Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession
August 2024, Volume 3, Issue 1
https://cbuopenpublishing.org/index.php/jfap

How Degree Programs Define, Measure, And Improve Faith Integration: An Analysis Of 80 Program Reviews

Kenneth Nehrbass
California Baptist University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand how degree programs at a Christian University define, teach, measure, and improve faith integration (FI). Data was gathered from the "faith integration" section of 80 "self-studies" that were conducted during a six-to-eight-year program review cycle. The central understanding of this study is that departments triangulate FI learning activities and assessments through a variety of efforts that are offered through the curricula, the campus' co-curricular programming, service learning, and the local churches. The article discusses the findings in light of literature in the field of educational effectiveness to develop a rubric that can help degree programs plan and improve their FI efforts systematically. Stakeholders in FI on campus may even use the rubric to set benchmarks for "acceptable" and "exemplary" FI systems at the degree program level.

Key words: Faith integration; assessment; learning objectives; improvement

---

Most of the literature on faith integration (FI) at universities has been conducted through theoretical or prescriptive approaches —either by formulating a distinctly Christian worldview that should permeate the students' minds (Dockery & Thornbury, 2002; Holmes, 2001; Plantinga, 2002); or by distinguishing Christian higher education from secular models (Malik, 1982; Nord, 2010; Rigenberg, 2006; Smith, 2018; Wells, 1996; Wilkes, 1981) or by thinking deeply about how Christianity intersects with specific academic disciplines (Dockery & Morgan, 2018; Lundin, 2013). Much less work on FI has been done through empirical research—reporting findings related to how students learn to integrate their faith with curriculum, or how faculty teach and assess such integration. The most comprehensive survey on FI at Christian campuses was Joeckel and Chesnes' (2012) quantitative survey of 1,907 faculty and 2,389 students regarding their attitudes toward statements of faith, mandatory chapels, and secularism. Elsewhere, Kaul et al. (2017) surveyed faculty perceptions of the place that faith belongs in the curriculum. The *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession* has a section for empirical studies on FI at universities, so it is likely that more of such studies will be produced. However, to date, no empirical studies have been published that use program review data to discover how FI is taught, measured, and improved at Christian universities.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to understand how various degree programs at a Christian university define, teach, measure, and improve FI.

Research questions include:

1. How do degree programs define FI?
2. What are the programs' learning objectives related to FI?
3. What are the learning activities related to FI?
4. How do the programs assess FI?
5. How do the programs develop faculty capacity to do FI?
6. How do programs describe their efforts to improve FI?

Data Collection Process

This study analyzed the "faith integration" section within the "self-studies" of degree programs at a medium-sized

private, non-profit Christian University in Southern California.[1] Each department has a six-to-eight-year assessment cycle that ends with a "program review year," where the self-study is performed. The data set for this study was all 80 self-studies that were carried out between 2017 and 2023. All of the schools and colleges at the university were represented in this data set, and all levels of study (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs) were included.

Program reviews provide an excellent data set for analysis because they report on what actually happened, rather than what stakeholders think should happen. Keith et al. (2023) describe the benefit of program reviews as a dataset:

> Through program review, institutions can assess the effectiveness of their programs, identify areas of strength, and make changes as needed. Another outcome of program review is the promotion of accountability and transparency within higher education institutions. By conducting regular reviews of curricular and cocurricular programs, institutions can demonstrate to stakeholders they are committed to maintaining high standards of quality and are accountable for the resources they receive. (p. 6)

This study will glean these benefits of program review, specifically in the area of faith integration.

Data Analysis Process

I performed the coding procedures described in Charmaz (2003). Once the self-studies were collected, the first round of coding, called "open" or "initial" coding, was applied line-by-line. As commonalities became apparent, the open codes could be categorized into thematic codes (pp. 94–95). Normally, the coding would continue until the research reaches theoretical saturation— the point at which no new codes were reached (Hennink, Kaiser & Marconi, 2017). But in this case, I coded all the faith integration data from all 80 program reviews.

The themes that emerged make up the findings section below, and are later discussed in light of literature on FI and educational effectiveness.

Findings

The central understanding of this study is that departments triangulate FI learning activities and assessments through a variety of efforts that are offered through the curricula, the campus' co-curricular programming, service learning, and the local churches. This section used the data from the self-studies to substantiate this thesis statement. First, the definitions of FI in the self-studies are analyzed.

Definitions of FI

A number of programs noted that they currently lack a definition of faith integration, however 28 did supply one. Definitions were formulated through one of four lenses: Worship, personal belief, career preparation, or the intersection of faith and academia.

Worship

Three programs understood that the ultimate goal is not integration in and of itself; rather the goal is to bring glory to God. One of these programs— in the School of Performing Arts —said that FI involves "music making that has emphasized an unwavering commitment to the Gospel of Christ," and another performing arts program said that FI is understanding that "Everything we do is for worship." Note that in both of these definitions, it is unclear whether it is the students' or professors' task to engage in such worship. Perhaps the subject is intentionally omitted, because the task belongs to professors and students alike.

One program in the Division of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (NMS) echoed the sense that FI is about worship, but understood the task from the point of view of the professor. It defined FI as "glorifying God by unearthing the beauty of mathematics for ourselves (through learning to study mathematics) and for others (through learning to teach mathematics)."

There is much more on the distinction between FI as a task for the professor or student in the sections below.

