, moderate tuition fees, and financial aid packages, all while continuing their regular employment, many are interested.³⁰

The more traditional colleges and universities – religious and secular – raised questions about the credibility of the new programs. Were they “bargain basement” programs that compromised quality and sometimes institutional mission to earn “easy money” (many of the programs employed high numbers of inexpensive, part-time instructors and in general required low maintenance) to enhance or even save their traditional programs? The defenders noted that innovative programs designed to bring the benefits of education to new population groups have always required time to develop quality controls.³¹

Among the evangelical institutions, the generally recognized leader in the field of nontraditional higher education is Indiana Wesleyan, which began its program in 1985, hired an aggressive young president, James Barnes, to promote it, and benefited from being in a state with a low college graduation rate and no community-college system. In the past decade, the IWU College of Adult and Professional Studies has come to maturity under the leadership of Mark Smith, being especially exemplary in quality control, the facilitation of student success, and a faith and learning integration emphasis commensurate with that of the traditional program. By 2005 the university’s nontraditional programs enrolled more than nine thousand students in its nine regional campuses and seventy total program centers while maintaining a high graduation rate (80 percent).³²

Distance learning (primarily online instruction but also interactive television, CD-ROM, and satellite modes) emerged in academe with much fanfare in the late twentieth century. The development of the World Wide Web offered the promise of replacing not only correspondence courses but much of the highly expensive on-campus forms of learning. By the early twenty-first century, about 8 percent of American undergraduate students were enrolled in one or more distance-learning courses, and more than 50 percent of all colleges – including about 50 percent of the CCCU colleges – were offering at least some electronic instruction.³³

The initial enthusiasm began to fade, however, as it became increas-

ingly clear that the students preferred the “face-to-face” (f-2-f) mode of learning. Still, electronic instruction is assuming a real although much more modest role in the learning process. Traditional classroom teachers are using computer technology to enhance their teaching, and traditional students are enrolling in limited numbers of e-courses.³⁴

The greatest value of electronic instruction in Christian institutions is to serve those who have no easy access – or no access at all – to traditional modes of learning; these include many adult learners, advanced home-schooling students, missionary children in remote locations, and – in the spirit of the Theological Education by Extension movement introduced by missiologist Ralph Winter and others a generation ago – the minimally educated pastors and Christian workers in the less-developed parts of the world. Among the Christian colleges, many institutions use online instruction to a limited degree, but only a few use it extensively. Among the latter are Liberty, Regent (40 percent of its students), Grand Canyon, Indiana Wesleyan, and Azusa Pacific.³⁵

One of the boldest ventures in nontraditional programming was the 2004 decision by Grand Canyon University to transform itself not just into a heavily online institution but also into the first for-profit Christian college in the United States. One major goal is to combine the profits of online instruction and the efficiencies of for-profit higher education to fund a low-cost, Christian mega-campus in Phoenix. The significance of the Grand Canyon experiment may lie less in its own development than in the influence that it has upon Christian higher education in general as the latter struggles with the issue of how to make its educational experience more affordable.³⁶

Two new colleges have closely identified with the sharply growing home-schooling network of pre-collegiate education. Patrick Henry (VA) opened in 2000 with the explicit purpose of recruiting students from the approximately 500,000 families that teach their children at home; then, once on campus, it seeks to train them as conservative political activists with the majority of the students majoring in political science. Pensacola Christian is less political in orientation but does specialize in preparing curricular materials – known as A Beka Book – for thousands of home-schooled children and Christian schools.³⁷

Meanwhile, both the predominantly white and the predominantly black Christian colleges have continued to work to make their programs available to all ethnic groups. Because of the higher cost of a private education, devout Christians of all races have enrolled primarily in public universities. Only 14 percent of evangelical college youth attend CCCU institutions, and only 12 percent of black students attend the approximately one hundred historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Within the CCCU institutions, the minority enrollment was 10 percent (5 percent

African-American, 2 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Asian) in 1991, while in the HBCUs the white enrollment was 10 percent in 1976 and 13 percent in 1994 (the total white, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American enrollment was 16 percent in the latter year). The white enrollment in the HBCUs was very uneven, however, being especially high in the public HBCUs of the upper South (from 17 percent to 92 percent in the fourteen institutions with the highest percentages in 1994) and especially low in the private HBCUs in the Deep South (less than 1 percent in the fourteen institutions with the lowest percentages in 1994).³⁸ The CCCU institutions with the greatest success recently in recruiting minority students include Nyack, Houston Baptist, Andrews, Belhaven, Indiana Wesleyan, Howard Payne, North Park, William Tyndale, and Warner Southern; also noteworthy are LaSierra, LaVerne, Columbia, Averett, Mercer, and Texas Lutheran. In addition to the many HBCUs founded by mainline Protestant denominations after the Civil War, more recently the Seventh-Day Adventists founded Oakwood (AL) in 1896, the Missouri Synod Lutherans began Concordia Selma in 1922, and the Churches of Christ opened Southwestern Christian College (TX) in 1948.³⁹ Among the HBCUs, Howard and Tuskegee operate especially effective chaplaincy programs, and Bethune-Cookman has sought to work in close cooperation with the mostly white CCCU. Perhaps the greatest contribution that the black colleges can make to Christian higher education – and also to American Christianity in general – is, in the words of Samuel Dubois Cook, to “be prophetic voices and agents,” to “speak truth to power,” both internally and to society in general as we all seek to overcome the “terrible evils that block progress toward the loving community of all of God’s children.” Also noteworthy is Bacone, which to this day serves as a mission project of the American Baptist churches and their many work teams. Chartered by the Indian tribes of Oklahoma, 60 percent of the college enrollees are Native American.⁴⁰

In addition to extending academic offerings to new types of students in this country, the modern Christian college has also created many new overseas study and service opportunities for its traditional students and developed alliances of mutual support and cultural understanding with similar institutions worldwide. Among American institutions, the Christian colleges and universities have long been leaders in promoting international awareness. Since the beginning of the modern missionary movement during the Second Great Awakening, through the YMCA/YWCA and Student Volunteer Movement organizations and with the rise of the Bible college, the Christian colleges have emphasized worldwide evangelistic concern and preparation for after-college missionary careers. What has been new to the last generation is the number of students who live overseas as a part of their undergraduate experience.

