Appendix B1: Rationale for choices of peer programs
In selecting these schools, we used the following criteria:
- primarily other state schools;
- schools with comparable faculty size;
- schools with a terminal Masters program that we could compare with our own;
- schools with a comparable appreciation for instruction and scholarship among their faculty;
- programs that have a similar programmatic shape (comparative study of religion);
- primarily schools in the Southeast.

*Florida State University* (aspirational institution)
http://www.religion.fsu.edu/Pages/default.aspx
18 TT faculty, 2 visiting faculty, 2 instructors
Offers BA, stand-alone MA, and PhD degrees
Emphasis on comparative study of religion

*Missouri State University* (peer institution)
http://www.missouristate.edu/relst/
12 TT faculty + 2 NTT faculty
Offers BA and stand-alone MA degrees
Emphasis on comparative study of religion

*Temple University* (aspirational institution)
http://www.temple.edu/religion
15 TT faculty + 3 NTT faculty
Offers BA, MA, and PhD degrees
Emphasis on comparative study of religion

*University of Georgia* (peer institution)
http://www.uga.edu/religion
11 TT faculty and 8 NTT faculty
Offers a BA and a stand-alone MA degree
Emphasis on comparative study of religion

*University of South Florida* (peer institution)
http://religious-studies.usf.edu
9 TT faculty + 3 NTT faculty
Offers a BA and a stand-alone MA degree
Emphasis on comparative study of religion
Appendix B2: Organization of Unit Governance & Committee Structure

The Department of Religious Studies has a straightforward and effective organization. Its Promotion and Tenure Manual was written in 2005 as the unit was established as a stand-alone department (Appendix B3). The Chair convenes a monthly department meeting with the entire faculty. In addition, the Chair meets regularly with the Undergraduate Director and Graduate Director.

The department's standing committees are as follows:
1. Executive committee (membership rotates through the faculty equally, with members serving 2-year terms)
2. Curriculum committee (with Graduate Director and Undergraduate Director as ex officio members)
3. Program committee

Committee membership is assigned annually at the first department faculty meeting in the Fall. The Chair annually evaluates all faculty members, and is an ex officio member of the Executive Committee. Proposals for curricular changes are initiated in the Curriculum committee and then are forwarded to the full faculty for approval. The Executive Committee advises the Chair on salary adjustments.

In addition, there are individual positions:
1. Library liaison
2. CTW ambassador
3. Assessment committee (with Assessment Coordinator as ex officio member)

When necessary, the Chair appoints ad hoc committees. In the case of hiring, all TT faculty members serve on the search committee, with one tenured faculty member serving as chair. During the review period, 5 searches have been conducted (2 TT positions, 2 Lecturer positions, 1 Visiting Instructor position).

Finally, the department depends heavily on the administrative services of 3 staff people shared with the Philosophy department (Ellen Logan, Business Manager; Claire Murata Kooy, Senior Administrative Coordinator; Felicia Thomas, Administrative Coordinator).
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1. Introduction

a. General Comments

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality of scholarship, instruction, and service in the university. The process is intended to be both thorough and fair. The promotion and tenure policies of the Department of Religious Studies have been formulated in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Georgia State University Policy on Promotion, and the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. The policies, procedures, and standards of the Regents, College and University take precedence over and govern the material in this manual.

The departmental guidelines contained in this manual are designed to provide information concerning expectations for performance and achievement for promotion and tenure to candidates from the Department of Religious Studies and to guide the deliberation of members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and the department chair. It is important that all of these parties become thoroughly familiar with these guidelines, as well as with those contained in the College and University manuals. Candidates are specifically directed to the College manual for guidance about preparing, formatting and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion.

The content, guidelines, and standards in this manual will be reviewed at any time if so requested by the Chair of the Department or by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures will require a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track members of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards will require a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured members of the Department. As specified in the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, any changes proposed by the Department only become effective upon approval of the College of Arts and Sciences Review Board.

b. Tenure

Tenure is established and governed by the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents. Only Associate Professors and Professors employed full-time may hold tenure.

Tenure may be awarded upon completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. The five-year period should be continuous, although a limited interruption because of leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted. This interruption may not exceed two years. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of Instructor at Georgia State University. Such credit shall be specified in writing and approved by the Dean.

Candidates for tenure who are granted probationary credit and apply this credit toward tenure must submit all work done (in professional development, instruction, and service) during the period for which probationary credit is given, as well as work done since arriving at Georgia State University. However, for some aspects of the evaluation of teaching (as outlined in the section of this manual on the Evaluation of Teaching), only courses taught by the candidate for the last four years at Georgia State University are considered.

c. Promotion

An Assistant Professor is normally considered for promotion and tenure in the sixth year of service at that rank. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an Assistant Professor may apply for promotion and tenure in the fifth year of service. An Assistant Professor must be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the seventh year. Credit received for service at other institutions or in the rank of Instructor may be applied (at the candidate’s
discretion) towards a candidate’s tenure. Assistant Professors must simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure, though tenure in the College will not be granted without promotion to Associate Professor.

An Associate Professor seeking promotion to Professor normally is not considered for promotion before the fifth year of service as Associate Professor at Georgia State University. However, a candidate may seek early promotion, if exceptionally strong justification exists for doing so, in the fourth year of service, but no sooner. A faculty member hired at the Associate Professor or Professor level may be considered for tenure no earlier than the fifth year of service and must be considered for tenure no later than the seventh year of service at Georgia State University. Credit for service at other institutions may be applied (at the candidate’s discretion) towards tenure. Thus, for example, a person with two years of credit may be considered for tenure in the third year of residence at Georgia State University. Non-tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion and tenure may not seek promotion prior to tenure; a candidate may seek tenure prior to promotion.

A faculty member may receive a maximum of three years of credit for service at other institutions.

Candidates for promotion must submit all work done since their initial appointments or since the completion of the dossier used in the review that led to promotion to his or her current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates with probationary credit must submit work done during the period for which such credit is given. For some aspects of the evaluation of teaching (as outlined in the section of this manual on the Evaluation of Instruction), only courses taught by the candidate during the last four years at Georgia State University are considered.

For a fuller explanation of these rules, please see the College Manual.
2. The Promotion and Tenure Process

a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process

Recommendations with regard to promotion and tenure begin at the departmental level. Both the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair provide independent evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The College Committee subsequently makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President. The President makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents, and the Board makes the final decision.

b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the Department Chair will remind all faculty in the Department who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure that they may so apply. All eligible faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must state their intention in writing no later than the date specified in the College Manual. Those who wish to apply must provide the Department Chair with a list of six possible outside reviewers. For each reviewer the candidate must provide the following: institution affiliation and title(s), addresses (both postal and e-mail), indication of her or his rank, areas of concentration, major achievements, standing in the discipline, and the nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate. Candidates must not contact any of the individuals on their lists of outside reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation. The Committee and the Department Chair will also compose a list of six possible outside reviewers. The reviewers should not be from institutions in Georgia, should not have taught at the institution from which the candidate received his or her Ph.D. during the time the candidate was at that institution, and should be from national research universities and national liberal arts colleges. In cases involving promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers may be either associate or full professors; in case of promotion to Professor, reviewers must be full professors. The Office of the Dean will select at least four reviewers, with at least two being from the candidate’s list and with at least two being from the Committee’s list.

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must provide the Chair of the Department with six copies of his or her professional development materials (i.e., his or her publications, professional development statement, and any other materials specified in the College Manual). These materials will be forwarded to the outside reviewers. The professional development materials are part of the dossier discussed in the next paragraph but the dossier also includes the instruction and service materials.

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must submit his or her dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be in the format required by the College Manual. Candidates should be aware that the format required by the College Manual is complex. The dossier includes three statements of interests and goals: one for professional development, one for instruction, and one for service. Very specific formats for the dossier are required. Candidates should be sure to allow sufficient time to compose these statements and compile the dossier before the deadline for its submission.

Candidates must also submit their Teaching Portfolio as a component of the promotion and tenure process. By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the syllabi for all courses taught, (b) all materials given to the students in all courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. By College Policy, the evaluation of instruction for the purposes of promotion and tenure is based only on the courses taught during the last four years that the candidate has taught courses at Georgia State. These courses, in turn, should be the ones covered in the Teaching Portfolio submitted for purposes of promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair will add the letters from the outside reviewers to the dossier before the dossier is given to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate will not be informed of the identities of the outside reviewers and will not see the letters themselves. Portions of the outside reviewers’ letters may be quoted in the evaluation letters written by the Departmental Committee and the Departmental Chair as part of the evaluation process, but the identities of the outside evaluators must not be explicitly or implicitly revealed.
c. Committee Membership

The Departmental Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor consists of those and only those members of the Department who have tenure and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, except the Chair of the Department and any members of the Department serving in a position that will require them to review the candidate’s promotion and tenure decision at the College or University level. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will be elected by its members and will have full voting rights.

The Departmental Committee on Promotion to Professor shall consist of those and only those members of the Department who have tenure and who hold the rank of Professor, except the Chair of the Department and any members of the Department serving in a position that will require them to review the candidate’s promotion and tenure decision at the College or University level. The Chair of this Committee will be elected by its members and will have full voting rights.

In the event that there are not enough eligible departmental faculty members to constitute a committee on promotion and/or tenure, the Departmental Chair and the College Area Committee shall make the promotion and/or tenure recommendation to the Dean of the College. If there is a single eligible faculty member for the departmental promotion and/or tenure committee, he or she shall write a letter assessing the candidate which will be included with materials sent to the College Area Committee.
3. The Evaluation of Candidates

a. Terms Used in Evaluation

Candidates for promotion are evaluated in three areas: professional development, instruction, and service (to the department, university, community, and profession). In each of these three areas, candidates are evaluated on a scale established by the university and referred to subsequently in this manual: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding.

Evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the Department of Religious Studies, the College, and of the University.

b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Associate Professor

In order to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must present evidence that he or she is recognized by professionals in his or her field outside of the University as contributing to the advancement and development of his or her discipline. The rank of Associate Professor also presumes a demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly and positively to the instructional and service activities of the department.

For a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other. The candidate must also be rated as at least good in service.

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing at Georgia State University and in their professions nationally. The quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor surpass those required for a recommendation to Associate Professor.

In order to be recommended for promotion to Professor, a candidate must be judged as excellent in both professional development and instruction, and at least very good in service.

To receive tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must meet the requirements for promotion to Professor stated above.

c. Departmental Evaluation Procedures

The Departmental Committee will meet to discuss and deliberate about each candidate being considered for promotion and tenure.
The Chair of the Departmental Committee will call the meeting to evaluate the candidate. Prior to meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with the College and Departmental manuals and read all of the candidate's materials.

Unless otherwise noted in this Manual, the College Manual, or the University Manual, *Robert's Rules of Order Revised* will be followed throughout the deliberations. In this manual, the word “majority” has the meaning used in *Robert’s Rules* and in standard usage, i.e., “more than half of the total votes cast.”

Confidentiality: As indicated in the College Manual, the deliberations of the Committee are strictly confidential. The only information the candidate should receive about the deliberations are the letters sent forward to the Department Chair. No discussion of substantive aspects of the deliberations should be held with any individual who is not part of the formal decision-making process. Because the privacy of e-mail cannot be guaranteed, e-mail correspondences, even between parties who are involved in the process, should not include substantive statements and judgments about individual cases.

d. Specific Evaluation Criteria for Professional Development, Instruction, and Service

The detailed criteria for the evaluation of each of these three areas are explained in sections 4, 5, and 6.
4. Evaluation of Professional Development

a. General Comments on Professional Development

The evaluation of a candidate’s professional development is based primarily on the candidate’s consistent publication of important original scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, books) and secondarily on other scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, book reviews, editing and refereeing work). This section describes the criteria for assigning evaluation terms (i.e., poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding) for a candidate’s professional development.

The Department of Religious Studies recognizes that professional development can take many forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his or her work in books which undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books). The Department judges no one path to be superior to others.

The Department also recognizes that a loose hierarchy of scholarly journals and presses exists within the discipline. As a result, it will seek the opinions of leading scholars in the field of religious studies from outside the University and ask them to rank the quality of journals and presses in the field (including strengths and weaknesses in individual subfields and series, when appropriate). These rankings will contribute to departmental deliberations about the impact and quality of a candidate’s published work, as outlined in section 4.c (below), though such considerations will not replace substantive consideration of the work itself. For a description of the process by which these journals and presses are ranked, see section 10 of this manual.

While the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the central importance of refereed journal articles to the profession, it also acknowledges the significant accomplishment represented by having leading scholars in one’s field invite one to contribute substantive articles and chapters to anthologies, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works. The particular significance of an individual instance of such scholarship can be weighed, in part, by gauging the reputation of the editor(s) of the volume and the quality of the journal or press in which it is published.

The Department of Religious Studies appreciates the increasingly prominent role that on-line publication and other electronic resources play in the production and dissemination of knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are often difficult to apply to these new forms of scholarship. Therefore, if including such materials in their dossiers, candidates should make a case for the quality of the project by briefly outlining its distinctive contribution to disciplinary knowledge and to the candidate’s professional development, providing evidence of peer review, when applicable, and/or by noting citations of the project in other venues.

Obtaining external funding for one's research or creative works is a valued professional development activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in one’s disciplines. At the same time, the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental sub-fields and, furthermore, that grant support is a means to the end of producing scholarship, not an end in itself.

Other scholarly activities, such as making presentations at professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the scholarly work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no one type of activity is mandated for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The Department of Religious Studies resists the idea that qualitative evaluations, such as excellent and very good, can be defined solely by the number of publications or other scholarly activities. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quantity and quality of their professional record.
Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual’s contribution.

b. Procedures for the Evaluation of Professional Development

The Committee will first consider whether any publications or professional development activities presented by the candidate as distinct items are in fact multiple instances of the same item (e.g., the same talk given in two different places). Should this issue be raised by any Committee member, the Committee, after discussion, will vote to determine whether the specific items in question shall be regarded as a single accomplishment or multiple accomplishments. If the vote is tied, the items in question will be treated as multiple accomplishments.

The Committee will then divide the candidate’s professional development materials into two categories, Category A and Category B. Category A items are important original publications of scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, and books). Category B items are other scholarly works significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, reviews, editing and refereeing work). While the departmental committee typically will have comments from the outside reviewers on the nature and quality of all of the items found in Category A, this will be less typical of the items placed in Category B.

Examples of Category A Items
- Articles
- Book Chapters
- Essays in Anthologies
- Book Review Essays
- Critical Encyclopedia Articles
- Critical Introductions to Anthologies
- Books
- Scholarly Monographs

Examples of Category B Items
- Anthologies Edited
- Bibliographical Monographs
- Book Notes
- Book Reviews
- Professional papers presented
- Commentaries on Papers Read at Professional Meetings
- Expository Encyclopedia Articles
- Fellowships, Grants, Honors, and Awards
- Editorial Service to Journal and Book Publishers
- Review of Programs and Candidates at Other Institutions
- Translations of Books and Articles

Note 1: Book review essays are article-length works that contain sustained critical discussion. Book reviews are standard-length reviews of the work of others. Book notes are short reviews of the work or others.

Note 2: In cases of collaborative efforts (e.g., coauthored articles), the candidate must submit a statement indicating the specific share he/she contributed to the item.

Note 3: The above divisions between Category A and Category B accomplishments are intended as a guideline for the Committee and as a starting-point for the discussion. These divisions should not replace the careful consideration of the actual work. For example, certain translations may be of such creative and scholarly significance as to qualify in Category A, while certain critical introductions may by substance and brevity qualify for Category B. If there is any disagreement about whether an item belongs in Category A or Category B, the view of the Committee will be decided, after discussion, by majority vote. If a vote regarding the classification of a work in Category A or Category B is tied, the item will be assigned to Category A.
c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development

The Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item placed in Category A individually.

First, the Committee will consider what the letters of the outside reviewers say, if anything, about the item in question. The Departmental Committee should consider that the letters from outside reviewers may be, at times, both more and less reliable than other appraisals of a candidate's work: more reliable because the reviewer may be a more objective judge and may share an area of specialization with the candidate, but less reliable because the reviewer may lack an understanding of the specific context and conditions in which and for which the material was produced. Therefore, the departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly. After a discussion of the outside reviewers’ comments on each item, each member of the Departmental Committee will announce whether, in his or her view, the reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration to be poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding, or none of the above. (“None of the above” will be selected when the outside reviewers do not address the quality of an item or do so in such a way that an overall assessment of their opinions cannot be made.) The highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee believes that the outside reviewers rank the item at that rank or higher will determine the Outside Reviewers' Ranking of the item.

Second, the Committee will consult the Departmental List of Presses and Journals—compiled over several years based on input from leading scholars from outside Georgia State University (see section 10)—to determine whether the press/journal in which the item appears is less than good, good, very good, excellent or unable to rank. This will determine the Press/Journal Ranking of the item. The fact that a scholarly work appears in a press/journal not on the Departmental List should not be taken to imply anything about its quality. It means nothing more than that the item has no Press/Journal Ranking.

Third, the Committee will establish the Initial Ranking of the item. The Initial Ranking is the higher of the Outside Reviewers’ Ranking and the Press/Journal Ranking. If an item is published in a press or journal not on the departmental list, then the Initial Ranking is the Outside Reviewers’ Ranking. If an item has no Outside Reviewer Ranking but is in a press or journal ranked on the departmental list, then the Initial Ranking is the Press/Journal Ranking. If an item is neither published in a press or journal on the departmental list nor is it discussed by the outside reviewers, then it has no Initial Ranking.

d. Assignment of Final Evaluation Term to an Item in Category A of Professional Development

The Committee shall then consider whether this initial evaluation should be made final. The Chair of the Committee should ask if all members are in agreement that the initial term assigned to the item represents a fair assessment of the accomplishment. If so, the initial evaluation term becomes the final evaluation of the Committee. If not, the Committee will discuss any and all arguments put forth by members of the Committee for lowering or raising the item’s ranking. A motion or motions to change the initial ranking of the item will then be entertained. If such a motion receives the majority support of the Committee members, the final ranking of the item thereby becomes the evaluation term specified in the motion. In the case of a tie, the initial ranking shall stand. All deviations from the initial rankings of an item by the Committee must be clearly explained and justified.

e. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development

The Committee next shall consider all Category B Professional Development accomplishments in the candidate’s dossier. The Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item in Category B individually. While supporting evidence will be sparser here (outside evaluation letters may contain no mention of these items and copies of presented papers are not included in the dossier), the Committee Chair will solicit comments about the scholarly significance of the various Category B accomplishments. Final evaluation terms will not be assigned to every item in Category B, but the candidate’s accomplishments in this area will become part of his or her Professional Development Profile (see section 4.f, below).
f. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Professional Development

With these discussions and votes complete, the Committee will arrive at a Professional Development Profile of the candidate. Such a profile might look something like the following:

**Category A:** 1 Very Good book, 2 Excellent articles, 1 Very Good article, 1 Good book review essay
**Category B:** 4 papers delivered at national conferences, 1 paper delivered at a regional conference, 4 book reviews, 2 book notes, 1 editorial board appointment to a Good journal.

To arrive at a final ranking in Professional Development, the Professional Development Profile will be examined and applied in light of the criteria set forth in the following paragraphs. The words and numbers set forth below are intended as guidelines and are not intended to replace the careful discussion of and deliberation about the individual and collective accomplishments of the candidate.

The phrase “on average” with regard to the quality of scholarly works refers to an averaging of the qualitative rankings for publications established in section 4.d, above. For instance, 3 articles of which one is ranked excellent, one very good, and one good would be “on average” very good. In arriving at such averages, a book will typically weigh three to four times that of any article, but the length and substance of the individual works may impact this ratio, as well as impacting the total number of publications required to earn a specific ranking. In all cases, the number of publications required to earn a particular qualitative ranking decrease as the quality of the candidate’s publications and the number and quality of the candidate’s Category B professional development activities increase.

The final ranking of the Departmental Committee for professional development shall be the highest evaluative term from among outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor such that a majority of the Committee members believes that the candidate deserves that rank or higher. As noted in the College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final ranking will write a dissenting letter. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the final ranking.

All numbers listed below are intended as guidelines, not as minimum or maximum requirements. The scenarios outlined are offered as examples and are not intended to exhaust all possibilities.

**Rankings for Associate Professor (Professional Development)**

As stated in the College manual, promotion to Associate Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be at least excellent in either professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other area.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will be judged outstanding in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is of an extremely rare quality and unquestioned importance. There are many ways for a candidate to provide justification for such a conclusion. A candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (7-8) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a smaller number (5-6) of articles and/or book chapters of on average outstanding quality; or a larger number (over 8) of articles and/or chapters of a mix of excellent and very good quality, or a book and a small number (3-4) of articles and chapters of on average excellent quality; or two or more books of excellent/very good quality. To qualify as outstanding, a candidate also should have been highly active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (5-6) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a larger number (6-7) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a smaller number (4 or so) of articles and/or book
chapters of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a small number (1-2) articles and/or chapters of on average excellent quality; or a book and a few (3-4) articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should have been very active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged very good in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is highly competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (5-6) articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality; or a larger number (7-8) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of an excellent quality; or a book and a small number (1-2) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a book and a few (3-4) articles and/or chapters of on average good quality. To qualify as very good, a candidate also should have performed several additional research roles, such as conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged good in professional development if the committee's general impression is that the candidate's scholarly work is competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a small number (2-4) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality, or a significant number (5-6) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality; or a larger number of articles (more than 6) and/or chapters of on average fair quality; or a book and small number (1-2) of articles of on average good quality. To qualify as good, a candidate also should have performed at least some additional research activities, such as conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The evaluation categories, fair and poor, are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good professional development.

Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Professional Development)

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the area of Professional Development are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

Rankings for Professor (Professional Development)

As stated in the College manual, promotion to professor is available only to those candidates whose professional development is judged as excellent.

