

No. 10-553

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

HOSANNA-TABOR EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH
AND SCHOOL,
Petitioner,

v.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION AND
CHERYL PERICH,
Respondents.

**On Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Sixth Circuit**

**BRIEF OF THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AS *AMICUS
CURIAE* SUPPORTING PETITIONERS**

AARON D. LINDSTROM
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW T. NELSON
WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 752-2000
alindstrom@wnj.com

QUESTION PRESENTED

The federal courts of appeals have long recognized the “ministerial exception,” a First Amendment doctrine that bars most employment-related lawsuits brought against religious organizations by employees performing religious functions. The circuits are in complete agreement about the core applications of this doctrine to pastors, priests, and rabbis. But they are evenly divided over the boundaries of the ministerial exception when applied to other employees. The question presented is:

Whether the ministerial exception applies to a teacher at a religious elementary school who teaches the full secular curriculum, but also teaches daily religion classes, is a commissioned minister, and regularly leads students in prayer and worship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of <i>Amicus Curiae</i>	1
Statement	2
Summary of Argument.....	3
Argument.....	4
I. Religious higher-education institutions exist to help their students integrate their faith into all areas of their lives, including “secular” subjects.	4
II. Ministerial employees at religious institutions of higher education have access to internal grievance and appeal mechanisms outside the courts.....	15
Conclusion	17
Appendix A: CCCU Members and U.S. Affiliates	A-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Adams v. Indiana Wesleyan University</i> , 3:09-CV-468, 2010 WL 2803077 (N.D. Ind. July 15, 2010)	12
<i>AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion</i> , --- U.S. ---, 131 S.Ct. 1740, 1749 (2011).....	15
<i>Carroll College, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , 558 F.3d 568 (D.C. Cir. 2009).....	14
<i>Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos</i> , 483 U.S. 327 (1987).....	13
<i>New York v. Cathedral Academy</i> , 434 U.S. 125 (1977).....	13
<i>NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago</i> , 440 U.S. 490 (1979).....	4, 12, 13
State Cases	
<i>Coulee Catholic Schools v. Labor & Industry Review Commission, Department of Workforce Development</i> , 320 Wis. 2d 275 (2009).....	12
Federal Rules	
S. Ct. R. 37.6.....	1

**BRIEF OF THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AS *AMICUS
CURIAE* SUPPORTING PETITIONERS**

Amicus curiae, the CCCU, respectfully submits that the judgment of the Sixth Circuit should be reversed.¹

INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*

The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (“CCCU”) is an international association of intentionally Christian colleges and universities. The CCCU exists “[t]o advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and to help member institutions transform lives by faithfully relating all areas of scholarship and service to biblical truth.” CCCU, *About CCCU*, <http://www.cccu.org/about>. Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the CCCU has 111 members and 28 affiliates in North America, all of which are fully accredited colleges and universities with curricula rooted in the arts and sciences. The CCCU’s members have over 300,000 students enrolled and over 1.5 million alumni. A list of the CCCU’s member and affiliate institutions is provided in Appendix A.

The CCCU’s member institutions are committed to applying Christian doctrine and belief to all areas

¹ Pursuant to this Court’s Rule 37.6, the CCCU states that this brief was not authored in whole or in part by counsel for any party, and that no person or entity other than the CCCU, its counsel, and its members made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief. All parties have consented to the filing of this brief, and letters of consent are on file with the Clerk’s Office.

of human endeavor. The Sixth Circuit's decision in this case has significant implications for religious employment decisions by the CCCU's members. Specifically, these institutions reject as contrary to their core religious beliefs the Sixth Circuit's view that there is a distinction between sacred subjects and secular subjects. The Sixth Circuit's decision invites courts to impose their own view as to whether a religious institution's employee's duties are "religious." Such questions are the very type of entanglement with religion that the ministerial exception was created to avoid.

STATEMENT

Because the very mission of the CCCU's members is to integrate faith into a variety of subjects and to encourage their students to understand how a Christian worldview illuminates all areas of learning and life, the Court's decision regarding the ministerial exception will directly affect how and the extent to which these religious institutions are able to pursue their missions. Accordingly, the CCCU submits this brief to provide the Court with a better understanding of the missions of colleges and university like the CCCU's member institutions, of how they strive to integrate faith into subjects ranging from mathematics to literature to business, and of how the Court's decision in this case will affect their ability to pursue this mission.

