

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

*Department of
Theology and Religious Studies*

Self-Study

April 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Issues Mentioned in the Last Program Review	3
2. Overall View of the Theology and Religious Studies Department	4
3. Undergraduate Curriculum Overview	6
3.1 Majors in the Department	7
3.1 Curricular Changes	7
3.1 Future Goals	11
4. Graduate Program	12
4.1 Overview of On-Campus Courses Offered During the Academic Year	14
4.2 Overview of Off-Campus Graduate Courses Offered During the Academic Year.....	14
5. Department	14
5.1 St. Ignatius Institute	15
5.2 Challenges	15
5.3 Recruitment.....	15
5.4 Demographics	16
5.5 Student Organizations	16
5.6 TRIP (Religion and Immigration Project)	16
5.7 DDTP (Dual Degree Program).....	16
6. Resources	17
6.1 Swig Judaic Studies Program	17
6.2 Catholic Studies Program	17
6.3 Facilities.....	17
6.4 Financial Aid	18

APPENDICES

A. Demographic Characteristics of Entering Freshmen, Fall Semesters (1998-2003).....	19
B. Theology and Religious Studies Major Profile.....	20
C. Demographic Characteristics of Graduating Students, Spring Semesters (1998-2003)	21
D. Course Enrollment History (Departmental Tables).....	22
E. The Immigration and Religion Project (TRIP) Progress Report	32
F. Publications	43
G. 2002 Student Survey Results (<i>in binder</i>)	48

Other materials like enrollment statistics, department curriculum, evaluations, curriculum vitae, grade distributions, supporting data for students, department budgets, etc. will be available on site.

1. Issues Mentioned in the last Program Review

Nearly ten years ago (October 1994) an external review team made recommendations to the Theology/Religious Studies Department. As we begin this self-study we should recall these suggestions made a decade ago and show how we have responded to them.

The first topic was entitled *Faculty Communication and Interaction*. The visiting team mentioned that this was the most important problem facing the Department. People were not talking to one another. Besides urging the Department to bring in a professionally trained facilitator, the team also urged facilitated retirement of senior members and the hiring of new faculty. The Department decided not to bring in an outside facilitator. The other recommendations were followed, however, as is seen section five (the past and current faculty members).

Topic two (*Department Mission, Programs and Faculty*) had several subheadings.

- *Department self-definition*. Sections three and four of the present self-study address these issues. There still exists tension in the Department as to what is Religious Studies and what is Theology, but with the introduction of the new undergraduate Core Curriculum and moving the graduate program to weekends much is still in flux. Department discussions center around whether there is an undergraduate Theology Major/Minor, or a Religious Studies Major/Minor, or just a single Major/Minor. The results of such discussions affect which courses are offered.
- *The need for disciplinary specialization represented on the faculty*. The team recommended hiring faculty who specialized in systematic theology, liturgy, history of spirituality, and moral theology. The greatest need cited was in the areas of moral theology and Asian religions. Since the last Program Review the University has hired in all these areas (with the exception of liturgy where no one thought a need existed for a full-time position).
- *Lack of a clear committee structure and procedures for dealing with important issues*. During the last decade we have constituted both undergraduate and graduate committees. Interest in standing committees has varied, so they usually meet on an *ad hoc* basis.
- *Lack of clear expectations about professional activity and scholarship*. This is no longer an issue. A glance at Appendix F shows how the Department has been most productive over the last several years.

Topic Three (*The Department and the GEC*) also had several subheadings.

- *The number of adjuncts teaching GEC courses seemed to be excessive*. At the present time the Department does not employ a single adjunct.
- *Lack of concern for the staffing of a capstone course*. With the new Core Curriculum there is no longer a capstone course.
- *The grading profile was excessively high*. That has been looked at, and a grading policy has been implemented. Since we have no adjuncts, this is addressed by the full-time faculty.

Topic Four (*The Saint Ignatius Institute*) no longer stands out as an issue with the change of administration. The Department now has control of the Theology courses. A still unsolved difficulty is the inability to exercise control over the Theology/Religious Studies courses offered by the College of Professional Studies.

Topic Five (*The Departmental Major*) has echoes today. After the last Program Review the Department believed that most of the issues had been addressed. With the introduction of the new Core Curriculum the issue has been reopened. Although many courses are offered not only by the Department but also by the St. Ignatius Institute, several believe that the Department should offer more courses in the area of Theology. We are talking about twenty majors total.

Topic Five (*The Graduate and Summer Programs*). The issues which the team brought up were:

- *Reviewing the needs of the graduate program with regard to hiring full-time faculty and summer adjuncts.* This has been done in several ways: the summer program has been reduced to a single course; the program during the academic year has been restructured according to a cohort model.
- *Do the nine graduate courses representative a coherent core?* The answer is “yes” especially with the initiation of the cohort model, though a new factor has been introduced within the last two years when the College of Arts and Sciences moved from a 3- to a 4-unit model. In order to keep the total number of units at thirty-six (36) the number of courses were reduced from twelve (12) to nine (9).
- *How has the reduction of requirements affected the number and quality of students?* Admissions have increased as well as the quality of students.
- *What is the role of the undergraduate comprehensive seminar?* The undergraduate comprehensive seminar has been eliminated.
- *How has the elimination of the language requirement affected the graduate program?* Although the language requirement has been eliminated, that has proved to be an asset rather than a liability; the two students in the last decade who have gone on to doctoral studies since the last Program Review have done so in the areas of Political Science as well as Peace and Justice; a French and/or German requirement would not have helped them.
- *How well are our programs being advertised?* The programs have received extensive publicity, especially after Arts and Sciences hired a full-time person in this area. Mark Landerghini’s efforts have proved most successful with his approach to brochures, personal contacts, and informational evenings.

Topic Six (*Other Recommendations*) contained several categories:

- *A Director of Majors and Minors.* Given the small number of Majors/Minors, the Department did not believe that undergraduates needed a separate Director; the Department Chair has been the advisor of all the graduate students. With the introduction of the cohort model with its course sequencing at the graduate level, advising has been rather easy.
- *Outcomes assessments* are part of the new Core curriculum, so this area has already been addressed (see section 3.2).

