

### 3 | Types of Church-Related Colleges

Many colleges and universities find themselves somewhere between the poles of "fully Christian" on one side and complete secularization on the other; indeed, it is perhaps the case that most find themselves at midpoints on that continuum. Consigning these less-than-perfect examples to perdition would obliterate many important signs of religious influence, for many schools have meaningful and valuable connections to their heritage that should be admired and cherished. In the following chapter I will mark distinct places on the continuum and describe, according to an "ideal type" method, the characteristics of the colleges and universities that inhabit those places. It is my contention that these partially secularized schools are not fated to complete the process of secularization. Not only should we appreciate the schools that have not succumbed completely to secularization, we should find ways to strengthen the partial connections they have to their sponsoring traditions and to find new connections that have never existed before.

The following is a typology of church-related colleges. Those on the left side of the chart have the strongest connection to their religious heritage; those on the right side have the weakest. Like all typologies, this one cannot take many different nuances into account, and it forces each school into one category when in reality schools are frequently mixtures of the various types even though they might most resemble one. Nevertheless, the typology will be helpful in understanding the various stages in the secularization process.

#### Types of Church-Related Colleges

	Orthodox	Critical-Mass	Intentionally Pluralist	Accidentally Pluralist
<b>Major divide:</b>	the Christian vision as the organizing paradigm		versus	secular sources as the organizing paradigm
<b>Public relevance of Christian vision:</b>	Pervasive from a shared point of view	Privileged voice in an ongoing conversation	Assured voice in an ongoing conversation	Random or absent in an ongoing conversation
<b>Public rhetoric:</b>	Unabashed invitation for fellow believers to an intentionally Christian enterprise	Straightforward presentation as a Christian school but inclusive of others	Presentation as a liberal arts school with a Christian heritage	Presentation as a secular school with little or no allusion to Christian heritage
<b>Membership requirements:</b>	Near 100%, with orthodoxy tests	Critical mass in all facets	Intentional representation	Haphazard sprinkling
<b>Religion/theology department:</b>	Large, with theology privileged	Large, with theology as flagship	Small, mixed department, some theology, but mostly religious studies	Small, exclusively religious studies
<b>Religion/theology required courses:</b>	All courses affected by shared religious perspective	Two or three, with dialogical effort in many other courses	One course in general education	Choice in distribution or an elective
<b>Chapel:</b>	Required in large church at a protected time daily	Voluntary at high quality services in large nave at protected time daily	Voluntary at unprotected times, with low attendance	For few, on special occasions
<b>Ethos:</b>	Overt piety of sponsoring tradition	Dominant atmosphere of sponsoring tradition — rituals and habits	Open minority from sponsoring tradition finding private niche  (Dominantly secular atmosphere)	Reclusive and unorganized minority from sponsoring tradition
<b>Support by church:</b>	Indispensable financial support and majority of students from sponsoring tradition	Important direct and crucial indirect financial support; at least 50% of students	Important focused, indirect support; small minority of students	Token indirect support; student numbers no longer recorded
<b>Governance:</b>	Owned and governed by church or its official representatives	Majority of board from tradition, some official representatives	Minority of board from tradition by unofficial agreement	Token membership from tradition

(College or university is autonomously owned and governed)

While many of the depictions on the chart are self-explanatory, a number need further clarification. *Orthodox* schools want to assure that the Christian account of life and reality is publicly and comprehensively relevant to the life of the school by requiring that all adult members of the ongoing academic community subscribe to a statement of belief. They insist on proceeding from a common Christian commitment, meaning all the ongoing personnel are assumed to live out that commitment at the school. Sometimes students are required to subscribe to a statement of belief, but often they are not held to the same rigorous standards as the adults. This unanimous Christian commitment presumably ensures that the ethos of the college will be Christian. For some orthodox schools, the communication of an ethos is the main point. For others the ethos must be supplemented by employing vision (the intellectual articulation of the faith) in an engagement with secular learning.