A candidate for promotion to Professor will be judged outstanding in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is of rare quality and truly exceptional importance. There are a number of ways for a candidate's work to meet these criteria. A candidate, for example, might have published a significant number of articles and/or chapters (more than 8) of on average excellent quality since the candidate's last promotion; or a smaller number of articles (6-7) of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a significant number (4-5) of articles and chapters of on average excellent quality; or two books of on average excellent quality. To qualify as outstanding, a candidate also will likely have secured extramural funding to support his or her research and should have been highly active in additional research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-7) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality since his or her last promotion; or a larger number (7-8) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or chapters of on average excellent quality; or a book and a larger number (4-5) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality.
average very good quality; or two books of on average very good quality. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also
should have been very active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference
session organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged **very good** in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the
candidate's scholarship is accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number
(6-7) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality since his or her last promotion; or a smaller
number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a larger number (7-8) of articles
and/or chapters of on average good quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or chapters of on
average very good quality; or a book and a larger number (4-5) of articles of on average good quality. To qualify as
very good, a candidate also should have performed several additional research roles, such as conference session
organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged **good** in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's
scholarship is competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-7) of articles
and/or chapters of on average good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average
very good quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality. To
qualify as good, a candidate also should have performed at least one or two additional research activities, such as
conference session organizer or presenter, journal referee, or book reviewer.

The evaluation categories **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed
above for good professional development.

**Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Professional Development)**

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the area of Professional Development are the same as those for
promotion to Professor.
5. Evaluation of Instruction

a. General Comments on Instruction

The Department of Religious Studies regards quality instruction and student learning to be of foremost importance to its mission. Instruction is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such, the Department recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the evaluation of its faculty members. The Department expects its faculty members to be engaged in instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom setting but also in directing individual student work.

Included in the evaluation of Instruction will be written documentation of the following:

1. All courses taught during the last eight semesters of the candidate’s teaching

2. Perceptions of students: including official student evaluation instruments for the last four years taught at Georgia State University

3. Honors or special recognitions for instruction

4. Evidence of instructional service beyond the classroom (e.g., independent studies, practica, honors theses, masters theses, service on dissertation committees, instructional service to other universities)

5. Published materials (e.g., textbooks, published articles, manuals and/or monographs on pedagogy)

6. Evidence of student mastery of material, including student publications, awards, and graduate school admissions

7. Teaching Portfolio. By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the syllabi for all courses taught, (b) all materials given to the students in all courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. By College Policy, the evaluation of instruction is based only on the last eight semesters in which the candidate has taught. These, in turn, are the courses that should be covered in the Teaching Portfolio.

8. Other Materials (some of which might be located in the Teaching Portfolio). This category might include: (a) the development of effective evaluation and assessment methods relative to student performance and the acquisition of knowledge and skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical philosophy); (b) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular materials); (c) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions, syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other examples); (d) the advisement of students on various levels and in various degree programs; (e) guest lectures in classes; and (f) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology.

b. Evaluation Process for Instruction

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's instruction according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor.
The evaluation of instruction is based on five factors: rigor, quality of course content and organization, non-course instruction, evidence of student learning, and student perceptions. For each of these five factors, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate on the following scale: poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent. The Committee’s ranking of a candidate in each of these five areas will be the highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee rank the candidate at that rank or higher.

**Rigor:** Do the candidate’s courses require an appropriate amount of effort of the students? Features of the candidate’s courses such as the nature and amount of reading required of the students and the type of assignments are relevant to this factor. Examples: A course which has only one multiple choice exam would show evidence of poor rigor; an introductory course which required 10 substantive papers might be judged to be too rigorous.

**Quality of Course Content and Organization:** Does the candidate assign appropriate, interesting and high-quality reading materials in his or her courses? How well organized are the courses? Both the organization of the course as a whole and the organization of individual class meetings may be considered. Good course content is demonstrated by features such as syllabi that present materials and assignments in a clear and coherent fashion.

**Non-Course Instruction:** How good is the quality and quantity of the candidate’s non-course instructional efforts? Has the candidate been active and effective in directing honors and masters theses? Has he or she been creative in non-classroom instructional efforts? Teaching publications would be weighed here.

**Evidence of Student Learning:** Is there evidence that students are actually learning from the candidate? Student publications, awards, fellowships, and graduate school admissions for which the candidate played a significant role would be weighed here, as would other measures of student learning.

**Student Perceptions:** What is indicated by the course evaluations completed by students? Numerical and written student evaluations will be important here. The committee should be mindful that the student evaluation averages mentioned in section 5.c (below) are given as approximate, general guidelines rather than to reify any particular number. The evaluation of student perceptions begins with the calculation of an average or base number. In calculating the base number one considers only the courses that were taught by the candidate over his or her last four years of teaching at Georgia State University. (For candidates with probationary credit from other institutions, student scores from other institutions will not be included.) To calculate the base number, the Committee will take the average of: (i) a candidate's average score on Question 17 of the student evaluation form for all applicable courses, and (ii) a candidate's average score on Questions 1-16 of the student evaluation form for all applicable courses. Cross-listed courses are to be treated as if they were one course. The base number will then be discussed by the Committee and adjusted, as deemed appropriate by Committee majority vote, based on the written comments of students, the level and type of courses taught by the candidate during the eight-semester period, trends such as marked increases or decreases in scores over the eight-semester period, and any other evidence of student perceptions.

c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Instruction

After the completion of discussion, the Departmental Committee shall vote on a final ranking for the candidate in the area of instruction using the guidelines set forth in the following paragraphs. The final ranking of the Departmental Committee for instruction shall be the highest evaluative term from among outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor such that a majority of the Committee members believes that the candidate deserves that rank or higher. As specified in the College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final ranking of the committee will write a dissenting letter. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the final ranking. The following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.
**Rankings for Associate Professor (Instruction)**

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will be judged to be outstanding in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is, on balance, truly exceptional—of the sort evidenced in only a few instances in the College. The candidate typically will be ranked as excellent in all five categories outlined above. The student evaluation scores might suggest extraordinary performance in the classroom (the base number is high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented will show exceptional preparation; a high degree of knowledge of the subject matter will be indicated; the candidate will demonstrate a very high level of involvement in mentoring students with accompanying impressive accomplishments by his or her advisees; and/or the candidate may have published a textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or received one or more significant teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be excellent in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly accomplished. The candidate should be ranked as excellent in at least three of the five categories listed above and no less than very good in any one. The student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the base number is mid- to high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented will show impressive preparation; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be very good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly competent. The candidate should be ranked as at least very good in three of the categories and no less than good in any one. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the base number is mid-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation; a better-than-average degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is competent. The candidate will be ranked as at least good in most of the five categories outlined above. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low-4 to high-3 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show merely acceptable preparation; a competent degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

**Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Instruction)**

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the Instructional area are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

**Rankings for Professor (Instruction)**

Candidates for the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of involvement and accomplishment required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in the Instructional area are expected to surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor.

A candidate for promotion to Professor will be judged to be outstanding in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is, on balance, truly exceptional—of the sort evidenced in only a few instances in the College. The candidate typically will be ranked as excellent in all
five of the categories. The student evaluation scores suggest extraordinary performance in the classroom (the base number is in the high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show exceptional preparation and continued refinement and improvement of course content; a great breath and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated by exceptional efforts to improve the department's curriculum might be manifested; the candidate might demonstrate an especially high level of involvement in mentoring students (completion of advanced degrees, conference participation, publications, career development, etc.); the candidate might have developed innovative teaching instruments and/or methods (such as the use of new technologies or creative approaches in the classroom); and/or the candidate may have published an exceptional textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or received one or more significant teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be excellent in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is superb. The candidate should be ranked as excellent in at least four of the five categories described above, and no less than very good in the other. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the mid- to high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show impressive preparation and a continuing devotion to improving and updating course content and syllabi, as well as overall curricular reform; the candidate might participate in college, university-wide, or national committees that focus on instructional improvements and issues; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be very good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly effective. The candidate should be ranked as very good or higher in at least four of the categories and no less than good in any one. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low to mid-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation and ongoing improvement and refinement; a better-than-average breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is competent. The candidate should be ranked as at least good in four of the five categories outlined above and no less than fair in any one. The student evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low-4 to high-3 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation and updated syllabi; some level of participation in curricular reform might be manifested; a moderate breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Instruction)

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the Instructional area are the same as those for promotion to Professor.
6. Evaluation of Service

a. General Comments on Service

The Department of Religious Studies is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the university, local, and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international professional organizations. Only those service activities which are related to the candidate's area of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of his or her service. While the expectations for the amount and quality of service work will be higher for those seeking promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, collegiality, in the broadest sense, is a necessary and highly valued quality sought in all candidates seeking promotion and tenure in the Department of Religious Studies.

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service. For promotion to the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least very good in service.

Appropriate service activities are listed below. Complete descriptions for any service category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when appropriate. Possible examples of each category of service are provided below.

1. Contributions to the Department: Chairing departmental committees, memberships on committees, development of programs and activities, participation in major department sponsored activities, holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

2. Contributions to the College, University, or University System: Committees served on or chaired at the College or University level, serving on the University Senate, holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

3. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: Consultantships, memberships on advisory boards, offices held.

4. Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues, collaborations with other University departments and programs.

5. Significant Discipline-Related Community Service: Community lectures, speeches, presentations, short courses, hosting conferences.

6. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies; major service awards that are discipline related.

The service category “Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations” refers to services to professional organizations (e.g., treasurer of a learned society, coordinating logistics of conferences) which do not rely predominantly on the scholarly expertise of the candidate. Professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, etc.), on the other hand, would be counted in Category B of Professional Development. A largely expository, introductory lecture to a church group would be counted under Service. A lecture on substantive and novel scholarly ideas presented in an academic setting would be counted in Category B of Professional Development. Should there be disagreement about the classification of an item, the view of the Committee will be decided by majority vote. No item may count in more than one category.

b. Evaluation Process for Service
The evaluation of service is based on two factors: *quality* of service work performed and *quantity* of the service work performed.

After a thorough discussion of the items listed in the candidate’s dossier under service and using the guidelines set forth below, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate on the following scale: poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent. The Committee’s ranking of a candidate in each of the two areas outlined below will be the highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee ranks the candidate at that rank or higher.

1. **Quality of Service Work Performed:** Can the candidate be relied upon to perform assigned tasks in a timely and competent fashion? Does he or she attend scheduled meetings? Does he or she provide good leadership and results when chairing a committee? Has he or she made substantive service contributions? Does the candidate work well with colleagues? Does he or she avoid unnecessary conflict?

A candidate ranked *excellent* for Quality of Service will merit unconditionally positive answers to each of these six questions. A candidate ranked *very good* for Quality of Service will receive strongly positive responses to most of the six questions. A candidate ranked *good* for Quality of Service will receive more positive responses than negative responses to these questions. A candidate ranked *fair* for Quality of Service will receive an equal number of positive and negative responses. A candidate ranked *poor* for Quality of Service will receive more negative than positive responses number of responses to these six questions.

2. **Quantity of Service Work Performed:** Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with the fair distribution of responsibilities in the Department? Does he or she consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles at the College and/or University levels? Does the candidate recognize a range of service responsibilities—not merely to the Department but to colleagues and the profession? Does the candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

A candidate ranked *excellent* for Quantity of Service will merit unconditionally positive answers to each of these six questions. A candidate ranked *very good* for Quantity of Service will receive strongly positive responses to most of the six questions. A candidate ranked *good* for Quantity of Service will receive more positive responses than negative responses to these questions. A candidate ranked *fair* for Quantity of Service will receive an equal number of positive and negative responses. A candidate ranked *poor* for Quantity of Service will receive more negative than positive responses to these six questions.

c. **Arriving at a Final Ranking in Service**

Based on the evidence submitted and the rankings with regard to the Quality and Quantity of the candidate’s service work (see section 6.b, above), the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's service according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor. As noted in the College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the Final Ranking will write a dissenting letter. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the Final Ranking. The following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.

*Ranking for Associate Professor (Service)*

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor who is judged as *outstanding* in service should be rated as excellent in both Quality and Quantity of service. Such a candidate will have performed major and time-consuming service responsibilities above and beyond those required to be judged excellent in service. The candidate may have
served as an officer or board member of a state, regional, or national professional association, and will have served effectively on a significant number of departmental, college, university, community or governmental committees, boards, or agencies. Such a candidate will consistently make major, positive contributions in his or her service roles.

A candidate who is judged as excellent in service should be rated as excellent in either Quality or Quantity of Service and at least very good in the other. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will serve effectively on major departmental committees, may serve on college, university, or professional committees, may be active in offering public lectures, and will consistently make highly valued contributions in these various service areas.

A candidate who is judged as very good in service should be rated as at least very good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will perform assigned departmental service tasks effectively, may serve on a college, university, or university system committees or may show significant service to community governmental, or professional organizations, and may offer some public lectures. The value of his or her service contributions will consistently be strong.

A candidate who is judged as good in service should be rated as at least good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be active in assistance to colleagues and effectively perform departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him or her. The service contributions made by such a candidate will be positive.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

In cases in which the rankings assigned to the candidate in Quality and Quantity of service do not coincide, the overall ranking shall be the average of the two qualitative terms assigned (i.e., a candidate assigned an excellent in Quality and a good in Quantity would be ranked very good overall.) In cases in which the averaging results in the exact mid-point between two qualitative terms, a majority vote of the committee shall determine which of those two terms shall be the final ranking of the committee.

Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Service)

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the area of Service are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

Ranking for Professor (Service)

A candidate for promotion to Professor who is judged as outstanding in service should be ranked as excellent in both Quality and Quantity of service. Such a candidate will have performed major and time-consuming service responsibilities above and beyond those required to be judged for excellent in service; regularly served as an officer or board member of a state, regional, or national professional association; and served effectively on a significant number of departmental, college, university, community or governmental committees, boards, or agencies. Such candidate will consistently make major, positive contributions in his or her service roles.

A candidate who is judged as excellent in service should be rated as excellent in either Quality or Quantity of Service and at least very good in the other. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues; will serve effectively on major departmental committees, often assuming a leadership role; will serve on a number of college, university, or professional committees; will show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations; and will consistently make highly valued contributions in these various service areas.

A candidate who is judged as very good in service should be rated as at least very good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues; will perform assigned
departmental service tasks effectively, at times assuming a leadership role; will serve on a college, university, or university system committees; and will show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations. The value of his or her service contributions will consistently be of high quality.

A candidate who is judged as **good** in service should be rated as at least good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be active in assistance to colleagues and effectively perform departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him or her. He or she may have served on some college, university, or professional committees. The service contributions made by such a candidate will be positive.

The evaluation categories of **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

In cases in which the rankings assigned to the candidate in Quality and Quantity of service do not coincide, the overall ranking shall be the average of the two qualitative terms assigned (i.e., a candidate assigned an excellent in Quality and a good in Quantity would be ranked very good overall.) In cases in which the averaging results in the exact mid-point between two qualitative terms, a majority vote of the committee shall determine which of those two terms shall be the final ranking of the committee.

*Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Service)*

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the area of Service are the same as those for promotion to Professor.
7. The Overall Promotion and Tenure Recommendation

The Departmental Committee will determine the Committee’s recommendation regarding promotion and tenure based on the previously outlined procedures for determining rankings in the area of professional development, instruction, and service.

Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor who are ranked as at least excellent in professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other, and who are ranked as at least good in service will be recommended for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Otherwise, the Committee will recommend that the candidate not be promoted and not be tenured.

Candidates for the rank of Professor who are ranked as at least excellent in professional development, at least excellent in instruction, and at least very good in service will be recommended for promotion to professor. Otherwise, the Committee will recommend that the candidate not be promoted.
8. Post-Evaluation Procedures

The Chair of the Departmental Committee will write a letter to the Department Chair expressing the Committee’s recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. Every member of the Committee will sign this letter or write and sign a dissenting letter. These letters must be in the format specified in the College Manual and must protect the anonymity of the outside evaluators.

The letter or letters of the Committee members will be given to the candidate at least five business days before they are due to the Department Chair. At least three days before the letters are due to the Department Chair, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Committee is not obligated to make any changes. The final versions of the letter(s) of the Committee members will be given to the Department Chair no later than the date specified in the College Manual. At the same time, copies of the final versions of the letters will be given to the candidate.

The Department Chair will review the Committee’s letter and conduct an independent review of the candidate’s qualifications in professional development, instruction, and service. In conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria specified in this Manual. The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee expressing his or her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. The Department Chair’s letter will be given to the candidate at least five business days before it is due to the Office of the Dean. At least three days before the letters are due to the Office of the Dean, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Department Chair is not obligated to make any changes.

The Committee’s letter(s), the Department Chair’s letter, and the candidate’s dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date specified by the College. At that time, a copy of the Department Chair’s letter will be given to the candidate.

The remainder of the promotion and tenure process is described in the College and University manuals.
9. Third-Year Promotion and Tenure Review

The Department of Religious Studies reviews all tenure-track faculty members during their third year of employment. Faculty members who come to Georgia State with one year of credit from a previous institution go through a third-year review in their second year at Georgia State University. Faculty members who come to Georgia State with two years of credit go through a third-year review in their first year at Georgia State. Faculty members who come to Georgia State with three years of credit do not go through a third-year review.

The purpose of this review, which considers the faculty member's effectiveness in professional development, instruction, and service, is to ensure that faculty members have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

While the faculty member under third-year review should be familiar with the Department Manual and use the manual as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. While extremely important, the third-year review is more informal; it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Department Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Department Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, he or she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure.

Process

By January 1 the Department Chair will ask third-year faculty in writing to prepare and submit, by March 1, a dossier for third-year promotion and tenure review. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier (including such materials as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications, and evidence of teaching effectiveness) and containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas of professional development, instruction, and service.

The Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will review the dossier. After due deliberations, Committee members will jointly prepare a summary report on the dossier that includes an evaluation of how well the candidate is progressing towards promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will hold a conference to inform the faculty member of how well he or she is progressing towards promotion and tenure. The Department Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of the Committee's written evaluation and a copy of the Department Chair's own independent report.

The Chair will forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and a member of the Dean’s Office will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
10. The Ranking of Journals and Presses

In order to assist both candidates who are preparing to come up for promotion and/or tenure (and who are deciding where they might seek to publish their work) and the Departmental Committee members who are evaluating the scholarly work of candidates, the Department of Religious Studies will maintain a list of rankings of the quality of major journals and presses in the field.

The Department Chair will circulate the list on a regular basis and solicit additions or deletions to the listed journals and presses from the departmental faculty. Any faculty member may request that an unranked journal or press be ranked, and this request will be honored. In order to allow adequate time for feedback from evaluators, such requests must be made at least 90 days before the beginning of the review cycle in which the journal/press ranking will be needed. Potential candidates for promotion and/or tenure are particularly encouraged to request ranking for all journals and presses in which they might plausibly publish.

The Department Chair will then solicit judgments about the quality of the journals and presses from leading scholars in the field who are not affiliated with Georgia State University. All tenured and tenure-track members of the department may nominate scholars to rank the journals and presses. Scholars will be asked to rank listed journals and presses on the following scale:

*Excellent*: the journal or press publishes consistently exemplary work in the field
*Very Good*: the journal or press publishes highly regarded work in the field
*Good*: the journal or press publishes valuable work in the field
*Less than Good*: the journal or press publishes work which is below the quality normal to the field
*Unable to Rank*: the quality of the journal or press is unknown

The Chair will request that contacted scholars not rank journals or presses on which they have major editorial or professional roles.

Every five years the Department will consider whether it is necessary to re-rank all the journals and presses. This issue will be decided by majority vote.
Appendix B4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Hire date</th>
<th>Entry rank</th>
<th>Current rank</th>
<th>Tenure status</th>
<th>Full/PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Renick</td>
<td>9/15/1986</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Herman</td>
<td>9/9/1996</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn McClymond</td>
<td>Aug-99</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis A. Ruprecht</td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Currently under review</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Lloyd</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareeha Khan</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bell</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Daley-Bailey</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B5: N/A

Appendix C1: Religious Studies Program Goals and Objectives 2003 from “Department of Philosophy Self-Study for Academic Program Review”

Note: in 2003 the Religious Studies program was housed within the Department of Philosophy, so its review is included in the Department of Philosophy Self-Study

B2. Religious Studies Goals and Objectives

I. Teaching

Goal: To successfully respond to the exceptional growth in student interest in Religious Studies at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Importance of goal: Religious Studies is an emerging field nationally. Moreover, with its central emphasis on the study of comparative cultures, Religious Studies particularly well fits the interests of Georgia State’s diverse student body. It also successfully addresses the University’s strategic goals to increase the ability of students to understand and deal with diverse cultures and to promote interdisciplinary approaches to the study of world problems. Finally, in both its established ability to hire first-rate teacher/scholars who contribute in multiple ways to University undertakings and its amazing track-record in placing its students in top graduate programs, the Religious Studies Program has shown that it has the ability to make excellent use of the resources with which it is provided.

Objective 1: Begin to address the curricular needs of a growing number of Religious Studies majors and other interested undergraduate students by adding two new junior tenure-track lines in Religious Studies and by filling the William Suttles Chair in Religious Studies in the next five years.

Rationale: With all but two courses in Religious Studies filled one week before the beginning of classes (Spring 2003), upper-level course enrollments often in excess of 40, and unmet demand for Perspectives 2001 offerings regularly topping 150, the needs of undergraduate students are not being well served at present. The success of the Program in placing its students in top graduate programs came in
part through the close mentoring of majors and the direction of them in projects like Honors theses. (One graduate just finished his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago and published an article in the _Journal of the American Academy of Religion_ based on a paper he first wrote as an Honors student at Georgia State). These undertakings have become increasingly difficult for the faculty to sustain with the exponential growth in majors and enrollments. In addition, there are important areas in the field of religion that simply cannot be covered by the four tenure-track lines currently held by the Program. To compare Georgia State with schools with comparably sized student bodies, the University of Tennessee’s religion program has 18 faculty members; Florida’s 14; the University of Georgia’s, UNC-Wilmington’s, and Florida State’s have 12 each; UT-Chattanooga’s 11; and Florida International’s has 9. Significantly, Georgia State, with four faculty members, has many more declared Religious Studies majors than any of these programs. (Georgia State has 81 majors; the University of Florida and Florida State are next highest with around 60 majors each; Florida International has 14 majors. See chart below.)