Topic Seven (*The Department’s Preliminary Development Plan*) still needs work. A new Core curriculum at the undergraduate level and the move to a cohort model for graduate students have presented problems as well as occasions for growth. We all recognize this. The challenge to the Department is to develop a new plan which includes these recent changes.

2. Overall View of the Theology and Religious Studies Department

A key passage in the USF Statement of Mission asserts USF’s commitment to “the Jesuit Catholic tradition that views faith and reason as complementary resources in the search for truth and authentic human development, and that welcomes persons of all faiths or no religious beliefs as fully contributing partners to the University.”

1) Aware that the Department of Theology and Religious Studies will be one of the major instruments upon which USF relies to carry out this premise in its Mission Statement, the Department defines its purpose in the following way. It is a community of scholars committed to teaching and research, serving the theological and religious studies needs of both USF and the wider human community.

2) The Department aims to understand the Catholic tradition more deeply, especially its relation not only to other Christians, but also to those of other world religious traditions. It seeks meaningful dialogue between the Gospel, the Catholic Church, and the present world.

Representing the Church to contemporary U.S. society, for instance, the Department will be asked to scrutinize, perhaps dispute, current premises about warfare and property, human dignity and human

rights, the link between faith and justice. On the other hand, representing modern life and academic scholarship back to the Church, the Department will be asked to clarify, question, perhaps reconceive, the Church’s own doctrinal tradition.

Vatican II views theology and religious studies as the completing touch to a broad interdisciplinary education. Listening carefully to literature and the arts, for example, offers every student a vivid expression of the ongoing human struggle — our unique strengths, miseries, and needs, often foreshadowing a better life. “Recent studies and findings of science, history, and philosophy raise new questions, which influence life and demand new theological investigations.” As a result, “religious practice and morality can keep pace with scientific knowledge and with an ever-advancing technology.” (*Gaudium et Spes*, 62)

3) The Department’s undergraduate program in particular encourages each individual to explore and articulate the unique religious factor within one’s own life, that center of meaning without which the rest of life would be otherwise incoherent.

One attractive feature of USF students is their richly varied religious, ethnic, and linguistic background. The official University demographics are:

Religious		Ethnic	
<i>Catholic</i>	48.3%	<i>Asian</i>	21.8%
<i>Unspecified</i>	30.7%	<i>African American</i>	4.6%
<i>Protestant</i>	6.5%	<i>Hispanic</i>	12.4%
<i>No Religion</i>	5.0%	<i>Native American</i>	0.5%
<i>Other</i>	3.3%	<i>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</i>	4.5%
<i>Buddhist</i>	2.5%	<i>Multi-Ethnic</i>	3.3%
<i>Jewish</i>	1.8%	<i>Other</i>	2.8%
<i>Hindu</i>	1.0%	<i>International</i>	8.0%
<i>Muslim</i>	1.0%	<i>Unspecified</i>	4.0%
		<i>White</i>	38.0 %

Welcoming this religious diversity as a challenge, the Department intends to expose students to the wisdom and values, not only of Christianity, but also of the other major world traditions. The goal is to grasp and appreciate more deeply not just one’s individual Way, but also the Way of those whose values and sense of the Sacred differ from one’s own.

A Few Selected Department’s Learning Objectives (the full list in the Undergraduate discussion is found on pp. 20-21):

- Sensitivity to religious values in the various ways they are expressed;
- Ability to integrate one’s religious vision with life experience, especially with an ethics of everyday life;
- Ability to apply sound historical, critical, and literary principles of interpretation to the various religious traditions;
- Ability to respect cultural diversity and each discipline’s unique methodology when engaging in cross-cultural and interdisciplinary dialogue;
- Ability to write and speak with clarity on religious and theological topics;
- Familiarity with basic theological resources and tools, major themes and authors, as well as classic and current trends in theology and religious studies;
- Familiarity with the major issues confronting religious institutions today.

Note: The “Learning Objectives” apply both to graduate and undergraduate programs. “Outcomes” (pp. 20-21) only concern undergraduate core curriculum courses.

3. Undergraduate Curriculum Overview

The undergraduate program in Theology and Religious Studies is in a period of transition at the time of this report. To explain this statement fully requires an understanding of the recent past, an assessment of the present, and a projection about the future covering the next five years.

Until the fall semester of 2002, the undergraduate program provided a service component to the undergraduate curriculum (the General Education Curriculum [GEC]) through courses that fulfilled students' general education requirements in Theology and Religious Studies. In order to deliver this service on a regular basis, many full and part-time faculty were engaged in offering one course at the lower division (either "Christian Experience" or "Sacred Quest"), with full-time staff offering one at the upper-division level for a total of six units under the old GEC. It should be noted here that of the total full-time faculty in the Department, several members were on half-time appointments or teaching in other areas, so meeting student, programmatic, and administrative demands for courses placed an even greater burden on the remaining full and adjunct faculty.

Enrollment figures from the Dean's office show that from the years 1995-2000, some 6,682 students enrolled in Departmental courses, averaging around 556 per semester in both Theology and Religious Studies courses. The data show that courses in Religious Studies consistently had higher enrollments than courses in Theology, resulting in increased workloads for faculty teaching those classes. Despite a Departmental discussion and agreement in 2001 to hire another full-time faculty able to teach both Religious Studies and Theology courses, this has not been acted upon. Instead, four hires were made in Theology and/or Scripture (Professors Jean Molesky-Poz and Sally Vance-Trembath in Theology; James Bretzke in Moral Theology/Christian Ethics; and Vincent Pizzuto in Scripture).