While the number of all American students studying abroad doubled

during the 1990s to 1.3 percent per year (or 5 percent of students during the four-year college period), Christian college students studied and/or served abroad at a higher than normal rate. Institutions with large numbers of students studying abroad included Baylor, Pepperdine, Wake Forest, Calvin, Wheaton, Messiah, Pacific Lutheran, Gustavus Adolphus, Concordia Moorhead, and Luther, while those with high percentages of students serving abroad included Goshen with its unique study-service program (see p. 194) and PTEV or LFP institutions Austin, Earlham, Goshen, Saint Olaf, and Wofford. Sometimes individual colleges developed a special relationship with a specific international institution (e.g., Malone with Hong Kong Baptist and Geneva with Christ College, Taiwan) with resultant student- and faculty-exchange programs.⁴¹

The CCCU has been very active in promoting international understanding. It is perhaps symbolically significant that six of its members include or imply "international" in their titles. Also, seven of the organization's eleven semester-long study programs are located at an overseas site (China, Costa Rica, Egypt, England, Russia, Australia, Uganda). Leaders among the CCCU colleges in the internationalization effort have been Gordon, Messiah, Calvin, Taylor, Andrews, and Eastern. Gordon offered well-developed travel/study courses, especially to Europe, for its students and others as early as the 1950s; the aforementioned Goshen program with its general-education requirement for a semester of studying and serving in a third world country has long been a model; Messiah hosted the influential 1986 CCCU conference on "Internationalizing the Curriculum" and produced a book of the same name; Calvin enrolls students from approximately sixty countries and offers approximately thirty-five off-campus courses each J-term; Taylor, which pioneered in overseas athletic evangelism in the 1950s and computer instruction for Wycliffe and other missions organizations in the 1970s, founded the first MK ("missionary kid") support group (MuKappa) in the 1980s. There are now MuKappa chapters on more than one hundred college campuses, where the MKs do much to facilitate cross-cultural appreciation.⁴²

Few colleges reflect an international environment as much as Andrews, and few denominations operate as many liberal arts colleges in as many countries as does Andrews's supporting denomination, the missionary-minded Seventh-Day Adventist Church. Inspired by the teaching of church cofounder Ellen White, who emphasized that "the work of education and the work of redemption are one," the Adventist worldwide educational network has grown to 99 tertiary institutions — mostly liberal arts colleges (86 outside of the continental United States), 1,100 secondary schools, and 4,400 primary schools to serve the denomination's 13 million members (more than 12 million outside of the United States). With Andrews being the Adventist institution with the broadest graduate curriculum, it attracts

many international Adventists seeking advanced theological or education degrees; these international students comprise eight hundred of the Andrews enrollment of three thousand—one of the highest percentages among American colleges.⁴³

Andrews and Eastern operate model graduate programs to train leaders of humanitarian-aid organizations in the developing world. Both institutions offer instruction on both their American campus and at overseas sites, with Andrews yearly enrolling nearly two hundred students (mostly employees of the large, worldwide Adventist Development and Relief Agency) at four overseas sites that rotate periodically. Eastern has worked closely with World Vision to develop its School of International Leadership and Development and describes its Economic Development Program as the hallmark of the university.⁴⁴

The late twentieth century witnessed a sharp rise worldwide in private colleges, including Christian colleges. The desire for higher education has outdistanced the ability of many governments to pay for it. Some countries such as Canada still discourage private colleges (except for Bible colleges); however, in Asia, Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe the growth is especially dramatic as governments are making it easier for non-public colleges to obtain charters. Even Africa is developing a meaningful private college system.⁴⁵

It is difficult, if not impossible, to gauge the degree of growth of the Christian college movement worldwide in recent decades. Joel Carpenter has identified forty-one evangelical liberal arts colleges begun outside of the West since 1980. Robert Andringa believes the number of overseas Christian colleges to be anywhere from five hundred to two thousand. In many cases they evolve from Bible colleges and theological seminaries as local church leaders—in contrast to the Western missionaries—are encouraging a broader curriculum to facilitate national social and economic development.⁴⁶

Many of the new international Christian colleges have sought membership with the CCCU, and to date the North American organization has accepted thirty-eight such institutions as affiliates. The majority of these international affiliates, like the plurality of the North American members, are interdenominational, and a description of some of them appears in appendix H. The newly developing overseas Christian colleges seek affiliation so eagerly because, in many cases, not being a Bible college, denominationally based, or government-owned, they have no natural local or national organization with which to identify. Being a member of the CCCU enhances credibility with government and accreditation officials, and it facilitates the recruitment of American students, professors, and other resources.⁴⁷

By contrast with the blossoming overseas Christian liberal-arts-college

movement, the overseas Bible colleges are much better linked to each other and to their North American counterparts. This should cause no surprise as throughout much of the twentieth century the United States and Canadian Bible colleges were the primary producers of overseas missionaries, and these international evangelists tended to reproduce the type of educational institutions with which they were most familiar and that could best facilitate their goals of evangelism and church planting. Beginning in the 1960s and following the model of the North American Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges (now the Association for Biblical Higher Education), the Bible colleges of the world founded regional accrediting associations in Africa, Latin America, the South Pacific, Asia, the Caribbean, Europe, and Euro-Asia with the worldwide umbrella organization of the associations being the International Council for Evangelical Theological Education (ICETE), which operates under the auspices of the World Evangelical Alliance. By 2003 the number of Bible colleges accredited by ICETE member organizations numbered 710.