Resources/Implementation: Add two new junior tenure-track lines in Religious Studies and fill the William Suttles Senior Chair in Religious Studies during the next five years. As evidenced by the fact that current Religious Studies faculty members graduated from schools like Princeton and Harvard, the talent pool in the field is deep. The Program would seek to hire scholars who have the ability both to teach lower-level Perspectives and introductory courses in comparative religion and to add an area of expertise (e.g., American religions, Native American traditions, Biblical studies) currently underrepresented in the upper-level offerings. With the right appointments, the Program can also deepen its existing strengths in contemporary religious thought and approaches to the comparative study of religion. The Program also seeks to enhance the gender and racial diversity of its faculty in ways consistent with the College Affirmative Action policy. Monies for the William Suttles endowed chair in Religious Studies are currently sizable but need to grow further before a senior hire can be made.

**Chart 3. Religious Studies Majors/Faculty at Comparably-Sized Universities in the Southeast**

![Chart showing religious studies majors and faculty at comparably sized universities in the Southeast.](chart)


Objective 2: To address the needs of Religious Studies-track Masters students, especially those who wish to go on to Ph.D. studies, by establishing a M.A. degree in Religious Studies with a strong interdisciplinary component.

Rationale: Thus far, the Program has had greater success in placing its undergraduate majors in top graduate, even Ph.D., programs than it has its Religious Studies Masters track students. The reasons seem to be three-fold: (a) the disadvantage faced by students applying to Ph.D. programs in Religious
Studies with an M.A. in Philosophy (a problem not faced by our undergraduates, who graduate with a
B.A. in Religious Studies); (b) the large size of 4000/6000-level offerings and the inability of over-taxed
faculty to offer 8000-level Masters-only courses on a regular basis; and (c) the handicap in recruiting top
Religious Studies graduate students into our program due to our inability to offer them a true M.A. in
Religious Studies. By establishing a formal M.A. in Religious Studies and by adding at least two tenure-
track lines, the Religious Studies Program will be able both to attract stronger M.A. candidates and to
provide a richer and more rigorous educational experience for them. The presence of these M.A.
students, in turn, will help alleviate some of the pressures on undergraduate instruction discussed above.

**Resources/Implementation:** Meeting this objective require no new funds beyond those requested
in Religious Studies Teaching Objective 1 above. A proposal for an M.A. in Religious Studies can be
submitted to the Board of Regents in the next 12 months. One of the strengths of the B.A. program in
Religious Studies is its strong interdisciplinary component. Students can take designated courses in
Sociology, History, Political Science, Africa-American Studies, Women’s Studies, Anthropology, and Art
History and apply them to their undergraduate Religious Studies major. A similar strategy will be
employed for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Building on the Religious Studies faculty’s strength in
comparative religions, the degree program can utilize connections already established with faculty
members in the above departments to build strengths in such areas as Islam, Asian religions, Judaism,
Christian history, approaches to the comparative study of religion, and ethics.

Objective 3: To hire staff in accordance with the plan set forth in Philosophy Teaching Objective 3
(above).

**Rationale/Resources:** See comments under Philosophy Teaching Objective 3 (above). Even with
a separate department, Religious Studies would continue to share staff and office space with Philosophy.
This joint request for increased staffing is to address current deficiencies and staffing. Creating distinct
Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies would not create any additional staffing needs.

**II. Creative and Scholarly Activity**

**Goal:** To establish the program as one of the premiere small Religious Studies programs in the
Southeast.

Objective 1: Create an environment in which a young and talented faculty can reach their research
potential.

**Rationale:** Religious Studies faculty members already have distinguished themselves. Faculty
members have published books with presses like SUNY and Westminster/John Knox, written dozens of
articles, presented research at international conferences, served on the review boards of journals, and held
office in national professional organizations. But the large instructional demands place constraints on the
research agendas of our Religious Studies faculty. Among the Religious Studies faculty are scholars who
conduct their primary research in Egypt and India, for example, but for them to gain release time to
conduct field work places yet greater strain on the slim instructional resources of the Program.

Additional tenure-track lines thus will serve to strengthen not merely the instructional component
of the Program but will also allow the faculty members to reach their research potential. This will come
not only through giving them the freedom to pursue external grants for release time without feeling they
are handicapping the instructional efforts of the Program but also through creating a richer environment
of peer scholars with whom to share ideas and collaborate.

By funding research-productive faculty members to the level of 10% of salary during the
summer, we will enable them to conduct the research and, oftentimes, international fieldwork expected of
scholars of Religious Studies.

**Resources/Implementation:** Same as Religious Studies Teaching Objective 1. In addition, it is
crucial that summer research monies be restored for research-productive faculty to the level of 10% (see
the details under Philosophy Objective II.2).
Objective 2: Establish a separate Department of Religious Studies.

**Rationale:** Crucial to efforts to provide an environment in which both students and faculty members can maximize their scholarly potential is the creation of a separate Department of Religious Studies. As it stands, students who have attended Georgia State for years often are surprised to learn that the University has Religious Studies courses, since the program is “buried” in the Philosophy Department and hence does not appear as a separate entity on the University website, the University phone directory, and so forth. (In fact the Sociology Department continues to receive much of the mail directed to “Religious Studies, Georgia State University.”) A separate department would not only provide far greater visibility on campus but would afford the faculty members, who are often assumed to be “philosophers” by insiders and outsiders alike, greater professional identity within their chosen field. This is particularly important given the fact that the Religious Studies faculty is young and many of its members are trying to establish themselves professionally. Imagine trying to convince conference organizers or grant selection committees in the field of sociology that, despite the fact that your CV says that you are a member of a Department of Psychology, you are a trained sociologist. This is an obstacle that scholars fresh out of graduate school should not have to overcome, but it is exactly what we ask of our Religious Studies faculty.

A separate Department of Religious Studies would also serve the interests of the students, both undergraduate and graduate. First, its enhanced visibility would make it far easier for interested students to discover the program. Second, it would afford students the advantage of applying to seminary or graduate school in religion from within a department in the field. Third, and most importantly, it would finally attach the appropriate label to the work being done by the Religious Studies faculty and students; the courses taught in Religious Studies simply are not Philosophy courses (despite the fact that all of the graduate-level courses currently have a misleading PHIL prefix) and students graduating from the Program are not philosophers—any more than students graduating from a psychology program are sociologists or political scientists.

**Resources/Implementation:** If organized to build upon and maintain the current administrative relationship with Philosophy, the development of a separate Department of Religious Studies could be established without additional staff or administrative costs other than the monies needed to establish a departmental chair.

Objective 3: To provide contiguous office space for Religious Studies faculty members.

**Rationale:** Adequate office space is a problem for the Department as a whole. Ideally, Religious Studies faculty will be housed in proximity to one another to promote support, dialogue, and collaborative efforts.

**Resources/Implementation:** This is not a proposal for new and distinct space for Religious Studies apart from Philosophy. The proposed creation of a Department of Religious Studies does not necessitate or entail physical separation from the Department of Philosophy and the currently shared quarters on the fourth and fifth floors of the Art and Humanities Building. The need for contiguous space applies whether or not separate departments are established.

### III. Service

**Goal:** To continue and extend the Religious Studies program’s fine record of service to the College and University.

Objective: Broaden and more evenly distribute the already sizable service contributions that Religious Studies faculty members make to the College and University.

**Rationale:** The faculty members of the Religious Studies Program already have made significant service contributions. Three of the four have major service roles within the Department: Director of Religious Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies (Religious Studies), and Director of Graduate
Studies (Religious Studies). Religious studies faculty members have been key organizers of the new College-wide programs in Jewish Studies and Asian Studies, have served on the College Executive Committee, the College Graduate Council, the College Curriculum Committee (chair), the Committee for Teaching and Learning, the University Senate, the University Graduate Council (chair), APACE, the Student Life Committee, the Cultural Diversity Committee, and the Animal Use and Care Committee (vice chair). Three of the four have held office in professional organizations and/or served as chairs of AAR groups. Most have served critically (and repeatedly) on search committees in Religious Studies. One was required to write the proposal for the B.A. degree in Religious Studies as an untenured, junior faculty member.

The fact of the matter is that, until two years ago, only a single faculty member was tenured. Thus, the service load for the entire Program has most often fallen on the shoulders of one or two individuals. As the junior faculty members are nurtured and hopefully earn tenure, the service load can be more evenly distributed. Additional appointments will assist in this area, as well.

Resources/Implementation: See Religious Studies Teaching Objective 1. In addition, resources are needed for course reductions and release time for faculty members who, due to the needs of a new and exponentially growing program, have unusually large service demands placed upon them.

Appendix D1: Learning Outcome Statements and Assessment Plans

Assessment Plan for the B.A. in Religious Studies

For undergraduate students, the assessment guidelines have been revised each year since 2005 in response to feedback. Currently, undergraduate students are assessed according to the following guidelines.

I. Assessment Procedures
   A. Outcomes Assessed

Students receiving a B.A. in Religious Studies are assessed for a series of specific intellectual and technical outcomes, in accord with the Policy on Learning Goals articulated by the Department of Religious Studies. The outcomes can be summarized as follows:

- General knowledge of the great historical religious traditions
- Detailed knowledge of specific religious traditions
- Familiarity with the thought of major religious thinkers
- Familiarity with the thought of major theorists in the study of religion
- Knowledge of critical theories in the study of religion
- Knowledge of basic scholarly categories in religious studies
- Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to specific themes
- Knowledge of the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture
- Knowledge of the ways that people in different cultures develop and apply religious resources
- Ability to read critically and with comprehension
- Ability to think critically and write persuasively
- Ability to apply principles of logic to the religious studies discourse
- Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies

B. Elements of Assessment
Students receiving a B.A. in Religious Studies are assessed through evaluative and narrative methods adapted from the Assessment Plan articulated by the Department of Religious Studies. The elements of this process can be summarized as follows:
- Each graduating senior is identified, and a research paper from an upper-level Department course is solicited from one of their current professors. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee with regard to the intellectual content and technical skills. The Assessment Committee consists of three tenure-track faculty members.
- Each student is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent is asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies major with regard to specific learning outcomes, to identify strengths of the program, and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

Assessment Plan for the M.A. in Religious Studies
For masters students, the assessment guidelines have been revised each year in response to feedback. Currently, masters students are assessed according to the following guidelines.

Assessment Method: Masters thesis, anonymous student questionnaire

A. Data Collection
1) The Masters thesis is the capstone project for all Religious Studies M.A. students. As the culmination of each student’s scholarly studies, each masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members are asked to review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns the masters thesis a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on each of four criteria related to mastery of content knowledge and mastery of skills appropriate to the academic study of religion. This evaluation is recorded on the M.A. Thesis Assessment form (Appendix C) and given to the Graduate Director, who provides them annually to the Assessment Coordinator at the end of the Spring semester. (The assigned letter grades are used for program assessment purposes only.)

2) Beginning with Fall ’08 graduates, as masters students complete their program, they will be asked to complete a questionnaire developed around the Departmental Objectives for Religious Studies M.A. students (see below). The Assessment Coordinator will review and compile the responses to this questionnaire. Each spring, the graduate committee will meet to review the survey responses and their grades and discuss whether the M.A. students are meeting the learning outcomes.

B. Elements of Assessment
Per the Religious Studies Masters degree proposal, the Department anticipates that Graduates of the Masters in Religious Studies program will have knowledge in six main areas:
1. history of religions (including general familiarity with at least four religious traditions and deeper knowledge of two traditions)
2. theories of religion (including general knowledge of at least three theorists/thinkers)
3. methodological approaches to religion (including an understanding of at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion)
4. concepts (including a grasp of major terms and concepts in the field)
5. the comparative study of religion (including knowledge of more than one religion on at least one comparative theme)
6. religious experience and practice (including general knowledge of the role religion plays in both elite and popular culture and the variety of ways people experience religion)

Graduates of the Masters in Religious Studies will acquire skills in three main areas:
1. the ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension;
2. the ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies;
3. the ability to construct clearly written arguments and commentary;

Faculty members have been assessing student work at the completion of the thesis defense for several years, although the questionnaire has been revised to encourage more specific feedback from the faculty members that addresses the six main areas of knowledge that students should develop while in the program (See Graduate Assessment Form below).

The masters student questionnaire is a new assessment instrument, which we are just beginning to administer beginning Fall ’08, so there is no data from that assessment available yet.

(The current Assessment Reports for both the B.A. and the M.A. degrees are available through WEAVEOnline.)
Graduate Assessment Form (rev. 10/08)

Date: ______________________________________________________________

Faculty member's name: _______________________________________________

Student's name: ______________________________________________________

For the purposes of graduate program assessment ONLY, please assign a letter grade (A-F) indicating the student's level of achievement in the following categories. If possible, also provide a brief comment on the student’s strengths and/or weaknesses in each category. This assessment should be based on the student's work as evidenced in the written thesis and in the oral thesis defense. Again, these grades and comments will be used for general graduate program assessment purposes ONLY, not for the individual student's evaluation.

*Please make sure that your comments address the departmental objectives for graduate students, as outlined on the back of this sheet.*

1) How well did the student demonstrate general familiarity with the tradition(s) she studies? _____ Comments:

2) How well did the student demonstrate familiarity with significant theories of religion, including key terms and concepts? ______ Comments:

3) How well did the student demonstrate familiarity with and the ability to apply different methodological approaches to the study of religion? _____ Comments:

4) How well did the student demonstrate mastery of critical reading, thinking, and writing skills necessary for the scholarly study of religion? _____ Comments:

*Please return this form to the Graduate Director*
Appendix D2: Current Course Syllabi for all approved Writing Intensive Courses

Virtually every 3000, 4000, 6000, and 8000 level course in Religious Studies is “writing intensive.” However, for the purposes of this Self-study we are including syllabi for 1) our new CTW courses, and 2) courses that have been approved as Writing Across the Curriculum courses

I. CTW COURSE SYLLABI

Religious Studies 3750                  Georgia State University                                    Spring 2007

Introduction to Methods and Theories
In the Study of Religion

Instructor:    Jonathan R. Herman
               Department of Religious Studies
               1110 One Park Tower   651-0714
               E-mail: jherman2@gsu.edu
               Office Hours: TTh 12:45-2:15, and by appointment

Course Description:
The purpose of this seminar is to introduce students to some of the principal theorists in the academic study of religion. As we examine various psychological, anthropological, sociological, phenomenological, theological, dialogical, and feminist approaches to the subject, it is hoped that students will begin to reflect critically on precisely what “religion” is and how it can be most appropriately conceptualized and studied. There are no prerequisites for this course.

CTW Designation:
This course is a designated Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) course and a required course for Religious Studies majors. While everyone is welcome, students who decide to take this course must be committed to developing critical thinking and writing skills. Students will be required to do a number of focused in-class writing assignments, exercises on understanding and evaluating evidence and a research essay that develops longer arguments.

Course Requirements:
Each student's grade will be based on:
1. Active and well-prepared class participation. All reading assignments should be completed before the class during which they will be discussed. (10%)
2. 10 in-class short critical thinking and writing assignments. To do these assignments well you will need to complete your reading on time (20%)
3. Two short (4-5 double-spaced typed pages) thesis papers that develop the writing and critical thinking you’ve done in class. The first is due no later than February 21 and the second no later April 18. You also will be required to revise one of these papers using feedback from your peers. (Each paper counts for 20%)
4. A final paper (10-12 pages) due on May 4 (30%). This final paper can be a revision and expansion of an earlier paper in this course.
**Required Texts:**


*** Note: The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary.
IMPORTANT INFORMATION ON THE SUBJECT MATTER AND COURSE:

• The Academic Study of Religion is currently a “work in progress.”
  Questions about the nature of religion, the characteristics that define specific religions, and
  the methods for studying religious phenomena are all subjects of much discussion and
  debate among scholars within the academic study of religion. It is necessary for those
  wishing to study theory and method in the study of religion to become familiar with both
  the historical development of the discourse and the contemporary contributions to that
  discourse.

• Assigned materials will include scholarly sources, but very few “textbooks.”
  The course will not employ any convenient reference book that categorically defines
  religion, articulates its types, or puts forth a single method for studying it with certainty.
  Such textbooks and web-sites do exist, but it is unlikely that they present the subject in a
  way that does justice to modern scholarly developments and the complexity of the subject
  itself. The assigned materials are mainly written by scholars to an audience of scholars;
  they will seldom try to reduce things to tidy definitions or categories.

• It will be common for authors of the assigned materials to disagree with one another.
  Students would be well-served to remember that any scholarship they read on theory and
  method in the study of religion presents an author’s scholarly hypothesis, not a settled
  “fact” about the subject, and to anticipate that such a hypothesis may be challenged by
  other scholars. How, then, is the student to determine which position is “right?” The same
  way scholars do. By evaluating the positions by the strength of their arguments, the extent
  of their evidence presented, and how well they are corroborated by the student’s own
  knowledge of the subject and observations of religious phenomena. In other words, this is a
  course in which it is necessary for the student to begin to develop his or her own scholarly
  voice.

• The course will be conducted as a seminar.
  Much of the actual learning in this course will take place not only in the reading, but also in
  the class discussion, which is the primary vehicle for students to develop and express their
  own emerging scholarly positions. The purpose of the discussion is for students not to
  demonstrate that they completed or understood the reading, but to participate in the
  scholarly conversations with which they are becoming familiar. The classroom
  environment is a safe one, in that students are encouraged to bring to the table any positions
  that they are considering or would like to have considered. However, students are also
  accountable for those positions, and they should be prepared to explain them or present
  evidence for them.

• The writing component is intended to expand the discourse that has developed in class.
  By the time students write about a particular text or group of texts, they will be familiar
  with the material itself and will have listened to and participated in extensive scholarly
  conversation on the topic. It is expected that the critical, scholarly approach encouraged in
  the class discussions will be brought to bear on students’ written work.

IMPORTANT DATES TO REMEMBER:

February 13: First paper due
March 15: Second paper due
April 12: Third paper due
May 3: Fourth paper due

COURSE SCHEDULE:

Tuesday, January 9: Introduction to the Course

**PART ONE: THE STUDY OF RELIGION**

Thursday, January 11: Paden, 1-47.

Tuesday, January 16: Paden, 48-109.


**PART TWO: THE “SACRED” AS A PHENOMENOLOGICAL CATEGORY**

Tuesday January 23: Eliade, 8-67.


Tuesday, January 30: Eliade, 116-213.

**PART THREE: THE DECONSTRUCTION OF “RELIGION”**

Thursday, February 1: W. C. Smith, 1-79.

Tuesday, February 6: W. C. Smith, 80-153.


**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13: PAPER #1 DUE**

**PART FOUR: FEMINISM AND THE STUDY OF RELIGION**

Thursday, February 15: Gross, 1-64.

Tuesday, February 20: Gross, 65-148.

Thursday, February 22: Gross, 149-197
PART FIVE: INTERFAITH DIALOGUE AS METHOD

Tuesday, February 27: Eck, 1-80

Thursday, March 1: Eck, 81-165

MARCH 5-9 – MID-SEMESTER VACATION: NO CLASSES
Tuesday, March 13: Eck, 166-231.

THURSDAY, MARCH 15: PAPER #2 DUE

PART SIX: HISTORY AND CONTEXT

Tuesday, March 20: J. Z. Smith 1-35.


Tuesday, March 27: J. Z. Smith, 66-89.

Thursday, March 29: J. Z. Smith, 90-120.

PART SEVEN: CONTEXT AND CONFLICT

Tuesday, April 3: Lincoln, 1-32

Thursday, April 5: Lincoln, 33-61

Tuesday, April 10: Lincoln, 62-92

THURSDAY, APRIL 12: PAPER #3 DUE

PART EIGHT: COMPARATIVE RELIGION REVISITED

Tuesday, April 17: Patton and Ray, 1-19, 47-74

Thursday, April 19: Patton and Ray, 77-91, 101-130

Tuesday, April 24: Patton and Ray, 131-171.

Thursday, April 26: Patton and Ray, 172-205

PAPER #4 DUE: THURSDAY, MAY 3, 11:00 A.M.
RELIGIOUS STUDIES 4750:  
SEMINAR IN RELIGIOUS STUDIES: 20th CENTURY RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Course Description and Goals

Can religion speak to the changing needs of the modern world? This course will address this question through an examination of major movements and thinkers in contemporary religious thought. Our emphasis will be upon western religious traditions (Judaism, Islam, and especially Christianity) with briefer forays into eastern thought, but the course will cover a diverse range of movements including theological existentialism, fundamentalism (in Christianity and Islam), "death of god," liberation theology (in its Latin American, African-American, and African contexts), feminism, anti-Semitism, and religion as a means of protest. Through our examination of these movements, we will read some of the most important religious thinkers of the 20th Century (e.g., Bultmann, Buber, Altizer, Suzuki, Hauerwas, Cone, West, Khomeini, King, Malcolm X, Daly, Stout) and explore religious attempts to deal with such issues as racism and oppression, warfare, poverty, women's rights, the environment, the nature of God, and the grounds of faith.

My hope is that, in the process of taking this course, you will gain not merely a familiarity with a rich array of important materials but an enhanced ability to think and write critically and constructively about some of the central issues of our day. In particular, you will be better equipped to respond to two over-arching questions: how does religion respond to the challenges posed by modern science, and how has religion changed in the face of the increased participation of diverse racial, gender, political, and economic groups?

CTW Designation

This course is a designated Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) course and a required course for Religious Studies majors. While everyone is welcome, I will assume that enrolled students will be committed to developing critical thinking and writing skills. Students will be required to do a number of focused in-class writing assignments, exercises on understanding and evaluating evidence and a research essay that develops new arguments.