These hires have helped to strengthen the graduate program in Theology, an accomplishment that is certainly to be applauded. At the same time, however, an unintended result has been that certain inequities have developed. Theology faculty, in particular, have frequent opportunities to teach graduate students, either at USF or in Phoenix at the Kino Institute, and benefit further from the Zabala Fund designated to promote graduate study in Theology. Departmental faculty who have recently taught in the Kino Institute program (which is due to terminate with the graduation of the current First Year Cohort in 2006) include Professors Bretzke, Kendall, Molesky-Poz, Noll, Pizzuto, and Vance Trembath. Departmental faculty who teach in the USF campus M.A. program in Theology include Professors Bretzke, Kendall, Molesky-Poz, and Noll.

Under the new Core Curriculum students are required to take only course in Theology and one course in Ethics. These changes are discussed below in the section on Curricular Changes, but in order to describe some of the inequities adumbrated above it would be helpful to note that the Learning Outcomes for the required Theology course do seem to privilege those courses which are explicitly in areas of Christian theology and Scripture, and the Ethics requirement (which may be satisfied in either the Philosophy or Theology and Religious Studies Department) would naturally direct more students to courses currently being offered by Professors Batsone, Bretzke, and Ruland, (and presumably by Professor Lorentzen upon return from her combined leave and sabbatical). Thus, those professors who teach courses in Religious Studies may reasonably feel that the competition for students to enroll in the required courses offered by the Department is slanted towards those working in Christian theology.

The enrollment figures mentioned earlier are not representative of the overall student body because theoretically, every student at USF should have taken lower and upper-division courses from the Department. However, due to the large number of transfer students, many lower-division requirements in the study of religion were met off campus at other institutions. Given the size of the Department, a higher student demand for classes would most likely have been met by the hiring of additional part-time faculty.

3.1 Majors in the Department

Despite this heavy responsibility to service the General Education Curriculum, the Department was able to graduate 43 majors and 32 minors between the years 1995 and 2003, as well as provide faculty for the graduate program in Theology both on the USF campus and at the Kino Institute in Phoenix.

The Department has developed dual degree concentrations that reflect the integrity of its two distinct yet related disciplines. In the Theological Studies track there are five areas of study: Scripture, Systematic Theology, Historical Theology/Interdisciplinary Theology, Moral Theology/Contextualized Theology, and Spirituality.

In the Religious Studies track, begun in the fall of 2002, the five areas are: Methods and Theories in the Study of Religion, Region and Religion, Genealogies of Religious Traditions, Social Issues in the Study of Religion, and Ethical Dimensions of Religious Traditions. Additional information about each track and their respective requirements can be found in the online catalogue.

For both the Theology and Religious Studies tracks, departmental majors have found themselves restricted and sometimes confined by the lack of courses available in any given semester. While some of the responsibility for this dilemma rests with the student and the kind of advising received about requirements for their major, it is also the case that courses are in short supply because faculty are frequently called upon to teach both within and outside the department. Additionally, some faculty are on half-time appointments or teaching in other areas (e.g. the Honors Program), which further restricts the number of courses available at any given time.

Students can, however, still complete their majors by combining regular courses offered by department faculty, engaging in directed study courses, and taking courses in other departments that are cross-listed with Theology and Religious Studies.

The Department continues to emphasize its double major program, one that offers students majoring in other disciplines the opportunity to broaden their USF educational experience by adding a second major in Theology or Religious Studies. Special advantages are an Interdepartmental program that is flexible, creative, and personalized, value-oriented classes with a contemporary emphasis. Twenty-eight (28) units of Theology/Religious Studies courses are required plus eight (8) units of approved and related upper-division courses from another Department.

Additionally, a dual degree program resulting in a credential in Catholic school teaching has been more fully systematized between the Theology major and the School of Education. Students add an additional year to their enrollment but graduate with a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) as well as a teaching credential from the State of California.

3.2 Curricular Changes

Overview

Of all the challenges affecting the undergraduate program in particular and department in general, none has been more demanding than the implementation of four-unit classes, followed by a thorough revamping of the undergraduate curriculum for the College of Arts and Sciences. The previous General Education Curriculum has been retitled the “Core Curriculum,” and has reduced the number of classes required in Theology and Religious Studies from two to one.

As explained earlier, the old GEC required the department to perform some “heavy-lifting” in order to provide both a lower and upper-division course for all USF students. As a result, many but not all of the lower division courses (especially “Sacred Quest” and “Christian Experience”) were taught by adjunct faculty, and upper division and graduate courses were taught by regular faculty. With the new Core curriculum and the reduction of this requirement to a single course, most of the adjunct faculty

have not been rehired and regular faculty have found themselves struggling on occasion to offer courses that will attract sufficient enrollments.

The Core has also required departments to set certain standards called “learning outcomes” that all classes listed as “Core” must meet. It is important to note that faculty in the department do not make the decision whether or not their courses meet the Core requirement. This is done by a committee of faculty from various departments that reviews the relationship of and correspondence between course syllabi and a given department’s learning outcomes. More discussion on this topic follows below.

In the new Core Curriculum students must take one course in Ethics. Supposedly students can take their ethics requirement in either the Philosophy or Theology Departments. In the past the Philosophy Department has offered regular innumerable sections of Ethics, and advisors throughout the college have become accustomed to think “Philosophy: Ethics” when they see the Core rubric “Ethics.” On the contrary, Theology/Religious Studies in the recent past offered only a few sections of Religious Ethics or its equivalent, such as Environmental Ethics, Feminist Ethics, etc., and all these courses were offered irregularly. Prospectively, Professor Bretzke intends to offer Religious Ethics or Moral Theology every semester, Professor Ruland (on reduced load) every other semester; Professor Lorentzen because of her Religious Immigration Project and Professor Batstone because of the Erasmus program and other projects are only part-time in the department. At present we cannot count on more than four regular ethics offerings per semester.

Four suggestions would help restore some balance to this situation. (1) Each semester the Chairs of Philosophy and Theology/Religious Studies should consult, so that they can estimate the number of courses offered all together under the Core Ethics label. If possible 50-50 equity between the two departments should prevail; if not, let the Theology and Philosophy Departments split the number of part-timers to be added. (2) Let the Core listings be clarified even further than before. For example, explain repeatedly that this requirement can be taken from the Philosophy OR Theology/Religious Studies Departments. (3) An even easier solution would be give all the philosophical and religious ethics courses a common label, simply ETHICS in their listing, without further specific titles. (4) Notice that the current learning objective for Core Ethics were written by the Philosophy Department, referring only to philosophical ethics. It would perhaps be more fair to have two sets of objectives, one for philosophical ethics and one for religious ethics.