These institutions have a real commitment to integrating faith into the subjects they teach; the concept of faith integration is not a subterfuge to take advantage of the ministerial exception. To the contrary, it is an integral part of the mission of many religious higher-education institutions and has been the subject of significant thought and study.

Likewise, these institutions do not seek to apply the ministerial exception to shield arbitrary and discriminatory employment decisions. Religious colleges and universities have adopted grievance and appeal procedures to ensure that employment decisions related to faculty are fair and just.

This is not to suggest that the ministerial exception should or does apply to all faculty at all religious colleges or universities. Nor does the CCCU urge the Court to address the application of the ministerial exception in the context of higher education. Instead, the CCCU merely provides this background to urge this Court to adopt a test for the ministerial exception that takes into account the stated mission of the religious institution when deciding whether its employees are important to the institution's religious mission or otherwise fall within the scope of the ministerial exception.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The very reason that many religious colleges and universities exist is to propagate their faith through instruction that demonstrates how religious faith is exercised in all subject matters. This instruction is frequently provided in a far more nuanced and comprehensive fashion than just engaging in group prayer, exhorting students to personal piety, and singing spiritual songs. Instead, faculty are required to integrate faith into the subjects that they teach. Consequently, an approach to the ministerial exception that simply measures the quantity of time a person spends on prayer, Bible reading, and the like fundamentally misperceives the role of faith in education at religious institutions of higher education.

As the CCCU's member institutions demonstrate, the requirement that faith be integrated into

all subject matters is not a ploy to avoid the jurisdiction of the courts, but a genuine outworking of religious colleges' and universities' religious mission. These same institutions adopt internal grievance and dispute-resolution processes to ensure that employment decisions regarding faculty are made for just and legitimate reasons. Thus, ministerial employees at religious institutions of higher education routinely retain the ability to have employment decisions reviewed even if they cannot seek recourse to the courts.

ARGUMENT

I. Religious higher-education institutions exist to help their students integrate their faith into all areas of their lives, including “secular” subjects.

Just as this Court recognized that “the *raison d'être* of parochial schools is the propagation of a religious faith,” *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, 440 U.S. 490, 503 (1979), many religious colleges and universities view their mission to be propagating faith by integrating it into the subjects they teach, including subjects sometimes deemed “secular.” Numerous religious universities and college spell this faith-integration goal out in their mission statements.

For example, Union University, located in Tennessee, states that its purpose as an institution includes seeking “to establish all aspects of life and learning on the Word of God, leading to a firm commitment to Christ and His Kingdom.” Union University, *Statement of Purpose*, <http://www.uu.edu/about/statement.cfm>. “This commitment calls for all faculty and staff to integrate Christian faith in all learning and doing,” the university explains, “based

on the supposition that all truth is God's truth and that there is no contradiction between God's truth made known to us in Holy Scripture and that which is revealed to us through creation and natural revelation." *Id.*

Kuyper College, in Michigan, shares a similar focus. Kuyper College uses "the integration of a high-quality academic curriculum and a Reformed worldview" to "provide students with the opportunity to see, understand, and live all of life through the lens of the Bible." Kuyper College, *About Kuyper*, <http://www.kuyper.edu/About/main.aspx>. Kuyper's curriculum is intended to awaken students to the need for possessing a solid, biblical worldview that gives every academic discipline significance as a tool for evangelism and discipleship, and for bringing social justice in Jesus' name. Kuyper College, *Integrating Faith and Learning*, http://www.kuyper.edu/Academics/integrating_faith.aspx.

To give yet another example, the purpose of Calvin College, in Michigan, is to "offer education that is shaped by Christian faith, thought, and practice." Calvin College, *Our Mission*, <http://www.calvin.edu/about/mission.html>. In the view of Calvin College, its "calling in Christian college education" is that "in an academic setting, with the peculiar tools, perspectives, and resources of academe, we have to equip ourselves with the knowledge, the skills, and the attitudes that can be thrown into the struggle for shalom, the battle for universal wholeness and delight." Calvin College, *Our Calling*, <http://www.calvin.edu/about/shalom.html>. Calvin College explains how this calling plays out in an academic setting:

So in a Christ-centered college we learn what we can about creation itself. We learn the

functions and beauty of numbers and sets of numbers; we learn the wonder of cells and cell division. . . . We study and teach history to develop judgement . . . [and] to understand from a biblical point of view what is comic and what is tragic in a fallen world, and how strikingly often they combine. . . . We learn in literature classes the best that's been thought and said. Reading fiction, for instance, is an excellent way to learn something about human character. We learn (as we would by reading the biblical account of King David) how possible it is for great goodness and great wickedness to cohabit in a single person. [*Id.*]

Numerous other religious colleges and universities share similar visions, including:

- Belhaven University (Mississippi): “Belhaven University prepares students academically and spiritually to serve Christ Jesus in their careers, in human relationships, and in the world of ideas.” Accordingly, “[e]ach academic department . . . clarifies the implications of biblical truth for its discipline.” Belhaven University, *Vision & Mission of Belhaven University*, <http://www.belhaven.edu/belhaven/mission.htm>.
- Erskine College (South Carolina): “The mission of Erskine College is to equip students to flourish by providing an excellent liberal arts education in a Christ-centered environment where learning and biblical truth are integrated to develop the whole person.” Erskine College, *Erskine College Mission Statement*, <http://www.erskine.edu/about-erskine/mission-statement.shtml>.

- Cedarville University (Ohio): “[T]he University seeks . . . [t]o undergird the student in the fundamentals of the Christian faith and to stimulate each student to evaluate knowledge in the light of scriptural truth.” Cedarville University, *Mission and Objectives*, <http://www.cedarville.edu/About/Mission.aspx>.
- Dordt College (Iowa): “[T]he mission of Dordt College is to equip students, alumni, and the broader community to work effectively toward Christ-centered renewal in all aspects of contemporary life.” Dordt College, *Our Mission*, http://www.dordt.edu/about/our_mission/.
- Biola University (California): Biola pursues “Christ-centered and Spirit-led education, scholarship and service that is grounded in Scripture and challenges our community to seek and integrate biblical principles into our fields of study.” Biola University, *Mission, Vision & Values*, <http://www.biola.edu/about/mission/>.
- Gordon College (Massachusetts): “Gordon students are taught that a Christian education has implications for every aspect of their lives.” Gordon College, *Community at Gordon*, http://www.gordon.edu/page.cfm?iPageID=382&iCategoryID=31&About&Community_At_Gordon.
- Seaver College, Pepperdine University (California): “Seaver College is a Christian College because of its Christian faculty, students, and commitment to the integration of faith and learning.” Pepperdine University, *Prospective Students*, <http://www.pepperdine.edu/prospective-students/>.

These and similar universities do not merely pay lip service to the goal of integrating faith across a variety of subjects; they follow through on that goal.

Regent University, in Virginia, for example, has a policy requiring prospective faculty to demonstrate they are “proficient in the integration of faith and learning” and offers that “[a] representative from the School of Divinity may be consulted in this process.” Regent University, *Faculty & Academic Policy Handbook*, http://www.regent.edu/academics/academic_affairs/faculty_handbook.cfm#worldview. If the prospective faculty member is not proficient, he must develop “a plan to achieve proficiency within a three-year period,” and that plan “shall include activities such as . . . [c]ompleting a prescribed reading list on doctrine, hermeneutics and integration.” *Id.* At Regent, annual performance reviews require current faculty to submit documentation that demonstrates proficiency, such as “a paper of an integrative nature” or “course materials that demonstrate appropriate integrative skills and understanding.” *Id.*

Similarly, Nyack College, in New York, has “a policy of requiring a faith/learning integration paper of all faculty seeking tenure.” Nyack College, *Bibliography for the Integration of Faith and Learning*, <http://www.nyackcollege.edu/library/onlinefl/onlineftoc.htm>.

Pepperdine University has a Center for Faith and Learning that “seeks to enhance the connections between classroom teaching, scholarship, and Christian faith and practice.” Pepperdine University, *Center for Faith and Learning*, <http://www.pepperdine.edu/centerforfaithand-learning/>. In fact, a number of religious colleges and universities have

similar centers devoted to faith integration. See, for example:

- Whitworth University (Washington), *Center for Christian Faith & Learning*, <http://www.whitworth.edu/FaithCenter/About.htm>;
- Waynesburg University (Pennsylvania), *Center for Faith and Learning*, <http://www.waynesburg.edu/index.php?q=node/818>; and
- Regent University (Virginia), *Center for Teaching & Learning*, <http://www.regent.edu/admin/ctl/consult/faith.cfm>.