*Critical-mass* colleges and universities do not insist that all members of the community be believers in their tradition or even believers in the Christian tradition, though they do insist that a critical mass of adherents from their tradition inhabit all the constituencies of the educational enterprise — board, administration, faculty, and student body. However, they define “critical mass” in different ways. For some it is three-fourths or more; for others it may be a bare majority, while for a few it may be a strong minority. But at any rate, the critical mass must be strong enough to define, shape, and maintain the public identity and mission of the college consonant with the sponsoring tradition. The insistence upon built-in pluralism of belief — or non-belief — is done for theological reasons. For some religious traditions, reason is respected enough that even non-believers can contribute genuinely to the quest for truth; reason and revelation need not conflict. Colleges and universities are, after all, places where people pursue the truth. For others, the belief that all human conceptions of truth are characterized by finitude and sin makes representation of a number of perspectives engaging together important in the quest for truth. Critical-mass schools are often committed to the proposition that there must be genuine alternative belief systems presented to students if their faith is to be genuine and strong. For them, operating from a solely Christian perspective leads to a certain kind of coercive smugness that is neither genuine nor strong. Nevertheless, these schools make clear that the Christian ethos and vision represented by the critical mass are “established.” They constitute the normative stance of the college or university.

There is a major divide between the *orthodox* and *critical-mass* schools and the *intentionally pluralist* and *accidentally pluralist* categories. The former two hold the Christian vision and ethos as the organizing paradigm for the life of the college or university. They are convinced that the Christian religious account of life and reality is comprehensive, unsurpassable, and central. This does not mean that the Christian account is their only source of knowledge and wisdom, but it does mean that the Christian account provides the umbrella of meaning and value under which all other knowledge is organized and critiqued, or, alternatively, provides the prescribed conversation partner for all other perspectives. Schools that operate with a theological vision of their identity and mission must be willing to move “against the grain” of the larger American educational world, which operates from very different paradigms. As George Marsden has observed, schools that have maintained their religious identity are often sponsored by traditions that are not entirely comfortable and accepted in American life.<sup>1</sup> They are sufficiently in tension with the American educational mainstream that they feel obligated to define themselves differently than mainstream institutions, even if they might have to bear the ridicule or even contempt of that mainstream.

The intentionally pluralist and accidentally pluralist schools, on the other hand, proceed from quite different assumptions. Here the religious paradigm has been dethroned from its defining role by the secularization process. It is no longer “established” or normative; some other conception of the educational enterprise has taken its place. That conception may be the classical ideal of liberal education in which the rational process itself becomes the defining reality. Then Christian perspectives take their place in the rough and tumble of unfettered inquiry and debate. Alternatively, it may be a more contemporary postmodern framework in which any overarching paradigm is rejected, including that of reason. Then Christianity is one perspective among many others. Or, more realistically, that alternative conception may be a practical notion of the educational task that equips students for finding good jobs. In any case, a different organizing model for defining and shaping the identity and mission of the college has supplanted the religious one. There is still room for Christian perspectives in this case, but they must make their way among many different viewpoints.

The intentionally pluralist college or university respects its relation to

1. Marsden, “Dying Lights,” *Christian Scholar's Review* 29 (Fall 1999): 180-81.

its sponsoring heritage enough that it intentionally places members of that heritage in important positions, starting with the president. There is a straightforward or tacit commitment to representation of the vision and ethos of the tradition here and there in the school's life. This approach does not establish or privilege the tradition as the guiding paradigm of the school, but does privilege it in the sense that persons from the sponsoring heritage are the ones who are intentionally and strategically placed around the school. For example, in this model a full-time chaplain from the sponsoring tradition is employed. Similarly, special attention is given to making sure that members of that sponsoring tradition are sprinkled through the faculty. This strategy is accommodated within a fundamentally secular model for defining the identity and mission of the college, but which often seems satisfactory to both school and sponsoring church. Christian presence, though very much disestablished, is nevertheless guaranteed in some form.