Personal Belief

Two programs narrowly restricted the definition of FI to personal beliefs about God. One definition stated that integration happens when students "know the redemptive story of God and are able to find their place in it." Note that it is impossible to tell from this definition what degree program the students are studying. The integrative aspect is eclipsed, while spiritual formation is at the fore. Another program—in the humanities—retained a semblance of the academic content, but still focused on the formation of personal belief system: FI is the "use 'life questions' as a means of analyzing and reflecting on Christian belief."

Career Preparation

Two programs defined FI in terms of career preparation. A program in the College of Health Sciences said that FI is "Guiding each student to become a health professional to serve those in need from a Christian perspective." The notion of "service" will be discussed in depth in the "Learning activities" section below.

A program in the NMS also understood FI as career preparation: "Placing a solid foundation in Statistics, using talents God equips in us to encourage students to impact the domain to which they are called to work." Note that in this definition, it is expressly the *faculty* who are doing the integration.

Intersection of Faith and Academia

The majority of programs that had a definition of FI integrated the formation of personal beliefs with the academic content. A program in the division of Modern Languages and Literature said that FI happens when a student "explains his or her worldview as well as biblical principles in relation to the creation and interpretation of literature." A degree program in the NMS focused on biblical principles as well as values: "Incorporating biblical principles and spiritual values into the teaching and learning mathematical concepts." Another degree program in the NMS saw FI as a recovery operation. From 1500 to 1800, philosophers saw God as the ultimate mathematician, but the natural sciences are now at odds with Christianity. For this degree program, FI involves "restoring the faith foundations of the mathematical sciences."

Other definitions that focused on the integration of a Christian worldview and academic content were as follows:

- "Incorporating our solid, Biblical understanding of humanity with our discipline;"
- "Placing revealed truth and discovered knowledge into proper relationship;"
- "Presenting a parallel perspective that compares the civil, cultural Christian, and biblical models;" and,
- "Seeking the contact points between the fundamental paradigms of one's discipline and one's faith commitments."

While the definitions above—whether from the point of view of worship, personal belief, career preparation, or content—are all admirable, they must all be operationalized with learning objectives; they must be apprehended through learning activities; and ideally, they will be assessed, for the sake of improvement. Below, the analysis of the objectives is presented, followed by the learning activities and assessments.

Objectives for FI

At the time of program review, degree programs should show how their course objectives (COs) and program level objectives (PLOs) relate to the first university student outcome (USO), which states that students will "demonstrate spiritual literacy, including Biblical Christian faith and practice, Baptist perspectives, and the Christian's role in fulfilling the Great Commission" (California Baptist University, n.d.). This USO is informally referred to as "biblically rooted" (BR). In fact, each degree program should show how *all* USOs are evident in *all* of the PLOs, and how *all* courses cover these PLOs and USOs. Table 1 below provides an example of a matrix from a nursing course syllabus that shows how the six USOs are aligned with the PLOs and the COs:

Table 1: Alignment between USOs, PLOs and Cos

USO	USO 1	USO 2	USO 3	USO 4	USO 5	USO 6
PLO	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	USO 5	USO 6
NUR 101	X	X	X	X	X	X
NUR 102			X	X	X	
NUR 103	X	X		X	X	
NUR 104			X	X	X	X
NUR 105	X	X	X	X	X	X
NUR 106		X	X	X	X	X

In the matrix above, the USO 1 (biblically rooted) is aligned with the nursing degree program level objective #1, and it has three courses (NUR 101, 103, and 105) that contain objectives that align with both this PLO and USO related to biblical rootedness.

However, not all programs can show such tidy alignment between the USOs, PLOs, and COs. Nonetheless, several program reviews could point to either PLOs or COs that do teach faith integration. The faith-related program level objectives are summarized below.

Program Level Objectives related to FI

After applying initial codes of 76 faith-related PLOs, they were categorized into six major thematic codes (see Table 2 below). Note that the first category is truly integrative in that it considers a synthesis of the academic course content and a biblical worldview. The second category asks students to apply biblical principles to their profession, but does not push students to find coherence or disjunction between a Christian worldview and their secular discipline. The third category is like the second but it applies *values* (in contrast to principles). The last three categories focus on faith formation, but are not actually integrative, in that they do not ask students to apply principles, values, or perspectives to their careers or academic subject matter (Nehrbass, 2022). Instead, they seek to help students adopt (or at least describe) the Christian worldview, to work out their own faith journey, or to attain some level of biblical literacy.

Table 2: Six types of PLOs related to FI

	Faith-related PLO category	**Frequency found in PLOs across campus**	**Example**
Faith Integration Objectives	**Synthesize or Integrate** Christianity with academic principles/practices/ perspectives	16	Integrate biblical principles into the advancement of business knowledge
	Apply biblical **principles** to a specific profession	21	Analyze and apply business concepts related to business and organizational management along with associated integration of Biblical principles
	Evaluate or apply **ethics**/ adopt **values** or habits	17	Demonstrate ethical integration of faith and spirituality in social work practice
Faith formation objectives	Describe the Christian **worldview**	15	Articulate a Christian worldview on personal, professional, technical, and societal issues
	Describe one's personal **faith pilgrimage**	4	Demonstrate in written and oral form engagement in a personal faith-pilgrimage
	Identify **biblical content/spiritual literacy**	3	Demonstrate spiritual literacy, and respect diverse religious, cultural, philosophical, and aesthetic experiences and perspectives

Some of the PLOs combined two or more categories above. For example, a criminal justice degree combines the "faith pilgrimage" and "application to profession" aspect: "Engage in a personal faith pilgrimage, which enables the integration of faith and reason." And a sports performance degree combines the "application to profession" concept with the "ethics/values" concept: "Understand how to view concepts in sports and exercise psychology through a Christian lens… understand how to apply Christian values to their interactions with their clients."