The ICETE institutions offer primarily undergraduate programs. By contrast, Overseas Council International (begun in 1974) facilitates developmental activities in the most advanced evangelical theological programs (primarily graduate seminaries) in each region of the world. Among the best-developed of the one hundred Overseas Council institutions are Central American Theological Seminary (Guatemala), the best-developed evangelical seminary in Latin America; South American Theological Seminary (Brazil); Bangui Evangelical School of Theology (Central Africa Republic), the best-recognized program in French-speaking Africa; Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology (Kenya); George Whitefield College (South Africa); Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo (Egypt), the largest evangelical seminary in the Arab-speaking world; Odessa Theological Seminary, the leading evangelical seminary in the Russian-speaking world; China Graduate School of Theology (Hong Kong), one of the best doctoral-level theological programs in the world; South Asia Institute of Advanced Christian Studies (India); and Union Biblical Seminary (India). Additionally, in 1989 the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada led in the organization of the World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions (WOCATI); however, WOCATI remains in an early stage of development.⁴⁸

Enlarging the Faith and Learning Dialogue

Since the 1960s the orthodox colleges have given major focus to the idea of bringing together the faith and knowledge domains in writing, thinking, and certainly in teaching (see pp. 193-94). What is new to the period since 1990 is that growing segments of the academy are increasingly ac-

knowledging the extent to which they have secularized (see chapter 4) and are reassessing how they can best offer a fair hearing to the spiritual dimension of human existence.

While in recent years the evangelical liberal arts colleges have continued to embrace the general goal of faith and learning integration, they debated just exactly what the concept meant and how it could best be applied to the specific academic subjects. The Bible colleges meanwhile discussed – and decided one institution at a time – how much and in what disciplinary areas they wanted to become like the Christian liberal arts colleges. The “critical-mass” Christian colleges struggled with the idea of how they could be both Christian and pluralistic. A growing number of the more-or-less secular church-related institutions, while not necessarily wanting to return to their earlier – often nineteenth-century – mode of being a Christian college, did begin to reassess whether they had unduly eliminated religious discourse and should find ways to reintroduce its most vital elements. Other secular private institutions recognized but resisted the growing public interest in spirituality.

Meanwhile, at the turn of the century, a few of the public institutions were starting to ask how a state university could deal both honestly and objectively with the religious aspect of the human condition. Mostly, however, the public universities – and many of the elite private institutions – were operating in a postmodern void that was still leery of considering religious issues.

The growing general discourse included a specific body of major literature.⁴⁹ The most widely influential studies were the critical laments of the secularization of the academy, beginning with George Marsden’s landmark *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York, 1994) and also including Douglas Sloan’s *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education* (Louisville, 1994) and James Burtchaell’s *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from Their Christian Churches* (Grand Rapids, 1998). Marsden focused on the secularization process in the elite, precedent-setting universities, beginning in the late nineteenth century; Sloan traced the subsequent movement in the mainline Protestant church-related colleges with special attention on their failed effort in the 1950s and 1960s to reunite faith and learning in the academy; while Burtchaell examined the related process of disassociation from the sponsoring denomination in Catholic and Protestant institutions alike. Also working effectively as a critique was Larry Braskamp’s *Fostering Student Development through Faculty Development* (n.p., 2003), a careful survey of the chief academic officers of 250 Catholic and Protestant mainline church-related colleges and universities in which the collective responses themselves

documented the significant degree of secularization in the traditionally Christian institutions.

While the literature of critique served the purpose of “consciousness raising,” a second type of literature began to appear – especially near and after the turn of the century – that sought to move beyond the negative ethic of social criticism to the more positive ethic of presenting models and proposing workable solutions. Certainly there were strong elements of this second approach even in the critiques as Marsden’s *Soul of the American University* called for the major institutions to more consistently implement their profession of pluralism when it involved religious discourse, and Braskamp’s report encouraged a much greater emphasis upon educating the instructors (most of whom had studied in secular doctoral programs) in how to meet the holistic learning expectations of their students. The latter, as the aforementioned Astin study had shown quantitatively, and Colleen Carroll, *The New Faithful: Why Young Adults Are Embracing Christian Orthodoxy* (Chicago, 2002) and Naomi Schaefer Riley, *God on the Quad: How Religious Colleges and the Missionary Generation Are Changing America* (New York, 2005) had demonstrated in narrative form, were seeking an education that did not neglect the spiritual domain.

Among the many fine new studies pointing the way to a religiously informed learning are two works that could be used in faculty development programs, Caroline Simon et al., *Mentoring for Mission: Nurturing New Faculty at Church-Related Colleges* (Grand Rapids, 2003), and Richard Hughes, *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind* (Grand Rapids, 2001). The Simon book is a helpful guide for those directing faculty-development programs while the Hughes book is a useful tool for introducing new faculty to a Christian higher learning that is both open in mind and gracious in spirit.

Multi-author books growing out of major faith and learning conferences or study groups include Paul Dovre, ed., *The Future of Religious Colleges* (Grand Rapids, 2002); Andrea Sterk, ed., *Religion, Scholarship, and Higher Education* (Notre Dame, IN, 2002); and Stephen Haynes, ed., *Professing in the Postmodern Academy* (Waco, 2002). These and other works, such as Robert Benne, *Quality with Soul* (Grand Rapids, 2001), Richard Hughes and William Adrian, eds., *Models for Christian Higher Education* (Grand Rapids, 1997), and John Wilcox and Irene King, eds., *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Colleges* (Washington, DC, 2000), sought to provide models for consideration by those institutions seeking to become more intentionally Christian or more intentionally inclusive of the spiritual domain.

In so many of the recent conferences and projects, Protestant and Catholic educators have been working together. Among the more signifi-

cant recent works on Catholic higher education are Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity* (1995), Alice Gallin, *Negotiating Identity* (Notre Dame, IN, 2000), and David J. O'Brien, *From the Heart of the American Church: Catholic Higher Education and American Culture* (New York, 1994). Gleason (to Vatican II) and Gallin (since Vatican II) together present the definitive history of twentieth-century Catholic higher education in America. Since the tumultuous 1960s, Catholic institutions have pursued the same movement toward secularization that their Protestant counterparts had followed during the prior two generations. The O'Brien book with its positive tone points the way toward religious reconstruction in Catholic higher education.