Course Requirements

Each student's grade will be based on:
1. Active and well-prepared class participation. All reading assignments should be completed before the class during which they will be discussed. (10%)
2. 10 in-class short critical thinking and writing assignments. To do these assignments well you will need to complete your reading on time (20%)
3. Two short (4-5 double-spaced typed pages) thesis papers that develop the writing and critical thinking you’ve done in class. The first is due no later than February 21 and the second no later April 18. You also will be required to revise one of these papers using feedback from your peers and me. (Each paper counts for 20%)
4. A final paper (10-12 pages) due on May 4 (30%). This final paper can be a revision and expansion of an earlier paper in this course.

Attendance/Late Assignments

Attendance is required. Students are responsible for the material covered in class. This is a seminar, and you presence and participation is crucial. While there is no formal grade reduction for each missed class, the student's class participation grade (see number 1 under Course Requirements) will be adversely affected by absences. Assignments are to be submitted in a timely matter; if you are to miss a due date, you should inform the instructor of the reasons at the earliest possible date.

Required Texts

Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (paperback)
Religious Studies 8210 Reader (available at the Printshop, 6 Decatur Street, a block and a half west of the General Classroom Building)

Reading Assignments

   Bertrand Russell: Why I Am Not A Christian
   Anthony Flew: Theology and Falsification (part one)

2. The Existentialist Response
   Rudolf Bultmann: Jesus Christ and Mythology
   Paul Tillich: Revelation and Miracle

3. The Death of God Movement
   Friedrich Nietzsche: Selections
   Thomas J.J. Altizer: Word and History, The Contemporary Jesus
   Emerson Shideler: Taking the Death of God Seriously

4. The Nature of Justification
   R.M. Hare: Theology and Falsification (part two)
   Daisetz Suzuki: Satori
   Ken Wilber: Eye to Eye, The Problem of Proof
Jeffrey Stout: Moral Disagreement

5. Christian Fundamentalism

Karen Armstrong: *The Battle for God* (excerpts)
James Barr: *Fundamentalism* (excerpts)
Jerry Falwell: A Biblical Plan of Action
Robert McAfee Brown: The Religious Right
Paris Donehoo: The New Right and the Sin Problem
Michael Novak: Capitalism and Christianity
Thomas Hanks: Why People Are Poor
Stanley Hauerwas: The Moral Authority of Scripture

6. Islamic Fundamentalism

Karen Armstrong: *The Battle for God* (excerpts)
Ayatollah Khomeini: We Shall Confront the World
*Qu’ran*: selections
William Shepard: What is Islamic Fundamentalism?
Louis Cantori: Conservative Islam and the Liberal Crusade

Fatima Mernissi: Regulation of Female Sexuality in Islam
David Hollenbach: Human Rights in the Middle East
Charis Waddy: The Spread of Islam
Jan Hjarpe: Islamic Fundamentalism and Women

7. Feminist Theology

Carol Christ: Heretics and Outsiders
Mary Daly: Dismemberment by Christian Myth; Glory to God the Verb
Kay Turner: Contemporary Feminist Rituals
Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza: The Sophia God of Jesus
Susan Brooks Thistlewaite: Every Two Minutes
Ellen Umansky: Creating a Jewish Feminist Theology
Carter Heyward: Heterosexist Theology

8. From Buber to Liberation Theology

Martin Buber: *I and Thou* (selections)
Jose Miquez Bonino: selections
Jean Galot: Jesus and the Plan for a Society of Brotherly Love


Theo Witvilet: Black Theology
James Cone: selections
Cornel West: Prophetic Afro-American Christian Thought and Marxism
Delores Williams: James Cone's Liberation, Womanist Theology and Black Woman's Voices
Jacquelyn Grant: White Woman's Christ and Black Woman's Jesus
Itmuleng Mosala: The Use of the Bible in Black Theology

10. Politics, Peace, and Protest

Martin Luther King, Jr.: Letter from a Birmingham Jail, selected sermons
Malcolm X: Saved, Debate on America's Race Problem
Julius Lester: Blacks, Jews and Farrakhan
Rosemary Radford Ruether: The Question of Jewish-Christian Relations
Jean Bethke Elshtain: Politics and Forgiveness
Walter Wink: Breaking the Spiral of Violence; The Acid Test: Loving Enemies
Stanley Hauerwas: The Presence of the Peaceable Kingdom

11. Emerging Conceptions of God and Religion
   Lois K. Daly: Ecofeminism, Reverence for Life, and Theological Ethics
   Sallie McFague: Models of God (selections)

Note: A number of the readings may be designated "optional" as the semester progresses. This syllabus represents a general plan for the course; changes may be necessary.
II. WAC-APPROVED COURSES: Modern Judaism; Religion and Literature

**Modern Judaism**  
Rels 4450/Phil 6450

Dr. Kathryn McClymond  
34 Peachtree Street, #1120  
Office hours: MW 1:30-2:30 and by appt.

326 Sparks Hall  
Writing Consultant: Jessica Tilley  
kmcclymond@gsu.edu  
jessicatilley@gmail.com

**Course Objectives**

This course is designed to give you a strong background in the issues that have concerned and shaped the development of modern Judaism. We will ask questions such as, how did all the different Jewish denominations develop? How was Jewish theology affected by the experience of the Holocaust? How did Jewish thought respond to the development of modernity, particularly in Western Europe? How have women’s roles changed in Judaism? What is Zionism, and what connection does it have to do with modern Judaism? How did Judaism develop in America? What are the issues that contemporary Judaism is wrestling with today?

In addition, throughout the course we will talk about how the study of Judaism affects the study of religion more broadly. What questions or issues does the study of Judaism raise? Do we think differently about “religion” when we examine Judaism than when we examine Christianity?

*Note: There are no prerequisites for this course. You do NOT have to have any background in Judaism or the study of religion in general to take this course. I will provide any background information you may need. Also, all readings will be in English. (I can suggest additional reading in English or Hebrew for those who are interested.)*

**Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Component**

This class meets a “Writing Across the Curriculum” requirement for Georgia State University. This means that the class incorporates more written work—both informal and formal—than other undergraduate classes might. This should not scare you off! Students are encouraged to use this class as an opportunity to improve their writing skills and expand their use of informal writing as part of the process of learning.

There are two key components to this class designed to help you with your writing. The first is your writing consultant, Jessica Tilley. You will be required to meet with Jessica twice over the course of the semester to review your writing, but you should also feel free to contact her whenever you’d like (via e-mail) for help with your writing. Jessica will also be involved in grading your informal writing work. She will not grade exams.

The second component is an on-line website that is dedicated to Writing Across the Curriculum classes. A few of your assignments will be submitted on-line. I will provide more information of this as soon as the website is up and running.
Note: plagiarism in any written work is a serious offense. Please make yourself familiar with the GSU Policy on Academic Honesty (attached to this syllabus). I am more than happy to teach you how to incorporate secondary material without plagiarizing someone else’s ideas.

Course Requirements and Attendance Policy
All students are expected to attend and participate in class discussions. Class participation is important to learning in an upper-division class, because your participation benefits other students as well as your own learning. I take attendance at the beginning of every class, and I consider participation in determining course grades. Undergraduate grades are determined as follows:
10% class attendance and participation (more details about this will be distributed in class)
10% informal writing portfolio
20% each for exam #1 and #2 (take home exam)
20% final exam (take home exam)
20% research paper and portfolio (including ALL pre-writing, outline, and draft pieces as well as the final paper)

Honors and grad students will have occasional additional meetings with the instructor. In addition they will be asked to answer one additional question on each of the exams
10% class attendance and participation
10% informal writing portfolio
20% each for exam #1, #2, and the final exam (take home exam, with one additional question per exam)
20% research paper and portfolio (including ALL pre-writing, outline, and draft pieces as well as the final paper)

*Please note that the instructor will assign plus-minus grades for this course, in accordance with Religious Studies department policy.

Course Texts
(1) Required: Reader, “Judaism in the Modern World,” edited by Dr. McClymond. This reader (2 volumes) is available for purchase at The Printshop, 6 Decatur Street (404-523-2679). The required reader includes primary and secondary material as well as maps, a glossary, a timeline of modern Jewish history, and suggested further reading.

I recommend this text for anyone who wants a brief overview of Jewish history. While it is not necessary to be familiar with traditional Judaism to take this course, it would certainly be helpful to have some sense of the development of Judaism prior to the modern period. This book is clear and concise.

Course Schedule
This course syllabus provides a general plan for the course lectures and reading; deviations may be necessary. “R” refers to reading assignments that everyone should complete.
Week 1 (Aug. 21-23): Introduction; brief historical overview of Judaism

Extra credit opportunity: Attend and write up a two page summary of “Understanding the Crisis in the Middle East,” a special presentation by the Middle East Institute and the Program in Jewish Studies. This panel discussion will include Dr. Dona Stewart, Director of the GSU Middle East Institute; Dr. Michael Galchinsky, Director of the GSU Program in Jewish Studies; and Dr. Michael Herb, Associate Professor of Political Science. The presentation is scheduled for Thursday, Aug. 24, 11:30 - 1:30, in the Speaker's Auditorium, Student Center. Your write-up is worth up to 10 extra points, which will be added to your first exam score.

Week 2 (Aug. 28-30): Moses Mendelssohn and the roots of modern Judaism
R: B. Martin, pp. 192-202: Mendelssohn, “The Right to be Different,” “Judaism is the Cornerstone of Christianity” and “Judaism as Revealed Legislation”

Week 3 (No class Sept. 4 for Labor Day; Sept. 6-8): “Haskalah” or the Jewish Enlightenment
R: Martin, Bernard, History of Judaism, vol. 2, pp. 210-231

Week 4 (Sept. 11-13): The Jewish Enlightenment, continued
R: No additional reading (read ahead if that would be helpful)

*The first exam will be distributed on September 13 and will be due one week later, September 20th. This exam covers material presented during weeks 1-4. If you will miss class for the High Holy Days (September 23-October 2), please let me know in advance and arrange to get notes from a classmate.

Week 5 (Sept. 18-20): The rise of Jewish denominations: Reform Judaism
R: Martin, pp. 232-244; “The New Israelite Temple Association,” “The Hamburg Rabbinical Court,” “A Reply Concerning the Question of Reform,” “the Pittsburgh Platform,” and “The Columbus Platform”

Week 6 (Sept. 25-27): Conservative Judaism
R: Martin, pp. 244-253; “On Changes in Judaism”

Week 7 (Oct. 2-4): Neo-orthodox Judaism
R: Martin, pp. 253-258; “The Orthodox Jewish Congregational Union of America”

Week 8 (Oct. 9-11): Reconstructionist Judaism
R: “The Reconstruction of Judaism”

Week 9 (Oct. 16-18): Jewish mysticism
R: Scholem, pp. 1-39, 213-214 (diagram of the sefirot); “The New Hasidim” and “Excommunication of the Hasidim”
*Exam #2 will be distributed on Wednesday, October 18th and will be due on Wednesday, October 25th in class. It will cover material presented during weeks 5-9.

**Week 10 (Oct. 22-25):** Modern anti-Semitism and its impact on modern Judaism  
R: “What We Demand of Modern Jewry,” “J’accuse,” and “First Decree to the Reich Citizenship Law”

**Week 11 (Oct. 30-Nov. 1):** Zionism and Judaism  
R: Martin. pp. 325-348, 465-466

**Week 12 (Nov. 6-8):** Zionism and Judaism  

**Week 13 (Nov. 13-15):** Women’s issues  

**Week 14 (Nov. 20; no classes Nov. 21-24 for Thanksgiving holiday):** Judaism in America  
R: Martin, pp. 286-318

**Week 15 (Nov. 27-29):** Judaism in America, continued  
R: “The Concordance of Judaism and Americanism” and “Zionism is Consistent with American Patriotism”; Dershowitz, *The Vanishing American Jew*

**Week 16 (Dec. 4-6):** Issues facing modern Judaism in the world today  

During the semester I will also schedule a tour of The Hebrew Benevolent congregation (better known as “The Temple”), a Reform synagogue on Peachtree Street that played an important role in Atlanta’s history. I will let you know when a date has been finalized.

*The final exam is a take-home exam covering weeks 10-16, and it will be distributed in class on Monday, Dec. 4. Completed exams are due in Dr. McClymond’s mailbox by 11 a.m. on Monday, Dec. 11. Late exams will not be accepted without a medical excuse from a physician.*

**General Resources**  
There are several general resources available to you at GSU that can be helpful in the study of Judaism. You should be aware that Pullen library has *The Encyclopedia of Religion* and *The Encyclopedia of Judaism*, both of which provide useful general and background information. In addition, there are a number of good scholarly journals: *Judaism, AJS Review, HUCA (Hebrew Union College Annual), Journal of Jewish Studies, Jewish Studies Quarterly*, and *Women in Judaism* (an on-line journal). There are also several good web sites, which we will refer to
throughout the semester. Finally, the Religious Studies librarian for Pullen Library has compiled an extensive list of resources for the study of Judaism (encyclopedias, journals, and web sites) that you can access on-line through the GSU library web site.

**Jewish Studies Minor**
Recently Georgia State University instituted an interdisciplinary minor in Jewish Studies. To complete the minor, a student must take five classes approved by the Jewish Studies minor committee, including a pro-seminar that introduces students to the field. This minor can be a strong supplement to another social science or humanities major, it may be a helpful companion to an education degree for those considering careers in Jewish education, or it may simply allow students to pursue a personal interest independent of one’s major. For more information about the minor see Dr. McClymond, Dr. Michael Galchinsky (Jewish Studies Program Director), or the Jewish Studies website at www.gsu.edu/~wwwjst.

**Other opportunities**
For students interested in pursuing Jewish studies further, language training is a must. Fortunately, GSU currently offers both Modern and Biblical Hebrew. Please see me if you are interested in learning either modern or biblical Hebrew, and I will direct you to the instructor.
Course Description
This course examines issues raised by the use of various forms of literature to investigate religious life. We will read modern works by authors from different religious and cultural communities. These works are explicitly or implicitly concerned with the issues and questions that concern religious traditions: who or what is ultimate reality? How am I affected by the nature of that reality? How is my religious identity related to—and sometimes in conflict with—my cultural identity?

We will also be concerned with how modern literature has provided a forum for religious questioning and challenge. Classic religious literature has shaped language and symbols used in modern fiction, but modern fiction has also spearheaded challenges to traditional religious institutions, beliefs, and values. We will examine how writers have used modern literary forms not only to raise traditional religious questions but also to present unpopular religious experiences and beliefs. Finally, throughout the course we will ask what makes religious literature “religious” and what makes it “literature”?

Course Requirements:
This course is discussion-oriented rather than lecture-oriented. Students are expected to attend class and to participate actively in class discussions. Students will be asked to make one presentation and to guide discussion (assisted by the instructor) on one of the assigned readings. Students will also write take-home exams on the assigned readings. These exams will test each student’s ability to discuss theoretical issues related to the study of religion and literature, incorporating examples from the class reading. Honors and graduate students will be asked to answer additional questions on their exams that involve comparing and contrasting the readings. Finally, students will be asked to write a research paper (8-10 pages for undergraduates; 12-15 pages for honors and graduate students) on a topic to be determined in conjunction with the instructor.

This course is designated as a “Writing Across the Curriculum” course by the university. This means that as part of the class we will be focusing on improving your writing abilities in writing assignments that help you process what you have read or that help you prepare for the final research paper. I will ask you to do “process” and “product” writing throughout the semester.
“Process” writing is writing designed to help you process the reading. We will do some of this in class, but some of this will be completed outside of class. You will keep all of these assignments throughout the semester and turn them in to me in a writing portfolio at the end of the semester. These pieces of writing will contribute to your participation grade. In addition, you will do writing throughout the semester that culminates in a term paper. I call this “product” writing, because it is geared toward a formal written product. We will work with you throughout the semester in a step-by-step manner to help you produce the best possible paper.

Because of the intensive writing (and grading!) load, a writing consultant, Christine Scott, will work with you in class and be available to you outside of class to assist in this process. Christine will attend every class session, and she is available to help you throughout the semester. You can contact her at cscott23@student.gsu.edu. You may e-mail her with a question by 9 p.m. the night before a class, and she will answer your question. If you want her to comment on your writing, you must send her your writing 24 hours before the next class session, so that she has time to respond and you have time to incorporate her comments into your work. Christine will evaluate your writing portfolios under my supervision, and you are required to meet with Christine once before the mid-point of the semester to check your progress on your term paper. I will assign all grades for papers and exams, as well as the final course grade.

Be aware that I take the Georgia State University Academic Honesty Policy very seriously. Make yourself familiar with this policy, and feel free to ask for help if you are unsure how to incorporate quotations or paraphrased material legitimately into your own work.

**Grading and Make-up Policies**

1) **Class participation: 40% (including process writing assignments and class presentation)**
2) **Term paper: 20% (8-10 pages; honors and graduate students 12-15 pages)**
4) Each student must submit 2 out of 3 possible take-home exams for a total of 40% of your course grade. Each exam covers one-third of the course material as outlined below. Each exam is worth 20% of your course grade. You may choose to submit all 3 exams, and I will drop the lowest of the three grades when calculating your course grade. Honors and graduate students will be asked to complete one additional question on each exam.

Exams are take-home, so there is no opportunity to “make up” an exam. Exams are due on the stated date, even if a student picks up the exam late. The first two exams may be turned in late, but the student will lose 3 points for each day or partial day the exam is late. Alternative arrangements may be made in the case of serious illness (with written medical excuse) or if there is a death in the family. In these situations, exams may be submitted without penalty at a later time to be determined by the instructor. Late exams must ALWAYS be submitted prior to the distribution of the subsequent exam. The final exam, the writing portfolio, and the term paper must be turned in on time, no exceptions.

**Attendance Policy**

Attendance is absolutely essential for students to learn the material presented in this class. This course depends heavily on class discussion and close reading of texts, so I will take attendance daily. Students are permitted two absences without question. After that, the student’s course
grade is lowered one-third letter grade for each class absence unless there is a medical excuse with a doctor’s note.

Course Texts
*All of the books are available at the Park Place Bookstore, but you do NOT have to buy them there! Use library copies or buy used editions elsewhere. You do not need to use the exact edition that I have ordered via the bookstore. Some suggested websites are Amazon (www.amazon.com) and Barnes and Noble (www.bn.com).

Course Schedule
*The course syllabus provides a general plan for the semester; deviations may be necessary.

Week 1 (Aug. 22, 24): Introduction: Religion and Literature
What is religion? What is literature? What is the study of religion and literature?

*During the second class session each student will select a book for which he or she will be the discussion leader. Your work as discussion leader will be incorporated into your overall class participation grade.

Aug. 26, 29, 31, Sept. 2: Religious identity
Reading: James Baldwin, *Go Tell It On the Mountain*

*No class on Monday, September 5—Labor Day holiday.

Sept. 7, 9, 12, 14: Wrestling with religious identity
Reading: Chaim Potok, *The Chosen*

Sept. 16, 19, 21, 23: Religious pluralism
Reading: Gita Mehta, *A River Sutra*

*Exam #1 will be distributed on Friday, September 23rd, and will be due at the beginning of class one week later on Friday, September 30th.*

Sept. 26, 28, 30, Oct. 3: Southern literature
Reading: Flannery O’Connor, “A Good Man is Hard to Find”; “The Lame Shall Enter First”; “Everything That Rises Must Converge”
*The instructor will make copies of the O’Connor short stories available.*

Oct. 5, 7, 10, 12: Challenging religious authority
Reading: Graham Greene, *The Power and the Glory*

Oct. 14, 17, 19, 21: Science fiction
Reading: Ursula Le Guin, *The Lathe of Heaven*

Oct. 24, 26, 28, 31: The role of allegory in religious fiction
Reading: Walter Wangerin, *The Book of the Dun Cow*
*Exam #2 will be distributed on Friday, October 28th and will be due at the beginning of class one week later on Friday, November 4.

Nov. 2, 4, 7, 9: Women and religion  
Reading: Nawal El Saadawi, Woman at Point Zero

Nov. 11, 14, 16, 18: Conflict between religious communities  
Reading: Shusaku Endo: Silence

*There will be no class the week of November 21 because of the annual American Academy of Religion conference and the Thanksgiving holidays.

Nov. 28, 30, Dec. 2, 5: Religion and censorship  
Reading: Nikos Kazantzakis, The Last Temptation of Christ

Dec. 5, 7, 9: Concluding reflections on religion and literature  
*Writing portfolios are due at the beginning of class on December 5th.  
*Research papers are due at the beginning of class on December 9th.  
*The final exam will be distributed on Monday, December 5th, and will be due at 12 noon on Monday, December 12th in my mailbox (11th floor, 34 Peachtree Street, the GSU Federal Credit Union building).

Guidelines for Leading Discussion

The following suggestions are designed to help you prepare for and lead an interesting class discussion on your assigned book. Feel free to adapt these suggestions to your own personality, the character of the book, research issues that intrigue you, and elements of the reading that appeal to you. You should plan on meeting briefly with me once before your presentation so that you feel comfortable leading the discussion.

Before the class session

1. First reading: the first time you read the book you should take notes or use reusable “flags” to note sections, sentences, images, characters, plot twists, etc. that you think are significant. Trust your gut instinct here; there’s usually a reason that a certain passage makes you stop and think. Also, write down questions or interesting ideas that occur to you as you’re doing your reading. Don’t over-analyze at this point. Just enjoy the book. As much as possible, do your reading in one sitting or in a few large chunks. Very few books can stand up to being read in little bitty pieces!

2. Second reading: this time you’re reading with an eye toward leading an insightful discussion. BEFORE you read the book a second time, review the passages you flagged the first time around and the questions/comments that ran through your mind. Pick 2 or 3 ideas or themes or images to focus on in your discussion. Now, read through the book focusing on these themes, images, etc. How does the author touch on these elements in other passages that you
missed the first time around? Is there a progression? Are there things you notice the second time through that you didn’t notice the first time?