Course Level Objectives

Some program reviewers were able to identify course level objectives related to faith. Here are some examples:

- Elicit a spiritual history (a course in the CHS);
- Apply the understanding of a patient's spirituality to appropriate clinical contexts (e.g., treatment planning, challenging clinical situations) (a course in CHS); and,

Knowledge of research data on the impact of spirituality on health and on health care outcomes, and on the impact of patients' beliefs and practices on their health outcomes (a course in CHS).

Learning Activities Related to FI

Just as the definitions and objectives of FI were diverse, there was wide variation in how degree programs describe the way that FI is taught or caught. Only one category was actually integrative (involving the intersection of academia and the Christian worldview). The other three categories were more devotional in nature, co-curricular, or service-oriented.

Integrative Learning Activities

One degree program promises that it "integrates faith into our courses," another said "faith integration is a part of every course in our program," and another program said it "integrates faith into the lectures and curriculum." How do

they do this? This section summarizes how those integrative learning activities were described in the self-studies.

One degree program in the humanities mentioned that an entire course is included in the program for the purpose of FI. The course covers epistemology and the Christian worldview.

Other degree programs mentioned integrative lectures on topics like biology and intelligent design, business and biblical ideas of stewardship, business and Christian ethics, or the Bible as an exemplar of journalism. Two self-studies included links to integrative lectures, including a public administration degree lecture on the Christian calling to be a public servant and a lecture on the Christian aspects of psychotherapy.

In addition to lectures, the self-studies mentioned that students view videos related to faith integration (e.g., how the Bible uses statistics). The self-studies mentioned integrative textbooks such as Nickel's (2012) *Math: Is God silent?,* Shearer's (2021) *Marketing like Jesus* and Sanders' (2017) *Spiritual Leadership.* Other learning activities included discussions on these readings, or on other topics such as a discussion board on the virtues in *Paradise Lost*; servant leadership in business, or ethical scenarios in business.

Lastly, one degree program in the NMS described a learning activity that involved a mentored research project from a Christian worldview.

Devotional-oriented Learning Activities

Such integrative activities above are not the only way that the self-studies envisioned that students encounter the Christian faith. Other classroom activities are rich in Christianity, but do not necessarily intersect with the academic discipline.

For example, three programs mentioned that professors share their testimonies. Five mentioned that professors read scripture and pray with students. One holds weekly Bible studies. And three mentioned that they model the Christian life or "live to be examples." One degree program in the CHS even appoints a "class chaplain." And another has "students choose a 'life verse.'"

While these activities are undoubtedly essential for the Christian ethos, it is important to note that there was no clear alignment with program learning objectives or with assignments and rubrics to measure those assignments—let alone benchmarks to determine if the objective is being met.

Co-curricular Activities

Some degree programs emphasized that FI happens outside the classroom. Surprisingly, only two mentioned chapel. But there were other examples. The College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS) invites Christian scholars to campus for "fireside chats" with students, which are held in conjunction with a "culture and justice lecture series" that is open to all students. Two self-studies referred to FI conferences held on campus.

Service Oriented Activities

Service to the community, as well as global service projects, figure prominently in the self-studies. Twelve programs mentioned that FI happens through service learning or global projects, such as "global health engagement." As one program reviewer put it:

> These are local outreach opportunities where students can apply their Christian worldview perspective in tangible ways whether feeding the poor, providing school supplies to local children, offering their time as tutors and mentors, or raising fund for a meaningful cause, students in anthropology have many opportunities to engage their worldview perspective. International Service Projects (ISP) also provide opportunities for service while simultaneously preparing and equipping students with Biblical knowledge to share (apologetics) and forming their own faith foundations.

This indicates that program reviewers believe the Christian faith should be acted on— it is not just a cognitive activity. However, note that those who mentioned service learning as a strategy did not explicitly show how the achievement of such objectives would be measured.

Assessments of FI

Just as degree programs triangulate the learning of FI with multiple approaches, the assessment of FI is also multifaceted. The sections below describe these approaches. A small number of programs measure FI through "worldview assignments." More use integrative assignments. Others rely on student evaluations, and a handful are unclear about how they measure FI.

Worldview Assignments

The section above on "objectives of FI" mentioned that the goal for some degree programs is that students would describe (or embrace) a Christian worldview. Not surprisingly, some degree programs have worldview assignments that are aligned with this objective. For example, a CHS degree asks students to write a capstone paper on "the role faith played during your studies at the

university." Another program asks students to "reflect on how you saw God in nature."