The shift to four-unit classes was motivated by a desire to streamline curriculum for the College of Arts and Sciences so that students could finish taking required courses more quickly and then move on to their respective majors. Beginning in 2002 for all Departments on campus, course syllabi had to be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for review. Faculty had to indicate how each three-unit course had been changed to meet the four-unit benchmarks. Changes could be made to increase any of the following components: more class contact hours, more reading or written assignments, more lab time, more extra-curricular or service-learning requirements, and so on.

Implications and Impact on the Department

The challenges and consequences for the Department in dealing with these momentous changes have been dramatic in three areas: **enrollments, revision of courses to meet Core requirements and Learning Outcomes, and the process through which courses are accepted into the Core.**

To summarize, the department weathered two semesters of confusion about the Core curriculum approval process resulting in small enrollments and some cancelled courses. Now, however, the rules of the game are clearer and faculty have been successful in either revising existing course material or submitting new courses that meet Core requirements. Some of these courses have expanded the scope and range of choices for undergraduate students to include a non-Western focus on religious traditions. While there is some feeling that the learning outcomes over-emphasize Christianity and thus may exclude subject areas that focus on other religious traditions, the Department has not yet had an extended discussion about this issue. One suggestion that is being informally discussed at the present would be to offer two concentrations as a major in Theology and Religious Studies. A student

could elect to concentrate in either “Theology” or “Religious Studies,” but would have to take a certain number of courses in the other wing of the Department. If this proposal is acceptable to the Department and the practicalia worked out it could help address some of the difficulties mentioned elsewhere in this report on redressing some of the inequities between the Theology and Religious Studies faculty in terms of courses offered and numbers of students likely to enroll, as well as help give some structure to the Departmental major and the organization of courses to be offered in a rotating cycle over two or three years in order to service adequately the students who elect to major in the Department. If Religious Studies were explicitly adopted as a potential concentration within the Department we might also increase the numbers of majors and help establish a critical mass of students for some of our majors courses. Further discussion of this proposal is planned before the end of the semester.

Enrollments

While our lower division classes usually meet enrollment quotas, our upper division courses have been under-enrolled with a number of classes cancelled by the administration. This has resulted in more full-time faculty teaching (or being assigned to teach) lower-division courses, with the regretful reduction in part-time faculty appointments. When two Theology and Religious Studies courses were required for the General Education Curriculum, many lower division classes were taught by adjunct faculty. Depending on whether it was the Fall or Spring semester, there were between six to eight individuals who taught one of our two lower-division offerings: Sacred Quest or Christian Experience. Several full-time faculty also taught lower division courses regularly in the old GEC.

Now, out of necessity due to the drop in upper-division enrollments, the Department must retool its course offerings so that they meet Core requirements and thus attract students. To put it bluntly, whereas the previous GEC gave us captive audiences on a regular basis at both lower and upper-division levels, now faculty must compete among themselves to attract and retain students for *all* their classes.

There has yet to emerge from within the Department a coherent, systematic strategy that charts course offerings over an extended period of time. If this were to be done, faculty would know how their course offerings fit into a bigger picture and would thus minimize competition with their colleagues. It would also advance a more systematic study of particular areas of interest (New Testament, Religion and Environment, Buddhism, and so on).

An additional issue related to enrollments is the number of majors and minors we have. The Dean's office would like to see twice the number of current majors (rising from 20 to 40) but despite some effort on the part of the Department to attract majors (setting up an information table during the "Majors" fair, holding an occasional gathering for students, offering classes taught by instructors with high evaluations for the quality of their teaching) we have not been able to increase this number substantially.

Revising Courses to Meet the Core

The new and reduced Core requirement in Theology and Religious Studies (Area D2) has necessitated revising courses so that they meet Departmental learning outcomes, listed below:

Students (taking Core courses in the Department) will be able to:

1. Investigate, appraise, and engage the spiritual dimensions of their own lives;
2. In the light of Catholic social teaching, evaluate the need for both prayer and action to work effectively for the good of the entire human family and the environment that sustains it;
3. Articulate the relevance of “faith that does justice” and its related praxis, a solidarity in the interests of liberation and the “option for the poor,” as inspired by the Gospel and the teachings of other religious traditions;
4. Identify and articulate the dynamic between religious institutions and religious practice, utilizing a discerning reflection upon faith, or “faith seeking understanding;”

5. Gain sensitivity to different values and experiences of the sacred through familiarity with a variety of human religious experiences;
6. Become familiar with Christianity and other religious traditions in keeping with Vatican II's stance on the Catholic Church's relationship with other faiths;
7. Analyze religion through theological and interdisciplinary perspectives that emphasize skills of analysis, evaluation, and synthesis;
8. Understand religious traditions in terms of their emergence, genealogies, major texts and figures, ritual practices and symbolic forms of expression, senses of the sacred, and ethical positions;
9. Explore the role of religion in the contemporary world, drawing conclusions about religion's role in human dignity, freedom, morality, and responsibility, as well as its role in social and political conflicts.

The process for having a course accepted into the Core curriculum follows the following outline. First, a syllabus is submitted to the College Curriculum Committee which makes a determination of whether or not the proposal meets College standards. If the course is an existing course, but the Department is requesting CD (Cultural Diversity) or SL (Service Learning) status, the course must be submitted to the College Curriculum Committee for these Core designations. If the course is an already existing course, and the Department is seeking Core status (Area D, typically), the course is submitted to the Core Area Committee. If the Core Area Committee recommends approval, the course goes to the Provost for final approval.