However, this strategy has a certain level of fragility. Sufficient numbers of persons in the educational community must continue to be convinced that representation of the sponsoring heritage is a good thing. Since a growing majority of persons in this undertaking are not part of the sponsoring tradition, it may become a "hard sell" to maintain even the modest representation of that heritage. Nevertheless, many schools cling to this strategy. For some schools there may be overt "payoffs" — indirect support, for example — for retaining this strategy, or there may be serious penalties for giving it up. Others may retain the intentionally pluralist strategy because key leaders in the college are simply committed to guaranteeing a voice for the sponsoring tradition in the life of the school.

The *accidentally pluralist* school does not have enough commitment to its sponsoring tradition to push for its representation in key facets of the school, though in many cases the president continues to be a member of that tradition. But he or she does not operate the college out of a religious vision, nor does he or she find it compelling to represent it in a disciplined way. Rather, the school leaves it largely to chance — or to providence — to maintain the presence of persons from the sponsoring tradition. Perhaps if the representation sinks to dangerously low levels a few strategic appointments may be made to maintain appearances. But other than that, members of the sponsoring tradition — and whatever ethos or vision they might bear — are in the community by chance. The makeup of the school may not include any more members of the sponsoring tradition than the local state college or university.

Obviously, such an approach indicates a low estimation of the continuing relevance of the tradition within the life of the college. It is difficult to see why the school and church would want to maintain a relationship under these conditions, but if both parties tacitly assume that the Christian account of life and reality is not comprehensive, unsurpassable, and central, then this mild and affable relation might continue indefinitely. On the other hand, if there is noticeable discomfort by either the church or the school with this mildly hypocritical arrangement, a decision may have to be made to push the school toward either a formal parting of the ways or a more intentional pluralism.

### Public Relevance and Rhetoric

Because defining marks of the orthodox and critical-mass schools are closer to one another than to the pluralist schools — which also share defining characteristics — it is useful to work through the various categories in pairs. The orthodox and critical-mass schools insist on the public relevance of the Christian vision in all areas of the school's life. Indeed, they organize the school's life according to the Christian vision. But since the orthodox school insists on everyone consenting to a substantive set of Christian beliefs, it assures that relevance by virtue of the persons it hires. The relevance of the sponsoring tradition might be most noticeable in the ethos expressed by the overwhelming numbers of persons from that tradition. But increasingly the orthodox colleges want that relevance also to be intellectual, so that the religious account with which it is operating is indeed demonstrated to be comprehensive. They want the Christian account to address the mind as well as the heart.

These colleges do this partly by educating new faculty into the tradition's account and partly by replenishing knowledge of the tradition for the continuing faculty. Orthodox schools have extensive programs that socialize their faculty into their vision. They want to deepen and enrich their understanding and equip them to use it in their teaching and scholarship. These programs are generally required of all new faculty and advanced versions are strongly recommended for continuing faculty.

The *orthodox* college unabashedly presents itself in its publications as a Christian endeavor. It aspires to be inclusive of all sorts of persons as long as they agree upon common Christian belief. If a student is not a

Christian of the sort that sponsors the school, the school explicitly states its intentions to shape them in that direction. Its mission statement is straightforward about all these things. Because it is so straightforward, the statement is often quite brief and simple. If the identifying materials of the school are read at all, it should come as no surprise to persons joining the community as faculty or students what sort of community it is. Every publication of the school has direct marks of its Christian commitment. In the academic catalogue, each department's mission is spelled out in relation to the college's Christian commitment.

The *critical-mass* college or university manifests some important differences. While it is clear that the Christian vision is normative for the operation of the whole school, there may be many places in the school where a secular orientation is noticeable — for example, many academic departments may operate according to secular modes. But each endeavor of the school could be in principle and often is in fact brought into dialogue with the Christian vision of the sponsoring tradition. The Christian commitment of the college or university conditions everything that goes on there, not in the sense that it can simply trump secular learning but in the sense that it is the honored partner in an ongoing dialogue. One way that the critical-mass school compensates for its toleration of secularity in some areas is its elaboration of centers, institutes, journals, and programs that are explicitly anchored in the vision or ethos of the sponsoring tradition. Even so, serious problems may arise when secular learning and the Christian vision conflict. The orthodox school is clear about which voice wins out in such a conflict, but the critical-mass school is less clear, particularly in intellectual matters. It lives with serious ongoing tensions.