3. Preparing questions: now that you’ve reread the book, you’re ready to prepare questions. There are number of ways that you can lead a discussion. The easiest is to begin with a brief comment on the elements of the book that you think are important and some questions anchored in specific passages to launch discussion (be sure to have page numbers handy for easy reference). Don’t ask yes/no questions. Rather, ask open-ended questions that lead to your major themes. Make sure you’re leaving room for the other students to raise ideas that are different than your own.

4. Handouts (optional): you may find it helpful to have handouts, but I encourage you to talk with me before you prepare anything elaborate or too detailed. If you know you want to discuss a passage in detail and you’re concerned that we have different editions among us you may want to photocopy a passage. Or you may have biographical information about the author that you want to share. Or you may have a few points to make that lend themselves easily to an outline. Use your imagination.

**During the class session**

After I take attendance and make any announcements I will turn the class over to you. You should begin the class with a brief introduction to the work. When you begin discussing the book DO NOT rehash the plot or main characters of the book. (Remember that each discussion session is only about 45 minutes!) Assume that everyone in class has read the book, and begin by giving your initial impressions of the book. Then zero in on a few themes, characters, plot elements, symbols, etc. that are connected to the points you want to discuss.

Remember that we are in a religion and literature class. I will expect you to touch on questions related to religion, religious literature, the way that your assigned piece relates to religious ideas or themes or strands, etc. You may find that it is easier to tackle these broader questions at the end of the discussion rather than right off the bat. Feel free to refer back to previous works and previous class discussions if you find comparisons or contrasts helpful, and be sure to coordinate your discussion with any other student assigned to the same book.

*If you need any help at all in preparing your presentation do not hesitate to contact me. Remember that you are not expected to lecture, just to kick off discussion. Enjoy!
Appendix D3: Degree Requirements for each Program (taken from the catalog)

Program Degree Requirements
In addition to the Program Degree Requirements, students must fulfill the College of Arts and Sciences Degree Requirements (see section 3030) and the University Degree Requirements (see section 1400).

B.A. in Religious Studies

Area F: Courses Appropriate to the Major (18)
1. Required Courses (6)
   Phil 2010 Great Questions of Philosophy (3)
   Lang 1002 Elementary Foreign Language II (3)
2. Recommended Courses (6)
   Lang 2001 Intermediate Foreign Language I (3)
   Lang 2002 Intermediate Foreign Language II (3)
3. Select additional 1000 and 2000-level courses from core curriculum Areas C, D, or E to complete the 18 hours required in Area F. (6-12)

The Department recommends, but does not require, that Religious Studies majors complete the foreign language sequence Lang 1002, 2001, and 2002. (See “Foreign Language Requirement for B.A. and B.I.S. Majors,” previously described.)

Area G: Major Courses (24)
A grade of C or higher is required in all major courses.
To satisfy the requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in religious studies, a student must take a total of 24 semester hours, including the following distribution requirements:
1. Required Courses (6)
   RelS 3050 Introduction to Religion (3)
   RelS 3270 World Religions (3)
2. Electives (18)
   Students must take an additional 18 credit hours in RelS courses at the 3000 and 4000 level to complete the major. Of these 18 hours, up to six semester hours may be taken in the following upper-division courses taught outside the Department of Religious Studies: AH 4020, AH 4200, Clas 2202, Clas 2203, Engl 4000, Hist 3510, Hist 3780, Hist 4525, Hist 4530, Mus 4300, PolS 4285, Soci 3228, Soci 4360.

Area H: Minor and Additional Courses
1. Students majoring in religious studies are not required to take a minor.
2. Additional courses not in the major must be taken as electives to complete a minimum of 120 semester hours, exclusive of 1000/2000 physical education or military science courses. The department strongly recommends that religious studies majors take the fourth semester of a foreign language as an elective course.

Minor in Religious Studies
Students who wish to minor in religious studies must take at least 15 hours in courses with a RelS prefix, including at least nine semester hours at the 3000 level or above. Students taking more than 15 hours in RelS courses may count the additional hours toward their electives or may consider completing a double major. (A grade of C or higher is required in all courses counting toward the minor.)

Master of Arts in Religious Studies
Department of Religious Studies
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4089
404/413-6110
http://www.gsu.edu/religion

Founded in the past century, the modern field of Religious Studies endeavors to better understand religion by means of modern academic approaches. The Department of Religious Studies offers a Masters of Arts in Religious Studies that trains students in a range of world religious traditions and theoretical perspectives. All students gain a general understanding of comparative approaches to the study of religion while having the opportunity to specialize in one
or more specific religion(s). Graduates of the program have gone on to study at Harvard, Yale, Oxford, Cambridge, Berkeley, and other top graduate programs and have entered successful careers in such fields as academia, international journalism, immigration law, public service, and the ministry.

Students who plan to seek a Ph.D. in the field are strongly encouraged to discuss their intentions with the Religious Studies faculty as soon as possible so that a course of study can be determined to prepare them for doctoral work. Applicants may obtain additional information about the Department of Religious Studies by contacting the Director of Graduate Studies at the addresses above.

**Additional Admissions Requirements**

In addition to the general requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of Religious Studies has the following requirements:
1. Three letters of recommendation addressing the ability of the student to undertake graduate study.
2. All applicants should submit a sample of their written work. See the electronic application for details.

**Degree Requirements**

The Masters of Religious Studies offers two tracks: a thesis track and a non-thesis track. Students declare which track they intend to pursue at the end of the first year of study. The requirements are as follows:

**Track 1 (Thesis track):**

In order to receive the Masters of Religious Studies, a student must complete 30 hours of coursework. These courses must include:
1. Twenty-four hours of non-thesis course work. As part of these twenty-four hours, a student successfully must complete:
   a. One course in approaches to the study of religion:
      - RelS 6220 Theories of Religion (3)
      - RelS 6260 Religion and Literature (3)
      - 204 College of Arts and Sciences
      - RelS 6630 Comparative Study of Mysticism (3)
   b. One course in comparative themes in religion:
      - RelS 6240 Death and the Afterlife (3)
      - RelS 6270 Women and Religion (3)
      - RelS 6290 Pilgrimage (3)
      - RelS 6270 Women and Religion (3)
   c. At least one course from each of the following areas (6):
      - Western Religious Traditions: RelS 6040, RelS 6200, RelS 6210, RelS 6215, RelS 6250, RelS 6280, RelS 6450, RelS 6460, RelS 6480, RelS 6490, RelS 6570, RelS 6580
      - Eastern Religious Traditions: RelS 6610, RelS 6612, RelS 6615, RelS 6620, RelS 6625, RelS 6628
   d. RelS 8210 Seminar in Religious Studies (3)
   e. Additional electives from either Religious Studies or affiliated courses (see below) to bring the total to twenty-four hours.

Because the interests and goals of each student are distinct, students are highly encouraged to consult their academic adviser when selecting courses to complete the program of study.
2. Six hours of RelS 8999 Thesis Research
3. A thesis
4. An oral thesis defense

**Track 2 (Non-Thesis track):**

In order to receive the Masters of Religious Studies, a student must complete 36 hours of coursework. These courses must include:
1. Thirty-six hours of non-thesis course work. As part of these thirty-six hours, a student successfully must complete:
   a. One course in approaches to the study of religion:
      - RelS 6220 Theories of Religion (3)
      - RelS 6260 Religion and Literature (3)
      - RelS 6630 Comparative Study of Mysticism (3)
RelS 6650 Religion and Ethics (3)
b. One course in comparative themes in religion:
   RelS 6240 Death and the Afterlife (3)
   RelS 6270 Women and Religion (3)
   RelS 6290 Pilgrimage (3)
   RelS 6670 Church and State (3)
   RelS 6680 War, Peace and Religion (3)
c. At least one course from each of the following areas (6):
   Western Religious Traditions: RelS 6040, RelS 6200, RelS 6210, RelS 6215, RelS 6250, RelS 6280, RelS 6450,
   RelS 6460, RelS 6480, RelS 6490, RelS 6570, RelS 6580
   Eastern Religious Traditions: RelS 6610, RelS 6612, RelS 6615, RelS 6620, RelS 6625, RelS 6628
d. RelS 8210 Seminar in Religious Studies (3)
e. Additional electives from either Religious Studies or affiliated courses (see below) to bring the total to twenty-
   four hours. Because the interests and goals of each student are distinct, students are highly encouraged to consult
   their academic adviser when selecting courses to complete the program of study.
   Students who intend to pursue additional graduate work after the Masters of Religious Studies at Georgia State
   University are required to pursue the thesis track option.

Restrictions
1. Only six hours of credit transferred from another institution may be applied towards the Georgia State M.A.
2. Of the hours taken at Georgia State and applied toward the M.A, no more than six hours may be from outside the
   Department of Religious Studies.

Foreign Language Competencies
Depending upon their area(s) of concentration, students who wish to go on to pursue a Ph.D. in Religious Studies
may need to initiate or complete studies in a particular language or languages before beginning doctoral studies.
Students are urged to consult with their advisers for advice and direction concerning language competencies.

The M.A. with Distinction
Students who meet all of the following requirements shall be awarded the M.A. with distinction:
1. A graduate Georgia State GPA of 3.50 or higher in courses applicable to the Religious Studies M.A.
2. A thesis that, upon vote of the committee grading the thesis, is judged to merit distinction.
3. A determination by the Director of Graduate Studies that the student’s graduate record at Georgia State University
   is one of distinction.
Appendix D4 (Table D-1): Courses Offered by the Department During Review Period

Table D-1: Departmental courses Taught by Fiscal Year, Course Level, Number of Sections, Number of Students and Average Number of Students, Religious Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>NUMBER SECTIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER STUDENTS</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PERS 2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>PHIL 2050/PHIL 2430</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>HON 3260/RELS 3300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>HON 3750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>HON 4000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>HON 4880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3230/RELS 3230</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4620/RELS 4620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4625/RELS 4625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4630/RELS 4630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3050</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3270</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4270/WST 4370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4880</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PERS 2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>FILM 4890/ RELS 4700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3230/ RELS 3230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4615/ RELS 4615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4670/ RELS 4670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4900/ RELS 4628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6615/ RELS 6615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6670/ RELS 6670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6900/ RELS 6628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8210/ RELS 8210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8950</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8960</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PERS 2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>103.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>HON 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>JST 3000/ RELS 4490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>MES 3400/ RELS 3400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4040/ RELS 4040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4610/ RELS 4610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4620/ RELS 4620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4680/ RELS 4680</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4270/ WST 4370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6040/ RELS 6040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6680/ RELS 6680</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6270/ WST 6370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 6700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8950</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>RELS 8999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D5: Department of Religious Studies Undergraduate Student Survey Findings Report

N = 23 (response rate = 41.1 percent)
University (28 departments) N = 3660 (response rate = 40.2 percent)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undergraduate program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the undergraduate program is preparing me for my professional career and/or further study.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size is suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree; “Don’t know/not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.
**Percentile Ranking based on 29 Departments

Graph 1

Graph 2

Graph 3

Graph 4

Graph 5

Graph 6
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
<th>Dept. Univ.</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>% Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=poor to 5=excellent; “Don’t know/not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 29 Departments
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Custom Tables

**[DataSet1] H:\Projects in Process\Religious Studies\Religious Studies_Undergrad Alumni.sav**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size was suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class size was suitable for effective learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">Class size was suitable for effective learning.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">Valid N (listwise).</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty members in the department were

Faculty in the department were
I feel the undergraduate program

There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students
Custom Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor Count</th>
<th>Poor Row N</th>
<th>2 Count</th>
<th>2 Row N</th>
<th>3 Count</th>
<th>3 Row N</th>
<th>4 Count</th>
<th>4 Row N</th>
<th>Excellent Count</th>
<th>Excellent Row N</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable Count</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable Row N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GGraph

[DataSet1] H:\Projects in Process\Religious Studies\Religious Studies_Undergrad Alumni.sav
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Procedures used to evaluate student
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Descriptives

[DataSet1] H:\Projects in Process\Religious Studies\Religious Studies_Undergrad Alumni.sav

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Custom Tables

[DataSet1] H:\Projects in Process\Religious Studies\Religious Studies_Undergrad Alumni.sav

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GGraph

Descriptives

[DataSet2] H:\Projects in Process\University Database\Alumni Survey University Database\Undergraduate Alumni Survey University Data Base.sav

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors.</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging.</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.

There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns.

Class size was suitable for effective learning.

Valid N (listwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[DataSet2] H:\Projects in Process\University Database\Alumni Survey University Database\Undergraduate Alumni Survey University Data Base.sav</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics**

| Academic advisement available in the department | 1467 | 1 | 5 | 3.58 | 1.208 |
| Career advisement available in the department | 1365 | 1 | 5 | 3.00 | 1.195 |
| Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom | 1499 | 1 | 5 | 3.87 | .987 |
| Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty | 1533 | 1 | 5 | 3.98 | .893 |
| Procedures used to evaluate student performance | 1497 | 1 | 5 | 3.77 | .923 |
| Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings | 1518 | 1 | 5 | 3.53 | 1.112 |
| Variety of undergraduate major course offerings | 1519 | 1 | 5 | 3.61 | 1.101 |
| Clarity of degree requirements | 1522 | 1 | 5 | 4.06 | 1.001 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 1281 |
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N = 13 (response rate = 61.9 percent)
University (33 departments) N = 2334 (response rate = 58.2 percent)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
<th>Dept. Mean*</th>
<th>Univ. Mean*</th>
<th>Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic development of graduate majors.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>12 (92.3)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The graduate program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>12 (92.3)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>11 (84.6)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the graduate program is preparing me for my professional career and/or further study.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>9 (69.2)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>9 (69.2)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size is suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>5 (38.5)</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree; “Don’t know/Not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.
**Percentile Ranking based on 34 Departments
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Don’t know/NA</th>
<th>Dept. Mean</th>
<th>Univ. Mean</th>
<th>Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 15.4</td>
<td>11 84.6</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5 38.5</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>4 30.8</td>
<td>2 15.4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 15.4</td>
<td>11 84.6</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 15.4</td>
<td>11 84.6</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4 8</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7 53.8</td>
<td>4 30.8</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4 6</td>
<td>4 35.8</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 23.1</td>
<td>10 76.9</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=poor to 5=excellent; “Don’t know/not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 34 Departments

---
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Academic advisement available in the department

Graph 8

Career advisement available in the department

Graph 9

Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom
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Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty
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Procedures used to evaluate student performance

Graph 12

Frequency of graduate course offerings
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Religious Studies

Table 4

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with classroom teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring teaching experience.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with grading?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring grading experience.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 17

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with grading?

Table 6

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with syllabus development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring syllabus development exp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 18

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with syllabus development?

Table 7

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to receive financial support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in receiving a financial support package</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 19

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to receive financial support?
Table 8

Do you feel that the financial support packages available to graduate students (offered in the forms of research and teaching assistantships) are adequate for an average student's financial needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no comment on the financial support packages.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N = 5 (response rate = 38.5 percent)
University (30 departments) N = 1266 (response rate = 44.1 percent)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of graduate majors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The graduate program of study was academically challenging.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size was suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree; “Don’t know/not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 31 Departments
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
<th>Dept. Mean</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>% Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=poor to 5=excellent; “Don’t know/not applicable (NA)” excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 31 Departments
Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Religious Studies

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with classroom teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring teaching experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with grading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring grading experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table  5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with syllabus development?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not interested in acquiring syllabus development exp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 17

Do you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to get experience with syllabus development?

Table  6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to receive financial support?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunities, but not enough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn't interested in receiving a financial support package</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 18

Did you feel that you were offered sufficient opportunities to receive financial support?

Table  7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel that the financial support packages available to graduate students (offered in the forms of research and teaching assistantships) were adequate for an average student’s financial needs?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no comment on the financial support packages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 19

Do you feel that the financial support packages available to graduate students (offered in the forms of research and teaching assistantships) were adequate for an average student’s financial needs?
N = 7 (response rate = 100.0 percent)
University (34 departments) N = 714 (response rate = 84.6 percent)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of the faculty in</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of required course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of advanced course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of clerical staff support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of departmental goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the next two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of computer/data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base software relevant to your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=poor to 5=excellent; “NA” (Don’t know/not applicable) excluded from analysis.
**Percentile Ranking based on 35 Departments
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/N</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department's program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department work together toward program goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our department, faculty feel comfortable expressing different views and opinions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate opportunities to influence decisions made in the department about our programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines regarding job performance are clear to faculty in the department.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree; “NA” (Don’t know/not applicable) excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 35 Departments
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significantly too little emphasis</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Significantly too much emphasis</th>
<th>Don't know/NA</th>
<th>Dept. Mean</th>
<th>Univ. Mean</th>
<th>% Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research tasks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to department</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in certain journals</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 1=significantly too little emphasis to 5=significantly too much emphasis; “NA” (Don’t know/not applicable) excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 35 Departments
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been the editor of any journals or served on any editorial boards in your field?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been awarded any grants from Georgia State University to support research in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been awarded any grants from a source other than Georgia State University to support research in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last two years, have you refereed or served as a reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journal(s) in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ. Mean</th>
<th>% Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many professional articles or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapters in books have you published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last five years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many authored books or edited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books have you published in the last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many monographs, manuals, or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviews have you published in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last five years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you given at professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over the last five years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you given at other colleges or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions over the last five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean range: 0=0, 1=1-2, 2=3-4, 3=5-6, 4=7 or more; “NA” (Not applicable) excluded from analysis.

**Percentile Ranking based on 35 Departments**

Graph 20

How many professional articles or chapters in books have you published in the last five years?

Graph 21

How many authored books or edited books have you published in the last five years?

Graph 22

How many monographs, manuals, or reviews have you published in the last five years?

Graph 23

How many formal presentations have you given at professional meetings over the last five years?

Graph 24

How many formal presentations have you given at other colleges or institutions over the last five years?
Supplemental Question Provided by the Department of Religious Studies

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 25

Appendix D6: Undergraduate and Graduate Advisement Procedures

UNDERGRADUATE ADVISEMENT
Undergraduate majors are tracked for advisement by the Director of Undergraduate Studies from the time they first declare their majors until the time they graduate. Each semester, most students receive individual correspondence appropriate to their progress toward the degree, including both a solicitation of specific programmatic questions-problems and an open-ended invitation to set up an advisement meeting. Depending on the student's progress, the correspondence may range from a general welcome to the Department and encouragement to sign up for the departmental listserv, to explanations of new major requirements, to information on applying for graduation.

GRADUATE ADVISEMENT
Upon acceptance to the Masters degree program, incoming students are required to talk with the Graduate Director as they plan their first semester of coursework. On the Friday before their first semester of enrollment, all incoming graduate students participate in a 2-hour orientation to the Religious Studies Department, including a review of progression-toward-degree requirements. That afternoon each individual student meets with the Graduate Director to plan
his/her course of study for the following 2 semesters with an eye toward 1) fulfilling Departmental requirements, 2) fulfilling University requirements, and 3) preparing for post-graduation plans, whether that includes application to a doctoral program or seeking employment. From that point forward, every graduate student must meet with the Graduate Director at the end of each semester to review his/her progress toward the degree, to plan the next semester’s coursework, and to assemble a thesis committee.

Appendix F1: Definition of Graduate Faculty
The Department has no specific statement regarding the definition of or criteria for selection of graduate faculty. Given the small size of the Department, it has been the practice to accord all permanent faculty members status as graduate faculty. That practice continues today, including all TT faculty as well as the Lecturer.

Appendix F2: List of Graduate Faculty
Dr. David Bell, Lecturer
Dr. Jonathan Herman, Associate Professor
Dr. Fareeha Khan, Assistant Professor
Dr. Vincent Lloyd, Assistant Professor
Dr. Kathryn McClymond, Associate Professor
Dr. Timothy Renick, Associate Professor
Dr. Louis A. Ruprecht, Jr., Associate Professor
Appendix F3: Curriculum vitae for full-time faculty members

Kathryn McClymond
Associate Professor, Georgia State University

Education
PhD., Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara
MA, Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara
BA. cum laude, History and Literature, Harvard University

Publications


Reference Work Entries & Reviews


Conference Presentations


“Microcosm and Macrocsm in Pancaratra Tantrism.” Association for Asian Studies, Western California, Claremont, October 1994.


**Fellowships, Grants, and Awards**


Writing Across the Curriculum Grant, 2006 (“Modern Judaism”; deferred to summer 2007).

Jewish Studies Program, Course Development Grant, “Judaism in the South,” Georgia State University, spring 2006 (deferred).


Writing Across the Curriculum Grant, (“Religion and Literature”), summer 2005, Georgia State University.

Included in AcademicKeys Who’s Who in Humanities Higher Education (WWHHE), summer 2005.

2006 Outstanding Teaching Award, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University.


Pluralism Project Affiliate Grant, January 2002-present.

Distinguished Honors Professor Award, Georgia State University, spring 2002.

Research Initiation Grant, Georgia State University, summer 2000.

Virginia Castagnola-Hunter Award for service to the University, Religious Studies Department, University of California, Santa Barbara, October 1997.

Harvey Fellowship ($36,000), 1993-1996.
Georgia State University Service
Chair, Department of Religious Studies, Georgia State University, August 1 2008-present.

Senate representative, Department of Religious Studies, Georgia State University, August 1, 2008-present.

Committee Chair, Department Self-study, Department of Religious Studies, Spring 2008-present.

Executive committee member, Jewish Studies Program, Georgia State University, September 2002-present.

Affiliate faculty, Women’s Studies Institute, Georgia State University, Fall 1999-present.

Affiliate faculty, Middle East Center, Georgia State University, Fall 1999-present; Executive Committee member, Fall 2007-present (Senate representative, Fall 2007-Fall 2008)

Religious Studies Graduate Director, Religious Studies Department, Georgia State University, Spring 2005-present.

Religious Studies Undergraduate Director, Philosophy Department, Georgia State University, September 2001-Spring 2005.

Committee chair, search committee for open tenure-track hire in Religious Studies, Religious Studies department, Georgia State University, Fall 2007-Spring 2008.