Given the enhanced interest in religion as illustrated by the above literature, it is not surprising that two of the major journals of higher education each devoted an entire issue to the phenomenon. *Academe*, the publication of the American Association of University Professors, entitled its November–December 1996 issue “The Academy: Freedom of Religion or Freedom from Religion?” while *Liberal Education*, published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, named its fall 2001 issue “Religion on Campus.” It is an apt reflection of the evolving nature of the dialogue that the first issue emphasized the lack of religious discourse and the second issue (five years later) stressed its growing presence.

The Lilly Endowment provided the financial resources for many of the books, conferences, projects, and study centers⁵⁰ that appeared after 1990. Vice President for Religion Robert Lynn, together with a late-1980s conversation group that included David Ray Griffin, Joe Hough, Mark Schwehn, and Douglas Sloan, introduced the Lilly Initiative of the 1989–99 decade; however, the fuller development of the program came with Lynn's successor, Craig Dykstra,⁵¹ who strongly believed that there should be a larger role for religion in the marketplace of ideas in the university. During the first decade of the initiative, Lilly, led by religion program director Jeanne Knoerle, awarded seventy grants totaling \$15.6 million to support approximately forty-five projects. More recently the initiative has featured the Programs for the Theological Explorations of Vocation (see section titled “The Recovery Continues” in this chapter).⁵²

The Mainline Reassesses

Beginning earlier than the faith and learning movement in the mainline colleges has been the related renewal movement in the mainline denominations. Of course, the mainline churches never secularized as much as did their colleges, but unlike their colleges they suffered significant enrollment losses – more than 20 percent during a period (1960–2000) when overall United States church membership was growing at a rate of 33 per-

cent. The resultant loss of influence by the historic denominations was described baldly by one inside analyst: "If at one time the churches whose life flowed from the Reformation . . . were considered mainline, they are now clearly sideline. If once they set the religious agenda, . . . they are now increasingly ignored. On the one hand an energetic secularism pays them scant attention; on the other hand, an equally energetic fundamentalist—charismatic—evangelical wave has taken the center religious stage."⁵³

Both church and college were influenced by an increasingly secularized society, and both church and college influenced each other. The churches' reduced emphasis upon an authoritative (and demanding) gospel gave greater freedom to the church college to proclaim alternate worldviews, and the educated alumni of the secularizing colleges often chose not to return to the churches. Sociologist Robert Wuthnow noted, "Between 1958 and 1982, the most serious declines in regular church attendance came . . . among younger people with at least some education. . . . Education seemed to have become associated with a kind of 'gap' in religious commitment that had not been there prior to the 1960s." Scholars Dean Hoge, Benton Johnson, and Donald Luidens reached the same conclusion in the mid-1990s, namely that the mainline decline primarily stemmed from a failure to retain the young adults, especially the well-educated ones.⁵⁴

If the mainline colleges previously were influenced by the secularizing tendencies in the churches and society in general, perhaps they will be influenced in the opposite direction by the previously discussed growing contemporary interest in spirituality—especially among young people—and by the renewal movement in the churches. As noted by Christian educator Dorothy Bass, "Revitalization in main-line church-related colleges needs to be accomplished—and maybe only can be accomplished—as one element in the general revitalization of society in general including specifically the churches related to a college."⁵⁵

So how much are the mainline churches reviving and how much will the revival affect their related colleges? By the early twenty-first century there were approximately thirty renewal (or confessing) groups in the mainline denominations with the largest being the United Methodist Confessing Movement with more than 630,000 members, the fastest-growing being the Confessing Church Movement of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America with 420,000 members and 1,400 churches, and the umbrella organization being the Association for Church Renewal (founded in 1986). Studies by sociologists Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, and Jennifer McKinley suggest that the momentum in the mainline churches is with the renewal groups. The renewal clergy are younger, they are learning how to be more effective in church politics, they are much more effective at the grassroots level, and through evangelism they are enlisting

most of the new members. One of the most optimistic observers of the movement is Methodist theologian Thomas Oden, who has stated flatly, "A reversal has occurred in our time," noting that just when the evangelicals and the Eastern Orthodox Church had largely given up on the major Protestant denominations, the renewal movement powerfully emerged in all of the mainline churches.⁵⁶

If the evangelicals are thriving, the mainline churches are nudging toward orthodoxy, and the whole country is witnessing a growing spirituality, can the mainline colleges, influenced as they are by market realities and offers of renewal program funding, resist gradually shifting to a greater concern with serious religious initiatives? Already most of the major denominational college associations have introduced programs to assist colleges in their reevaluation of institutional mission or identity. Change is occurring; of course only time will tell how extensive the renewal will become.⁵⁷

In general, the mainline colleges that have secularized the least are the ones most active in revitalization. More specifically, this includes the midwestern and western Lutheran colleges and the Catholic institutions. The Lutheran colleges are known for their emphasis upon teaching scholarship, exemplary chorale music programs, and a "two spheres" approach to the faith and learning issue. Thus, while the Lutheran colleges are experiencing revitalization, it is with a somewhat different type of emphasis than the integration focus of many of the CCCU colleges. Perhaps the most prominent recent advocate of the two-spheres philosophy often associated with Lutheran thinking has been James Nuechterlein, who at one of the classic "dialogues" of the 1980s among representatives from the geographically proximate Valparaiso, Notre Dame, and Calvin, argued for the critical importance of both faith and learning but as largely separate rather than largely blended components. He stated, "I think of the relationship between faith and learning less in terms of integration or transformation and more in terms of paradox and tension. . . . Faith and learning, while . . . not ultimately irreconcilable and while, indeed, they must for their mutual health inform each other at certain points, do exist largely on different planes and are incapable of essential fusion or integration."⁵⁸

The most secularized Lutheran colleges are the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA) institutions in the East; the most culturally isolated ones are the Missouri Synod Lutheran (MSL) colleges; the schools leading the renewal movement include Valparaiso, Saint Olaf, Concordia Moorhead, Luther, and Gustavus Adolphus; colleges that have become more intentionally Christian in recent years include Augsburg, Concordia Moorhead, Luther, and Roanoke.