One of the tensions with which the critical-mass school lives is that between wanting the whole faculty to have an adequate grasp of the tradition's construal of the Christian vision and respecting the freedom of each participant. Most critical-mass schools have educational or mentoring programs that aim at introducing new faculty to the riches of the Christian intellectual tradition as it is borne by the specific parent religious body. But rarely are these required or rigorous. However, because the specific Christian account is "established" in the public life of the school, there are many opportunities for the newcomer to hear perspectives from that account. Meanwhile, an inner core of members of the tradition are expected to bear its vision, teach it to others, and connect that vision with all facets of the school's life.

The critical-mass school's public presentation of itself is unambiguous — it is unmistakably Catholic or Lutheran or Baptist — but because it posits a more complex and tense relation between faith and learning than the orthodox college, its mission statement is longer and more complex. Further, it often explicitly invites believers of other traditions and non-believers into the institution as administrators, faculty, and students. Because there are many secular domains in the school, many facets of the school's life are presented with a less Christian appearance. Academic departments will not necessarily relate their mission to the Christian commitments of the school itself. Persons of other beliefs can find space within such a school to live without feeling pressed. But they can also be attracted to the rich tradition of the school and therefore support and participate in it vigorously. On the other hand, they can move in the other direction; they can become resentful of the "established" character of the sponsoring tradition and work to undercut its strength.

The *intentionally pluralist* college or university sees the Christian account represented by its sponsoring tradition as publicly relevant as one voice in a larger discussion. That voice is not *the* honored partner in every major intellectual engagement; it is one voice among many. The school may not even ensure that that voice is heard in all or even the majority of scholarly conversations. But it does recognize it as an important perspective that should not be shut out of the ongoing life of the school. It should neither dominate nor disappear. The school is operating out of a different paradigm than the Christian story, but its continuing relation to a religious tradition reminds it that the tradition's perspective is legitimate and important. However, because another paradigm has replaced the religious tradition, many persons within the institution will pay little heed to that voice. Hiring, promotion, and tenure will generally have little to do with membership in the sponsoring tradition. It is not unusual for the administration in the intentionally pluralist school to intervene now and then in the hiring process to insist that a member of the parent heritage be hired. Indeed, this modest "affirmative action" of the intentionally pluralist model may cause resentment among those who see little relevance for the religious tradition. The secular domain of such a college is extensive and liable to increase. Thus, the college often establishes a center or institute to remind its religious constituency that the voice of faith has not been ignored completely. But by and large the school proceeds with the voice of faith audible only as one among many.

Since such a school does not privilege its own religious account, it has no real grounds for educating new faculty or staff into its religious tradition. Few schools of the intentionally pluralist stripe have mentoring or induction programs into the sponsoring religious tradition. But the sprinkling of voices from the tradition may at least serve as an invitation for other faculty to learn more about it. But in general the intentionally pluralist school as a whole knows little about the tradition. The students may not even be aware of any religious connection.

This unsurprising and unhappy fact results from presenting an institution as a secular liberal arts college. It has attracted its current market share of students and faculty on secular grounds, and it is reluctant to put forward a more "Christian" image. Its mission statement often claims "grounding" or "rootage" in the Christian heritage but this can mean as little as a few Christian voices sprinkled about or as much as a serious representation of the Christian voice in each of the school's endeavors. The statement often avoids a strong affirmation of any specific denominational heritage. However, the intentionally pluralist college will recruit students from its sponsoring denomination. It looks to the denomination as one of its promising recruitment fields because it still affirms its church connection and can with some integrity point to the places in the college where the tradition's presence and voice are represented. Frequently the minority of students from the sponsoring tradition makes contributions to the school far out of proportion to its numbers.

