

6

Evoking Wholeness

To Renew the Ideal of the Educated Person

Theodore E. Long

“We educate the whole person.” That claim expresses a widespread ideal among colleges and universities in the United States, especially residential liberal arts colleges. It suggests that baccalaureate education has a larger purpose than simply transmitting knowledge, namely, the multi-dimensional formation of persons for full and meaningful lives beyond the academy. What that ideal means and exactly how it is realized, however, are rarely explained, as if its meaning were clear to all and its accomplishment a foregone conclusion.¹ By taking it for granted, however, we educators have left its realization at best uneven and often neglected. If we believe that developing “the whole person” is important, we need to focus on it and create a systematic, assessable educational approach to realizing its possibilities. Doing so, however, will require a different mode of thinking about higher learning and a redesign of the educational enterprise, for our current practice is not well suited to fulfill the dream we espouse.

In what follows, I sketch some major elements of a renewed educational emphasis on evoking wholeness in our students. This is not so much the beginning of a conversation, which others have already initiated, as an effort to center thinking, map the terrain, and clear a path for more extensive and systematic work ahead. The discussion is intentionally broad in scope and focused primarily on substantive analytic issues, not matters of process or practice. I first reframe the concept of wholeness, and then the main body of the chapter elaborates its major features and shows how they might be evoked educationally. I conclude with some comments about the liberally educated person for the twenty-first century.

Reframing the Idea of Wholeness

An exegesis of the gauzy rhetoric of mission statements, viewbooks, and catalogs would expose several assumptions about the education of the whole person that are rarely articulated. First, students are composed of multiple dimensions (e.g., mind, body, and spirit, or intellectual, social, ethical, and aesthetic), and the educational program addresses each of them in some way. Second, higher education finishes, extends, or elaborates upon these naturally occurring traits, functioning as an agent of a natural maturation process rather than developing traits distinctive in kind. Third, the formal academic curriculum primarily develops the intellectual side of persons; most education related to the other dimensions takes place outside the classroom in the cocurriculum.

It has long been clear from personal testimony and research on college effects that cocurricular experiences can make a substantial impact on students, often cited as among the most important and memorable of their college careers.² Historically, such student development was primarily generated informally and idiosyncratically through life experience in the array of cocurricular activities, organized or not. As Harvard dean Archie Epps often observed, students participated in an “invisible curriculum” in which they learned a great deal, but without design or guided instruction, and not always to their benefit. It has been difficult for students to sort out what they have actually learned from the power and intensity of their experiences. To the extent they can do so, it is not easy to discern how much of their learning is actually part of natural maturation as opposed to some higher learning that would not have otherwise occurred.

Over the past generation, colleges and universities have started to build intentional programs to focus and intensify cocurricular learning and to identify methods to make it more productive. Those welcome initiatives have brought whole-person education into the sunlight, insisting that it deserves just as much serious educational attention as the formal curriculum, perhaps even enhancing academic learning in the process. So we are developing in higher education today what I would call a *curriculum and pedagogy of the whole person* that seeks to make good on the promise so many colleges make to their students.³

Even so, the prevalent view among faculty is that educating the whole person should remain sequestered in the cocurriculum. Faculty often raise questions of purpose and priority about investments in efforts they consider tangential to the primary educational mission of the academy, from athletics to civic engagement. As a result, eager reformers may lack willing partners or meet active resistance in their efforts to advance whole-person education. As Richard Keeling has aptly noted, colleges are organized

in vertical silos, and whole-person education actually cuts across them horizontally.⁴ Our challenge is to find a way to bring those horizontal processes into organizational practice, but we cannot do that without reframing the idea of whole-person education in a way that can gain allegiance of both faculty and student affairs professionals.

I believe we can do so by moving away from the traditional viewpoint about educating the whole person in two ways.⁵ First, we should refocus whole-person education on what is distinctively “higher” about what students learn, and I believe the idea of *evoking wholeness* outlined in this chapter is a distinctive, transformative contribution higher education can make to student development. Unlike the traditional ideal, which concentrates on honing the common features of personhood students *bring* to higher education, the new ideal of wholeness defines a set of specific educational *outcomes* we want students to achieve. An education for wholeness seeks to develop genuinely new capacities and outlooks that flow specifically from *higher* learning. Students will continue to develop along the multiple dimensions of personhood, and colleges can certainly assist in that maturation, but that is not the primary calling of higher education. What we seek instead is to evoke in our students a higher order of personhood, one that becomes whole, or integral, in some meaningful sense by virtue of the higher educational experience.