As the foregoing suggests, the question how to integrate faith into subjects that might appear “secular” to a court has been a subject of significant thought and study. Scholars have written books discussing how different areas of learning relate to or are illuminated by religious beliefs. Here, for example, is a short list of books that examine how revealed truth (i.e., Scripture) can relate to or help explain discovered truth in specific academic disciplines:

- Brabenac, R.L. *A Christian Perspective on the Foundations of Mathematics*. Wheaton: Wheaton College, 1977.
- McIntire, C.T., ed. *God, History and Historians: Modern Christian Views of History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Moreland, J.P. *Christianity and the Nature of Science: A Philosophical Investigation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Co., 1989.

- Halterman, James. *The Clashing Worlds of Economics and Faith*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1995.
- Petersen, Michael. *With All Your Mind: A Christian Philosophy of Education*. Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Jeeves, Malcom A., and David Myers. *Psychology through the Eyes of Faith*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.²
- George, Robert P. *The Clash of Orthodoxies: Law, Religion, and Morality in Crisis*. Wilmington: ISI, 2001.
- Kuyper, Abraham. 1898 Stone Lectures, Princeton University. *In Creating a Christian Worldview*. Compiled by Peter S. Heslam. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Grunlan, Stephen, and Marvin Mayers. *Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988.

This is just a short list to highlight the breadth of scholarship that exists on integrating faith. Many religious colleges and universities publish more complete bibliographies to aid their students and faculty in their quest to understand how particular subjects inform and are informed by religious beliefs and insights. *E.g.*, David S. Dockery, *A Bibliography for the Integration of Faith and Learning* (Fall 2007),

² The CCCU sponsored a “Through the Eyes of Faith” series, published by Harper Collins, that addresses a variety of academic disciplines, including mathematics, business, music, biology, literature, sociology, and history.

http://www.uu.edu/dockery/FaithLearnBooklet_Fa07.pdf; Waynesburg University, *Bibliographies by Discipline on the Integration of Faith and Learning*, <http://www.waynesburg.edu/depts/jthompso/integ.htm>; International Ass'n of Baptist Colleges & Universities, *Faith & Learning Bibliography*, http://www.baptistschools.org/bc/FL_Bibliography.html; Institute of Christian Studies, *Faith & Learning Network*, <http://www.icscanada.edu/library/fln.shtml#bibliography> (hosting a bibliographic database).

Some areas of study may appear to be harder to integrate with faith than others. But as an assistant professor at Cedarville University has explained, even mathematics is influenced by the worldview of the mathematician:

Let me give an example. How does a mathematician view his latest result? When he proves a theorem, is he creating this result or discovering it? There have been many letters published in mathematics journals in the last few years concerning this. Most humanists seem to believe that they are creating new identities which did not exist before they "created" them. Most theists, on the other hand, view their work as discoveries of already existent, but previously unseen, mathematical truths. [James Sellers, *Biblical Integration in Mathematics: Why and How?*, <http://www.icl-net.org/pub/facdialogue/24/sellers24.>]

Mathematics, for example, can be used to illustrate the "distinction between absolute truth and truth based on axioms." *Id.* "All mathematics is based on a set of axioms, whether it be Peano's [Postulates] or Euclid's for Euclidean geometry." *Id.* If "the axioms are changed, then the 'mathematical truths' based on

the axioms can also change.” *Id.* (giving the example that the truth of the equation $2 + 3 = 5$ depends on whether it is in a base-10 system or a nondecimal system, such as base-4). This distinction illustrates that “[a]lthough mathematics is one of the purest of sciences, it is based on an axiom system and, therefore, does not generate absolute truths.” *Id.*

As these examples show, the Sixth Circuit’s approach, which would assume a professor’s primary duties are secular if the professor teaches math or English, rather than theology, would ignore, to paraphrase this Court, the “critical and unique role of the [professor] in fulfilling the mission of a church-operated [college].” *NLRB*, 440 U.S. at 501. The *raison d’être* of these institutions is to teach their students a comprehensive worldview and to show them how their faith can inform all of these areas of study, and courts should not “minimize . . . religion by calling a faith-centered social studies class, for example, ‘secular’ because it does not involve worship and prayer.” *Coulee Catholic Schs. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm’n, Dept. of Workforce Dev.*, 320 Wis. 2d 275, 304 (2009). Accord, *Adams v. Indiana Wesleyan Univ.*, 3:09-CV-468, 2010 WL 2803077 (N.D. Ind. July 15, 2010) (holding that the nature and character of social work professor’s duties were ministerial in nature so as to invoke the ministerial exception).