The *accidentally pluralist* school is not likely to be aware of such contributions, because it no longer keeps track of the number of students from its sponsoring denomination. Neither does it do so for its faculty, for it neither establishes nor assures the voice of its sponsoring tradition in the life of the school. The teaching and scholarship of the school proceed in a pervasively secular manner. But since there may be serious Christians on the faculty — even Christians from the sponsoring heritage — it is likely that Christian perspectives will surface now and then. The accidentally pluralist school does not discourage such phenomena; indeed, it welcomes them as evidence of its affable connection to its church. The college does not make any attempt to educate new faculty into its parent heritage. But the few members of that heritage yet remaining serve as colorful adornments to an otherwise secular community.

Obviously, the accidentally pluralist school will not present itself as a church-related college, let alone a Christian college of a specific denomi-

national perspective. The prospective student or faculty member has to dig deeply into the school's history or its catalogue to find clues of a connection to a religious heritage. New students and new faculty do not expect to be met with any sort of religious pitch at such a school, and they don't. Religion is at best a grace note on a secular score.

## Membership Requirements

I have already commented above about requirements for membership in the sponsoring tradition. However, it may be useful here to reflect briefly on the resistance exhibited by many academics concerning the use of any kind of religious membership requirement. A large proportion of the professorate react in horror to any kind of "religious test" required by colleges or universities. But such a reaction seems premature for a number of reasons. First, if the sponsors and leaders of the school really do believe that the Christian account of life and reality is comprehensive, unsurpassable, and central, it seems perfectly permissible that it would require its members to believe in that account. That requirement may lead to a heavy-handed conviction that the Christian account can simply trump or negate secular learning; such an attitude then would threaten the school's status as an academically respectable enterprise. But if the tradition and its school have a far more sophisticated conception of the relation of faith and secular learning, in which both are given due respect, then orthodox belief can indeed coexist fruitfully with secular learning. The "constraints" put upon the school's members might not seem in principle debilitating or oppressive in such a case. Indeed, critical-mass schools intentionally hire faculty from other or no religious traditions on theological and pedagogical grounds. For them the interaction between faith and secular learning takes place not only within Christian scholars, but also between believers and non-believers within Christian institutions. But maintaining a critical mass of believers is a necessary means to ensure that the Christian account is taken seriously.

Second, the claim that there are no constraints involved in the exercise of academic freedom in secular schools is a canard. Up until very recently, the constraints required by the Enlightenment paradigm were very strict indeed. They were nurtured and enforced by the major research institutions and reinforced by the learned societies to which faculty belong. The belief, for instance, that only knowledge acquired through scientific

rationality is trustworthy was and is a powerful constraint that simply does not allow revelation — upon which great religious traditions are based — any space at all at the academic table. Further, every college or university has a mission that involves constraints upon how people are hired, promoted, and tenured. A research institution such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology hires according to much different criteria than an undergraduate teaching institution. The government, too, with its many regulations and requirements, exercises constraints. But above all, the academy's culture — whose subtly but powerfully enforced canons have come to be an important part of a larger movement known as “political correctness” — places sharp limits and conditions on what faculty do or say or write. In the legions of schools dominated by a politically and culturally liberal atmosphere, a philosopher who wrote strongly and publicly against abortion would be subject to much disapproval, if not ostracism. In more politically conservative colleges — a far smaller category than the first — a public defense of strong affirmative action would make life uncomfortable for a professor. In such a welter of already extant constraints, why are religious ones particularly horrifying?

All of this does not mean that schools informed by a Christian account ought to ignore or throw over the basic standards of evidence and argument. The Enlightenment paradigm certainly should not be cast out; it has much that is valid in it and much that has its origin in Christian approaches to truth. But it does mean that the Enlightenment account of life and reality is a tradition too — one with its own limitations. While we should recognize and respect its constraints, we ought not absolutize them so that Christian accounts are simply pushed to the side. If a college or university is to remain Christian in some meaningful sense, it has the right and obligation to consider the accounts of life and reality to which its leadership and faculty subscribe. Since every school has its constraints, there are more serious questions to be asked. Which constraints are valid? From whence do they arise? How defensible are they? How are they administered? To what do they lead in the life of a school?