Second, we cannot sequester an education for wholeness in the cocurriculum. It must also be *grounded in the academic program*, a compelling expression of the curriculum itself. Knowledge developed through formal study lies at the heart of the academic enterprise, and it engages many critical dimensions of the whole person we presume to educate. The academic curriculum is also the one common feature of higher education across the country and around the world, so academic learning must contribute in some significant way to an education for wholeness for it to be complete and authentic. An education for wholeness must certainly go beyond the curriculum, but no effort to evoke wholeness can have integrity without a strong academic component. In addition, there must be strong ligaments linking academic programs to the cocurriculum to ensure that the learning process itself is as well integrated as the outcomes we seek. Evoking wholeness is itself a holistic process that musters its greatest impact across the entire array of educational experiences a college or university provides.

Major Elements of Wholeness

In part I, Don Harward identifies three major dimensions of liberal learning: the epistemological, the psychosocial (“eudaemonic”), and the civic.

Because they express the primary aspects of the persons we educate, those three dimensions provide a compelling framework for classifying the elements of wholeness we hope to evoke in our students. Along each dimension, I suggest three primary learning outcomes that are genuine expressions of wholeness *and* that mark a distinctively higher, collegiate level of learning. Along each dimension, the first outcome describes a *type of knowledge and understanding* that higher education can nurture. A second outcome in each set identifies the *higher-order capacity or skill* that higher education can elicit. Finally, the third element in each category defines an *ethic* we hope students will embrace in that dimension of life. There may well be more such outcomes, but these nine at least display oft-noted features of the educated person that are integrated coherently within and across the three dimensions.

Epistemic Wholeness

When we talk about what college students learn, our ordinary referent is the epistemological dimension, where we focus on developing breadth and depth of subject-matter knowledge. Often neglected, however, is the development of the *knowing person*, or what kind of knowers our students become. Mastery of higher-order subject matter is integral to higher learning, but so is becoming one who knows in the particular way that higher learning evokes. When higher education is successful, students go beyond earlier modes of knowing to develop (1) a coherent worldview, (2) the capacity for judgment, and (3) intellectual honesty.

Worldview

Students learn many things before coming to college; indeed, they often know more things about the world than their teachers. But rarely have they organized their knowledge of discrete things into any coherent understanding of the relationship of those things, how they fit together or influence one another. The vocation of higher education is to help students put the pieces together in a coherent and well-considered worldview so they can understand how the world works, establish core analytic principles of their own, and address the big questions of life.⁶ It is important to note that in addition to systematizing discrete knowledge, a worldview involves definitions of value, primacy, and beauty, so it taps multiple dimensions of knowing that grow out of academic and cocurricular experience alike. Philosophers, artists, scientists, coaches, chaplains, counselors, and even facilities workers all can contribute to helping students build a worldview.

Judgment

Academically, first-year students seem fixated on learning the correct answers rather than exploring uncertainties. Socially, they want to know exactly where they stand with others to guide their behavior rather than navigate each situation on its own. In both realms, the new student lacks a fully developed capacity for judgment, which involves weighing the facts and circumstances and settling on a balanced conclusion or a prudent course of action in an uncertain and complex situation. Academically, judgment is perhaps the premier higher-order skill of reason, and as students benefit from good instruction, we see over time the blossoming of that capacity in their response to questions, their papers, and their dialogue on increasingly difficult issues. Likewise, we often see new students who make harmful blunders in social judgment and then build and demonstrate impressive social and emotional maturity. Such development of judgment clearly marks a person who has benefitted from a higher education.