Integrative Assignments

Several degree programs require students to compose discussion boards, essays, or capstone projects in response to the courses' learning activities related to Christian ethics, biblical content, the Christian worldview, or Christian exemplars. For example, one degree program asks students to write an essay answering: *"How do business majors ensure that they engage in their professions ethically and in keeping with Biblical standards?"*

An NMS degree program requires students to compose a research paper and presentation on Christianity and biomedical sciences. Another degree program in that division asks students to write reflections on readings related to young earth creationism. One graded assignment has students journal about their reflections on the lecture about the Christian calling to public service. A business ethics course has students write responses to Rae and Wong's (2012) *Beyond Integrity.* The row in the rubric that measures students' degree of faith integration is in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Rubric for Faith Integration in a particular assignment from the School of Business

	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Introductory
Dimension 3 Identification and analysis of ethical and biblical issues	Correctly identifies all legal, ethical, and biblical issues presented without error. Analyzes all ethical and biblical issues from an objective viewpoint, uses the literature cited in the review to guide analysis.	Identifies most legal, ethical, and biblical issues with minor errors. Analyzes most ethical and biblical issues from an objective viewpoint. Uses some of the literature cited in the review to guide analysis.	Identifies some issues. Multiple issues are not identified and/or identification contains multiple errors. Analyses some issues, mainly from only one viewpoint. Literature cited is not a driving force of analysis.	Does not identify issues and/or paper contains multiple errors and/or major errors. The analysis does not take competing viewpoints into account. Literature used sparingly or not at all.

There were various other assignments that can be referred to as "'Philosophy of' assignments." For example, students must write a "philosophy of English" or "philosophy of computer science" paper. A business degree asks students to "discuss how companies do or do not portray Christian values." Other assignments included graded discussion boards on topics like ethics in business or the Bible and technology.

While many of the degree programs above did identify a critical assignment (and sporadically, a rubric for assessing that assignment), only three degree programs actually mentioned criteria for successful FI, and reported on whether they achieved that milestone. For example, one program aimed for an 80% target grade (B- or better) and reported that of 18 students, 100% achieved that criteria. A program in CBSS reported that 97.49% of students scored in the exemplary level on a critical assignment related to FI.

Teaching Evaluations

Student work on faith integration assignments is not the only route for measuring FI—it is not even the most common one. The most common method (described by twenty degree programs) is the question on end-of-semester student evaluations that asks students to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 how much they agree with the following two questions:

1. Christian faith is integrated into the course material as relevant to the subject matter; and,
2. Professor models Christian ethics ⟪integrity, honesty, kindness, respect⟫.

Programs either reported on the percentage of students who rated FI as a 4 or 5 (out of 5) on those two questions (e.g., the score was 90% for a degree program in the CBSS, 94% for a program in the College of Arts and Sciences, and 93% for a doctoral program in the CHS). The schools and colleges at the university set benchmarks for acceptable and superb student ratings, including these two questions. One

program even disaggregated the data, showing how students rated FI in all 17 courses in the program.

A handful of programs used qualitative data on the course evaluation to provide evidence of FI. One student remarked that the professor "helped me relate my faith with my educational career and I am very grateful for that." Another said the professor "has a great way of incorporating the Bible into all technological aspects of life and his courses." And a third commented, "The instructor would read prayers out of a prayer book, which no other professor has done. It was refreshing and made me reflect."

Unclear Processes

Some programs were unclear about their process for measuring FI. They said that it was assessed "ad hoc" or that it was measured by "the fruits." One self-study said that FI can be seen by "what happens in office hours," but the criteria for success was not clear. Another program review said FI can be seen in the "Long term response of graduates" (though no method was mentioned for gathering or analyzing such data). And one program said that FI is assessed through "extra credit assignments," though no mention was made of the specific assignment, the rubric, the alignment with program objectives, or the criteria for success.

Developing Faculty for FI

The program reviews were required to describe how faculty develop in the area of FI. The responses fell into four categories: training events, their own scholarly work, collective devotionals at the departmental level, and faculty members' own church involvement. Each of these approaches is described below.

FI Training

Eight program reviews referred to the annual online training that is required of all professors who teach courses for a degree that is offered in an online modality. This online training refreshes faculty's memory of the Apostle's Creed, the Baptist Faith and Message, and the essentials of the gospel.

FI can also be accomplished through a seminary degree or other theological training. Three degree programs noted that they had faculty who had received formal theological education.

Self-studies also referred to FI seminars that are offered annually at the mandatory fall faculty workshop; and 13 program reviews specifically mentioned the optional FI speaker series that is offered throughout the year through the Teaching and Learning Center. Four departments held their own FI workshop for faculty. For example, the NMS department studied and applied the "faith restoration model" to their classrooms.

Other optional trainings that were mentioned included reading groups such as *Faith for Exiles* (Kinnaman et al., 2019).

Scholarly Work

Nine program reviews indicated that some faculty develop their own capacity for FI by publishing research on the subject. Fifteen current faculty have published in the *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession.* Publications there included a survey of 160 graduate students' perceptions of how FI happens on campus (Purper et al., 2023) and a pre and post-test design (n=153) that tested students' increase on a psychology and faith integration scale throughout the semester (Mun & Bermejo, 2023).

Additionally, self-studies noted that faculty present at professional organizations such as the Western Region Conference on Christianity and Literature or the Christian Library Association.

Lastly, the program reviews noted that faculty report on their own development in the area of FI on their annual review form.

Collective Devotional

Seven self-studies reminded readers that the university requires all faculty and staff to affirm the Baptist Faith and Message, and to be members of a local church. In fact, two self-studies specifically viewed regular church attendance as a method for developing FI. And a self-study in the School of Performing Arts mentioned that faculty members attend song writing workshops that serve the local church.

