NOTE

In an attempt to personalize the context of the book, readers are encouraged to think about various ideas in relation to a campus or campuses they know best. Those institutions may include ones they attended, that operate in their immediate area, are operated by their denomination, or ones where they serve. In essence, part of what we try to do is encourage readers to get more out of this book by thinking through these ideas in relation to campuses where they are stakeholders in some fashion.
INTRODUCTION

Can the Soul of the University Be Saved?

1. In what way(s), if at all, do the institutions you know best reflect the qualities of the multiversity? What, if any, are the common interests of those colleges and/or universities?

2. What are the identities and associated loves of those colleges and universities? In what ways, if at all, do those identities affect the views of their students of the good, the true, and the beautiful?
BUILDING THE UNIVERSITY
CREATING THE ORIGINAL BLUEPRINT OF A UNIVERSITY

1. How is knowledge classified and/or organized on campus? In what way(s) would faculty describe that organizational schema? What about students?

2. In what way(s), if at all, do those institutions seek to help students become like Christ?

3. What role does theology play on campus? Where is it practiced? How is it practiced?

4. How did Hugh of St. Victor conceive of a student-centered approach to learning? How does that understanding compare with the one in place on campus?

5. What practices are at the core of what students experience on campus?

6. At the University of Paris, ideas were sharpened through dialogue. In what way(s) are ideas sharpened on campus?

7. What role did theology and Scripture play in the academic palace Hugh envisioned? What role do you think they should play?
1. What is your assessment of the role that the liberal arts play on campus? What impressions do you think students, faculty, and alumni have of that role?

2. What is your assessment of the reform efforts of individuals such as Peter Ramus and William Ames? How would others on campus respond to their ideas?

3. From your perspective, what are the positives and/or negatives of theological particularity? How does one know when such forms of particularity are practiced to give shape to a community, versus simply acting as a means to exclusion? What form of theological particularity, if any, is practiced on campus?

4. What is your assessment of John Witherspoon's appeal to nature? In what way(s) is a comparable appeal made on campus?
THE STATE TAKES OVER THE ACADEMIC PALACE IN EUROPE (1750–1870)

1. What forces led the state to show a compelling interest in the efforts of the university? In what way(s) are those forces similar to or different from the ones in place today?

2. How are the ideas of Immanuel Kant different from the ideas of Hugh of St. Victor? How do those differences then reflect the organizational differences between the institutions they sought to cultivate? In what ways, if at all, are their ideas operative on campus even today?

3. What are the definitive qualities of John Henry Newman’s *The Idea of a University*? How do they differ from Kant’s ideas? What is your assessment of Newman’s *The Idea of a University*? In what way(s), if at all, could Newman’s ideas be of benefit on campus?
THE AMERICAN IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY

Freedom Within the Bounds of Science (1825–1900)

1. How did the university and even some ecclesial leaders in the United States in the 1800s and early 1900s respond to theological sectarianism? What were the practical ramifications of their responses in terms of the nature of the university? How are those responses comparable to ones being offered on campus today?

2. In what ways did the leaders of German universities conceive of freedom? What about the leaders of American universities? In what ways were they similar? Different? How is freedom thought of and practiced on campus today?

3. What philosophical and organizational commitments defined Johns Hopkins University at its founding? What influence did Johns Hopkins have on other campuses? In what way(s) are those influences still being felt today?

4. What convictions drove the faith in science? What limits were then realized? How are those limitations recognized and navigated, if at all, on campus today?
FRACTURING THE SOUL

The Creation of the American Multiversity (1869–1969)

1. Who was Charles Eliot? In what way(s) did his vision of the university influence his own campus? Other campuses? In your assessment, what are the positives and/or negatives of his vision?

2. Who were Robert Maynard Hutchins and Clark Kerr? What pressures were each one of them contending with in relation to their respective visions of the university? What then were their respective visions of the university? Between the two, for which vision do you have a greater affinity? Why? Is either set of pressures still being felt on campus today? If so, in what way(s)?
THE FRAGMENTATION OF
THE MULTIVERSE
THE FRAGMENTED SOUL
OF THE PROFESSOR

1. What qualities define a good professor? What pressures on campus make it easier for faculty members to be good professors? What makes it more difficult?

2. What, if any, are the positive outgrowths of the emergence of a professionalized faculty? In what way(s) should faculty members be evaluated? In what way(s) are faculty evaluated on campus?

3. How would you define teaching, service, and research? What relationship should they share? On campus, how are they defined? What relationship do they share there?

4. Who was Ernest L. Boyer? What is your assessment of the ideas he presented in Scholarship Reconsidered? In what way(s), if any, has his ideas influenced the campus and how scholarship is understood? Evaluated?
FALLING TO PIECES
Declaring Independence from Curricular Coherence

1. In what way(s) does the curriculum in place most widely in American higher education reflect a desire for coherence? In what way(s) does that desire hold true? Not true?

2. Over time, what ideas served as points of coherence for the curriculum in place in American higher education? What ideas, if any, still provide that sense or inclination toward coherence?

3. In relation to recent arguments for the value of liberal education (e.g., Michael Roth’s Beyond the University), what is your assessment of their strengths? Weaknesses? In what way(s), if any, might they prove beneficial or detrimental on campus?
FRAGMENTING STUDENTS
The Curricular/Cocurricular Division

1. How did the curricular and cocurricular spheres of campus life come to be perceived as two distinct spheres? Were those pressures inevitable?

2. How do you define the cocurricular sphere? How do you define its value? In what way(s) does that definition and sense of value say anything about your understanding of the curricular sphere? How, if at all, should the two relate to one another?