Further, this Court has also recognized that “[t]he line” between secular and religious activities “is hardly a bright one, and an organization might understandably be concerned that a judge would not understand its religious tenets and sense of mission.” *Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos*, 483 U.S.

327, 336 (1987). Given this concern, “[f]ear of potential liability might affect the way an organization carried out what it understood to be its religious mission.” *Id.* That is one of the reasons the circuits have adopted the ministerial exception. In the context of higher education, the CCCU’s members (and similarly devoted colleges and universities) understand their religious mission to be to teach their faith, not just in theology classes, but in history classes, in English classes, in chemistry classes, and in mathematics classes. In other words, they believe that the subjects they teach are not secular.

Therefore, for faith-integrating religious educational institutions that view the duty of their professors to be identifying for students the integration of faith in each course’s subject matter, the state should not, through its courts, be in the business of telling these religious institutions that this duty is not important enough to the mission of the religious organization to make the professor a ministerial employee. *New York v. Cathedral Acad.*, 434 U.S. 125, 133 (1977) (“The prospect of church and state litigating in court about what does or does not have religious meaning touches the very core of the constitutional guarantee against religious establishment.”). Instead, courts should take into account the stated missions of the religious organizations, particularly in the educational context. If the institution’s mission is to integrate faith into all subjects, and it affirmatively requires its teachers to do so, then those teachers will qualify for the ministerial exception. This approach will avoid the entanglement that would result if the court had to decide if a history class taught at a religious college was a secular activity. *NLRB*, 440 U.S. at 502 (recognizing that “the very process of inquiry” for claims against “religious

schools” “may impinge on rights guaranteed by the Religion Clauses”). In the words of the D.C. Circuit, “trolling through the beliefs of [schools], making determinations about [their] religious mission, and that mission’s centrality to the ‘primary purpose’ of the [school]” is “just ‘the sort of intrusive inquiry that [*NLRB v.*] *Catholic Bishop* sought to avoid.” *Carroll Coll., Inc. v. NLRB*, 558 F.3d 568, 572 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (explaining that courts should look at a university’s “course catalogue, mission statement, student bulletin, and other public documents,” rather than inquiring “into the content of the school’s religious beliefs” or expressing “skepticism whether those beliefs were followed”). Determining whether a particular class was a secular activity, after all, would require the court to examine the curriculum, to investigate what the professor discussed in class, to assess whether the professor’s instruction was consistent with the intent of her employer, and to impose its view as to whether the class was primarily secular or religious.

The Sixth Circuit’s decision also highlights the hazards of applying a quantitative approach to determining the employee’s importance to the institution’s religious mission. At the college level, even a professor who devotes 100% of his time to teaching mathematics or theater might rightly be viewed as having a ministerial role, if the college’s mission statement or his job description tasks him with spreading the faith or with educating students in how that faith applies in the context of those particular subjects. Indeed, the assumption that the importance of the task is shown by the amount of time spent on the task bears little connection with reality, even in a secular context. Under this quantitative approach, one would conclude that the primary duty

of a soldier is to train for war, not to fight in war, given that soldiers typically spend far more time training than they do in actual combat. *But see* U.S. Army, *Organization*, <http://www.army.mil/info/organization/> (“The Army’s mission is to fight and win our Nation’s wars.”) Accordingly, this Court should reject the theory that an employee’s importance or religious significance can be evaluated simply by calculating, as the Sixth Circuit did, the amount of time the employee spends on a given subject.

This is not to say that all faculty at every college or university with a religious affiliation will qualify as ministerial employees. Many religious colleges view their mission differently and do not seek to integrate faith in such a comprehensive way. Accordingly, the duties of faculty at these institutions may not be ministerial in nature. This Court should therefore develop a test for the ministerial exception that takes into account the stated mission of the religious institution when deciding whether its faculty fall within the scope of the ministerial exception.

II. Ministerial employees at religious institutions of higher education have access to internal grievance and appeal mechanisms outside the courts.