Intellectual Honesty

I have chosen this term to describe the multiple dimensions of what we might understand as an epistemic ethic. Fundamentally, intellectual honesty entails seriousness about truth seeking and accountability to norms of truthfulness about the world, as well as self and others.⁷ It first obliges us to do our best to discern what is true, recognizing that we cannot expect to grasp the full truth, and correspondingly, to acknowledge the limits of our understanding. The academic norm against plagiarism then amplifies that obligation by insisting that we acknowledge others' contributions to knowledge and that we not falsely claim as our own what others have created or developed. Finally, to be intellectually honest is to be a realist about the world and ourselves, to "confront the brutal facts," even when they run counter to our own assumptions or beliefs.⁸ Academic instruction has long insisted on this principle, but one can readily see its applicability to life beyond the classroom in developing and using knowledge about all aspects of life with others.

Psychosocial (Eudaemonic) Wholeness

Today, psychosocial wholeness is often framed in terms of wellness—the healthy development of body, mind, life habits, and social skills—for the sake of both personal maturation and academic success. Noting the increasing lack of wellness among students today and its adverse effect on learning, early efforts of the Bringing Theory to Practice Project endeavored

to refocus the academy on strengthening collegiate programs of psychosocial development and reconnecting well-being with academic success.⁹ These are well-placed and needed efforts, but they retain the traditional assumption that the psychosocial contribution of collegiate education is to refine and elaborate the basic features of personhood. We must now reach further to identify the genuine contribution of higher education, academic and cocurricular, to personal development. Three higher-order aspects of wholeness are particularly noteworthy in that regard: (1) life meaning and purpose, (2) self-guidance, and (3) personal integrity.

Life Meaning and Purpose

What am I here for? What should I do with my life? In what can I find fulfillment? How do I make a contribution? These are the kinds of questions that collegiate education enables students to address coherently and systematically. Academically, students go beyond their taken-for-granted assumptions to examine classical answers to such questions and to form both a viewpoint about their adequacy and a consolidation of the most compelling elements for themselves. In preparing for a career, they should now go beyond saying, "I want to be a _____," as younger students often do, to determine why they want to do such work and how it will be meaningful to themselves and others. In relationships, they now should build on affinity and attraction to develop a sense of what is important to them in selecting friends and partners. In college, life meaning and purpose are therefore not given as something natural; they are rather considered and chosen, becoming "mine" in the fullest sense, filling out the students' sense of possibility and direction.

Self-Guidance

Prominent among academic aspirations is the goal of developing independent, lifelong learners out of students who start by wanting to know what will be on the test. But there is much more to self-guidance, which involves the capacity to steer oneself effectively through all the aspects of life. Self-guided persons are able to envision possibilities and set direction, to translate those visions into effective action to reach goals, to reflect on and assess one's own actions, to exercise personal discipline and self-correction, and to adjust one's own behavior to that of others. This capacity should be distinguished from being willful or selfish, as many new students are, because it is not simply motivation, desire, or self-regard that is required to be self-directed. What collegiate education fosters is both an internal cybernetic guidance system to navigate the world and a coherent

sense of personal responsibility for the active management of one's life affairs and the consequences of one's own actions.

Integrity

Personal integrity is a collegiate ideal emphasized both in academic and in cocurricular programs, but too often it is simply taken as part of a code to be enforced rather than an educational outcome to be fostered. As Stephen Carter understands integrity, it involves three steps: "1) *discerning* what is right and what is wrong; 2) *acting* on what you have discerned, even at personal cost; and 3) *saying openly* that you are acting on your understanding of right from wrong."¹⁰ Integrity therefore requires more than following a rule book, and higher education goes beyond that to help students discern what is right and wrong in particular situations, not just in general; to construct action as an expression of reasoned discernment, not just personal pleasure or pain; and to treat oneself as being accountable, not only for acting thusly but also for providing a morally coherent account of why one acted that way. This is the second great contribution that higher education can make to ethical development.

Civic Wholeness

In recent years, the ideal of civic engagement has become a prominent feature of collegiate education—not just service projects but also active involvement in the activities of the public square. Historically and philosophically, developing citizens has always been seen as an important aspect of higher education, but recently, educators have become much more intentional about citizenship education.¹¹ In AAC&U's renewed conception of liberal education, one of the focal learning outcomes is "civic knowledge and engagement—local and global," a central aspect of learning for personal and social responsibility.¹² There are many dimensions to civic education, and in a global age, education for civic wholeness is more complex and challenging than ever. Nonetheless, there are three specific civic aspects of persons that collegiate education is especially well positioned to foster, and they are applicable to most all dimensions of citizenship: (a) cosmopolitanism, (2) commitment to a common good, and (3) civility.