### Theology — Departments and Courses

In both orthodox and critical-mass schools the theology departments are large and prestigious. In these schools theology is still “queen of the sci-

ences.” The departments are large because they have many required courses to teach and prestigious because they bear the prized Christian vision of the parent heritage in its most articulate and persuasive form. This latter function is essential to the entire project of the school and can be entrusted only to highly capable and faithful Christian intellectuals. The mission of the theology department in orthodox and critical-mass schools is to articulate accurately the tradition's theological account, to communicate it creatively to the rest of the school, to employ its theological vision in shaping the school's curriculum and in justifying its ethos, to use that vision constructively in grappling with new issues of faith and morality, and above all to provide a general or specific Christian intellectual tradition that can engage secular learning across the board.

These are “theology” rather than “religious studies” departments because they stand confessionally and normatively in a religious tradition. They study and present theology on behalf of the tradition and the school so that the school can maintain a substantive religious direction. Such departments are not detached or neutral. They speak *for* the tradition that sponsors the school, not simply *about* it. This is certainly not to say that other theological or religious traditions — including other world religions — are not presented accurately or fairly in such schools; good scholars can always present fairly what the world looks like from points of view other than their own.

Orthodox colleges typically insist that their entire theology departments be communicants of the sponsoring tradition, while critical-mass schools allow more diversity in terms of both belief and orientation toward the mission of the department. Critical-mass schools intentionally hire persons from other faith traditions and employ specialist scholars who cannot or will not participate directly in the mission-based functions listed above, but who are nevertheless expected to support the overall mission of the department. Such diversity can be the source of creative dialogue, but it also can be the occasion for endless bickering in the theology departments of critical-mass schools.

The theology departments of orthodox colleges teach a required battery of courses. These schools believe that students simply must encounter the normative claims of the Christian tradition as it is taught in their college. That encounter is the most important thing that goes on at the college, since the Christian account is held to be comprehensive, unsurpassable, and central. Those qualities of the faith are so important that most, if

not all, courses taught in other areas of the curriculum are affected by the Christian account shared by the faculty who teach them. Orthodox schools aim at an *integration* of the Christian account and secular learning on terms set by the Christian account. This integration may in some cases mean a heavy-handed "trumping" of secular learning by Christian faith, but that need not be the case. These institutions simply claim that the Christian account is unsurpassable, so other sources of knowledge must be brought into harmony with it.

Critical-mass colleges or universities typically require two to four courses in theology, but there are usually a number of choices for students. Given the diversity in both the faculty and the student body, those choices allow students to follow their own preferences more freely than they could in orthodox schools. The critical-mass schools also attempt to foster dialogue between the Christian vision and secular learning; they are likely to aim at an *engagement* of the Christian account with secular learning rather than an *integration* of the two. They are usually willing to live with more ongoing uncertainties than orthodox schools are. They tend to strive for a mutually probing dialogue, which is also nurtured by the institutes and centers they typically foster. Like orthodox institutions, the critical-mass school intends that all students seriously encounter Christian moral and intellectual claims somewhere along their journey, but in a more open-ended way.

An intentionally pluralist college or university typically has one required course in religion or philosophy where Christian claims are presented, perhaps in the general education curriculum, where those claims are mixed with other religious and philosophical claims. While there may be one or two "confessional" theologians in a small religion department, the department itself is more aptly characterized as a "religious studies" department in which scholarly detachment is cultivated. There tend to be far more courses in other traditions and religions than in the specific tradition that has sponsored the school. Courses in that tradition usually consist of one or two electives. The faculty of an intentionally pluralist school is often reluctant to see the sponsoring tradition "established" in any way, so its specific tradition of thought is allowed to be only one option among many.