Plans for Removing Obstacles and Improving FI

The program reviews noted a few difficulties in relation to training faculty in FI, and assessing students' achievement of FI objectives. First, nearly a third of programs noted they "don't have a definition of FI." Other programs noted when they "don't have any PLOs associated with FI." The need to develop FI definitions and objectives was noted in these improvement plans.

Additionally, "working with lots of adjuncts" can make it difficult to calibrate faculty approaches to teaching FI, their use of FI assignments, and their grading of those assignments.

Other plans for improving FI efforts included:

- Adding "an explicit definition and explanation of faith integration requirements to the first course in the program;"
- Adding more "essential topics" to the learning activities;
- Adding FI assignments such as essays and presentations, journals;
- Creating rubrics for FI assignments;
- Implementing a pre- and post-test to measure growth of FI for students; and,
- Identifying "the number of students that have come to know the Lord each year."

Discussion and Implications

The findings above show robust approaches to FI, but there are also gaps in each section of the program reviews, including unclear definitions, lack of objectives, unclear learning activities, missing assessments, unclear plans for the development of faculty, and lack of plans for improvement. The discussion below brings in works from the field of educational effectiveness to help sharpen each of these facets of FI within degree programs.

FI Objectives

The program reviewers found it easier to describe FI learning activities than to identify specific course level or program level objectives related to FI. This is concerning because recent studies in educational effectiveness have noted that the objective —not the course content— must be the starting point. "Effective curriculum is planned backward from long-term, desired results through a three-stage design process (Desired Results, Evidence, and Learning Plan) (Wiggins & McTighe, 2012, p. 1).

Plenty of programs were able to locate FI objectives, even if they were not expressly aligned with the learning activities and assessments. The findings indicated that faith-related program level objectives fell into six categories: integrative, application of principles, application of ethics, Christian worldview, faith pilgrimage, and spiritual/biblical literacy. These six approaches are similar to a theoretical article on "entry points" to faith integration (Nehrbass, 2022). For example, the integrative PLOs relate to Nehrbass' entry points of "Using theology to critique Academic Perspectives" or "Using academia to critique evangelical perspectives" (p. 21). And the application of ethics or principles relates to the entry point of "biblical practices" (pp. 19-20). There are other entry points in Nehrbass (2022) that are missing in the survey of PLOs at this university but which would help accomplish the USO of biblical rootedness. Namely, no PLOs seem to be aimed at "applying the purpose of 'furthering the kingdom'" (p. 20), though the great commission is specifically mentioned in the university's first USO.

The Faculty-Centered Approach

The findings above showed that many degree programs envision FI as something that professors produce (through scholarship), or that they live out (as role models), rather than something that students produce (and which can be measured). Korniejczuk (1994) revealed his "faculty-centered" paradigm when he argued that "the most important manifestation of faith-learning integration is the daily life of the Christian teacher" (p. 4). More recently, Purper et al. (2023) conducted a survey that revealed that graduates look more to their professors' personal lives and treatment of students as the locus of FI than they do to the curriculum. Although the next section argues that learning should be student-centered, there is no doubt that the Christian character of the faculty and staff are essential elements of faith integration.

The program reviews that evidenced a "faculty-centered approach" also focused on the FI publications of professors. Note that Kaak's (2016) definition is focused on faculty research:

> Academic faith integration is the work carried out by Christian faculty members when they meaningfully bring the scholarship of their discipline or professional practice and the scholarship representing insights and perspectives from Christian faith into dialogue with each other, applying that dialogue and its results to their research, the courses they teach, and their discipline-related products resulting in disciplinary perspectives that are uniquely informed by faith and/or faith perspectives that are uniquely informed by the discipline or profession. (p. 192)

Christian scholars have produced much work on the integration of Christianity with their specific disciplines, such as athletics (Ressler, 2008), art (Dyrness, 2001), popular culture (Pinsky, 2003), music (Begbie, 2007), and politics (Grudem, 2010). But faculty reported that their institutions are far more interested in supporting teaching than providing time and funds for scholarship (Van Zanten, 2012).

However, given how many professors are teaching globally in Christian universities, it is astounding (or worrisome) how few publish how they teach or assess FI. Miller (2018) asked why are mid-career professors at Christian schools so good at interacting with the theories of Locke, Smith, Mill, Marx, and Weber—and publish disciplinary articles in peer-reviewed journals — yet their faith integration papers do

not see the light of day? Why is it so much easier for theology professors to do FI than for professors of subjects like chemistry and math to publish integrative articles? Decades ago, Gaebelein (1968) observed that some subjects are easier to integrate with Christianity than others. He believed that math was the hardest subject to find FI, while literature and the arts are the easiest. However, FI scholarship in the "hard sciences" has made significant advances in the last several decades. There are now integrative works from biology (Falk, 2004), chemistry (Schaefer, 2016), engineering (Kallenberg, 2013), mathematics (Howell & Bradley, 2016), and physics (Halsmer et al., 2001). The next step is for professors to discover what learning activities are used to help students think through these ideas. And how do students respond to such learning activities?