Cosmopolitanism

This term has recently been associated with issues of globalization, where it is certainly central, but its relevance is not limited to that context.

Cosmopolitanism involves a general capacity of persons to reach beyond social boundaries and engage people who are different from themselves in a way that effectively bridges diverse communities.¹³ Appiah thinks of cosmopolitans as people who can navigate a “world of strangers” peacefully and affirmatively, the capacity for which rests on a sense of “obligation to others” by virtue of their humanity, and embrace the particularity of others, which he describes as “taking seriously the value . . . of particular human lives.”¹⁴ In its academic dimension, a baccalaureate education that introduces students to new social worlds and fosters an appreciation for them naturally drives in the direction of cosmopolitanism. Engaging others from different backgrounds in a learning environment, the quintessential experience of undergraduates even in the classroom, establishes higher education as the premier institution for learning to navigate difference effectively. That suggests that homogeneity and the tight bonding of similar persons is inimical to genuine higher education, which is designed not only to confront students with difference but also to nurture their capacity to appreciate and navigate it.

Commitment to a Common Good

The point of developing this orientation in students is not, as some worry, to inculcate a singular point of view about public policies or what the common good includes, with all the contention that implies. It is rather to guide students beyond their own personal concerns and self-interest toward the ideal and challenge of building communities that work for all participants. The *civitas* in question may range from the family to the globe, but in every case, it is higher education’s vocation to nourish students’ capacity and commitment to address public issues from the point of view of what is best for the community as a whole. The more diverse the community, of course, the more difficult it will be to discern and to realize that ideal, but one minimal baseline commitment would seem to be fundamental: to support human flourishing, individually and collectively, an ideal that aligns self-regard with collective interests. In that context, we seek to educate persons who center their lives on making life better for all, not just themselves.

Civility

Like cosmopolitanism, civility combines both a capacity and an ideal. Civility’s competence is to participate effectively in the life of the public square in ways consistent with democratic discourse; its hope is to do so in a way that respects others engaged in public discourse and action,

honoring their common humanity and citizenship. The special gift of civil discourse is therefore to confront differences of viewpoint and interest with a graceful and affirming counterpoint that discerns common elements and seeks productive ways to reconcile honest and deeply held differences. As “the sum of the many sacrifices we are called to make for the sake of living together,” civility constitutes a public morality that holds communities together, especially when they are quite diverse.¹⁵ The ethos of colleges and universities has long been built on this principle, perhaps uniquely among societal institutions, and it is even more important today as public discourse becomes increasingly coarse and caustic. It should not be difficult to see that its cultivation is built into academic dialogue and has a critical role to play in cocurricular life as well.

Evoking Wholeness

Educating the whole person in those nine dimensions is not a didactic process so much as it is a process of socialization.¹⁶ Instead of filling persons up with knowledge, it involves drawing out their human capacity for wholeness in new ways. Rather than being marked by a threshold of achievement, it is much more an ongoing process of development and elaboration of personal capacities. It is therefore proper to characterize the education of the whole person as one of evoking wholeness, in which students do not simply *acquire* an education in the way they purchase a product or receive a gift; they actually *become* someone who exemplifies certain distinctive personal qualities, the qualities of an educated person.

For too long, we have accepted whatever wholeness students develop in college simply as a happy by-product of the learning setting, especially in residential colleges, where the greatest array of resources for whole-person education are typically mobilized. We have not been as intentional or systematic as we might in designing pedagogies and executing processes of learning specifically toward the objective of socializing persons for wholeness. When we do so, we will discover that evoking wholeness requires both academic and cocurricular educators to adopt some new approaches to (1) institutional alignment and coordination, (2) curriculum and pedagogy, (3) advising, and (4) assessment.

Institutional Alignment and Coordination

For whole-person education to succeed for all students, the entire institution must be mobilized for that purpose. Doing so may require significant change in the way colleges and universities organize the delivery

of their programs, for it requires careful alignment and coordination of (1) educational goals and objectives, (2) curriculum and cocurriculum, and (3) theory and practice.