Although the application of the ministerial exception prevents judicial review of employment decisions affecting ministerial employees, this does not mean that these employment decisions cannot be reviewed. Cf., *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, --- U.S. ---, 131 S.Ct. 1740, 1749 (2011) (acknowledging parties’ discretion in designing arbitration processes). Christian colleges and universities have adopted grievance and appeal processes for faculty who disagree with employment decisions.

These policies are often spelled out in faculty handbooks and typically involve appealing decisions to the institution's president or governing board. Consider, for example, Calvin College's grievance and appeal procedures: A faculty member aggrieved by an employment decision (including denial of tenure) may seek reconsideration from the body making the decision and appeal the decision to the college's president or the executive committee of the board of trustees (or both). Calvin College, *Handbook for Teaching Faculty*, §§ 3.7.6.2.3, 6.1 (procedures for addressing allegations of misconduct), 6.5 (antidiscrimination policy), <http://www.calvin.edu/admin/provost/handbook/>. *Accord*, Dordt College, *Faculty Handbook*, §§ 4.4.6, 4.4.9.3, 7.5, http://www.dordt.edu/publications/faculty_handbook/faculty_handbook.pdf; Gordon College, Administrative/Faculty Handbook, §§ 4.8.3, 4.9.2, [http://www.gordon.edu/download/pages/Admin%20Faculty%20Handbook%20-%20updated%20Feb%202011%20\(2\)1.pdf](http://www.gordon.edu/download/pages/Admin%20Faculty%20Handbook%20-%20updated%20Feb%202011%20(2)1.pdf). Calvin College guarantees to its faculty the right to have complaints giving rise to possible termination made in writing, to be represented at the hearing by a colleague, and the right to have witnesses examined in the presence of the accused. Calvin College, *Handbook for Teaching Faculty*, § 3.10.3.2; *accord*, Nyack College, *Faculty Handbook*, § 6.6 (including right to have a gender-diverse hearing panel for all grievances involving gender discrimination), http://www.nyack.edu/files/NYACKFacultyHandbook2009_10.pdf.

The CCCU presents this information simply to show that the ministerial exception does not deprive ministerial employees of all review of employment decisions. Ministerial employees and religious organizations have and will continue to provide griev-

ance and appeal procedures to ensure that employment decisions are fair and just.

CONCLUSION

In the end, it is the religious institution that must decide how to fulfill its spiritual mission, and to do that, it must define the duties of its employees. When an institution assigns its teachers the task of integrating faith into all subjects and holds them accountable for that task, those teachers are central to the institution's religious mission and therefore fall within the ministerial exception. Courts are ill-equipped and without authority to second-guess those decisions, particularly by relying on the amount of time the employee spends on tasks the court considers "secular" but the religious institution considers spiritual. Further, the entire undertaking of determining whether duties are spiritual or secular is fraught with risks of unnecessary entanglement in the exercise of religion. For these reasons, the CCCU respectfully requests that this Court reverse the decision of the Sixth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted.

AARON D. LINDSTROM
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW T. NELSON
WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 752-2000
alindstrom@wnj.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

June 20, 2011

APPENDIX A: CCCU MEMBERS AND U.S. AFFILIATES

CCCU Members

1. Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX
2. Anderson University, Anderson, IN
3. Asbury University, Wilmore, KY
4. Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA
5. Belhaven University, Jackson, MS
6. Bethel College—IN, Mishawaka, IN
7. Bethel University, Saint Paul, MN
8. Biola University, La Mirada, CA
9. Bluefield College, Bluefield, VA
10. Bluffton University, Bluffton, OH
11. Bryan College, Dayton, TN
12. California Baptist University, Riverside, CA
13. Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI
14. Campbellsville University, Campbellsville, KY
15. Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, TN
16. Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH
17. College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, MO
18. Colorado Christian University, Lakewood, CO
19. Corban University, Salem, OR
20. Cornerstone University, Grand Rapids, MI
21. Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, GA
22. Crown College, Saint Bonifacius, MN