Strong tensions continue to exist between the ELCA (about five million

members) and MSL (about 2.5 million members) denominations, and this strain manifests itself in the relationships between the colleges of the two traditions. The MSL colleges (with Concordia River Forest as the traditional flagship institution and Concordia Wisconsin as the largest school) are doubtful of the theological purity of the ELCA colleges, while the latter question the intellectual openness of the former. More than any other institution, Valparaiso is the university that provides a bridge between the two traditions.⁵⁹

In Catholic higher education, secularization and renewal are compressed into a shorter time span (a single generation) than has been the case with the Protestant colleges (a century); therefore, one can observe evidence of continuing secular growth and serious revival simultaneously in the former. The Cardinal Newman Society commissioned a study by the Higher Education Research Institute (UCLA) that showed that students at thirty-eight Catholic colleges in the 1997–2001 period graduated with a reduced devotion to the Catholic church and its teachings. Still, of course, there is contrasting evidence of a growing spiritual hunger in the students. The colleges themselves have declared their independence from the church (note the 1967 Land O'Lakes meeting led by President Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame) while Pope John Paul II responded through his *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (1990), essentially designed to maintain control over the theology faculties and to assure that the Catholic colleges would remain at least critical-mass institutions.

What are the long-range prospects for Catholic higher education? Father Burtchaell of Notre Dame has received much attention because of his sense of doom. Alice Gallin, for many years a leader of the 230-member Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, is more sanguine, preferring to view the changes since the 1960s as generally beneficial: "What we witness may be a shedding of a religious culture rather than a loss of faith."

The Catholic institutions that have secularized the most have been the large (frequently Jesuit) research institutions. As with the Protestant universities, the desire to compete for recognition as a publishing institution has made it tempting to hire established or promising writers irrespective of religious orientation. The institutions that have led the renewal movement include Notre Dame, Boston, Dayton, Holy Cross, and Fairfield. New or newly focused small colleges that have positioned themselves as centers of orthodox Catholicism include Ave Maria (MI, FL), Christendom (VA), Franciscan of Steubenville (OH), Magdalen (NH), Thomas Aquinas (CA), and Dallas (TX).⁶⁰

Presbyterian higher education has long been a producer of leaders for American society and long has identified closely with the development of

the American culture. Therefore, as society in general and its colleges in particular have become more secular, it is not surprising that the Presbyterian colleges have done so also. By 1990 the colleges and the churches were losing interest in one another to the point that the presidents of the nearly seventy Presbyterian colleges and universities stated that "the Presbyterian church could be close to the point where its involvement in higher education could be lost forever." More recently there is a larger basis for hope. Encouraging factors include the growing influence of the denomination's renewal movement, and the still strongly creedal basis of Presbyterianism. One Presbyterian scholar recently estimated that of the sixty-six Presbyterian colleges, nearly 45 percent have a denominational connection that is historic only, another 45 percent retain a partial connection, while about 10 percent still maintain a close connection.

Eight Presbyterian colleges participate in the CCCU or CSR (Belhaven, Grove City, King, Montreat, College of the Ozarks, Sterling, Waynesburg, and Whitworth) while twelve are LFP or PTEV institutions (Alma, Austin, Davidson, Hanover, Hastings, Illinois, Macalester, Maryville, Presbyterian, Rhodes, Whitworth, Wooster).⁶¹

Noteworthy examples of recent revitalization in Presbyterian higher education exist at Davidson, Waynesburg, and Eckerd. With the help of its PTEV grant, Davidson is preparing three to four times more ministerial graduates than it did a decade ago, placing a major emphasis upon training its faculty in theological understanding, and in general moving back toward being a critical-mass institution. Few colleges of any denomination have changed as completely from largely secular to orthodox in as short a time while growing sharply in enrollment and affluence as has Waynesburg during the tenure of President Timothy Thyreen. Eckerd began only in 1958 as a cooperative effort of the then two major branches of Florida Presbyterianism, and thus has not had to recover from the period of secularization. In addition to operating model programs of international and intergenerational learning, it infuses its curriculum with a values and "quest for meaning" emphasis, and it operates a comprehensive Center for Spiritual Life led by Duncan Ferguson, longtime leader in Presbyterian higher education.⁶²

No denomination has produced more elite universities than have the Methodists; and there is no denomination where there is a bigger gap in worldview between the laity and the denominational colleges than in Methodism. One Methodist leader estimates that 25 to 30 percent of United Methodists are evangelical with some degree of understanding while 70 percent are conservative or moderate on theological issues. Yet most of the colleges are more or less secular. F. Thomas Trotter, Methodist higher education leader in both denomination and university, defends the Methodist

educational institutions as they had become by the 1980s. He describes the denomination as having given birth to the colleges, raised them, and then as an act of love freed them from church control to pursue unfettered the love and truth of God. Bishop Will Willimon is not as pleased with this separation and, while noting with appreciation the contemporary trend of church colleges to partially reconnect with the denominations, is fearful that "our Methodist colleges and universities have gotten so far away from the church that they may not be able to establish a truly meaningful connection. That grieves me."

Still there are hopeful signs. On the grassroots level, the influential renewal movements are becoming increasingly effective in church politics. The renewal-related Asbury Theological Seminary is now producing one-sixth of the new United Methodist ministers, and the Foundation for Theological Education has prepared more than one hundred young evangelical scholars for academic positions in Methodist institutions.

On the national level, the church and college officials agreed to a noteworthy statement of increased cooperation ("An Educational Covenant of Partnership") at the 2000 General Conference, and four years later at an Institute of Higher Education they discussed more specifically how the relationship between the two entities might better realize John Wesley's goal of blending "knowledge and vital piety."⁶³

Perhaps the most realistic expectation is that increasing numbers of Methodist colleges and universities will follow an active version of the intentionally pluralist model of a church-related college in which the students receive, among other views, a clear understanding of the best case that can be made for Christian theism. An example of an institution that articulates this approach is the University of Indianapolis.⁶⁴ LFP or PTEV Methodist institutions in addition to Indianapolis include Bethune-Cookman, Claflin, Columbia, Duke, Hamline, Hendrix, Millsaps, Morningside, Ohio Wesleyan, Simpson (IA), Williamette, and Wofford.