The Student-Centered Approach

While the faculty-centered approach still has currency, many programs had student-centered objectives. As Terry Doyle (2018) argued, the one doing the work does the learning (p. 1). As noted in the objectives section above, the implication for practice is that FI should not begin with the professor's favorite FI learning activities. It must begin with FI objectives that are student-centered. What knowledge, skills, or attitudes (KSAs) should the student have related to faith integration, and how will those KSAs be measured?
Actually, the student-centered approach is not as new as it seems. St. Olaf College's Self Study Committee (1956) argued, "integration must … be achieved by the student himself. Otherwise educational integration is a failure" (p. 117).

FI Learning Objectives

The findings section explained that only one of the four categories (i.e., integrative learning) of FI learning activities focused on the integration of the academic discipline and biblical content. Other approaches included devotional-oriented activities, service learning, and co-curriculars like chapel. Scholars of FI have also noted that the Christian ethos extends far beyond the course content. For example, the community standards of a Christian university can help formulate Christian character. Benne (2001) noted that community standards are not simply the domain of student affairs, for many Christian schools —the standards aren't just in *loco parentis*; instead, these standards are worked out by faculty and denominational stakeholders as a way of ensuring faith in learning.

Other FI learning activities in the self-studies that extended beyond worldview content in the classroom included service projects. Service learning, which has been described as a "high impact practice" (Sigmon, & Pelletier, 1996; Simons & Cleary, 2006), is widely used in higher education to teach values. But how can it be assessed to determine if specific objectives are measured? Nehrbass and Rhoades' (2021) article on Jesus' use of experiential learning explains that for any type of active learning to be effective, it must be "framed" in advance and must be debriefed afterwards. The debriefing includes a measurement of a specific objective.

Assessing FI

Assessment is "the act of assembling and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative teaching and learning outcomes evidence in order to examine their congruence with an institution's stated purposes and educational objectives" (Volkwein, as cited in Serban, 2004, p. 17). Judd et al. (2013) reasoned that assessment can be used for benchmarking standards across the disciplines, or for measuring growth within a degree program (p. 4).

Student work serves as the direct evidence for qualitative and quantitative achievement of these outcomes. The assignments, then, must be aligned with the FI objectives (at the course level, the program level, and the institutional level). Of course, for this sort of alignment to happen, a program must begin by developing student-centered FI objectives.

What kind of student work can serve as evidence of an FI objective? Using Susukie's (2018) model, if the objective is knowledge of a biblical concept, a multiple-choice test may be suitable. If the objective is to assess a student's ability to integrate biblical ideas with the ideas in the discipline, a paper or project would be suitable; but it must be scored with a rubric that has criteria that match the objective. If the objective is for students to perform a task in a way that aligns with biblical standards, a field experience or performance may be necessary; but again, it must be assessed with a rubric that aligns with the objective.

Faculty Development in FI

Taken together, the 80 program reviews described a robust plan for faculty development in FI, though no single self-study covered all of the aspects, from scholarly publications and presentations, to required trainings, to church life, to departmental devotions. The most highly developed plan for developing faculty in their FI efforts is found at Azusa Pacific University. Their *Faith Integration Faculty Guidebook* (n.d.) lists five levels of competency in faith integration from novice to expert, covering the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for each level. Faculty demonstrate their move up the competency scale through successful completion of 1) first year faculty seminar, 2) mentor with a faculty faith integration fellow, 3) participation in Faculty Learning Communities, 4) complete two faith integration courses called GRAD 501 (Faith Integration and Curriculum

Development) and GRAD 521 (Theological Research in Academic Disciplines), and 5) publishing and presenting on faith integration in their fields. Faith Integration Fellows at the university score the papers with a rubric. Note that promotion in rank requires moving up the competency scale (p. 46).

The following rubric (Table 3)—designed based on the findings in this study—can help degree programs plan and improve their FI efforts systematically. Stakeholders in FI on campus may even set benchmarks for "acceptable" and "exemplary" FI systems at the degree program level.

A Rubric for Assessing FI at the Program Level

Table 4: A rubric for assessing FI systems at the program level

	Beginning	**Developing**	**Satisfactory**	**Exemplary**
Objectives - alignment	One or more FI objectives, but it is not clear how they align with program level or university level objectives; objectives are not student-centered	One objective, but not student-centered, but aligned with program level outcomes and university level outcomes	FI objectives are student-centered, and are aligned with either program level outcomes and university level outcomes	FI objectives contain Blooms-type verbs, are student-centered, and are clearly aligned with program level outcomes and university level outcomes
Objectives-breadth	An objective is written, but it is unclear whether it relates to worship, application of Christian ethics and principles to a profession, development of personal beliefs, and synthesis of Christianity and the principles of an academic discipline	One objective present, either the goal of worship, application of Christian ethics and principles to a profession, development of personal beliefs, and synthesis of Christianity and the principles of an academic discipline	Two objectives present, either the goal of worship, application of Christian ethics and principles to a profession, development of personal beliefs, and synthesis of Christianity and the principles of an academic discipline	Three or more Objectives, including the goal of worship, application of Christian ethics and principles to a profession, development of personal beliefs, and synthesis of Christianity and the principles of an academic discipline
Learning activities – alignment	It is unclear how learning activities are aligned with objectives at the course, program OR university level	Learning activities are somewhat aligned with objectives at the course, program OR university level	Learning activities are aligned with objectives at the course, program OR university level	Learning activities are clearly aligned with objectives at the course, program and university level
Learning activities - breadth	An FI activity is present, but it is unclear whether it is integrative, service-oriented, or devotional-oriented	One FI learning activity among the following: integrative readings and lectures, service learning, OR devotional-oriented activities	Two FI learning activities among the following: integrative readings and lectures, service learning, OR devotional-oriented activities	Three or more FI learning activities are multifaceted, including integrative readings and lectures, service learning, and devotional-oriented activities
Assessment – alignment with objectives	Unclear how assessments of student work are aligned with the objectives at the course level,	Assessments of student work are aligned with the objectives at the course level, program	Assessments of student work are aligned with the objectives at the course level, program level OR university level. Rubrics are used.	Assessments of student work are aligned with the objectives at the course level, program level and university level. Written assignments are assessed