Committee member, search committee for tenure-track hire in Islam, Religious Studies Department, Georgia State University, Fall 2007-Spring 2008.

Committee member, search committee for lecturer in Hebrew, Middle East Institute, Georgia State University, Spring 2008.

Committee member, search committee for two junior hires, Women’s Studies Institute, Georgia State University, November 2004—Spring 2006.

Committee member, search committee for Suttles Chair, Program in Religious Studies, Philosophy Department, Georgia State University, September 2003—Spring 2005.

Committee member, curriculum committee, Philosophy Department, Georgia State University, September 2001—Spring 2005.

Executive committee member, Philosophy Department, Georgia State University, September 2003-May 2004; September 2000-May 2001.

Committee member, search committee for position in Islamic studies, Program in Religious Studies, Philosophy Department, Georgia State University, September 2000.

Committee member, search committee for position in African-American studies, Women’s Studies Institute, Georgia State University, December 1999-spring 2000.
**Other University Service**
Committee member, search committee for position of Chancellor, University of California, Merced, January-June 1999.

Chair, committee to review the selection process for the Student Regent, University of California, January-June 1999.

Regent, University of California Board of Regents, July 1, 1997-June 30, 1998; Regent Emeritus, June 1998-present.

**Professional Service**
Steering Committee Member, Comparative Study of Religion Section, American Academy of Religion, November 2008-present.


External reviewer, University of Missouri Review Board, “The Riddle of the Two Vasubandhus” research grant application, November 2003.


**Invited Lectures**
“Ritual Gone Wrong: What we Learn from Mistakes in Ritual,” Emory University, Religious Studies Department, April 2006.


“Overview of Judaism,” Middle East Center, Georgia State University, Title VI Workshop, July 13, 2004

Special Colloquium on the work of McKim Marriott, Department of Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, May 24, 2000.

Professional Association Memberships
Alpha Lambda Chapter, Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars
American Academy of Religion
Association for Jewish Studies
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
North American Association for Sanskrit-Hebrew Studies
EDUCATION
· Ph.D.  1992  Harvard University GSAS, Study of Religion
· M.A.  1987  Harvard University GSAS, Study of Religion
· M.T.S.  1984  Harvard Divinity School, World Religions
· B.A.  1977  Grinnell College, Mathematics

AREAS OF TEACHING COMPETENCE


PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Georgia State University, Associate Professor, 2001- , Assistant Professor, 1996-2001:
· World Religions
· Confucianism and Taoism
· Zen and Shinto
· Buddhism
· Classical Chinese Philosophy
· Theories of Religion
· The Comparative Study of Mysticism
· Religion and Popular Culture
· Eastern Religion and Philosophy
· Eastern Religion and Philosophy I
· Eastern Religion and Philosophy II
· Women and Religion
· Martin Buber: His Thought and Influence (in development)
· Perspectives on Comparative Culture: Comparative Religious Traditions
· Independent Research
· Directed Readings
· Research in Religious Studies
St. Lawrence University, Assistant Professor, 1992-1996:
· The Religious Life of China.
· The Religious Life of Japan.
· The Buddhist Religious Tradition.
· The Hundred Schools of Classical China.
· Mystical Experience, Eastern and Western.
· Feminist Issues in the Study of Religion
· Religious Studies Majors Seminar
· Personal Stories of Faith and Doubt.
· Conceptions of Self and Other (Interdisciplinary Program).
· The Human Search for Meaning (Interdisciplinary Program).
· Metaphors of the Self in Fantasy and Science Fiction (Interdisciplinary Program).
Lewis and Clark College, Visiting Assistant Professor, 1991-1992:
· Religions and Culture of East Asia.
· Buddhism: Theory, Culture, and Practice.
· Religion and Culture of Hindu India.
· Seminar: Methods in the Study of Religion.
· Seminar in World Religions: The Comparative Study of Mysticism.
· Women and Religion: Western.

Boston College, Visiting Lecturer, 1989:
· Introduction to Asian Religions: Their Origins and Development.
Tufts University, Visiting Lecturer, 1988-1989:
· Confucianism, Taoism, and the “Hundred Schools” of Ancient China.
University of Vermont, Visiting Instructor, 1988:
· Introduction to the Study of Religion: Asian Traditions.
· Religion in China.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Teaching Fellow, 1987:
· East Asian History: China.
Harvard University, Teaching Fellow, 1985-1990:
· Belief, Experience and Symbol: The Interpretation of Religion.
· Scriptures and Classics.
· Pilgrimage: A Thematic Introduction to Religion.
· Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion.
· World Religions: Diversity and Dialogue.
· Junior Tutorial in Chinese Religion: The “Hundred Schools” Period.
· Junior Tutorial in Comparative Religion: Readings in Sacred Texts.
· Tradition and Transformation in East Asian Civilization: China.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES
· “Talkin’ ’Bout My Parents’ Generation: Confucian Ethics and Family Values,” Education About Asia 8:2 (Fall 2003), 11-19.

ENCYCLOPEDIA CHAPTERS

REVIEWS

PAPERS
· “The Mystical and the Mundane: The Case of Neo-Confucian Mysticism,” presented at the University of Georgia Department of Religion Graduate Student Colloquium, Athens, GA (April 2001).
· “A Deconstruction of Zen, a Meditation on Postmodernism,” presented at the Emory University ‘Traces of Dogen’ Conference, Atlanta, GA (October 2000).
· “Taoist and Western Mysticism: Can We Compare?” presented at the Grinnell College Chinese Studies Series, Grinnell, IA (April 1998).
· “Can There be a Comparative Study of Mysticism,” presented at the University of Georgia Department of Religion Graduate Student Colloquium, Athens, GA (November 1997).
· “Framing the Way: Introducing and Concluding the Survey Course,” presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Asian Studies (Southeast Conference), Savannah, GA (January 1997).
· “Primitive Religion in American Culture: The Sacred, the Profane, and the Stoogical,” presented at the annual meeting of the Popular and American Culture Associations, San Antonio, TX (March 1992).
· Discussant: Asian Religions Section (on Lao Tzu’s Tao Te Ching) at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion (New England - Maritime Region), Worcester, MA (March 1989).

HONORS AND AWARDS
· Georgia State University Program in Jewish Studies Course Development Grant, for new course on Martin Buber (2006)
· American Academy of Religion Collaborative Research Initiation Grant, for research on collaborative book project (Summer 2004).
· Georgia State University Research Initiation Grant, for research on collaborative book project (Spring 2003).
· St. Lawrence University Faculty Research Grant, for travel to San Diego, CA (March 1995).
· St. Lawrence University Faculty Research Grant, for travel to the People’s Republic of China (August 1993).
· Lewis and Clark College Faculty Research Grant, for travel and dissertation research (December 1991).
· Foreign Language Area Studies Fellowship (1985-1987).
· Harvard Divinity School Grant, for study of German and Literary Chinese (1985-1986).

LANGUAGES
Literary Chinese, Modern Chinese, French, German

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS
American Academy of Religion.
· AAR Chinese Religions Group Steering Committee Member, 1999-2005
· AAR Daoist Studies Consultation Steering Committee Member, 2005-
· AAR Daoist Studies Group Co-chair, 2006-
Northern American Association for the Study of Religion
Association for Asian Studies.
Society for the Study of Chinese Religions.
· SSCR Treasurer, 1999.
· SSCR Secretary, 2001-
EDUCATION
Ph.D. Princeton University, Department of Religion (1986).
B.A. Dartmouth College (1982), *Phi Beta Kappa, summa cum laude* with High Honors in both Religion and Government (double major).

ACADEMIC AREAS
Religion and Ethics; War, Peace and Violence (including the Just-War Tradition); Comparative Religious Ethics; Contemporary Religious Thought; Church and State; Religious Pluralism and Ethical Discourse; Thomas Aquinas; History of Christianity

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Georgia State University, Chair of the Department of Religious Studies, 2005-2008; Director of the Religious Studies Program, 1991-2005; Director of the Honors Program, 2003-2005; Associate Chair of the Department of Philosophy; 2000-2005; Associate Professor of Religious Studies, 1993-present; Assistant Professor, 1986-1993.
Princeton University, Teaching Assistant (Preceptor), Department of Religion, 1983-84.
Dartmouth College, Lecturer, Department of English, Fall 1980 and Fall 1981.

FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS
Chair, Board of Advisors, Department of Religion, Princeton University, 2008-present (4-year term).
Teagle Foundation, $75,000 Grant for the project “The Religion Major and Liberal Education,” a two-year study of the religion major’s contributions to undergraduate education, 2006-2008.
Outstanding Teacher Award, Golden Key International Honors Society, 2005.
Outstanding University Teacher Award for the State of Georgia (Research Universities), State of Georgia Board of Regents, 2002
Distinguished Honors Professor Award, Georgia State University, 1995.
Outstanding Teacher Award, Blue Key National Honor Society, 1995.
Outstanding Teacher Award, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University, 1991.
Named to the *Dictionary of International Biography* (Cambridge University Press); *Who's Who in American Education; Who’s Who Among America’s Teachers; Who's Who in America (Southeast);* and *The Directory of American Scholars*.

Association of Princeton Graduate Alumni Teaching Award (Department of Religion), 1985.
Phi Beta Kappa, Dartmouth College chapter,
Rufus Choate Scholar (top 5%), *summa cum laude* (top 2%), graduated ranked 6th in a class of 1,100, Dartmouth College, 1982.

**PUBLICATIONS**

**A. BOOK**

**B. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES**


C. REVIEWS


"Through the Moral Maze--Searching for Absolute Values in a Pluralistic World" (Robert Kane), Religious Studies Review, 24, 2, April 1998, 182.


**DISSERTATION**


**PROFESSIONAL PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS**

“Lessons from Aquinas on the War in Iraq,” Joyce McMahon Hank Chair In Catholic Theology Annual Lecture, St. Mary’s College, South Bend, Indiana, 2008.


"Living Among the Fragments: Ethical Disagreement, Reconciliation, and the Languages of Morals," Seventh International Symposium on Trans-/Inter-Cultural Communication, University of Cairo, Egypt, December 2002.

"Is the War in Afghanistan a 'Just War'?", Middle East Center for Peace, Culture and Development, Georgia State University, Fall 2001.


"Religious Liberty in America: Accommodation or Neutrality?", Georgia Interfaith Council, November 1997.


SELECTED PUBLIC LECTURES


“The Ethics of Warfare: Is the War in Iraq Just?” The Michael Ryan Lecture, Kennesaw State University, Fall 2004.


“The Bible and Homosexuality,” Alliance for Sexual and Gender Diversity, Atlanta, Fall 2003, Fall 2004.

“The Ten Commandments and the Courts,” Interfaith Alliance, Atlanta, Fall 2003.

“Abortion and ‘St. Lucy’ Eyes’,” Alliance Theater Company post-show discussions, Spring 2003.

"Cloning Our Way Into the Future?" BBA Annual Conference, Fall 2002.

"Religion, Terrorism, and the 'Other'," BBA Annual Conference, Fall 2002.


"Who's Afraid of Cloning?", Baptist Student Union, Georgia State University, Fall 1998.

“The Catholic Church and Fundamentalism on Evolution,” interview with Mark Pricard, Channel 11 (NBC) television, Fall 1996.

"What Is Hate Speech and Does It Belong at Georgia State: The Example of the Nation of Islam," Philosophy Forum, Georgia State University, March 1994.


"Religious Ethics and the Terminally Ill," Symposium hosted by Hospice Atlanta and the Visiting Nurse Association of Metropolitan Atlanta, October 1989.


**OFFICES HELD IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS/ SERVICE TO THE DISCIPLINE**


Member, Task Force on Job Placement, American Academy of Religion, 2007-present.

On-Site Evaluator, Department of Religious Studies, Towson University, 2008; University of North Carolina-Greensboro, 2007.


Chair, Religious Studies Group of the University Center in Georgia (an organization of over 140 scholars of Religious Studies from fourteen colleges and universities in the State of Georgia), elected to office by the membership, 1990-1992.


Session Chair at various meetings of the American Academy of Religion, the Society of Christian Ethics, and Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology.


**GEORGIA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Chair, Department of Religious Studies, 2005-present; Director, 1991-2005. Primary author of proposals to establish a B.A. in Religious Studies, a Masters in Religious Studies, the Department of Religious Studies, and a core course “Introduction to World Religions” in Area C. Program has produced two of the past three university valedictorians, two Fulbright and one NEH student scholars, the winner of the Provost’s Award at University Undergraduate Research Day 2008, and graduate acceptances to Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale, Brown, Princeton, Chicago, Virginia, Duke, Berkeley, and Columbia. Masters program has a 4-year graduation rate of over 85%.

Chair, Committee on Academic Programs (CAP), 2004-present; member, 1990-present. Committee responsibilities include: proposals for new academic programs, proposals for changes in existing academic programs, academic program review, the University core
curriculum, Perspectives and GSU 1010 courses, the Critical Thinking Through Writing program, assessment of General Education outcomes, assessment of the major, and Writing Across the Curriculum. Since 2004, the committee has established new procedures/policies for the “Creation of New Academic Programs,” “Deactivation and Termination of Academic Programs,” “Changes and Additions to the Core Curriculum, “Establishing a Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) Requirement,” and “Cross-Listing Graduate Courses;” has established new committees for General Education Assessment and the governing of Perspectives and GSU 1010 courses; has new created new procedures for academic program review and the governing of university-wide courses; and has developed the university’s Instructional Delivery Plan (IDP).

From 2003-05, student membership in the Honors Program expanded by 84%, the number of Honors stand-alone sections and Honors course enrollments grew by over 100%, the Honors Faculty Affiliate Program was established, funding was secured for a fulltime Honors Lecturer, and Honors expanded to offer three FLCs featuring different tracks and foci. Served as an active participant in INCEPT, Panther Preview, University Scholars Day, and in other recruitment efforts.

Georgia State Representative, Core Curriculum Design and Assessment Committee of the Board of Regents, 2008. Worked to try to moderate and redirect System-wide plan to reconfigure the USG core curriculum. Made presentations to the College of Arts and Sciences and Health and Human Sciences; the departments of Computer Science, English, Geo-Sciences, Nursing, Political Science, and Art History; and the State of Georgia AAUP.

Member, University Senate, 1994-present.

Chair, Graduate Council (Academic Programs Committee), 1998-2004; member 1990-2004.

Member, Admissions and Standards Committee, University Senate, 2003-present.

Member, Enrollment Management Group, Georgia State University, 2003-2005.


Member, Student Life and Development Committee, 1996-1998.

Member, Cultural Diversity Committee, 2002-2003.

Member, Honors Council, Honors Program, 1992-2005.


Chair, Humanities Group, Research Initiation Grant Program, 1996; member 1995-1999.

Faculty representative, INCEPT, 1999-present.

Faculty Advisor for the Marshall Scholarships, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation Scholarships, the Goldwater Scholarships, and the Udall Scholarships, Georgia State University, 2003-2006.

Member, Executive Committee, College of Arts and Sciences, 1997-2003.

Chair, Dean's Triennial Evaluation Committee, 1998.


Chair, Faculty Awards Committee, College of Arts and Sciences, 1998; member 1997-1998.


Member, Undergraduate Committee, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University, 2003-2005.

Committee on Religion, Board of Regents, University System of Georgia, 1994.

Author, proposal for a Bachelor of Arts degree in Religious Studies, approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University, 1990; instituted 1992.

Author, proposal for a Masters of Arts degree in Religious studies, approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, 2004, and the University Senate, 2004.

Author, proposal for a Department of Religious Studies, approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, 2004.

Faculty Adviser, Georgia State University Young Democrats, 2000-2006, Religious Studies
Student Forum, 2001-present; Georgia State Buddhist Students, 1986-1996; Amnesty

COURSES TAUGHT
Religion and Ethics
War, Peace, and Religion
Religious Pluralism and Ethical Discourse (graduate seminar)
Church and State
Introduction to Religion
World Religions
Philosophy of Religion
Augustine and Aquinas
History of Christian Thought Through the Reformation
History of Christian Thought Since the Reformation
Contemporary Religious Thought
Christian Ethics and Society
September 11: Causes and Consequences
20th-Century Religious Thought (graduate seminar)
Ethics of Euthanasia (Honors seminar)
Ethics of Animal Rights (Honors seminar)
The Middle Ages (Honors seminar)
Texts and Interpretation (Honors seminar)
Perspectives on Comparative Religious Ethics
Introduction to Philosophy
Social and Political Philosophy
Ancient and Medieval Philosophy

STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Directed over 40 Masters theses and 25 Honors theses since 1987.
Advised and sponsored a recipient of an NEH Young Scholar's Grant.
Advisees admitted to and enrolled in graduate work in religion at Oxford University,
Cambridge University, St. Andrews University, Harvard University, Yale
University, Princeton University, the University of Chicago, the University
California-Berkeley, the University of Virginia, Princeton Theological Seminary,
Brown University, Vanderbilt University, University of California at Santa
Barbara, and Emory University, and in post-baccalaureate programs at Oxford and
Cambridge.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS
American Academy of Religion
Society of Christian Ethics
REFERENCES
Professor Jeffrey L. Stout, Department of Religion, Princeton University.
Professor Ronald M. Green, Department of Religion, Dartmouth College.
Professor Paul Ramsey (deceased), letter on file with the Department of Religion, Princeton University.
Dr. Lauren Adamson, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University.
Dr. David Blumenfeld, Associate Dean for the Humanities (retired), Georgia State University.
EDUCATION

**University of Michigan**, Ann Arbor, MI

**University of Chicago**, Chicago, IL
*M.A. in Middle Eastern Studies*, June 2002

**Loyola University Chicago**, Chicago, IL
*Bachelor of Arts in English, Bachelor of Science in Chemistry*; May 1999
Magna Cum Laude

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

**Assistant Professor of Islam**, Department of Religion
Georgia State University, Fall 2008

**Instructor**, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Designed an undergraduate course exploring issues related to women and Islam in the contemporary Muslim world. Presented lectures and led discussion related to class readings. Designed and evaluated student assignments including required readings, short papers, and research papers.

**Graduate Student Instructor**, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
“The English Bible,” Winter 2004

Taught discussion section for popular undergraduate course. Led discussions for 15-20 students. Developed and graded written assignments and quizzes. Held office hours 3 hours per week.

PUBLICATIONS

“Sometimes a Dream is Just a Dream: Inculcating a Proper Perspective on Dream Interpretation,” *Dreams in Islamic Societies: Exploring the Muslim Subconsciousness*, ed. Alexander Knysh and Ozgen Felek, forthcoming.


RELATED ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE


Provided guidance and feedback on the historical and religious content of the theatrical script, including actor and director cultural sensitivity-training.

**Research Assistant**, Nawawi Foundation, Chicago, IL, 2001-2003

Aided the scholar-in-residence on various projects related to his research on Islam in America, particularly with his work on the life and publications of the 19th century American convert Muhammad Alexander Russell Webb. Helped to trace rare publications of M.A.R. Webb.


IQRA International Educational Foundation, Chicago

**Test Preparation Instructor**, Kaplan, Inc.


FELLOWSHIPS/SCHOLARSHIPS

Rackham Predoctoral Fellowship, 2006-2007

University of Michigan Rackham Merit Fellowship, 2002-2007

FLAS government grant, Summer 2003

University of Michigan, NES Department Hourani Fellowship, Fall 2003

University of Chicago Unendowed Funds Scholarship (full tuition grant), 2000-2002

Loyola University Chicago Presidential Scholarship, 1995-1999

Humana Healthcare System Scholarship, 1995-1999

Illinois State Scholarship, 1995

ACADEMIC LECTURES/INVITED COLLOQUIA/WORKSHOP PARTICIPATION


Invited delegate for historic interfaith conference sponsored by Yale Center for Faith and Culture.