There have been three difficulties resulting from this process. Initially, faculty did not know it was necessary to "spell out" how their proposed course met each learning outcome. In retrospect, this requirement makes sense because it should not be the burden of the Core committee to interpret the correlation between a given syllabus and course content. However, for the first two semesters, a number of courses were submitted and rejected until the Core committee made it clear what was expected. These rejections resulted in courses being revised and later accepted, but it also meant they missed the deadline for inclusion in the printed Schedule of Classes, the primary reference document students use to select courses when enrolling. A course not listed in the Schedule can be viewed online, but since students rarely check online listings, the course must still be advertised by word of mouth, mass e-mailings, flyer distribution, and so on.

A second complication resulting from these learning outcomes concerns courses in Religious Studies. Because of the emphasis on incorporating Christianity into all Core courses (a requirement handed down from the Board of Trustees in 2002 during deliberations on the new Core curriculum), a considerable rethinking of course content is needed for many classes in comparative religions or in specific religious traditions. Courses on Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaic Studies, and Islam — all of which met upper-division GEC requirements in the past — must now make a substantial portion of their classes relate to Christianity if they are to be considered for Core credit. If the learning outcomes were revised to be less prescriptive and more generic, the sense of structural exclusion felt by some faculty members would be eliminated. On the other hand, more generic learning outcomes increase the likelihood of other Departments offering Core courses. To date, no extended discussion of revising the learning outcomes has been held.

The third difficulty from the new Core curriculum involves other campus divisions and Departments (Nursing, Business) that want to have their own courses in Theology/Religious Studies or Ethics, taught by adjunct faculty. They reason that if their proposed course meets the learning outcomes set by their Department, they should be allowed to teach the course. For example the School of Business might offer a course on "Business Ethics" and argue that it should fulfill the Theology/Religious Studies Core Curriculum requirements if it meets Departmental learning outcomes. We in the Theology/Religious Studies Department worry that this trend would lead to a proliferation of self-styled "theologians" and further impact our enrollments. This is a topic that can only be dealt with at a university and not Departmental level.

A final major change at the Department and University was an administrative “reboot” of the St. Ignatius Institute, ending long years of conflict about a parallel and competitive program in theology to what is offered by the Department. Faculty provide (3-4) courses for the now revamped SII, and the competition for students and resources has ended. This is not the case at the College of Professional Studies, however. Here, adjunct faculty completely outside the Department’s purview, offer courses in Theology, Religious Studies, or Ethics.

3.3 Future Goals

As the Department shifts from its past role in “servicing” the General Education Curriculum at lower and upper-division levels, and adjusting to more erratic enrollments for upper-division courses, it has tried to reformulate its objectives and mission regarding undergraduate education. Courses that were formerly in the upper-division level have been revised to meet Departmental learning outcomes and thus qualify for the Core. There have also been several new courses created to specifically attempt to attract students to particular areas of study beyond the old Sacred Quest (Religious Studies) / Christian Experience (Theology) dichotomy. The Department has begun to advertise its courses, faculty, and major/minor programs more aggressively, but much still needs to be done. A survey conducted by students in the Fall of 2002 polled over 600 undergraduates in an effort to identify a number of thematic areas and topics of interest that could be developed into courses. Several of these suggestions, such as offering a course in the Geography of Religions (retitled “Sacred Spaces”), have been acted upon. This survey will be found in Appendix F.

Additionally, the need for building more of a sense of community among our majors, as well as establishing clear goals, has not yet gelled into a methodology for achieving this goal. We anticipate starting a student-centered, semester-long series of talks and presentations that bring our majors and minors together on a regular basis. We have also discussed starting a semester-long faculty seminar over the noon hour whereby colleagues in the Department can present their research and publications to both students and the university community. To date, only the undergraduate gatherings have taken place, and then irregularly.

Hiring goals within the Department is another area for debate and discussion. Currently, a fairly good balance between men and women has been attained in the last three years. However, there is still a pressing need to attract and hire scholars of color. Because of last year’s anxiety over low enrollments, the Department did not exercise an option last spring (via the Irvine scholars program) to bring a minority scholar into the Department for a probationary period that would, if satisfactory, lead to a full-time appointment. The issue was decided by a vote, with the Department splitting almost evenly along Theology/Religious Studies lines.

Additionally, there seems to be a lack of interest on the part of the Provost, President, and Board of Trustees to hire any more faculty in Religious Studies. The student survey poll of 2002 indicated interest in more courses related to Religious Studies, and statistics from the Dean's office mentioned earlier also show higher enrollments for these courses than Theology courses. Nonetheless, there have been no additional hires in Religious Studies since 2000. The last four hires have all been in various areas of Theology. Professor Jean Molesky-Poz was hired to teach Spirituality. Although she does work in Latin American religions, including Maya, her training and doctoral degree are both theological. Professor Sally Vance-Trembath’s degree is in systematic theology, Professor Vincent Pizzuto’s degree is in New Testament and Professor James Bretzke’s degree is in moral theology (though he also has both training and experience in Confucianism in the Korean context). At present, the only faculty whose primary training would be considered religious studies are Professors John Nelson, Vijaya Nagarajan, and Vernon Ruland. This means that it is difficult to offer a concentration in religious studies without more hiring, and hiring in religious studies has not been a departmental priority.

It is imperative that a clear vision about the importance and emphasis of the undergraduate curriculum be further articulated so as to reference more fully the ongoing dialogue between Theology and Religious Studies. We need to educate not only our students but also the University Community at large — from our colleagues in other Departments to the highest levels of administrators — about what we are doing as a Department and the invaluable contributions we make to the overall mission of the University.

4. Graduate Programs

USF's Graduate Theology Programs, which began in 1961, have, for the most part, been very successful. Part of the reason for the early heavy enrollments was owed to the Department's bringing in world renowned scholars to teach during the Summer. Other factors which entered into this good fortune included extra money from the Zabala family trust to finance this venture, the attraction of the city of San Francisco itself, the excitement generated by Vatican II, and the large number of teachers, especially religious, who wanted theological updating. Theology Summer Schools were crowded while the on-campus graduate program usually had a very modest enrollment. Besides the MA in Theology, USF offered a Master of Applied Spirituality (MAS), Master of Arts in Religious Education (MARE), Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry (MAPM), and Master's in Pastoral Theology (MPT). These programs were also offered off-campus during the academic year in Monterrey, Santa Rosa, Stockton, Fresno, Honolulu, and Phoenix where adjunct faculty were almost exclusively used.