In degree of secularization, the United Church of Christ colleges are perhaps comparable to the Methodist institutions. Among its colleges with the greatest interest in bridging the faith and learning gap are Catawba, Dillard (which is also Methodist-related), and Elmhurst, all PTEV institutions; and Defiance, Elon, Lakeland, Northland, and Piedmont. One leader is Elmhurst, which established its Niebuhr Center (H. Richard is a graduate and former president; Reinhold is also an alumnus, and his statue graces the center of campus) to encourage the college to return toward a Niebuhr-type of religious earnestness.

The general Disciples and Northern Baptist traditions contain many orthodox colleges, but most of these are connected with groups that broke from the Disciples of Christ and the American Baptist Churches in the

United States during the early-twentieth-century Fundamentalist-Modernist conflict. Of the seventeen colleges listed on the Disciples of Christ higher-education website, one each participates in the CCCU (Northwest Christian), the LFP (Culver-Stockton), and the PTEV (Transylvania); Butler, with an earlier Disciples connection, is also a PTEV institution. Three of the sixteen American Baptist colleges are CCCU members (Eastern, Judson, and Sioux Falls), while Alderson-Broadus and perhaps Keuka would also view themselves as orthodox institutions. William Jewell is more nearly a critical-mass college.

The colleges of one small denomination, the Church of the Brethren, are worthy of mention because of their unusual combination of moderate secularization theologically and freedom from secularization in social practice. More specifically, while the Church of the Brethren colleges would not qualify for membership in the CCCU, nevertheless in many respects they serve as models for the entire Christian college community in their emphasis upon the Christian virtues of humility, service, peace witness, social justice, and distrust of power politics.⁶⁵ Brethren

Of the major denominations, the Southern Baptist Convention is the one whose colleges have secularized the least. Nevertheless, the Southern Baptist colleges have been going through their own type of reassessment with the major focus being whether to continue the governing oversight of the individual state conventions. During the 1990s, ten or more colleges (including Baylor, Furman, Grand Canyon, Houston Baptist, Ouachita Baptist, Samford, Stetson, Carson-Newman, Mississippi, and Meredith) altered or discarded their traditional relationship with their specific state Baptist organization, and by the early twenty-first century twice that number (or a large plurality of the colleges) had joined the CCCU.⁶⁶

The major factor in the movement toward independence from the Southern Baptist denomination was a desire to escape the effects of the intense battle between the conservative and moderate wings for control of the denomination. Beginning in 1979, the insurgent conservative party led by Paul Pressler and Paige Patterson gradually secured control of the denomination, including the right to select the trustees of the major seminaries. Consequently, the colleges and universities led by Baylor in 1990 and Furman and Stetson shortly thereafter, began to seek a greater degree of independence.⁶⁷

One Southern Baptist scholar described the colleges as fighting a two-front war in the twentieth-century ideological conflicts, battling against anti-intellectual fundamentalism in the church on one hand and secular trends in the academy on the other. By the late twentieth century, secularism in Southern Baptist universities had achieved its greatest impact at Richmond and, to a lesser extent, Wake Forest, both of whom had become

free of Southern Baptist control earlier in the century. In the early twenty-first century, however, Wake Forest, in the way it was using its PTEV grant and with its hiring of evangelical scholar Nathan Hatch as president, was showing signs of becoming the primary example of a major Southern Baptist university that had partly secularized but was now reevaluating whether it wished to reconnect more completely with its Christian heritage.⁶⁸

If the Southern Baptist colleges were increasingly disconnecting from their state conventions, they were increasingly relating to – perhaps even becoming a part of – the growing evangelical college network. Their presence in the CCCU grew from four in 1984 to twenty in 2005; their faculty members increasingly interacted with their evangelical-college counterparts in the academic faith and learning conferences and student personnel association meetings; Baylor since 1990 has sought to adopt an explicit model of faith and learning integration, and the evangelical Institute for Advanced Christian Studies in 2002 contributed the majority of its resources to the Baylor University Institute for Faith and Learning to create the Carl F. H. Henry Endowment for Christian Scholarship; and the evangelical monthly, *Christianity Today*, regularly and thoroughly reviewed the turn-of-the-century saga of Baylor in its efforts to become the premier intentionally Christian research university in America.⁶⁹

Led by President Robert Sloan (1995–2005) and provosts Donald Schmeltekopf and David Jeffrey, Baylor developed a plan (articulated in its “Vision 2012”) to enhance and give more specific theological definition to Baylor’s already strong Christian orientation and to develop further Baylor’s graduate school and research emphasis with the result that the institution would become the unquestioned premier Christian research university of the Protestant tradition in America. The Baylor plan attracted much interest in the evangelical community, especially among those who long had hoped for a fully developed, broadly recognized, seriously Christian university of the Protestant variety, and a number of its bright scholars began to relocate to the Waco institution. But the plan also attracted much opposition within the quite evenly divided Baylor faculty, many of whom were not pleased with the increased research expectations, what some of them perceived as a reduced level of religious freedom, and the not always deliberate process of implementing change. While the Baylor experiment is bold and promising, whether it will ultimately be successful is unclear. The initial comments of the newly appointed Baylor president, Frank Lilley, express a strong commitment to the Baylor 2012 plan.⁷⁰

Southern Baptist institutions holding membership in the CCCU or CSR include Baylor, Bluefield, California Baptist, Campbell, Campbellville,

Carson-Newman, Charleston Southern, Dallas Baptist, East Texas Baptist, Hardin-Simmons, Houston Baptist, Howard Payne, Judson, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Greenville, Oklahoma Baptist, Palm Beach Atlantic, Samford, Southwest Baptist, Union, Wayland, and Williams Baptist. LFP or PTEV member institutions include Baylor, Georgetown, Mercer, Samford, and Wake Forest.⁷¹

The External Governors

Not since the colonial era — when the few colleges often combined public and private features — has the government been so involved in supporting and regulating private, including church-related, institutions of higher education as has been the case since the Lyndon Johnson administration (1963–69).⁷² The court decisions of the 1970s discouraged the granting of public aid to “pervasively religious” colleges with the result that some of the institutions — especially Roman Catholic ones — that had not yet become secular, decided — perhaps unnecessarily — to move in that direction to assure the continued flow of the governmental assistance. Even the colleges that did not secularize tended to loosen their denominational relationship.