To become anything more than ad hoc or occasional, the major elements of wholeness must be framed explicitly as part of institution-wide learning goals. We cannot claim to educate the whole person unless we are intentional about and accountable for that objective across the entire institution. Further, all educational programs of the institution must also embed those same objectives in their goals and objectives. It is important to affirm that whole-person education itself must be *wholistic* in the institutional sense of being part of the entire educational program—not just core curriculum, not just residential life, but everything.

The second alignment critical to whole-person education is that between theory and practice. Professional studies programs often engage students in practice but often are not focused on the whole person. Liberal studies programs frequently address aspects of the whole person but often fail to connect to practice. Cocurricular programs are noteworthy for emphasizing practice but too often neglect theory. The education of whole persons, however, depends both on understanding that is rooted in theory and on practice that enables students to test those principles and to make them real in their lives. To achieve wholeness, for example, students cannot merely study worldviews; they have to build one for themselves. They cannot simply admire historical figures who are self-guided; they have to develop a practical method of guiding themselves. Bringing theory and practice together in both curriculum and cocurriculum is a large challenge, but it is critical to successful whole-person education.

The achievement of aligned goals and objectives entails an alignment of educational effort between curriculum and cocurriculum. Educational idealism notwithstanding, however, this has been contested territory as faculty and student affairs professionals have each claimed exclusive authority in one sphere and resisted encroachments from the other. Moreover, the conception and role of a cocurriculum vary considerably according to the residential character and community culture of the institution, so even at its best, the significance of this alignment will vary by institutional type. For those where cocurriculum is or can be robust, a new approach to realizing this critical alignment is required. Rather than claiming authority and educational roles on the basis of organizational position, we have the opportunity to coordinate educational effort on the basis of mutual accountability to student learning goals for whole persons, where all parties have both educational interest and some special expertise.

Curriculum and Pedagogy

This is an appropriate point to reiterate the importance of the academic dimension of whole-person education, which must have the capacity to deliver some level of whole-person outcomes on its own, whatever the character of an institution's cocurricular program. Where a robust cocurriculum is available to students, academic learning should also provide a strong foundation for a partnership that can deliver even more powerful whole-person outcomes. Thus, academic leaders and faculty must take educational responsibility for some of what has previously sequestered in student affairs. At the same time, student affairs professionals must adopt some of the important curricular and pedagogical tools that faculty routinely employ if they are to maximize their effectiveness in whole-person education.

The need to create new approaches to curriculum and pedagogy becomes manifest when institutions are well aligned for whole-person education. With regard to curriculum, the minimum requirement for the academic program is to *integrate* whole-person learning goals into the formal curriculum. For epistemic goals, that may simply involve making explicit what is implicit, but integrating eudaemonic and civic learning goals is a more substantial task, for they are often not even implicit in academic programs today, and curricular elements will have to be created anew. In the cocurriculum, the first challenge is not so much to integrate whole-person elements into programs as to *create* formal curricula to educate the whole person, for much cocurricular learning remains ad hoc and unsystematic, even if it is often powerful. It needs to be formalized and disciplined to ensure the widespread achievement of whole-person outcomes. In addition, just as academic learning tends to neglect psychosocial and civic goals, cocurricular learning often lacks any focused attention on epistemic learning, which remains fundamental to whole-person education, even in the cocurriculum.

Developing a pedagogy expressly for whole-person education is a second educational challenge. Considered a socialization process, whole-person education involves the formation of knowledge about the nine aspects of wholeness, skill sufficient to put them into practice, and a commitment to doing so. Because higher education is a secondary, consensual form of socialization that builds on the deep, primary qualities developed through compulsory engagement with parents, tutelage for wholeness relies primarily on an affirmative, experiential pedagogy combining elements from both academic and cocurricular pedagogies but replicating neither exactly. Knowledge of the elements of wholeness is built most effectively through case studies, in which students learn not just patterns

of what has gone before but also examples they can link to their own experience. In complementary fashion, the skills of wholeness are best nurtured through coaching in experiential settings where students confront challenging life situations, some academic and some not. Commitment to living in wholeness, while sometimes enforced by sanctions for violating academic and community rules, is primarily fostered by student engagement with multiple role models who can demonstrate in their daily lives what it means to live a life of wholeness.