3. In conceptual terms, how do you define a student? What ramifications does that sense of definition then have to do with how you value the curricular and cocurricular spheres on campus? How, if at all, should those two spheres relate to one another?

4. What is your assessment of both the philosophy and operating principles that define the residential college system? How, if at all, does that philosophy and those operating principles differ from the ones in place on campus?
1. What pressures led to the emergence of the professional administrator? Was the emergence of the professional administrator inevitable? If so, why? If not, why not? What benefits, if any, came as a result of the emergence of the professional administrator?

2. In your opinion, what is the overarching purpose driving administrative efforts on campus? What is your assessment of those efforts in relation to the ongoing health and well-being of the campus?

3. Are administrators convenient scapegoats for frustrations that surface on campus? Or are the criticisms justified? Why or why not?
THE MULTIVERSITY’S RELIGION

The Unifying and Fragmenting Force of Athletics

1. What benefits do intercollegiate athletic programs offer the campus? At what price are those benefits enjoyed? At what point is that price (or, more accurately, prices) unjustified?

2. When the phrase “student-athlete” is used on campus, what exactly does it mean? What attendant privileges and/or responsibilities come with being a student-athlete?

3. Historically, what forces led to the rise of intercollegiate athletic programs? In what way(s), if any, were those forces positive? Negative? How do those forces then compare to the ones active today?

4. In the end, who, if anyone, is responsible for the corruption of the student-athlete model? The NCAA? The media? Alumni? Administrators? Coaches? Faculty members? Why? What, if anything, can be done to reverse that sense of corruption?
1. What is the underlying impulse driving many expressions of online and/or for-profit forms of higher education? In what way(s), if any, were those impulses and attendant forms of impact positive? Negative?

2. What, if any, forms of online and/or for-profit education are practiced on campus? In what way(s), if any, do you deem those forms of online and/or for profit education positive? Negative? Why?

3. In what way(s) are the recent (i.e., from the last twenty-five years) forms of online and/or for-profit higher education similar to earlier forays into technical education? What ways are they different?

4. In the end, what forms of assessment will allow online and/or for-profit forms of higher education to be measured by more than whether they are simply different from other forms of higher education?
RESTORING THE SOUL OF THE UNIVERSITY
WHEN THEOLOGY SERVES THE SOUL OF THE UNIVERSITY

1. How do you define theology? How is theology defined on campus? How, if at all, is that definition different from one that aspires to view theology as the queen of the sciences?

2. By its very nature, is the university an entity that must operate with an understanding of theology as the queen of the sciences? Will a university absent such an understanding invariably struggle with the identity described as a multiversity?

3. In what way(s) can even robust theology departments play a role in domesticating the role theology could otherwise play on campus?

4. What role does common worship (and the various practices it includes) play in cultivating an understanding of theology as the queen of the sciences?

5. If theology is the queen of the sciences, what then are the ramifications for how the curricular and cocurricular spheres are defined separately and also in relation to one another?
REIMAGINING THE ACADEMIC VOCATION

1. What is your assessment of what is defined as faithful teaching, scholarship, and service? In what way(s) do those ideas compare with the ones in place on campus?

2. What practices are needed in order to resist (or ideally transcend) forces that may otherwise facilitate fragmentation?

3. What role do the virtues play in the cultivation of the academic vocation? How are such virtues cultivated? What then are the ramifications for faculty development programs?
1. How do you compare the curricular proposal offered by Gilbert Meilaender with the one offered by Parker Palmer and Arthur Zajonc? What are the merits and/or deficiencies of each approach?

2. What are the implications for practicing theology as the queen of the sciences for the relationship the disciplines could, and arguably should, share? Is it possible for the disciplines to be properly ordered in relation to one another absent such an understanding of theology?

3. What responsibilities do faculty members have for the proper ordering of the disciplines? What responsibilities do students have? In what ways do those responsibilities compare with the ones presently being exercised on campus by faculty members and students?

4. In what way does such an understanding of the disciplines extend beyond what are commonly referred to as traditional curricular spaces? For example, what impact does such an understanding then have on the cocurricular (and, as argued in chapter fifteen, vice versa)?
REIMAGINING THE COCURRICULAR

Transforming the Bubble to a Greenhouse

1. What does it mean to refer to a university as a community? What comparable language, if any, is used on campus? If theology is practiced as the queen of the sciences, what ramifications then affect how such a sense of community is defined?

2. What lesson(s) does the story of Nehemiah offer for the cultivation of community? For the virtues that are needed to cultivate such a community?

3. What lesson(s) does the story of the creation of humanity offer for the cultivation of identity? For the virtues needed to cultivate such a community?

4. What kind of relationship are curricular and cocurricular educators to share in such an understanding of the university? What are the practical ramifications? How, if at all, does such an understanding differ from the one in place on campus?
1. What insights does Walter Brueggemann’s understanding of Jeremiah’s prophetic utterances hold for higher education today? What are the implications for Brueggemann’s understanding of Jeremiah for administrators?

2. Are there areas or elements of administration that seem most available for or resistant to reimagining? Why?

3. If the present time is, in fact, exilic, what are the ramifications for administrators? What are the ramifications for how others view their identity and work? What, if anything, does the story of Daniel have to offer in terms of those two forms of understanding?
CONCLUSION

Can a University with a Singular Soul Exist?

1. In a post-Christian culture, what qualities should define excellence? What defines excellence without idolatry?

2. What value does coherence offer? How is coherence to be defined? Practiced?

3. If knowledge of God is always possible yet partial on this side of eternity, how then are we to learn in community? To live in community?