Under USF's President John Lo Schiavo (1977-91) the University agreed to give partial tuition remission to students in the Theology graduate programs. This usually amounted to 50% of the posted cost of the graduate tuition. Later on (in the 1990s) additional money became available through the Zabala Trust which further reduced the costs. Both of these subsidies are in effect today.

By 1990 enrollment in all these programs began to drop significantly. Factors causing this were the rising cost of living, competition from other college and universities, fewer religious, and the inability for people to take time off work for extended periods of time. At the time of the last Program Review the graduate programs were in the process of being reduced to only the MA in Theology, and the off-campus programs were being discontinued except the one in Phoenix. When the number of student credit hours fell below 600 for the extensive Summer School, its demise was imminent. After 35 years it was discontinued in 1996. In its place usually one or two courses are taught.

At the time of the last Program Review, a new and revised MA/Theology curriculum was being implemented. This new curriculum was proposed, in part, because only a few faculty members were teaching graduate students, since the graduate program was so narrowly focused. Another reason was that there were no required courses in the curriculum in the area of non-Christian religions. The committee drew up a new curriculum which used the talents of all members of the Department. That curriculum, which was adopted, divided the program into twelve (12) areas. Students were required to take courses in nine (9) of these areas, and electives in three (3) of these areas. The areas were: Principles and Methods of Biblical Interpretation, Religions in Dialogue, Hebrew Scriptures, Theological Methods, Spiritual Classics, Historical/Systematic Theology, Moral Theology, Church and Sacraments, and a Graduate Comprehensive Seminar (which took the place of a thesis). This structure gave both students and teachers an organized sequencing of courses in the program.

The primary goal of the program is to give those people who plan to make the MA a terminal degree a solid background in Theology. The secondary goal is to provide those who wish to pursue doctoral studies in theology or other disciplines a solid foundation. Among our alumni some have chosen to pursue a doctoral degree in Theology while others have chosen other fields (e.g. Law, Political Science). Both those who have stopped at the MA level and those who have gone on to a higher degree have been universal in praise of the program and believe that it has prepared them well.

Even with this new curriculum revision, the problem of rolling admissions remained in both Phoenix and on-campus. The number of students in Phoenix dropped to five (5), while on campus a number of students would enroll in January, or in September but frequently in the middle of a sequence. The course offerings were few because the number of students enrolled did not justify more courses. The program in Phoenix was the place where new approaches were tested. At Dean Nel's insistence, beginning in January 1994, the Department developed a cohort model. Students would take the same courses together for three (3) years on selected weekends. No new students would be admitted during the life of the cohort. Full-time faculty from the campus would teach the courses, and tuition would remain the same during the life of that cohort. In that way the University would not be obligated to maintain a presence in Phoenix when a cohort ended and there were not enough students (usually 20) to begin a new one.

The cohort model proved extremely successful. The first cohort enrolled twenty-three (23) students. So great was the demand that a second cohort was begun after only two (2) years. A cohort has begun every two years in Phoenix since then. Unexpected benefits have included high retention, better sequencing of courses, a common theological background, and a greater sense of community among the students themselves.

At the beginning of the new millennium two factors converged to force a change in the on-campus graduate program. Enrollment was low (20-25 students at any one time) mainly due to the fact that students could not devote two evenings each week to attending classes, and the University was moving to a 4-unit model. In March 2002, the Department spent a day reflecting on these two issues and on developing new approaches.

The Department proposed a revision rather than a radical overhaul of the existing MA program to fit a 4-unit cohort model, and moving the classes to Saturday, imitating the success of Phoenix model. Members of the Department believed that Saturday meetings would draw more people from the greater Bay Area than did the weeknight classes with rolling admissions.

The revised program consisted of requiring students to take 4-unit courses in the areas of (1) Methods in Theology and Ministry, (2) Spirituality, (3) Historical Theology, Christology and Trinity, (4) Church, Sacraments, and Liturgy, (5) Methods of Biblical Interpretation, (6) Religions in Dialogue, (7) Methods and Issues in Moral Theology, (8) one Elective, and (9) the Comprehensive Seminar.

To implement the program on campus, all admissions were suspended for the 2002-03 academic year. This enabled most of those already in the program to finish before the new format took effect.

Concomitant with the changes just mentioned, the Zabala Trustees decided to offer fifteen (15) full scholarships to potential graduate students working in education (administrators, teachers, campus ministers). During 2002 the Chair, Dan Kendall, personally visited diocesan personnel in Santa Rosa, Phoenix, Oakland, San José, and San Francisco to promote these scholarships. In September 2002 these scholarships were publicly announced and potential students were asked to apply before February 1, 2003. These 3-year scholarships would coincide with the beginning of the cohort model on campus in Fall, 2003, as well as the beginning of a new cohort in Phoenix at the same time.

Though it is too early to assess the results of the (1) 4-unit structure, (2) cohort model, and (3) the fifteen full-scholarships, the number of applications by February 1, 2003, surpassed 60. By mid-February the number had risen to 75. Of the 75, 31 were in Phoenix, the remainder being on campus. Only when students actually show up for the Fall semester will we have an accurate count. The question right now is whether or not to open another cohort in 2004 instead of waiting two years. Factors to be considered include whether the University can afford to give the 50% grant, and whether the value of the stocks in the Zabala Trust will be adequate to supplement the University grant. Despite the downturn in the national economy, the picture for our graduate programs looks good.

The ongoing MA Program (as opposed to no MA Program) has been an incentive for faculty recruitment, and made USF more competitive in the job market.

4.1 Overview of On-Campus Graduate Courses Offered During the Academic Year

The statistics and schematic view of the on-campus graduate courses offered between 1998 and 2003 are listed in Appendix D.

4.2 Overview of Off-Campus Graduate Courses Offered During the Academic Year

These courses were offered in Phoenix. The statistics and schematic view of these 1998-2003 courses are listed in Appendix D.