“Legal Autonomy vs. Social Taboos: Granting Muslim Women the Right to Divorce, India, 1931”, Annual Conference on South Asia, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2007.
“Maintaining Scholarly Authority While Redefining Women’s Right to Divorce: India, 1931,” annual South Asia conference at the Center for South Asia Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2007.
“Madhhab as Tool for Reform: Establishing and Maintaining Interpretive Authority While Redefining Women’s Right to Divorce,” annual conference of the Middle East Studies Association (MESA), Washington D.C., 2005.
Participant at the Islam, Asia, Modernity Pedagogy Workshop, held in conjunction with the Islam, Asia, Modernity conference at the University of Washington, Seattle. For this workshop I designed and received critical feedback on the syllabus for a new course, entitled “Evolution of Islamic Thought in the Modern World,” 2005.
Panelist at the “Changing Voices for the Poem of the Cloak: Cross-Cultural Adaptations of Qasidah al Burdah” workshop, held as part of the University of Michigan theme semester on “The Cultural Treasures of the Middle East”, 2005.
PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS
American Academy of Religion, member
Middle East Studies Association, member

LANGUAGES
Arabic (reading, writing, spoken), Urdu (reading, writing, spoken), Persian (reading, writing), German (reading), French (reading)
VINCENT W. LLOYD

CURRENT POSITION

2008- Assistant Professor
Religious Studies Department
Georgia State University

EDUCATION

2008 Ph.D. University of California, Berkeley
Dissertation: “Gillian Rose and the Rhetoric of Transcendence,”
Advised by Daniel Boyarin
2004 M.A. University of California, Berkeley
2003 B.A. Princeton University
Thesis Advised by Eric Gregory

VISITING POSITIONS

Summer 2008 Visiting Research Associate, University of Warwick
Winter-Spring 2005 Exchange Scholar, University of Chicago Divinity School

BOOKS

Law and Transcendence: On the Unfinished Project of Gillian Rose
Palgrave Macmillan, December 2008

[[Secular Faith, co-edited with Elliot Ratzman]]
Contract offer has been made by Cascade Books
Contributions from David Chidester, Jean Comaroff, Melvin Rogers, Edward Blum,
Cindy Huang, Andrew Gibson, Michael Saler, Adam Webb

[[The Problem with Grace: Reconfiguring Political Theology]]
At external reviewers for Stanford University Press

ARTICLES

Forthcoming “Michel Houellebecq and the Theological Virtues,” Literature and Theology
2008 “Law, Grace, and Race: The Political Theology of Manderlay,” Theory & Event 11:3
2008 “On Gillian Rose and Love,” Telos 143
2007 “On Saying Yes: Perversion and the Sacred,” The Symptom 8
2003  (with Zia Mian) “Notes from the Princeton Divestment Campaign,” Social Text 21:2

SELECTED BOOK REVIEWS AND REVIEW ESSAYS

Forthcoming  Review of David Kyuman Kim, Melancholic Freedom: Agency and the Spirit of Politics in Political Theology
Forthcoming  Review of Peter Hallward, Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation in The Heythrop Journal
2009  Review of Jean-Luc Marion, The Erotic Phenomenon in Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology 40:1
2008  Review of Jonathon Lear, Radical Hope: Ethics in the Face of Cultural Devastation in Political Theology 9:2
2008  “Resisting Sophistry,” discussing Talal Asad, On Suicide Bombing and Jacqueline Rose, The Last Resistance in New Formations 63
2007  Review of Alain Badiou, Being and Event in Law, Culture, and the Humanities 3:2

PRESENTATIONS

2009  “The Secular Faith of Gillian Rose,” Florida State University
2008  “Politics of the Middle: John Milbank, Gillian Rose, and the Sharia Controversy,” Theology and the Political Consultation, American Academy of Religion, Chicago
2008  “Politics of the Middle: John Milbank, Gillian Rose, and the Sharia Controversy,” Anti-Liberalism and Political Theology, conference held at Sciences Po, Paris
2007  “The Problem with Grace: Lars von Trier’s Political Theology,” Rhetoric Department Graduate Student Colloquium, UC-Berkeley
2007  “What is Prophecy? Cornel West and the Philosophy of Public Theology,” College Theology Society Annual Conference, Philosophy of Religion Section, University of Dayton
2005  “Two Concepts of Tradition: Pragmatism and Theology in Post-Secular Politics,” Thinking the Present: The Beginnings and Ends of Political Theory, Graduate Conference, University of California – Berkeley, 2005
[Also organized conference panel: “The Politics of Tradition,” three papers with response by Naomi Seidman]
2004  “The Coming Christian Community? Postmodern Theology and Oppositional Politics,” New York University Comparative Literature Department Graduate Conference

WORK IN PROGRESS
•  “Politics of the Middle: John Milbank, Gillian Rose, and the Sharia Controversy,” solicited for a Special Issue of Political Theology.
•  Race and Political Theology, co-editing volume of essays with Gregory Kaplan, contributors include Daniel Boyarin, Elliot Wolfson, J. Kameron Carter, Corey Walker, Christoph Schmidt, Jonathon Kahn, George Shulman, Gil Anidjar

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
As sole instructor –
MA Seminar: Religion, Ethics, Politics (Spring 2009, Georgia State University)
Topics in Philosophy of Religion (Spring 2009, Georgia State University)
Introduction to Religion (Fall 2008, Georgia State University)
Christianity and Democracy (Fall 2008, Georgia State University)
Introduction to Ethics (Spring 2007, Indiana University-South Bend)
As co-instructor or section leader –
Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion (Spring 2008, UC-Berkeley)
The Craft of Writing (Fall 2007, UC-Berkeley)

GRANTS AND AWARDS
University of California Regents Fellowship (2003-2005)

UNIVERSITY SERVICE
Georgia State Religious Studies Curriculum Committee (2008-)
Georgia State Religious Studies Search Committee (2008-)
Georgia State Religious Studies Director of Graduate Studies (2008-)

**Professional Memberships**
American Academy of Religion
Association for Jewish Studies
Society of Christian Ethics (pending)
Louis A. Ruprecht, Jr.

EDUCATION
Ph.D, 1990, Graduate Division of Religion, Emory University
M.A., 1985, Theology and Ethics, The Divinity School, Duke University
A.B., 1983, Religion, Department of Religion, Duke University

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY
July 2005-, Associate Professor, William M. Suttles Chair of Religious Studies, Georgia State University
January 2004-May 2005, Associate Professor of Ethics and Culture, Claremont School of Theology and Graduate University
April 2003, Visiting Lecturer, Department of History, The Ionian University, Corfu, Greece
Islam and the Modern West
April-June 2002, Visiting Lecturer, Department of History, Ionian University, Corfu, Greece
The Other Americas as Seen Through Literature
Spring 2002, Fall 2003, Visiting Lecturer, University of Georgia, Graduate Program in the Social Foundations of Education
2000-2004, Assistant Professor of Humanities, Tift School of Education, Mercer University
1999-2000, Visiting Assistant Professor, Duke University, Department of Religion and Kenan Ethics Center
Fall 1998, Visiting Assistant Professor, Princeton University, Department of Religion and Program in Hellenic Studies
1996-1997, Visiting Assistant Professor, Barnard College, Department of Religion
Spring 1996, Visiting Assistant Professor, Emory University, Department of Classics
1992-1995, Visiting Assistant Professor, Emory University, Department of Religion

Languages
Classical and Modern Greek (fluent), German (fluent), Italian (reading knowledge, some speaking proficiency), French (reading knowledge), Spanish and Biblical Hebrew (proficiency)

Specializations and Teaching Competencies
Religion and Culture, Religion and Art, Nineteenth Century Europe, Theories of Tragedy, Modern Greek Studies, Comparative Religious Ethics, Hebrew Bible, New Testament Studies, Greco-Roman Environment, Classical Literature and History, Greek Archaeology, Palestinian Archaeology, Islamic Civilization, Philosophical Ethics, Sociology of Religion

PUBLICATIONS
Books
Shrines to the Muse: A Religious History of the Modern Public Art Museum (draft currently under revision).
Winckelmanns Secret History: How a Sometime Catholic and Full-time Romantic Turned Art Into A Religion and Museums into Temples (draft currently under review).
This Tragic Gospel: How John Took the Cup of Christian Compassion Away (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass of Wiley Imprints, 2008).


Note: The Conference on Christianity and Literatures Book of the Year, 1995

Translations


Odysseas Elytis, Diary From an April, As Yet Unseen [1984], in Arion, Third Series 12.2 (2004): 67-103 [from Modern Greek].

Johannes Martin Wagner, Report on the Aeginetan Sculptures in the Possession of His Royal Highness the Crown Prince of Bavaria, with art-historical notes by Friedrich W.J. Schelling [1817] [from German] 220-page unpublished manuscript.

Review Essays


Being Modern, Being Beyond, a review of Thomas A. Carlson, Indiscretion: Finitude and the Naming of God (The University of Chicago Press, 1999), Philosophy Today 44.3 (2000): 326-333


Book Chapters
Caught Between Enlightenment and Romanticism, in Reimagining Islam in Theory and Practice: Essays in Honor of Bruce B. Lawrence, Carl W. Ernst and Richard C. Martin, eds. (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, forthcoming 2009)


Why the Greeks? Agon, Logos, Polis: The Greek Achievement and Its Aftermath, Johann P. Arnason and Peter Murphy, eds. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001), 29-55

Are We Living in an Ethical Age? Instilling Ethics, Norma Thompson, ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 167-177


Journal Articles
Placing Helen Within Hellenism: Where Identities Collide, Journal of Modern Greek Studies (submitted)
The Whole Story, Religion and Literature (submitted)
The Virtue of Courage: The Penultimacy of the Political, Soundings 83.3/4 (2000): 635-668
God Gardened in the East, Avram Wandered West, South Atlantic Quarterly 98.4 (1999): 689-710


Homer's Wisdom and Heroic Friendship, South Atlantic Quarterly 97.1 (1998): 29-64

In the Aftermath of Modernism: On the Postures of the Present and Their Portrait of the Past, Soundings 75.2/3 (1992): 255-285
Nietzsche's Vision, Nietzsche's Greece, Soundings 73.1 (1990): 61-84
Petition for Clemency Submitted to the Right Honorable James Hunt, Governor of the State of North Carolina, on Behalf of Velma B. Barfield, with James Little and Lao Rubert (October 26, 1985)

Book Reviews

In Process
Still in the Middle of a Wine-Dark Sea: The Cretan Landscape in History and Myth
(book proposal)
Panamanian Peregrinations: Leaves From a Travelers Notebook
(book in draft form)
The Pilgrims Gait: Journeys Out of the Ordinary, edited with Peter Murphy
(manuscript currently under review)
His House, Her Home: Heidegger on the Ancient Greeks and Germans
(article in draft form)
Romanticism and the (Choral) Birth of Tragedy
(article in draft form)
LECTURES

International
On the Place of Religion in Modern Thought, International Collegium Phaenomenologicum, Città di Castello, Italy (July 31, 2008)
God and the Gardens in Genesis, Radio Interview with Julie Copeland, ABC Radio National, Melbourne, Australia (recorded April 15, 2008, to be aired in August 2008)
Modern Shrines to an Ancient Muse: A Religious History of the Modern Public Art Museum, at The Greeks: Muses, Myths and Modernities, Monash University, Melbourne Australia (May 3, 2007)
Greek Exercises: The Modern Olympics as Hellenic Appropriation and Reinvention, at From Aristotle to Us, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia (May 1-2, 2007)
Iyyiny ṣəyy ṣəyy ṣəyy ṣəyy (Islam and the Modern West), Department of History, The Ionian University, Corfu, Greece (May 8, 2003)
A Small Piece of German Romanticism, Department of History, The Ionian University, Corfu, Greece (May 29, 2002)
An Archaeology of Helen at Troy, Department of History, The Ionian University, Corfu, Greece (May 27, 2002)
The Ethos of Modern Olympism: Nineteenth-Century Genealogies, Department of History, The Ionian University, Corfu, Greece (April 19, 2002)
On Conjuration in Contemporary Religion and Art, Museo De Arte Contemporaneo, Panama City, Panama, at Como se cuenta el cuento? (How do we tell the story?) in conjunction with Angeles, Arcangeles y Antepasados by Dr. Arturo Lindsay (December 16-17, 1994)
On Greco-Macedonian Rhetoric and Modernist Assumptions and Post-Modern Rhetoric, both delivered at the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation Institute, Religious Rhetoric and Violence, in Toledo, Spain (October 11-15, 1993)

Radio Interviews
On Placenames, Translations, and Sex, for Lingua Franca Australia (recorded June 11, 2008 in Rome, to be aired in August 2008)
The Greek Olympics as Religion and Their Relation to Political Protest, for State of Belief, a program sponsored by AirAmerica (recorded April 17, 2008, aired the next day)
God and the Gardens in Genesis, Radio Interview with Julie Copeland, ABC Radio National, Melbourne, Australia (recorded April 15, 2008, to be aired in August 2008)
Museums: Modern Shrines to an Ancient Muse, Radio Interview with Julie Copeland, ABC Radio National, Melbourne, Australia (recorded May 7, 2007, aired August 19, 2007)

Professional Organizations
When the Virtues of the Polis Meet the Capitalist Academy, Special Topics Forum for the Academic Relations Committee of the American Academy of Religions Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA (November 17, 2007)
Commentator for the Religion and Popular Culture Section of the American Academy of Religions Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA (November 24, 2003)
Commentator for the Religion and Popular Culture Section of the American Academy of Religions Annual Meeting, Denver, CO (November 20, 2001)
The Messy Business of Ethics in Public Health: Competing Paradigms and the Ethics Establishment in America, a panel presentation with James J. Winchester, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA (January 12, 2001)
Categories for Impeachment: Comedy, Tragedy and the Erotic, at the American Academy of Religions Annual Meeting, Boston, MA (November 20, 1999)
The Matter of Cultural Relativism, at The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD (January 22, 1996)

Universities
On University Support for Research in the Humanities, Arts and Sciences, The Presidential Trustees Luncheon, Georgia State University (November 1, 2007)
Winckelmanns Secret History: Toward a Religious History of the Public Art Museum, Department of Religious Studies Faculty Research Series (October 10, 2007)
Modern Shrines to an Ancient Muse: Museum Cultures in Europe, The European Studies Seminar, Emory University (March 5, 2007)
Was Socrates the Expert on *Eros* He Claimed to Be, and What Does This Have to Do With Philosophy? Georgia College and State University, Millidgeville, GA (September 21, 2006)
Respondent to Jeannie Alexander, John Rivenbark, Zeyneb Talal, Religious Studies Student Paper Symposium, Georgia State University (April 19, 2006)
Athena at the Parthenon, Respondent to Paul Courtright, The European Studies Seminar, Emory University (February 6, 2006)
What Sexual Identity is Not: On the Lost Art of Crossing Over from Animals to the Human, The Georgia State University Brains and Behavior Lunchtime Colloquium (February 2, 2006)
Caught Between Enlightenment and Romanticism, at Islam in Theory and Practice, Duke University, Durham, NC (January 7-8, 2006)
Modern Liberalism and the Liberation from Identity, for Can There Be a Liberal Liberalism? with Philip Clayton and D.Z. Phillips, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA (April 14, 2005)
Driving with the Barbarians: An Exercise in Scattershot Moral Reflection, Inaugural Lecture, Claremont School of Theology, Claremont, CA (February 16, 2005)
Crete in Between: Still in the Middle of a Wine-Dark Sea, a keynote lecture for the Platsis Conference, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI (October 3-4, 2004)
Religion, the Death Penalty and Constitutional Law

and

Ritual, Religion and Rivalry: Notes on the History of the Revival of the Olympic Games, Georgia College and State University, Milledgeville, GA (April 9, 2004)
The Whole Story, for Narrative in Theology and Ministry, Claremont School of Theology, Claremont, CA (January 23-24, 2004)
Ten Commandments in Alabama, Greek Temples in Washington: On the Place of Religion in Our Political Culture, Georgia College and State University, Millidgeville, GA (September 19, 2003)
Islam and the Modern West: Situating the Current Conflicts, Georgia College and State University, Millidgeville, GA (April 16, 2003)
The Greeks on Trial: Religion, Sex, and the US Supreme Court, First Annual Alumni Lecture Series, Graduate Division of Religion, Emory University (November 1, 2001)
Over His Shoulder and Across the Border, Keynote Address at the Southeastern Regional Meeting of the Society for Values in Higher Education, the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC (April 9, 2001)
Archaeology as Metaphor, for Knowing and Speaking, a symposium held in association with Retreat: Palimpsest of a Sea-Island Georgia Plantation, Clark Atlanta University Art Galleries (March 11, 2001)
Washingtons Parthenon: Reading the Supreme Court Building as a Greek Text, for Art in the Public Sphere, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville (March 9-10, 2001)
Greeks On Trial: Religion, Sex and the US Supreme Court, the Annual Sibley Lecture, Alfred University, Alfred, NY (February 19, 2001)
Putting Helen Into Hellenism, for Literature on Trial, Emory University, Atlanta, GA (October 6, 2000)
Putting Helen Into Hellenism: From Homer to Euripides By Way of Sappho, presented at a panel for the stage deus of Peter Burians new translation of Euripidess Helen, Durham, NC (December 5, 1999)
Re-Locating the Classical, presented to the Mediterranean Studies Group of Duke University, Durham, NC (November 16, 1999)
What is the Place of Ethics in Higher Education? a Keynote Address at Mercer University, Macon, GA (April 23, 1999)
Socratic Spirituality, and the Life of Virtue for Moral Education in a Diverse Society, a Conference Sponsored by the Kenan Ethics Center, Duke University (April 9-11, 1999)
Comedy, Satire, and Democratic Politics, for After Impeachment: Moral Lessons, Dangers and Opportunities, Duke University (February 24, 1999)
Why the Greeks? A Romantic Question, for the Program in Hellenic Studies Fall Lecture Series, Princeton University (December 4, 1998)
On the Holy Icons: The Debate Over Representation in the Christian Tradition and
Leaves From a Pilgrims Notebook, for Black Christs in the Americas, a symposium sponsored by Spelman College, Atlanta, GA (November 19-21, 1998)
Was Greek Thought Religious? The View From the Courts, for the Department of Religion Seminar Series, Princeton University (October 12, 1998)
Responding or Responsible? Tracking the Moral Trajectory of the Modern University, at Stewardship and Opportunism: The Moral Roots of Accountability, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville (April 16-18, 1998)
Are We Living in an Ethical Age?, a Keynote Panel Presentation at the Olmsted Symposium on Instilling Ethics, Yale University (February 27-28, 1998)
Nietzsche and the Roots of Postmodernism, at the Kenan Ethics Program Conference on Moral Education in a Diverse Society, Duke University (February 20-22, 1998)
The Contemporary Recovery of the Ancients, and Why the Greeks? for faculty and students in the Departments of Philosophy and Theology, Loyola Marymount University (November 25, 1997)
Getting in Touch with Orthodoxy, a panel discussion for the Inter-departmental Group for Religious Studies at the University Center of Georgia, Emory University (May 22, 1997)
Eternal or Cyclic? The Return of the Ethical in Contemporary Theory, at AGON: On the Common Place, Tragic Fate, Contemporary Return and Democratic Future of the Classical, The Ohio State University (April 10-13, 1997)
Was Greek Thought Religious? at the Columbia University Law School (February 28, 1997)
The Olympic Ideal, Annual Lecture, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (November 20, 1996)
The Embassy to Achilles: iliad Book IX, lecture delivered to the Hellenic Friends of Antiquity, Atlanta, GA (April 28, 1996)
On Teaching Ethics in the Multicultural University, and A Parthenon in Nashville, Greek Temples in Washington: The Ethos of Modern Olympism, keynote lectures (with Vincent Harding and David Miller) for Ethics and the Curriculum: Teaching and Moral Responsibility, University of Tennessee at Knoxville (April 10-14, 1996)
The Classics as a Model for the Contemporary Area-Studies Curriculum, for Whither the NeoHellenic? a conference sponsored by the Program in Modern Greek Studies, Ohio State University (March 30-31, 1996)
The Ethos of Olympism, the Center for Ethics in Public Policy and the Professions, Emory University (March 5, 1996)
On the Moral Meaning of Deconstruction, for Ethics and Deconstruction, sponsored by the Center for Ethics in Public Policy and the Professions, Emory University (February 22, 1996)
Fundamentalism and Modernity: A Counter-Thesis, for Wrestling With Global Fundamentalism(s) in the Mid-90s, at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro (February 6-7, 1996)
The Ethics of Desire: Readings from the Symposium and Phaedrus
and Ethics and the Dilemma of Moral Failure, delivered to the ALPHA Seminar at the University of Northern Illinois, Dekalb, IL (November 15-16, 1995)
In Sapphos Name, presented to the Department of Religion, Emory University, as part of their Faculty Lecture Series (April 12, 1995)
What Do We Mean By Multicultural? at Multiculturalism: Ancient and Modern, Emory University (February 27, 1995)
Tragic Postures and Tragic Visions, at the Museum Scholars Bookshelf, Carlos Museum, Emory University (February 16, 1995)
Socratess Erotic Philosophy

and

Sappho: Poetess of Lesbos, delivered to the ALPHA Seminar at The University of Northern Illinois (November 17-18, 1994)

 Conjuring The Ancestors as a Religious Practice, roundtable discussion of some current work of Dr. Arturo Lindsay, Chassie Post Gallery, Atlanta, GA (August 2, 1994)

 The Macedonian Question: A Narrative Question, Religion and Violence Study Group, Society for Values in Higher Education, Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA (August 1, 1994)

 Socratess Erotic Philosophy, delivered at Spelman College, Atlanta, GA (February 2, 1994)

 First Things First, The Office of Residential Lifes Last Lecture Series, Emory University (November 1, 1993)

 Loving and Knowing in an Unloving Age

and

 The Heidegger Controversy: An Antimodern Legacy, delivered to the Honors Symposium at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN (April 1-2, 1993)

 In the Pirate Lair of Phalasarna, delivered to the Archaeological Institute of America, Atlanta Chapter (April 23, 1991)
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Honors and Awards
Georgia State University Scholarly Support Grant
May-August 2008
Georgia State University Research Initiation Grant
May-August 2006
Outstanding Faculty Member of the Year, College of Continuing and Professional Studies, Mercer University, 2002-2003
Nominated for Distinguished Teaching Award in the Humanities, Duke University 1999-2000
Distinguished Teaching Award, Emory University Inter-Sorority Council 1994-1995
Robert W. Woodruff Graduate Fellowship, Emory University 1985-1989

Professional Associations
Modern Greek Studies Association (committee member for the Modern Greek Book of the Year award, 2007- )
The Society of Biblical Literature
The Society for Values in Higher Education
The Woodrow Wilson Foundation
The American School of Classical Studies in Athens
The American Academy in Rome

Other Educational and Research Experiences
Visiting Research Fellow, The Vatican Secret Archives (June-July 2008)
Visiting Research Fellow, The Vatican Library and Secret Archives (June-July 2007)
Visiting Research Fellow, The Vatican Secret Archives (May-August and December 2006)
Research Fellow, The Vatican Museums Archives (May-June 2005)
Visiting Research Fellow, The American Academy in Rome (April-May 2004)
Faculty Enrichment Seminar Leader, St. Anselm College, Manchester, NH (June 24-28, 1996)

Visiting Fellow, The American School of Classical Studies in Athens
(February 1989-September 1990)
Trench Supervisor, Phalasarna Excavation Project, Phalasarna, Crete
(Summers 1988-1991)
American School of Classical Studies Summer Program in Greek Archaeology
(May-July, 1987)
Princeton Theological Seminary Summer Program in Biblical Hebrew
(May-July, 1985)
Duke University Summer Program in Palestinian Archaeology, Jericho and Jerusalem,
(May-July, 1982)