Advising

Student advising is a pivotal site for mentoring students toward whole-person outcomes, but it is rarely exploited for that purpose to any significant degree. That possibility is usually overshadowed by registration timetables and the competing demands faced by faculty and staff. Those realities only accentuate the fundamental emptiness of our idea of academic advising, which is conceived not as an educational act devoted primarily to learning but as a bureaucratic one of processing people through a system. Where there is serious educational advising, it tends to focus on the best students, to whom faculty are attracted, or the worst, who need to make up academic deficits, so most students miss out on that opportunity. Likewise, some educational advising does involve aspects of wholeness, but to the extent that wholeness is not formally incorporated in a curriculum or pedagogy, it does not arise naturally in the dialogue of faculty and students.

There are four important steps we can take to enhance advising for whole-person education. First, organize advising as an aspect of whole-person education by establishing an *advising protocol* for advisors and students that defines how advising is linked to the whole-person curriculum and how it can be used productively for whole-person development. Second, require students to produce *assessable learning products* from their advising relationship that express what they have learned regarding whole-person education in the process. Third, *deploy all faculty and professional staff* as advisors/mentors as a defined part of their workload. Finally, create *advising/mentoring partnerships* among advisors with different types of experience and expertise to ensure that students get multidimensional mentoring. Achieving such systematic attention to advising will certainly require some realignments, but the effort would benefit more general academic dialogue as much as whole-person education, and it could inspire some significant innovations in educational delivery that would profit the entire educational enterprise.

Assessment

The assessment of learning outcomes has gained great momentum over the past decade, but sadly, whole-person learning outcomes have not ordinarily been included in that effort. So the most important innovation we must undertake in assessment at this time is to include whole-person learning outcomes as a central topic of assessment. For many, whole-person outcomes are not readily subject to assessment because they are qualitative, even ineffable, rather than quantitative and directly measurable. Social science has demonstrated, however, that every human phenomenon can be measured and assessed in some way, even though the methods of assessment must vary according to the nature of the phenomenon, and the knowledge produced has different levels of precision and completeness. As Jim Collins has observed, saying we cannot measure such outcomes “is simply a lack of discipline.” If we are serious about whole-person education, “what matters is not finding the perfect indicator, but settling upon a *consistent and intelligent* method of assessing your output results, and then tracking your trajectory with rigor.”¹⁷

Consistent with the previous discussion of whole-person pedagogy, it is important to devise assessment instruments that are well aligned with the nature of the desired outcomes and how they are produced. Whole-person outcomes are not associated singularly with any specific major program, the core curriculum, or any one aspect of the cocurriculum, so they can only be assessed cumulatively across the student’s total educational experience. That fact suggests a simple pretest/posttest model for assessing such learning, but because whole-person education is also developmental, there is good reason to assess whole-person learning periodically, perhaps annually, so the developmental process itself can be understood, and assessment can be used as part of the learning process itself, not just an up or down measure after learning is completed. Finally, in light of the learning involved in whole-person education, it is important that we not try to wedge whole-person learning into an artificially precise measurement framework but rather utilize qualitative measures based upon students’ active demonstration of their capacities in the nine areas identified earlier.

The Ideal of the Educated Person in Higher Education

Since higher education became a mass phenomenon in the United States, people have taken an educated person to be someone who “has gotten an education,” as if education is a consumer good not integrally connected to the person but merely possessed. The ideal embedded in that conception

is *getting* the product, to finally possess it as a badge that qualifies the graduate for certain occupational and social opportunities. That narrow conception of what it means to be educated has eclipsed a more historic ideal of education as a transformational experience in which colleges actually educate the person to become someone who can lead a fulfilling life of wholeness, not just display a badge of ownership. The time is right to renew this historic ideal of the educated person by concentrating intentionally on evoking the distinctive attributes of wholeness appropriate to higher education.

That historic conception of educating the person was originally associated with small liberal arts colleges as a naturally occurring aspect of the educational experience. In the era of mass education, however, that ideal foundered as interest in professional studies came to overshadow liberal arts, as close faculty-student relationships became increasingly difficult to sustain, as close residential communities gave way to universities as small cities, as faculty specialists concentrated more on their disciplines than on students as persons, and as the cocurriculum claimed the task of building personal skills independent of academic preparation.