5. Department

Since the last Program Review the following professors have left the faculty: Paul Bernadicou, Francis Buckley, David Davis, Joseph Eagan, John Elliott, Francis King, and Mary Neill. Of this group, one has died, and one other was named Rector of the Jesuit Community at Loyola Marymount University. They have been replaced by James Bretzke, Jean Molesky-Poz, Vijaya Nagarajan, John Nelson, Vincent Pizzuto, and Sally Vance-Trembath. The continuing faculty are David Batstone, Daniel Kendall, Lois Lorentzen, Ray Noll, Peter Togni, and Vernon Ruland (reduced time). Although Peter Togni remains at the University, he was appointed Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences since the last Program Review so he teaches only an occasional course for the Department..

The Department has a full-time program assistant, plus two work-study students to help with clerical work. In addition, the Department (and University) has an on-site Coordinator of the Phoenix program. Department meetings are held once a month and last about an hour. Student representatives are frequently invited to these meetings. Any member of the Department can propose items for the agenda.

Each year members of the Department are asked for their teaching preferences two semesters in advance. The dates and meetings of some courses are predetermined (e.g. graduate courses, those for the St. Ignatius Institute, etc.), while others are left to the wish of the individual. In any given semester a certain number of core curriculum courses need to be taught. Once the schedule has been drawn up then any needed adjuncts are hired.

Two members of the Department have Scripture as their specialty (Fr. Kendall and Dr. Pizzuto), one specializes in the area of Church and Sacraments (Dr. Noll), three specialize in the area of Christian Ethics (Dr. Batstone, Fr. Bretzke, and Dr. Lorentzen), three specialize in the area of Systematic Theology (Dr. Molesky-Poz, Fr. Togni, and Dr. Vance-Trembath), and three specialize in the area of World Religions (Dr. Nelson, Dr. Nagarajan, and Fr. Ruland).

Since the last Program Review members of the Department have distinguished themselves through their contributions and visibility in the greater USF and Bay Area communities. Besides teaching, faculty members have taken students on international trips (Cuba, Peru, Guatemala, South Africa, and El Salvador), and have been (and are) actively involved in university life (University Ministry, Erasmus Program, Davies Forum, Peace and Justice Studies, International Studies, Dual Degree Program, the Center for the Pacific Rim, and Latin America Studies). Especially notable is the Religion and Immigration project, funded by a Pew Grant, and headed by Dr. Lois Lorentzen. Courses offered by Department members have become increasing cross-listed with the *Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good*.

In addition faculty members teach outside the Department: *Environmental Studies*: Lois Lorentzen; *Erasmus Program*: David Batstone; *Honors Program*: Vincent Pizzuto; *Latin American Studies*: Lois Lorentzen, Jean Molesty-Poz; *St. Ignatius Institute*: James Bretzke, Daniel Kendall, Sally Vance-Trembath; *USF Center for the Pacific Rim: Master's of Asian Pacific Studies*: John Nelson, Vijaya Nagarajan; *Women's Studies*: Lois Lorentzen; *Environmental Studies*: Vijaya Nagarajan.

Teaching evaluations of the full-time members of the Department will be available on site.

5.1 The St. Ignatius Institute

Between the late-1970s and 2002 there was an ongoing conflict between the St. Ignatius Institute (SII) and the Theology/Religious Studies Department. The main issue centered around who would select the teachers of the SII Theology Courses. The three Directors of the SII during this period (Fathers Joseph Fessio and Robert Maloney, and Mr. John Galten) successfully maintained that they had the right to choose the teachers, even if that meant picking an adjunct instead of a full-time faculty member. In January 2002 the University President (Fr. Stephen Privett) removed Mr. Galten as Director and replaced him with Dr. Paul Murphy. Since then there has been close cooperation between the SII and the Theology/Religious Studies Department. The Director of the SII now works with the Chair of the Theology Department in selecting teachers of SII Theology courses.

5.2 Challenges that face the Department in the months and years to come are:

- Adjusting to a new core curriculum where only one 4-unit Theology/Religious Studies course is required for graduation;
 - Attracting enough majors and minors to support both a Theology concentration and a Religious Studies concentration;
 - Recruiting new teachers for the Religious Studies track as well as hiring minorities to bring a greater diversity to the faculty;
 - Making certain that those members of the faculty who are not Catholics feel that they are full members of the Department;
 - Maintaining the quality of the Master's degree as it expands to a cohort model on campus
 - Achieving a balance between the number of undergraduate courses taught in both Religious Studies and Theology.
- Difficulties in accomplishing these goals include:
- Permanent loss of one faculty member to administration;
 - Very reduced teaching load in the case of three (3) members of the Department due to their involvement in the "Religion and Immigration" project, the Erasmus Program, and half-time teaching.

5.3 Recruitment

At the graduate level this is done in conjunction with other Arts and Sciences programs. Mr. Mark Landerghini has designed flyers and organized open houses for both San Francisco and Phoenix. The Chair, Dan Kendall, has met with various directors of Religious Education in the Bay Area and in Phoenix to promote the graduate program. In Phoenix, the on-site coordinator Ms. Diana Stickney, has recruited by attending diocesan meetings, meeting with pastors and directors Religious Education as well as members of the permanent deaconate program. All these factors plus the generous financial aid package given by USF have managed to attract students.

At the undergraduate level Drs. Nelson and Nagarajan have organized afternoon teas with discussion groups for current and prospective majors/minors, moderated an afternoon hour long workshop put on by current majors/minors, formulated questionnaires to find out what students want discussed, and encouraging students to recruit students.

5.4 Demographics

A look at the demographics of the Department shows one member over age 70, two members aged 60-70, four between 50 and 59, four under 50, and one under 40.

5.5 Student Organizations

The Department belongs to Theta Alpha Kappa, the National Honor Society for Religious Studies/Theology. No formal on-campus meetings have been held for several years. During the past year Drs. Nagarajan and Nelson have begun to involve the major and minors on an irregular basis in afternoon teas with discussions.