By the latter decades of the twentieth century, most of the church-related colleges and universities were becoming increasingly confident that their general religious nature would not prevent the federal government aid from continuing to come to their students; at the same time, such institutions were becoming increasingly dependent upon that aid.⁷³ After 1980, the institutions that faced the greatest likelihood of losing government financial benefits were (1) those who were closely connected to a church — especially a specific, high-profile local church — or a highly visible ministry (e.g., televangelism); (2) those who were highly religious institutions in states that provided significant financial assistance to private education (e.g., tuition-equalization grants) but which had constitutions with greater limits on the ability of the government to aid religious organizations than does the federal constitution; and (3) those who were in non-compliance with a highly valued government and/or public social goal.

On another level of governance, the turn-of-the-century Christian colleges faced increasing pressure from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and some of the accrediting agencies to conform to the philosophy of the public universities. This challenge, however, has been partially reduced by the growing public criticism of secular higher education, including its undue restrictions on the free exercise of religion in the state institutions.

An example of a university with a close connection to a specific church known for its widely televised ministry was Liberty. The Virginia institution, associated with the televangelist Jerry Falwell and his Lynchburg

Thomas Road Baptist Church, sought Virginia tuition-assistance grants for its in-state students. When in 1989 the Virginia Supreme Court ruled that at Liberty “religion is so pervasive that a substantial portion of its functions are subsumed in religious function,” the university agreed to modifications in course and chapel requirements and in the institutional descriptions in its publications. This then was a striking case of a state government and a Christian college negotiating institutional alterations in exchange for eligibility for state funds. A decade later, in a somewhat less restrictive judicial environment, the Virginia Supreme Court allowed another institution (Regent) begun by another televangelist (Pat Robertson) to issue tax-exempt bonds to finance campus building projects.⁷⁴

In recent years the federal courts have been less willing to disqualify “pervasively religious” colleges from eligibility for public aid even while they have allowed states to rule theological students to be ineligible to receive payments from state tuition-grant programs. For example, in *Mitchell v. Helms* (2000), a pre-collegiate case with implications for higher education as well, the Supreme Court argued that the constitutionality of public aid should be determined primarily by the secular nature of the aid program rather than by the degree of religious orientation of recipient institutions. The plurality opinion of Justices Kennedy, Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas sharply criticized the earlier “pervasive sectarianism” doctrine as not only “unnecessary, but also offensive. . . . This doctrine, born of bigotry, should be buried now.” Consistent with *Mitchell v. Helms*, a year later the Fourth Circuit Court ruled not only that Columbia Union, a Maryland Adventist college, was not pervasively sectarian and thus eligible for the Maryland funding program, but also that being “pervasively sectarian” was not a valid basis for disqualifying a college for state assistance.⁷⁵

Meanwhile, in *Locke v. Davey* (2004), the Supreme Court, consistent with its earlier decision in *Witters v. Washington* (1986), ruled that while a state aid program may include theological students, it did not have to do so to be in compliance with the free-exercise provision of the First Amendment. Joshua Davey, a student at Northwest, an Assembly of God college in Washington, had sued the state of Washington when it denied him a scholarship because of his major in pastoral studies and business management and administration. In 2003, Washington was one of eleven states (also Alabama, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) that prohibited state aid for theological students. Some critics of these state constitutional provisions – and the Supreme Court’s willingness to tolerate them – compared them to earlier discriminating codes against Catholics (“Blaine Amendments”) and blacks (Jim Crow laws).⁷⁶

Two cases from the early 1980s demonstrate the limits of the First

Amendment free-exercise-of-religion guarantees when they clash with the restrictions of the civil rights and equal-employment opportunities acts that prohibit discrimination based upon sex or race. While the restrictions, as they pertain to religious belief, generally exempt religious educational institutions, especially those directly connected to a denomination, they do not necessarily do so when the beliefs involve limits upon the eligibility of women and minorities for certain activities. In *EEOC v. Mississippi College* (1980), the Fifth Circuit Court stated that the federal government might prohibit a college from maintaining a policy of hiring only men for the religion faculty. More explicitly, in *Bob Jones University v. the United States* (1983), the Supreme Court upheld the Internal Revenue Service regulation calling for withdrawal of tax-exempt status for schools and colleges with policies of racial discrimination. The Bob Jones standard forbade students from interracial dating and marriage, and the court determined that a "fundamental national public policy" could override sincerely held religious beliefs regardless of the effect that such a ruling could have on the financial welfare or even survivability of a college.⁷⁷

In the early twenty-first century, a major concern of many Christian colleges is that a federal higher education act or court decision might declare them ineligible for continued federal student aid because of a hiring policy that reflects an institutional belief that homosexual practice is morally wrong. The threat of accreditation removal by discipline-specific accrediting agencies in social work and psychology may be even greater. Increasingly the orthodox and critical-mass institutions are building defense coalitions to protect their employment policy interests.⁷⁸

Meanwhile, the Christian colleges are watching with great care the relevant gay-and-lesbian court decisions. After the Washington, DC, Human Rights Act of 1987 declared it an "unlawful discriminating practice" for an educational institution to deny a person access to its services and facilities because of that person's sexual orientation, two gay organizations at Georgetown University sued the institution for (1) refusing university recognition, and (2) refusing the use of facilities and services that comes with such organizational recognition. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals ruled that the institution must grant the groups the facilities and services but not necessarily the recognition.