Fortunately, those conditions are no longer barriers to the achievement of whole-person education. Thanks to the fine work of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and other associations and national projects, the historic ideal of the educated person has been reconstituted in a conception of liberal education for the twenty-first century that includes whole-person educational outcomes, that drives liberal education into all the disciplines, and that ties liberal education to practice and engagement with experience in the world.¹⁸ By framing a specific set of liberal learning outcomes within a context and culture of educating the whole person, the institution can make explicit what once was implicit and can demonstrate that intentional design of curricula and pedagogy, coupled with rigorous assessment, can make liberal education possible—even in large universities.

The burden of this chapter has been to analyze and articulate more extensively the whole-person dimensions of the liberally educated person that can guide transformative education for baccalaureate students in all institutions. The key to that achievement is to realize once more that whole-person education is *anchored* in academic learning and *extended* into experiential learning associated with the intellectual disciplines and with experience beyond the classroom. That will not occur by trying to import and assimilate all the dimensions of whole-person education from the cocurriculum into the academic program. Instead, it will become possible when we see that the general conception of whole-person learning includes what faculty already can deliver through their disciplines and

through their scholarly and professional norms. As they embrace and expose those possibilities in their own work, we will make whole-person education available to everyone and magnify its impact by partnerships across the different sectors of our colleges and universities. Then we will realize the full possibilities and power of baccalaureate education to evoke the multiple dimensions of what it means to be an educated person in the twenty-first century. And as we transform our students' lives in that way, they will in turn transform our world in ways we can only imagine.

Notes

1. Thomas Christenson, "Educating the Whole Person" (unpublished manuscript, 2010).
2. Richard J. Light, *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini, *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).
3. Stanley Fish, among others, has recently argued against the efforts to build a systematic program of whole-person education in colleges and universities. He suggests it is not our job and we can't do it well, so we should not do it at all. Derek Bok has offered a persuasive rebuttal to this point of view, and I would add only two points for emphasis. First, the evidence of significant college effects on students, even without intentional design for whole-person education, implies an ethical responsibility on our part to ensure that students get the best outcomes higher education can foster. Second, higher education provides the best institutional occasion, context, and resources for developing certain socially valuable capacities; few other institutions can make such a difference. Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Derek Bok, *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).
4. Richard P. Keeling, "Creating a Culture for 'Campus Change for Learning'" (paper presented at the Presidential Leadership Coalition of the Bringing Theory to Practice Project, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, November 10–11, 2008).
5. I came to these conclusions in dialogue with Richard Hersh and Richard Keeling about their valuable and stimulating work on transformational education for the whole student, and I am grateful both for their thoughtful work, which provoked me to think anew about whole-person education, and for their generous intellectual engagement, which enabled me to sharpen my own thinking. Richard H. Hersh, Matt Bundick, Richard Keeling, Corey Keyes, Amy Kurpius, Richard Shavelson, Daniel Silverman, and Lynn Swaner, "A Well-Rounded Education for a Flat World" (paper sponsored by the S. Engelhard Center: College Outcomes Project, presented at the Leadership Coalition: President's Symposium, Washington, DC, November 10–11, 2008).

6. Anthony T. Kronman, *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007).
7. Sissela Bok, *Exploring Happiness: From Aristotle to Brain Science* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).
8. Jim Collins, *Good to Great and the Social Sectors: Why Business Thinking Is Not the Answer* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005).
9. Association of American Colleges and Universities, "Bringing Theory to Practice Project", www.aacu.org/bringing_theory.
10. Stephen L. Carter, *Integrity* (New York: Basic Books, 1996).
11. A. Bartlett Giamatti, *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University* (New York: Norton, 1988); Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).
12. Association of American Colleges and Universities, "Liberal Education and America's Promise," www.aacu.org/leap.
13. Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000).
14. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: Norton, 2006).
15. Stephen L. Carter, *Civility: Manners, Morals, and the Etiquette of Democracy* (New York: Basic Books, 1998).
16. Theodore E. Long and Jeffrey K. Hadden, "A Reconceptualization of Socialization," *Sociological Theory* 3, no. 1 (1985): 39–49.
17. Collins, *Good to Great*, 9.
18. Association of American Colleges and Universities, "Liberal Education and America's Promise."