The accidentally pluralist school also has a small, religious-studies-oriented department. There may be no representative of the sponsoring tradition in the department and therefore no courses in the thought or

history of that tradition. Indeed, it is unlikely that the general Christian account is normatively taught at all. It is more likely that trendy courses on New Age religion or the search for spirituality are offered to entice students to take courses in religion, since none are required in the regular curriculum. Religion courses are options in a distribution system or simply electives. This reflects the deeper fact that the Christian account is no longer publicly relevant in the educational life of the school.

### Chapel and Ethos

Orthodox and critical-mass schools have "public" chapels in imposing buildings. They are public in the sense that the worship they sponsor is held at times set aside for chapel services, during which other educational functions of the schools are supposed to be closed down. They are also public in the sense that they are officially sanctioned and encouraged events in the institutional life. High-quality worship is planned and led by a staff of clergy and student assistants. It is held from three to five times a week. Chapel is one of the institutional habits of such schools. Even though only a portion of the academic community usually attends, worship is felt to be an event offered on behalf of the whole community. Both orthodox and critical-mass schools place chaplains in visible and important roles, often as members of the governing cabinet. Orthodox schools are more likely to require worship, while critical-mass schools rarely do. Even if not required, chapel attendance at orthodox schools is likely to be higher than at critical-mass colleges and universities.

Both types of schools supplement the religious formation offered by chapel activities with large networks of Bible and religious study/devotion groups in dorms. Such networks are officially endorsed and often organized and encouraged by the chaplain's office. They also often connect to service activities that are usually intense and widespread in these schools.

Orthodox colleges exhibit the piety of their sponsoring tradition. The language and practices of the sponsoring tradition are evident in the life of both students and faculty. Christian personal moral ideals are articulated and rehearsed repeatedly. These schools are willing to take the *in loco parentis* role with regard to the formation of their students. They are so public and enthused about their religious and moral vision that they of-

ten stimulate pockets of rebellion among students who consider their atmosphere oppressive or hypocritical or both. Critical-mass colleges are more secular in tone, although the language and practices of the sponsoring tradition are publicly and unapologetically present. Since there is room for dissent and variance, the atmosphere of such a college is more inattentive than rebellious with regard to its ethos. Its moral vision is oriented more to social rather than personal morality. It is less willing to take a strong *in loco parentis* role.

Chapel at intentionally pluralist schools is absolutely voluntary. The chaplain must search for convenient times to have worship services because there is no set-aside time for one common chapel program. This generally means that there are a variety of services tailored for specific groups. The worship practices of the sponsoring tradition are represented, but only as one among a number of options. Worship often takes place in the small chapels or alcoves of a large worship facility left over from the days when worship was more central to the institution. Only a very small percentage of the student body and faculty attend. Worship is not a public habit of the institution. There may be some student religious organizations sponsored by mainstream Protestant or Catholic traditions, but interdenominational groups like InterVarsity or Fellowship of Christian Athletes provide much of the Bible study, devotions, and worship activities. The ethos of the intentionally pluralist college is definitely secular, but there are pockets of piety on campus. There may in fact be a strong network of Bible study and prayer groups springing out of the interdenominational ministries, but they are not a result of the official strategy of the school. Service activities may well be organized and encouraged by the school, but their justification rarely comes in Christian terms.

Accidentally pluralist schools are easy to describe with regard to chapel and ethos. They often have chapels that are used for other purposes along with worship. Public worship, if there is any, is held only on special occasions and then is intended to be "inclusive" of many religious traditions. Chaplains, who may or may not be from the schools' sponsoring traditions and who may or may not be full-time, are definitely peripheral to the life of these colleges. The ethos of such schools is pervasively secular and may in fact be hostile to publicly devout Christians. Only the interdenominational groups seem to survive and perhaps thrive in such an atmosphere.

## Church Support and Governance

The orthodox college or university is dependent upon its sponsoring religious tradition for both financial support and an ample supply of students from that tradition. Significant direct financial support from religious organizations (churches, judicatories, individual congregations) and even more significant indirect support from wealthy persons of the sponsoring tradition provide the orthodox college with a reliable financial base. Perhaps even more important for tuition-dependent schools is the supply of students from the sponsoring tradition. If an orthodox school is to be viable it has to have available ample numbers of committed students and faculty from its sponsoring tradition.