5.6 (TRIP) The Religion and Immigration Project

In 2002 Professor Lois Lorentzen obtained a grant from the Pew Charitable Trust and additional funding from the Jesuit Foundation to investigate the role of religion in the lives of new immigrants to the San Francisco Bay Area. Though the grant was for a 3-year period, it has been extend another year.

Project researchers study Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, Mexican, and Salvadoran immigrant communities to assess how religious groups and communities encourage the participation of recent immigrants in the political, civic, and associational life of San Francisco and of the larger U.S. political/social system, as well as maintenance of involvement with the political and social systems of the societies of origin.

The project also analyzes the role of religion, religiosity, and religious communities as part of a transnational migration paradigm and a multi-dimensional approach to understanding political and cultural identities. Researchers from China, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Mexico, and El Salvador collaborate with San Francisco-based researchers in analyzing transnational religious communities and networks.

In the first year of the study, researchers conducted ethnographic research in Bay Area religious sites with high levels of migrant participants. The second year involved interviewing families and writing oral histories. In the final two years of the study, the team is creatively channeling its findings through theater productions, art exhibits, and documentaries to supplement its academic production.

The project is designed to give voice to the unique needs and challenges of traditionally underserved ethnic minority immigrants. Collaborative, community-based endeavors are integral to the Religion and Immigration Project, and at least two working conferences that address migrant needs as defined by local religious and service agencies are held each year.

For more information on TRIP, please see Appendix E.

5.7 (DDTP) Dual Degree Program

The DDTP is a collaborative effort between the College of Arts and Sciences (undergraduate preparation) and the School of Education (graduate preparation).

The Dual Degree in Teacher Preparation program has been especially designed to serve students who have shown an interest in considering teaching as a career through their past educational experiences, service to the community and work with children. The Department of Theology and Religious Studies works with majors who wish to be a part of this program. One of the D-2 level courses, "The Christian Village" was designed especially (but not exclusively) for this program.

This program prepares students to teach in California's schools. In the DDTP students will receive a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Arts in Teaching degree, and will complete the requirements to be recommended for a preliminary California Credential issued by the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing.

Students in this program must have at least a 3.0 high school Grade Point Average to qualify to enroll in the program and must maintain at least a 3.0 GPA in their college coursework.

Students in the DDTP preparation follow a rigorous course schedule (usually 16-18 units a semester) and typically complete the requirements for the bachelor's degree, the preliminary credential, and a master's degree from USF's School of Education in approximately five (5) years and one (1) summer.

The University of San Francisco currently offers approved subject matter preparation programs leading to a multiple subject credential (teaching in a self-contained classroom, typically at the elementary level), and approved single subject preparation programs in English, Mathematics, Social Science, and Physical Education, which qualify the student for secondary teaching.

6. Resources

Members of the faculty are the primary resources for students. Over the last decade the faculty has increasingly utilized computer technology in addition to library resources. The University Library has subscribed to the database ATLAS which specializes in Theology/Religious Studies literature. In many cases whole articles can be downloaded. Some faculty members maintain their own web page while others use *Blackboard* and *Power Point* in their class presentations. Each month the University provides free classes to help faculty and staff update their computer skills.

6.1 Swig Judaic Studies Program

The Judaic Studies Minor Program is designed to expose students to the history, thought and culture of Judaism and the Jewish people. The program embraces the disciplines of Theology, History, English, Modern and Classical Languages, and Philosophy, and it offers internships in Psychology, Sociology and Politics as well as History. With its own funding the Swig Judaic Studies Program provides courses and teachers in these various areas. Students can also use certain designated Judaic Studies courses to fulfill their Core requirement in Theology/Religious Studies.

6.2 Catholic Studies Program

The Catholic Studies Program is an interdisciplinary minor which invites students to study the Church and the experience of Catholics from a variety of perspectives drawn from theology, philosophy, the natural and social sciences, history, literature, and the arts. Certain courses in the various disciplines are designated to fulfill this minor. Among these courses are Theology Courses (e.g. Catholic Social Thought) which are not restricted to Catholic Studies Minors.

6.3 Facilities

Since 1961 the University has been especially generous in providing the Gleeson Library with a generous budget. Over the last forty years the Theology/Religious sections (both books and periodicals) have benefited from good purchases. Gleeson Library has also kept up with current computer technology. The library staff has been generous with time and expertise in helping students program their computers so they can readily log on to the many available databases from sites off of the campus. Vicki Rosen, from the library staff, travels to Phoenix each year to help the students update their computer programs, and gives individual instruction to those who desire it. The lack of "Smart Classes Rooms" as well as many without current technology stand out as glaring needs.

6.4 Financial Aid

Theology/Religious Studies Programs have benefited from generous aid from the administration as well as from individual donations. Forms of financial aid include:

Ignatian Tuition Grant (ITG). Each year the President sets aside a fixed sum of money to benefit students in the Theology Graduate Program and the School of Education's Institute for Catholic Educational Leadership (ICEL). While the President does this to help the Church in her mission, he also realizes that jobs associated with religious ministry usually pay poorly. This grant enables students in Theology and ICEL programs to pay 50% of the going tuition rate. During the 2003-04 academic year the on-campus graduate tuition has been set at \$880/unit. With the ITG a student will pay \$440/unit.

A. J. Zabala Trust. According to the provisions of the trust, monies are available for scholarships at the graduate level, for library supplements, and for a Zabala Chair. This last-name provision will come into effect when \$250,000 has been built up in its particular area of the trust. During the last decade the Zabala trustees have set aside funds for both the on-campus library and the Kino library in Phoenix. Additional money has been used for merit scholarship (\$150 for each unit a students takes) for those students who maintain a 3.5 Grade Point Average or better. In Fall 2003 fifteen students who are involved in education (administrators, teachers, campus ministers) will begin the MA program with tuition entirely covered by Zabala monies for a 3-year period.

Adolph Becker Fund. This is money available for graduate scholarships. It replenishes itself. The amount of principal is small, so it is used only occasionally.