**International Seminars**
Faith and Reason, The Collegium Phaenomenologicum
Lecturer: On the Place of Religion in the Modern Age
Città di Castello, Italy (July 31, 2008)
Image and Word, The Collegium Phaenomenologicum, Seminar Leader
Città di Castello, Italy (July 12-18, 2007)
Hegel and the Modern Philosophy of History, The Collegium Phaenomenologicum
Città di Castello, Italy (July 11-17, 2005)
No Exit: Levinas and the Finite Within the Infinite, The Collegium Phaenomenologicum
Città di Castello, Italy (July 11-17, 2003)
Città di Castello, Italy (July 15-August 2, 2002)
National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar
Representing Geography and Community in the World of Imperial Rome
The American Academy in Rome, Italy (June-July 2000)
National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute
Plato and the Polis
Duke University (June-July, 1994)
Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation Institute, Religious Rhetoric and Violence
Toledo, Spain (October 11-15, 1993)
National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute
Beyond the Text: Teaching Religion and Material Culture
University of Hawaii at Manoa (June-July, 1993)

**Conference Organization**
Identity and Conflict, Coordinator, The Southeast Regional Meeting of the Society for Values in
Higher Education, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA (March 8-10, 2002)
Moral Education in a Diverse Society, Steering Committee, Conference sponsored by the Kenan
Ethics Program of Duke University, The North Carolina Central University, and Shaw
University (April 9-11, 1999)
Black Christs in the Americas, Co-Coordinator, Conference sponsored by Spelman College and
the Georgia Humanities Council (November 19-22, 1998)

**Dissertations**
Reader, Michelle Miles, All the Dead Voices: Communication Across the Grave in
Contemporary Irish Poetry, Ph.D., Department of English, Emory University, *in progress*
Director, Ivy Helman, Fundamentally Anti-Feminist: A Comparative Analysis of Three Forms of Religious Anti-Modernism, Ph.D., School of Religion, Claremont Graduate University, in progress
Director, Alan van Wyk, Becoming Subject: Conceptions of the Subject in Augustine, Nietzsche and Foucault, Ph.D., School of Religion, Claremont Graduate University, in progress
Reader, Melanie Pavich, The Beginning of True Life: Martha Schofield and a Woman's Choice to Become a Freedmen's Teacher in South Carolina, Ph.D., Program in Social Foundations of Education, University of Georgia, pending 2008
Co-Director, Michael Bevers, This Lone Brightness: Frances Flaherty and the True Dharma Eye, Th.D., Claremont School of Theology (2005)
Reader, Michael Brant Lippman, Women Obscene, Not Heard: Women's Comic Rituals and Women in Aristophanic Comedy, Ph.D., Department of Classics, Duke University (2004)
Director, Patrick Kelly, The Soul of Sport, Ph.D., School of Religion, Claremont Graduate University (2004)
Reader, Phil Parkinson, Our Infant State: The Maori Language, the Mission Presses, the British Crown and the Maori, 1814-1838, Ph.D., Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand (2002)
DAVID M. BELL

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
Research Methods in the Study of Religion
   Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods for the study of religion
Psychology and Religion
   Research specialized in cognition and memory
Philosophy of Science
   Interest in the role of scientific pursuits and post-positivist interpretation
History of Science and Religion in North America
   19th century specialization
American Eschatological Religion
   Research in role of religious experiences in eschatological movements

EDUCATION
Emory University, 2001-2008
   Ph.D., Research Methods, Psychology and Religion
Princeton Theological Seminary, magna cum laude, 1994-1997
   M.Div., Psychology of Religion, Science and Religion
Samford University, magna cum laude, 1990-1994
   B.A., Religion, Psychology dual major; sociology minor
   Special student status: Princeton University, University of Durham, Universität Tübingen

DOCTORAL EXAMS
Science, Religion and the Legacy of William James
Cognitive Science and Philosophy
Evolutionary Psychology and Religion
Methodological Approaches to the Study of Religion

DISSERTATION
Religious Identity: Conceptualization and measurement of the religious self
Summary: This project provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the ways in which religious beliefs, experiences, and cultural institutions factor into the psychology of identity construction in individuals. As part of a construct validity study establishing a measure for religious identity, this work uses cognitive science, phenomenological methods, and statistical research to provide insight into the psychological development of religious identity. The results have immediate application for researchers in psychology and religious studies as it presents evidence that religious identity may be more central to religion than are attachments to religious beliefs or practices. Furthermore, it presents evidence for how religiosity is psychologically cultivated in late adolescence in different world faiths, and may provide some insight into the current tension between Islam and Christianity.

   Committee                     Area of Specialty
   Advisor:  John Snarey         Developmental Psychology, Psychology of Religion
   Readers: Ted Brelsford        Religious Practices and Religious Education
   Robyn Fivush                  Cognitive Psychology, Autobiographical Memory
   Ralph Hood, outside reader    Psychology of Religion

GRANTS AND HONORS
Emory University               2006-2007
Dean’s Teaching Fellowship
(University wide award for excellence in teaching, $17,000)
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium August, 2006
Research and travel grant in religious identity
(Funded jointly by Emory and Katholieke U. Leuven, $3,500)
University of Manchester, United Kingdom April, 2006
Research and travel grant in identity formation
(Funded jointly by Emory and the University of Manchester, $2,800)
Emory University 2005-2006
Woodruff Library Research Fellowship
(Constructed the "Religion and Missions Project," $15,000)
Duke University July, 2005
Summer research grant in religion and mental health
(Funded by Emory University, $2,800)
Emory University June, 2005
Master Teacher Program Fellowship (Awarded to two doctoral candidates across the university, $1,200)
Emory University 2001-2005
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Fellowship
(Four year full tuition scholarship and stipend, $167,000)
Princeton Theological Seminary 1994-1997
Academic scholarship
(Three year full tuition scholarship, $37,000)

EDITORIAL EXPERIENCE
Editorial Board, Philosophical Writings, (Durham, UK) 2002-present (review articles submitted in Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Religion, & American Pragmatism)

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES
American Academy of Religion
American Psychological Association, Div. 36
International Association for the Psychology of Religion
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
International Association for the Cognitive Science of Religion

TEACHING COMPETENCE
Primary: Introductory Courses in Religion; Psychology and Religion; Philosophy of Religion; Religious Practices and Experiences; Religious Identity; Philosophy of Science; Cognitive Foundations of Religion; Philosophy of Mind; Philosophical Psychology
Secondary: American Religions; World Religions; Mysticism; Religious Ethics; Moral Development; Developmental Psychology; Social Psychology.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
Undergraduate Courses
Lecturer Fall, 2008
World religions
Georgia State University
Department of Religious Studies

Lecturer Fall, 2008
Introduction to Religion
Samford University
Department of Religion
Adjunct Professor

Psychology and World Religions
Emory University, Emory College (undergraduate)
Department of Psychology & Department of Religion
Adjunct Professor

Psychology and Religion
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (undergraduate)
Department of Psychology

Graduate Courses
Adjunct Professor

Sociology of Religion
Mercer University, McAfee School of Theology
Practical Theology Department
Adjunct Professor

Faith and Identity Development
Emory University, Candler School of Theology
Religion and Personality Department
Adjunct Professor

Youth: Development and Identity
Mercer University, McAfee School of Theology
Practical Theology Department

Teaching Assistantships
Teaching Assistant – supervisor, Jon Gunnemann

Introduction to Christian Ethics
Emory University, Candler School of Theology
Ethics and Society Department
Teaching Associate – supervisor, John Snarey

Adult Development and Aging
Emory University, Candler School of Theology
Religion and Personality Department
Teaching Assistant – supervisor, Karen Scheib

Introduction to Pastoral Care and Counseling
Emory University, Candler School of Theology
Pastoral Care and Counseling Department
Teaching Assistant – supervisor, John Snarey

Classic Readings in the Psychology of Religion
Emory University, Candler School of Theology
Religion and Personality Department
Other related teaching experience:

Visiting lectures:
- The College of New Jersey (World religions, Psychology of religion)
- University of Durham, UK (Philosophy of cognitive science and religion)

Pedagogical Training:
- Master Teacher Program Award, Emory University Advisory Council on Teaching, June, 2005
- TATTO program, Emory University (workshops and courses on teaching), 2001-2003
- Philosophy of Education (graduate course, Georgia State University), Fall, 2000
- Dean’s Teaching Fellowship, awarded for excellence in teaching, Emory University, 2006-2007

PUBLICATIONS

Forthcoming


“This sacred self: implicit and explicit aspects of religious identity”
- American Psychological Association (San Francisco, California) August 2007
- International Association for the Psychology of Religion Triennial Conference (Leuven, Belgium) September 2006

“Development of the religious self: a theoretical foundation for measuring religious identity”
- British Sociology of Religion Conference (Manchester, United Kingdom) April 2006

“Closer to the gods: rethinking the stigma of mental disability and its role in religious experiences”
- Southeastern Regional American Academy of Religion (Atlanta, Georgia) March 2006

“Religious identity: conceptualizing a measure for research and practice”
- American Psychological Association, Psychology of Religion Mid-year Conference (Baltimore, Maryland) March 2006


COMMUNITY SERVICE
Habitat for Humanity, Atlanta, Georgia, 1997-2008
Trinity House (Drug-Rehab house), Atlanta, Georgia, 1997-2007
Metro Food Pantry, New York City, New York, 2006
North Charleston Metanoia Project, Charleston, South Carolina, 2004
Earth Day Southeast Atlanta Work Coordinator, Atlanta, Georgia, 2002
Friends of Families (shelter for abused women and children), Panama City, Florida, 1999
Appendix F4: Faculty Involvement in Self-Study
The initial research for the Self-Study was conducted by Kathryn McClymond, assisted by Kenneth Smith, a graduate research assistant. In Fall 2008 Timothy Renick (former Department Chair) and Jonathan Herman (current Undergraduate Director) were asked to contribute data and text for the initial draft of the study. An initial draft was developed, based on 1) information obtained through the Department and OIR research and 2) informal input from faculty regarding goals and objectives for the next cycle. This draft was circulated to the TT faculty and to the lecturer for review and input. The Self-Study committee chair then incorporated those comments into a second draft, which was also circulated for review and input. This final draft was approved by the full faculty. Upon approval by the full faculty, the Chair of the Department wrote an executive summary, which is included with the full report.

Appendix G1: Summary Data on Student/Faculty Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># TT Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Majors (All)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/TT Ratio</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/TT Ratio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ph.D. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Grad Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G2: University Library Report

RELIGIOUS STUDIES DEPARTMENT REVIEW: LIBRARY RESOURCES

Summary: Strengths and Weaknesses of the University Library Collection and Services

In general, the University Library’s collection of monographs, serials, and databases supports the Department of Religious Studies’ programs through the master’s level. Notable strengths in the monographs collection include the areas of Philosophy of Religion, Rationalism, Christianity, Biblical studies, Christian Denominations, and, to a lesser extent, Judaism. The number of monograph titles supporting the program is, with a few exceptions, appropriate to a religious studies program granting master’s degrees in the comparative study of religion. In addition to monographs in the religious studies collection, material relevant to the program is also available in areas such as African Studies, African-American Studies, Anthropology, Art, Asian studies,
Classical Studies, History, Jurisprudence and Law, Literature, Middle Eastern Studies, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, and Women’s Studies.

The table in the “Relevant Library Statistics” portion of this document reflects the percentage of the Yankee Book Peddler approval plan universe in the primary religious studies call number ranges that the Library received in FY08. The percentages may indicate the need to increase the number of titles received in certain call number ranges as a few ranges are being collected at a relatively low level of the approval plan universe. This may be because the approval plan has not been updated since Religious Studies established itself as a separate department from the Department of Philosophy under which it used to be included. Areas which are collected at or above 50%—Philosophy of Religion (51%), Natural Theology (52%) and Rationalism (55%)—are areas that would have been important when Religious Studies was a part of the Department of Philosophy. As a separate department, however, increases may be needed in areas such as Buddhism (38%), Hinduism (33%), Islam (39%), and Judaism (39%). To confirm the above findings, Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) approval order acquisitions were compared with those of three peer institutions: Miami University of Ohio, Oxford; New York University; and the University of Kansas, Lawrence. These three universities have terminal master’s degree programs of similar size and scope to that of the Department of Religious Studies at Georgia State University. Titles acquired by these institutions were examined for the period from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The results of this comparison indicate that the Library is collecting on a comparatively low level when compared to universities of similar size and with similar programs. For example, during the period under review, the University of Kansas added 1171 titles, New York University added 1039, and Miami University of Ohio added 709, while the University Library at Georgia State University added 667 titles. In almost all call number ranges significant to a program of comparative religion, the University Library added fewer titles. One subject area in which the University Library received considerably fewer titles was Buddhism [BQ1-BQ9800], which is central to the Department’s course of study.

In addition to monographs, the University Library maintains a satisfactory collection of online databases and journals to support the needs of the Religious Studies faculty and students. The electronic databases used by the Department are made available via Georgia State University Library subscription and GALILEO, a Georgia initiative of database collections. The journals are available in both print and online formats, with increasing emphasis on online access as many databases increase their full-text availability. No journals were added to the collection during the past three fiscal years and only one title was canceled. Two databases of relatively minor importance were added during the same time period to the list of other resources already made available. Overall, the Library continues to maintain an adequate collection of religious studies journals for both student and faculty use. The collection of databases could be significantly improved by the addition of the online versions of the *Index Islamicus* and the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, both of which are essential to students and faculty conducting research in the area of Islamic studies. Journals recently requested by Religious Studies faculty include: *Islamic Studies* (ISSN: 0578-8072), *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory* (ISSN: 0950-2378), *Contemporary Pragmatism* (ISSN: 1572-3429), *Communio: International Catholic Review* (ISSN: 0094-2065), *Culture and Religion* (ISSN: 1475-5610), *Scottish Journal of Theology* (ISSN: 0036-9306), and *The Hedgehog Review* (ISSN: 1527–9677). While the Library was unable to purchase these databases and journal titles at the time they were requested due to
budget constraints, the Library will make an effort to add these journals to the collection if and when funding becomes available.

For resources not available at the University Library, patrons can request materials through the library’s interlibrary loan service. The Interlibrary Loan Services Office can obtain most types of materials, including books, microfilmed newspapers, dissertations, theses, and periodical articles. Audio-visual materials may be requested, but are sometimes difficult to obtain on loan. This service is free of charge to Georgia State University faculty, staff and students. Books available at other University System libraries may be obtained through the GIL Express service.

In terms of library service to the Department in the form of instruction and individual consultations, there is good use of the consultation services provided by the Religious Studies Librarian, but only limited use of instruction services, as evidenced by 48 consultations and only 3 instruction sessions provided during fiscal year 2007-2008. The Department is strongly encouraged to take advantage of the instruction services offered and to continue to refer students to the Religious Studies librarian for research assistance. With continued outreach, including the holding of office hours within the Department by the Religious Studies Librarian, usage of these services should increase.

**Relevant Library Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>STATISTIC</th>
<th>COMMENTS/NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journal titles supporting program</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related journal titles added in last three fiscal years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related journal titles cancelled in last three fiscal years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• <em>Studia Mystica</em> [Per. BL625 .S79]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number of related databases added in last three years | 2 | • *Early English Books Online*  
• *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* |
<p>| Number of related databases cancelled in last three years | 0 |  |
| Number of monograph titles supporting program | 21,915 |  |
| Number of monograph titles in key call number ranges added in last two years (01/2006-01/2008) | 1,242 |  |
| Percentage of available universe of related monograph titles purchased through approval plan during previous fiscal year. |  |
| • BL1 - BL50 [Religion-General]: 35% of 31 available titles. |
| • BL51 - BL65 [Philosophy of Religion]: 51% of 108 available titles. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Titles Available</th>
<th>Available Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL70 - BL99</td>
<td>18 available</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL175 - BL265</td>
<td>50 available</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL270 - BL290</td>
<td>0 available</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL300 - BL325</td>
<td>8 available</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL350 - BL632.5</td>
<td>52 available</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL660 - BL980</td>
<td>34 available</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1000 - BL1060</td>
<td>3 available</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1100 - BL1289.592</td>
<td>40 available</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1300 - BL1595</td>
<td>0 available</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1600 - BL1710</td>
<td>11 available</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1750 - BL2240</td>
<td>34 available</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL2390 - BL2670</td>
<td>37 available</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL2700 - BL2790</td>
<td>20 available</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM1 - BM990</td>
<td>141 available</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP1 - BP253</td>
<td>184 available</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP300 - BP395</td>
<td>3 available</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP500 - BP610</td>
<td>32 available</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ1 - BQ9800</td>
<td>98 available</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- BR1 - BR1725 [Christianity]: 21% of 361 available titles.
- BS1 - BS2970 [Bible]: 6% of 598 available titles.
- BT10 - BT1480 [Doctrinal Theology]: 13% of 318 available titles.
- BV1 - BV5099 [Practical Theology]: 4% of 309 available titles.
- BX1 - BX9999 [Christian Denominations]: 14% of 483 available titles.

**Services**

| Number of library instruction courses taught for department during previous fiscal year. | 3 | July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 |
| Number of library consultations held with students from department during previous fiscal year. | 48 | July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 |

**Electronic Resources**

Students and faculty in the Department of Religious Studies rely heavily on journals, major reference works and databases to conduct research and complete assignments. The following section provides an overview of some of the major electronic resources available for Department of Religious Studies research.

**GSU Library Subscription Databases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th Century Masterfile</td>
<td>Index for magazines and periodicals published from 1802 to 1906. The basis of this database are citations from Poole's Index to Periodical Literature and Stead's Index to Periodicals. Also includes Richardson's Index to Periodical Articles in Religion (1890-99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America: History &amp; Life</td>
<td>Abstracts of articles on the history of the United States and Canada from prehistory to the present. Covers over 2,000 journals published worldwide, including state and local history journals and selected journals in the social sciences and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnthroSource</td>
<td>Complete archive of all issues of the American Anthropological Association's current and past publications including peer-reviewed journals, newsletters and bulletins. Relevant for religious ethnographic research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA Religion Database with ATLA Serials</td>
<td>Consists of more than one million bibliographic records covering the research literature of religion. Includes article citations from 1,400 journals, more than 150,000 essay citations from 14,000 multi-author works, and nearly 350,000 book review citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Online Journals</td>
<td>Access to full-text to subscribed journals in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, including classical studies, law, medical policy, philosophy, political and international relations, psychology, and religious studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early English Books Online</td>
<td>Contains digital facsimile page images of virtually every work printed in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and British North America and works in English printed elsewhere from 1473-1700. Relevant subject areas include: English literature, history, philosophy, linguistics, and theology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth Century Collections Online</td>
<td>Includes over 138,000 English-language titles and editions published between 1701 and 1800 printed in the United Kingdom, as well as thousands of works from the Americas. Relevant subject areas include history and social sciences, literature, religion, philosophy, and law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Encyclopaedia Judaica                                        | Online version of the 2nd ed. of the 22-volume Encyclopaedia of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Newswatch</td>
<td>Includes news, culture and history from 200 publications of the ethnic, minority and native press. Covers nearly 500,000 full-text articles dating back to 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Abstracts</td>
<td>Covers the history of the world from 1450 to the present (excluding the United States and Canada, which are covered in America: History and Life). Currently over 2,000 journals published throughout the world are covered in the database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities International Index (formerly American Humanities Index)</td>
<td>Covers journals, books and other important reference sources in the humanities. Provides cover-to-cover indexing and abstracting for over 1,700 journals and contains more than 1.5 million records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER: Gateway to the Middle Ages and Renaissance</td>
<td>An interdisciplinary index to the journal literature pertaining to the Middle Ages and Renaissance (400-1700).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>Provides access to back issues of journals, many of which date from the 1800s. Pertinent subject areas include classical studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press Journal</td>
<td>Provides access to over 180 online journals published by Oxford University Press in the humanities, law, and social sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals Index Online (formerly PCI/Periodicals Contents Index)</td>
<td>Index to millions of articles published in 4,698 periodicals in the humanities and social sciences. Covers 37 key subject areas in the humanities and social sciences and offers vast variety within these subject areas. Currently indexes 15.1 million articles since the eighteenth century and every article in each journal is indexed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosopher's Index</td>
<td>Provides indexing and abstracts from books and journals of philosophy and related fields. Includes philosophy of religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Muse</td>
<td>Provides full text access to recent issues of more than 40 key journals in the humanities and social sciences. Pertinent subject areas include language and linguistics, law, medieval and renaissance studies, philosophy, politics and policy studies, psychology, religion, and women's studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Abstracts</td>
<td>Resource for accessing research in sociology and related disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences. International in scope, over 2,600 journals and other serials publications, plus conference papers, books, and dissertations are covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Electronic Journals</td>
<td>Includes over 50 journals in the social sciences, humanities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies Encyclopedia</td>
<td>Online version of the 3-volume <em>Women's Studies Encyclopedia</em>, published by Greenwood Press in 1999. Covers all aspects of women's studies from the sciences; literature, arts, and learning; history, philosophy, and religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies International</td>
<td>Covers the core disciplines in Women’s Studies to the latest scholarship in feminist research. Supports curriculum development in the areas of sociology, history, political science &amp; economy, public policy, international relations, arts &amp; humanities, business and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GALILEO Databases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology Plus</td>
<td>Provides worldwide indexing of journal articles, reports, commentaries, edited works, and obituaries in the fields of social, cultural, physical, biological, and linguistic anthropology, ethnology, archaeology, folklore, material culture, and interdisciplinary studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives USA</td>
<td>Describes over 160,000 collections of primary source material housed in thousands of repositories across the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible in English</td>
<td>Contains twenty versions of the Bible. In addition to the twelve complete Bibles, there are five New Testament works, two Gospel works and William Tyndale's New Testament, Pentateuch and Jonah translations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; Philosophy Collection (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Contains more than 243 full-text journals covering topics in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual, ethical, philosophical, cultural, and historical aspects of the world's major religions.</td>
<td>Sociological Collection (at EBSCOhost) Database with more than 475 full-text titles. Provides information on all areas of sociology, including social behavior, human tendencies, interaction, relationships, community development, culture and social structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History Collection (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Offers a global look at history with content from Africa, Asia, North and South America, Europe and the Middle East. World History full text for 150 titles, including many peer-reviewed journals. Full text dates as far back as 1964.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>