Because of such significant support by committed churchly institutions and wealthy individuals, and because the school itself has obligated itself to transmit the vision and ethos of the sponsoring tradition, there is a strong bond of accountability between the school and the sponsoring tradition. Sometimes the school is owned by the church and therefore is directly accountable to the church. But the more likely link of accountability is the board. An orthodox college has a board composed solely of communicants of the sponsoring tradition, many of them elected to serve on the board by the church itself. Some members of the board may be wealthy and successful, but the main mark of the orthodox college board member is that he or she is a faithful and significant participant in the parent religious tradition. Indeed, orthodox board members understand the religious vision of the tradition and can often articulate it well. They know it well enough to hold the president of the college and the college itself accountable to the vision. The president, being a faithful communicant of and an articulate spokesperson for the tradition, is responsible for assembling the leadership that will hold the college or university to its stated mission as an arm of the tradition.

The critical-mass college or university is far less dependent than orthodox schools on direct support from church organizations, though indirect support from wealthy individuals in the sponsoring tradition is very important. A critical-mass school is also dependent on its parent religious body for supplying the critical mass of students it needs to maintain its specific identity. The governing board of such a school is often made up of a preponderant majority of communicants of the sponsoring tradition. A significant percentage of board members are alumni of the school. A



smaller number are official representatives of the sponsoring religious body. Board members are not expected to be as articulate about the religious vision of the school as those of an orthodox school. Even though the board is knowledgeable enough of the tradition to hold the administration accountable in a general sense, the religious direction of the school is more dependent upon the leadership of the president and provost. So while the links of accountability are not as strong as those of orthodox schools, they can and often do provide reliable guidance for the identity and mission of the school.

The intentionally pluralist school continues a relation to its sponsoring tradition by eliciting targeted support for the religious dimensions of the school's life. For example, an endowed professorship reserved for a scholar from the sponsoring communion might be established by the school and funded by the church or one of its wealthy members, or a similar arrangement might be made for a chaplain from that tradition. But otherwise there is minimal direct support from the church. The school continues to recruit among the communicants of its tradition, but only a minority portion of the student body come from that tradition — perhaps 10 to 20 percent. The board of the intentionally pluralist school will insist on continuing representation of the parent body among its numbers, but often only by tacit agreement or custom. Still, that small representation can stimulate the college to continue to provide a voice for the tradition within the school.

The accidentally pluralist college or university often continues to receive indirect support from members of its sponsoring communion long after its connection to that communion has weakened, but most of the direct and indirect support from the tradition is in the past and may linger on only in the names of buildings and programs. Likewise, students from the tradition continue to be present but no special effort is made to recruit them. They are small in number. The board contains only a token representation from the tradition, and those who represent it are trusted not to raise uncomfortable questions about the religious identity of the school.



Tracing the various stages on the continuum from maximal to minimal connection of schools and their religious heritage provokes a number of challenging questions. Are colleges and universities destined to move

across the chart from left to right as the forces of secularization gradually press in upon them? Will they slowly but inexorably secularize as they seek acceptance by and approval from the educational establishment? Must colleges therefore seek quality by neglecting soul? Is movement only possible in one direction — from left to right on the chart, from less secularization to more?

James Burtchaell strongly suggests an affirmative answer to each of the questions above, but such an answer is not wholly satisfactory. In the following chapters I intend to examine quality colleges in which the Christian light has not died. While nothing in the future is certain, I will also argue that those colleges and universities that have maintained a robust relation to their religious heritage have a fighting chance to maintain it, and perhaps even to strengthen it, in the future. Moreover, I believe that many of the colleges and universities that have moved in a secular direction have the chance to recover a more meaningful relation to their sponsoring heritage than they have had in the recent past. The future does not have to be as dark as it may seem.