23. Dallas Baptist University, Dallas, TX
24. Dordt College, Sioux Center, IA
25. East Texas Baptist University, Marshall, TX
26. Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA
27. Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy, MA
28. Eastern University, St. Davids, PA
29. Erskine College, Due West, SC
30. Evangel University, Springfield, MO
31. Fresno Pacific University, Fresno, CA
32. Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA
33. George Fox University, Newberg, OR
34. Gordon College, Wenham, MA
35. Goshen College, Goshen, IN
36. Grace College & Seminary, Winona Lake, IN
37. Greenville College, Greenville, IL
38. Hannibal-LaGrange University, Hannibal, MO
39. Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, TX
40. Hope International University, Fullerton, CA
41. Houghton College, Houghton, NY
42. Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX
43. Howard Payne University, Brownwood, TX
44. Huntington University, Huntington, IN
45. Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN
46. John Brown University, Siloam Springs, AR
47. Judson College—AL, Marion, AL

48. Judson University, Elgin, IL
49. Kentucky Christian University, Grayson, KY
50. King College, Bristol, TN
51. The King's University College, Edmonton, AB
52. Lee University, Cleveland, TN
53. LeTourneau University, Longview, TX
54. Lipscomb University, Nashville, TN
55. Louisiana College, Pineville, LA
56. Malone University, Canton, OH
57. The Master's College & Seminary, Santa Clarita,
CA
58. Messiah College, Grantham, PA
59. MidAmerica Nazarene University, Olathe, KS
60. Milligan College, Johnson City, TN
61. Mississippi College, Clinton, MS
62. Missouri Baptist University, Saint Louis, MO
63. Montreat College, Montreat, NC
64. Mount Vernon Nazarene University, Mount
Vernon, OH
65. North Central University, Minneapolis, MN
66. North Greenville University, Tigerville, SC
67. North Park University, Chicago, IL
68. Northwest Christian University, Eugene, OR
69. Northwest Nazarene University, Nampa, ID
70. Northwest University, Kirkland, WA
71. Northwestern College—IA, Orange City, IA

72. Northwestern College—MN, Saint Paul, MN
73. Nyack College, Nyack, NY
74. Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, OK
75. Oklahoma Christian University, Edmond, OK
76. Oklahoma Wesleyan University, Bartlesville, OK
77. Olivet Nazarene University, Bourbonnais, IL
78. Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK
79. Palm Beach Atlantic University, West Palm Beach, FL
80. Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA
81. Redeemer University College, Ancaster, ON
82. Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, NY
83. San Diego Christian College, El Cajon, CA
84. Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA
85. Shorter University, Rome, GA
86. Simpson University, Redding, CA
87. Southeastern University, Lakeland, FL
88. Southern Nazarene University, Bethany, OK
89. Southern Wesleyan University, Central, SC
90. Southwest Baptist University, Bolivar, MO
91. Spring Arbor University, Spring Arbor, MI
92. Sterling College, Sterling, KS
93. Tabor College, Hillsboro, KS
94. Taylor University, Upland, IN
95. Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA
96. Trevecca Nazarene University, Nashville, TN

97. Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, IL
98. Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL
99. Trinity Western University, Langley, BC
100. Union University, Jackson, TN
101. University Of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Belton, TX
102. University of Sioux Falls, Sioux Falls, SD
103. University Of The Southwest, Hobbs, NM
104. Vanguard University of Southern California, Costa Mesa, CA
105. Warner Pacific College, Portland, OR
106. Warner University, Lake Wales, FL
107. Waynesburg University, Waynesburg, PA
108. Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA
109. Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL
110. Whitworth University, Spokane, WA
111. Williams Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, AR

CCCU U.S. Affiliates

1. Arizona Christian University, Phoenix, AZ
2. Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY
3. Atlanta Christian College, East Point, GA
4. Baylor University, Waco, TX
5. Bethany University—CA, Scotts Valley, CA
6. Campbell University, Buies Creek, NC
7. Central Christian College, Mcpherson, KS
8. Charleston Southern University, Charleston, SC

9. Columbia International University, Columbia, SC
10. Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX
11. Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, GA
12. Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, OH
13. Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA
14. Johnson University, Knoxville, TN
15. Kuyper College, Grand Rapids, MI
16. Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA
17. Lincoln Christian University, Lincoln, IL
18. Mid-America Christian University, Oklahoma City, OK
19. Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL
20. Multnomah University, Portland, OR
21. Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA
22. Philadelphia Biblical University, Langhorne, PA
23. Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA
24. Samford University, Birmingham, AL
25. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC
26. Valley Forge Christian College, Phoenixville, PA
27. Walla Walla University, College Place, WA
28. William Jessup University, Rocklin, CA