	program level and university level. No rubrics.	level OR university level. No rubrics.		with rubrics that align with the objectives.
Assessment Breadth	An assessment is present, but it is unclear if it assesses scriptural content, integration, or a personal philosophy/ worldview	One FI assessment. Either an assessment of scripture content, ability to integrate Christianity and the academic discipline, OR ability to articulate a personal philosophy or worldview	Two assessments, including assessment of scripture content, ability to integrate Christianity and the academic discipline, OR ability to articulate a personal philosophy or worldview	Three or more assessments are multifaceted, including assessment of scripture content, ability to integrate Christianity and the academic discipline, and ability to articulate a personal philosophy or worldview
Improvement	Program has ad hoc discussions about improvement, but does not have a systematic process for evaluating student work in FI	Program reflects on student FI work, but does not have a systematic schedule for doing so, and does not set benchmarks	Program has a system for reflection on student FI work, but does not set benchmarks for satisfactory attainment of those outcomes	Program sets benchmarks for student achievement in FI assignments, and has a schedule for evaluating student achievement of those outcomes
Faculty development	One example of faculty development, either university level trainings, devotional times. No way to track church involvement, or recognition of scholarly writing, presenting, or leadership in FI	FI faculty development plan contains one of the following: departmental and university level trainings, devotional times, a way to track church involvement, and recognition of scholarly writing, presenting, or leadership in FI	FI faculty development plan contains two of the following: departmental and university level trainings, devotional times, a way to track church involvement, and recognition of scholarly writing, presenting, or leadership in FI	FI faculty development plan is multifaceted, with departmental and university level trainings, devotional times, a way to track church involvement, and recognition of scholarly writing, presenting, or leadership in FI

Limitations

I encountered an issue with dependability, which is defined as the assurance that "the findings were established despite any changes within the research setting" ("Trustworthiness", n.d.). The process for program review changed in 2020 with the addition of some specific questions about objectives and improvement. This additional guidance means that the later self-studies may have more depth of reflection. This issue of dependability can be mitigated by using the same coding process for all the data points ("Qualitative Rigor", n.d.). In this case, I applied Charmaz's (2003) open and thematic codes to all 80 program reviews.

Additionally, while the self-study is meant to be comprehensive by faculty and staff, the reviews may not have captured all the programs' FI-related objectives, definitions, learning activities, assessments, or improvement plans. But hopefully the rubric above will help program reviewers be more comprehensive in their descriptions of FI activities in the future.

Conclusion

An analysis of 80 program reviews shows that the university in this study avails itself of a remarkable number of avenues for teaching and assessing FI. Program reviewers found what the literature has found as well: FI is not only located in the curricula, but in the co-curricular activities, service learning, and even involvement in local churches.

However, few, if any, of the programs in this study had a complete FI system— beginning with a clear definition of FI, program level FI objectives, course level FI objectives, FI assessments related to those objectives, benchmarks for achieving those objectives, and improvements based on the findings. Current literature on educational effectiveness explains that any type of learning —including faith integration— must begin with clear, student-centered

objectives. And those objectives must be assessed, or we have no idea if we are attaining our goals.

References

Azusa Pacific University. (n.d.). *Faith Integration Faculty Guidebook.* https://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/219/faith_integration_faculty_guidebook.pdf

Begbie, J. (2007). *Resounding truth: Christian wisdom in the world of music*. Baker.

Benne, R. (2001). *Quality with soul: How six premier colleges and universities keep faith with their religious traditions.* Eerdmans.

California Baptist University. (n.d). "Mission." https://calbaptist.edu/about/mission

Charmaz, K. (2003). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. (Eds.), *Strategies for qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). 249–291. Sage.

Dockery, D., & Morgan, C. (Eds). (2018). *Christian higher education.* Crossway.

Dockery, D. & Thornbury, G. (Eds). (2002). *Shaping a Christian worldview.* B&H.

Doyle, T. (2018). *Learner-centered teaching, putting the research on learning into practice*. Stylus Publishing.

Dyrness, W. (2001). *Visual faith: Art, theology and worship in dialog*. Baker.

Falk, D. (2004). *Coming to peace with science: Bridging the worlds between faith and biology.* IVP Academic.

Gaebelein, F. E. (1968). *The patterns of God's truth: Problems of integration in Christian education.* BMH Books.

Grudem, W. (2010). *Politics – According to the Bible.* Zondervan.

Halsmer, D., Roso, C., & Odom, P. (2016). "Relating Christian Faith to Physics for Scientists and Engineers." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for Christians in Higher Education,* 7(1).

Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Marconi, V. C. (2017). Code Saturation Versus Meaning Saturation: How Many Interviews Are Enough? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(4), 591-608. doi:10.1177/1049732316665344

Holmes, A. (2001). *Building the Christian Academy.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Howell, R., & Bradley, J. (2001). *Mathematics in a postmodern age: A Christian perspective.* Eerdmans.

Joeckel, S., & Chesnes, T. (eds). (2012). *The Christian College Phenomenon. Inside America's fasting growing institutions of higher learning.* Abilene Christian University Press.

Judd, T., Pondish, C., & Secolsky, C. (2013). Issues in institutional benchmarking of student learning outcomes using case examples. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 20*, 1-15.

Kaak, P. (2016). Academic faith integration: Introduction to a new section within *Christian Higher Education. Christian Higher Education, 15*(4), 189-199.

Kallenberg, B. (2013). *By Design: Ethics, theology and the practice of engineering.* Wipf and Stock.

Kaul, C., Hardin, K., & Beaujean, A. (2017). "Predicting Faculty integration of Faith and Learning." *Christian Higher Education, 3*(16) 172-187.

Keith, C.J., Karnick, K.B., Kohler, C.L., Teske, E.J., & Ninon, A.S. (2023). Program Review: Perspectives on an Improvement-Oriented Process. *Assessment Update, 35*, 6-14. https://doi-org.libproxy.calbaptist.edu/10.1002/au.30363

Kinnaman, D., Matlock, M., & Hawkins, A. (2019). Faith for Exiles: 5 Ways for a New Generation to Follow Jesus in Digital Babylon. Baker.

Korniejczuk, R. (1994). *Stages of deliberate teacher integration of faith and learning: The development and empirical validation of a model for Christian education.* [Unpublished dissertation]. Andrews University.

Lundin, R. (2013). *Christ across the disciplines.* Eerdmans.

Malik, C. (1982). *A Christian critique of the university.* IVP.

Miller, E. (2018). Anti-Intellectualism and the integration of faith and learning. *Christian Scholar's Review, 47*(4), 329-333.

Mun, S., & Bermejo, R. Faith Integration and Learning in Classrooms. *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession, 2*(1), 48-55.

Nehrbass, K. (2022). Taking the "fear factor" out of Faith Integration: Four main "entry points" *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession 1*(1), 13-24.

Nehrbass, K., & Rhoades, J. (2021). Jesus' Use of Experiential Learning in the Sending of the Seventy: Implications for Ministry Internships. *Christian Education Journal, 18*(1), 74–88.

Nickel, J. (2012). *Mathematics, is God silent?* Ross House.

Nord, W. (2010). *Does God make a difference? Taking religion seriously in our schools and universities.* Oxford University Press.

Plantinga, C. (2002). *Engaging God's World: A Christian vision of faith, learning and living.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans

Pinsky, M. (2003). *Redeeming pop culture: A kingdom approach*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R.

Purper, C., Morris, E., Stumpf, A., & Duncan, R. (2023). A survey of Graduate Students' Perspectives on the Integration of Faith and Learning. *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession, 2*(2), 59-70.

"Qualitative Rigor." (n.d.). Queens university of Charlotte. https://online.queens.edu/resources/article/guide-to-qualitative-rigor-in-research/

Rae, S., & Wong, K. (2012). *Beyond Integrity: A Judeo-Christian approach to business ethics.* Zondervan.

Ressler, L. (2008). The integration of athletic and faith. *Direction, 37*(1), 91-102.

Rigenberg, W. (2006). *The Christian college: A history of protestant higher education in America.* Baker.

Sanders, O. (2017). *Spiritual Leadership.* Moody.

Schaefer, H. (2016). *Science and Christianity: Conflict or coherence?* Apolos Trust.

Serban, A. (2004). Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the Institutional Level. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 126,* 17-27.

Shearer, D. (2021). *Marketing like Jesus.* High Bridge Books.

Sigmon, R. L., & S. G. Pelletier (Eds.). (1996). *Journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities*. Council of Independent Colleges.

Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The Influence of Service Learning on Students' Personal and Social Development. *College Teaching, 54,* 307-319. https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.54.4.307-319

Smith, D. (2018). *On Christian teaching.* Eerdmans.

St. Olaf College Self Study Committee. (1956). *Integration in the Christian liberal arts college*. St Olaf College Press.

Susukie, L. (2018). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*, (3rd Ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

"Trustworthiness", n.d. National University. https://resources.nu.edu/c.php?g=1007180&p=7392379

Van Zanten, S. (2012). "Christian scholarship: Opportunities, realities and challenges." In Joeckel, S & T. Chesnes, eds. (pp. 45-56). *The Christian College Phenomenon. Inside America's fasting growing institutions of higher learning.* Abeline Christian University Press.

Wells, R. (ed). (1996). *Keeping the faith: Embracing the tensions in higher education.* Eerdmans.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2012). The Understanding by Design framework. ASCD. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/siteASCD/publications/UbD_WhitePaper0312.pdf

Wilkes, P. (1981). *Christianity challenges the university.* IVP.

Author Information
Kenneth Nehrbass
California Baptist University
knehrbass@calbaptist.edu

[1] Program reviews are secondary data, and are made available to the public. This study is not considered human subject research because it is not a study of faculty and staff, rather, it is a study of the program review documents.