Later, major decisions have more completely upheld the rights of private organizations. In *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston* (1995), the Supreme Court upheld the right of organizers of the Boston St. Patrick's Day Parade to exclude marchers who wished to identify themselves as gay, while five years later the court ruled in *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale* (2000) that the scout organization, which instructs its members that homosexual conduct is not "morally straight," can deny

the scoutmaster position to gays. Also in 2000, a federal court upheld the right of Baptist Memorial College of Health Science (TN) to terminate a lesbian employee. During the following year, American Christian educators followed closely the Trinity Western case across the Canadian border in which the British Columbia College of Teachers, which accredits teacher education programs in the province, withheld professional recognition for the Trinity Western program because the university "Community Standards" document contained a prohibition on homosexual behavior. When the university brought suit, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled for the university, declaring that the Trinity Western standard by itself was not a valid basis for denying accreditation.⁷⁹

The federal and state governments are not the only external governors of the Christian college. For example, the AAUP has long exerted an extralegal but powerful control in its ability to influence both public opinion and accrediting agencies in their evaluations of Christian higher education. The AAUP began in part as a Progressive Era reaction by secular reformers such as John Dewey against the late-nineteenth-century Protestant dominance in American higher education. No organization has done more to promote the cause of academic freedom, but the AAUP focus has always been that of individual freedom rather than institutional freedom and, as pertains to religion, freedom from religion more than freedom of religion. It has focused much more on the restrictions of academic freedom at religious colleges than on the limits of religious expression at secular institutions. Since its original 1915 statement, the major AAUP pronouncements on academic freedom (most notably those of 1940 and 1970) have displayed a barely tolerating disdain toward the religious colleges.⁸⁰

The most recent AAUP statement (1996) is somewhat more moderate in tone, undoubtedly reflecting the more accepting religious climate in the nation. Interestingly, in 2005, the CCCU, the Catholic higher educational agencies, and the independent colleges organizations actually were able to work together with the AAUP against a common threat – the possibility of greater government intervention and regulation, motivated in part by the public concern over the growing tuition expenses. Altogether, twenty-eight national higher education organizations signed the statement on academic rights and responsibility, which seeks to maintain the present level of self-governance in higher education.⁸¹

Fortunately, the actions of the Supreme Court and the regional accrediting agencies have moderated the effects of the AAUP posture toward religious institutions. In a Cold War-era case, *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957), and elsewhere, the Supreme Court defended the idea of institutional academic freedom. The frequently quoted line from the *Sweezy* case came from the concurring opinion of Justice Frankfurter (together

with Justice Harlan) that identified “the four essential freedoms” of a university, namely “to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.” Of course, the court added that these freedoms are not absolute, but must be consistent with the constitutional limitations protecting individual freedoms. Although the regional accrediting associations have reflected much of the AAUP thinking on academic freedom, they have always had a broader agenda and have usually employed their considerable power with an evenhandedness. Particularly in recent years, they have tended to evaluate institutions on the basis of how well they were fulfilling their self-defined educational mission.⁸²

In contrast to the AAUP record, the Christian colleges, especially the more orthodox ones, historically have placed greater emphasis upon institutional academic freedom than upon individual academic freedom. Reflecting their growing maturity in general, the Christian colleges are demonstrating a growing capacity to both understand and articulate a compelling apologia for the rights of religious colleges and universities and also to be increasingly insistent of clear communication, due process, and Christian charity in the implementation of their own processes of academic freedom. Particularly helpful in this area have been the recent writings of Calvin-related scholars George Marsden, Nicholas Wolterstorff, and Anthony Diekema.⁸³

While in recent years the federal courts have shown a greater tendency to accommodate the interests of the religious colleges, and many of the mainline colleges are increasingly interested in religious learning, the state universities and even more so the secular private institutions have largely moved in the opposite direction, challenging the right of campus Christian organizations to select their officers from only Christians, to view homosexual practice as a moral wrong, and in general to receive recognition equal to that of other student organizations with specific ideas and goals. Scholar Candace DeRussy talks of “the campus war against faith,” and lawyer David French states that, “in many ways, religious liberty is the new center stage in the battle for freedom on the secular campus.” Both DeRussy and French are active in the aggressive and effective political action group, Foundation for Individual Rights in Higher Education (FIRE). The religious discrimination of the secular institutions most directly affects the Christian colleges in its traumatic impact upon the graduate programs of their present and future faculty members. Secular mentors often are free to discourage and even forbid the expression of religious perspectives in scholarly work with the threat of rejection of professional credentialing.⁸⁴

In addition to the fate of religion on the secular campuses, the decisions of the courts on the role of religion in pre-collegiate education also have a

direct impact on Christian higher education because of the general judicial trends that they demonstrate. Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s the Supreme Court was concerned that the public schools not violate the establishment clause of the First Amendment, in recent years it has focused more upon protecting the free-exercise rights of citizens in the public and private schools. In response to the prayer and Bible-reading decisions of the 1960s,⁸⁵ many local schools had overreacted; in an effort to avoid promoting a specific faith, they had disadvantaged the study of religion and voluntary religious expression in general. Just as *Widmar v. Vincent* (1981) had said that the University of Missouri must allow religious clubs to use the university facilities in the same way that other clubs do, so also *Westside v. Mergens* (1990), *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union* (1993), and *Good News Club v. Milford* (2001) determined that a public school must not distinguish between religious organizations and other types of student and community groups in determining who could use the school facilities for their after-hours meetings. In a similar spirit of accommodation, *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* (2002) determined that a publicly funded voucher program could be organized in a way to allow students to choose to use their stipend to attend a religious school. Collectively these cases reflect a growing judicial commitment to the neutrality principle with respect to religious organizations – government programs must not disfavor religious education any more than they must not favor it.⁸⁶

The Christian College

A HISTORY OF
PROTESTANT HIGHER
EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Second Edition

WILLIAM C. RINGENBERG

Introduction by Mark A. Noll

A RenewedMinds Book

 **Baker Academic**

A Division of Baker Book House Co
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49516

Murray Library
Lancaster College, Gantham, PA 17027

© 1984, 2006 by Council for Christian Colleges & Universities

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Book House Company
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Ringenberg, William C., 1939–

The Christian college : a history of Protestant higher education in
America / William C. Ringenberg. – 2nd ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 10: 0-8010-3145-1 (pbk.)

ISBN 978-0-8010-3145-8 (pbk.)

1. Church colleges—United States—History. 2. Protestant churches—
United States—History. I. Title.

LC621.R56 2006

378'.0710973—dc22

2005055586

Scripture quotations labeled NKJV are from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982
by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.