

The 2012-13 Survey of  
Humanities Departments at  
Four-Year Institutions:  
**Religion**

Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko  
Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics

An excerpt from the full technical study conducted for the American Academy of Arts & Sciences.

**Recommended Citation:** Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko, *The 2012–13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions* (College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014; sponsored by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences).

## Religion

In this section, we will provide an overview of HDS-1 Religion departments still awarding degrees in Religion at the time of HDS-2. Table R1 shows the number of departments and faculty members. While there has been no statistically significant change in the average number of faculty members per department overall, the more granular results show small increases in departments at Comprehensive institutions and in departments which offer only a bachelor's degree.

**Table REL1: HDS-1 Departments and Faculty Members by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. "No  $\delta$ " indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members*
Primarily Undergraduate	245 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	7.4 No $\delta$	1,810
Comprehensive	154 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	11.4 <i>Up 0.4 to 3.6</i>	1,750
Primarily Research	103 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	12.6 No $\delta$	1,300
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members
Bachelor's	404 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	8.6 <i>Up 0.0 to 1.6</i>	3,460
Master's	61 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	13.3 No $\delta$	810
Doctorate	37 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	15.9 No $\delta$	590
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>502</b> <i>See Appendix D.</i>	<b>9.7</b> No $\delta$	<b>4,860</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table REL2 presents faculty members by tenure status. Overall, there have been no significant per-department changes in the distribution of faculty members across the types of appointments since the previous round of the study. At the more granular level, we see small changes in the average number of tenured and tenure-track faculty members in departments housed in Primarily Undergraduate institutions, in the number of part-time faculty members in departments housed in Comprehensive institutions, and in tenured faculty in departments that award only bachelor's degrees.

**Table REL2: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments\* by Tenure Status, Fall 2012**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Primarily Undergraduate	1,000 <i>Up 0.2 to 1.2 per department</i>	250 <i>Down 0.5 to 0.9 per department</i>	220 No $\delta$	340 No $\delta$
Comprehensive	600 No $\delta$	220 No $\delta$	170 No $\delta$	760 <i>Up 0.1 to 3.1 per department</i>
Primarily Research	710 No $\delta$	250 No $\delta$	140 No $\delta$	200 No $\delta$
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Bachelor’s	1,620 <i>Up 0.2 to 1.3 per department</i>	500 No $\delta$	360 No $\delta$	980 No $\delta$
Master’s	340 No $\delta$	110 No $\delta$	90 No $\delta$	270 No $\delta$
Doctorate	350 No $\delta$	110 No $\delta$	80 No $\delta$	50 No $\delta$
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>2,310</b> No $\delta$	<b>720</b> No $\delta$	<b>530</b> No $\delta$	<b>1,300</b> No $\delta$

For changes in the number of departments see Tables REL1 or REL4.

\* These values should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not included data for any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table REL3 presents faculty members by employment status and gender. As with the tenure status, there have been only a few statistically significant per-department changes at the more granular levels. Overall, though, there are no statistically significant changes.

**Table REL3: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments\* by Employment Status and Gender, Fall 2012**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Primarily Undergraduate	1,430 No $\delta$	380 No $\delta$	1,240 No $\delta$	570 No $\delta$
Comprehensive	930 No $\delta$	820 <i>Up 0.0 to 3.3 per department</i>	1,260 <i>Up 0.4 to 2.7 per department</i>	490 No $\delta$
Primarily Research	1,080 No $\delta$	220 No $\delta$	850 No $\delta$	450 No $\delta$
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Bachelor’s	2,380 No $\delta$	1,080 No $\delta$	2,390 No $\delta$	1,070 <i>Up 0.0 to 0.7 per department</i>
Master’s	530 No $\delta$	280 No $\delta$	560 No $\delta$	250 No $\delta$
Doctorate	530 No $\delta$	60 No $\delta$	400 No $\delta$	190 No $\delta$
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,440</b> No $\delta$	<b>1,420</b> No $\delta$	<b>3,350</b> No $\delta$	<b>1,510</b> No $\delta$

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Not every department housed in an institution classified as Primarily Research using the Carnegie classifications offers a doctorate, or even a master’s. Table REL4 details the highest degree offered by Religion departments housed at various institutions. At fifteen Primarily Undergraduate institutions, the Religion departments offer a master’s degree.

**Table REL4: Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments\* by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012**

		Highest Degree Offered			All Remaining HDS-1 Departments
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate	
Carnegie Classification	Primarily Undergraduate	230	15	0	245
	Comprehensive	123	28	3	154
	Primarily Research	51	18	34	103
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments		<b>404</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>502</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table REL5 summarizes responses to the question of how many bachelor's degrees were awarded in Religion during the 2011-12 academic year. About 80% of the departments (404 out of 502) offer only a bachelor's degree, and these departments accounted for about 80% of the bachelor's degrees awarded. There have been no statistically significant changes in the average number of students earning a bachelor's degree in Religion per department.

**Table REL5: Bachelor's Degrees completed in Religion in HDS-1 Departments in the 2011-12 Academic Year**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. "No  $\delta$ " indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded*
Primarily Undergraduate	245	9.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	2,210
Comprehensive	154	9.4 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,440
Primarily Research	103	13.2 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,360
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded*
Bachelor's	404	10.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	4,050
Master's	61	8.4 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	510
Doctorate	37	12.2 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	450
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>10.0</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>5,010</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table REL6 presents data on the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Religion. Overall, there is a significant decrease in the per-department number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Religion. This decrease is seen in departments that offer only a bachelor's degree.

If the number of students receiving bachelor's degrees is to remain fairly constant, then one would expect the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major to be at least twice as large as the number of bachelor's degree recipients. While that was true in the first round of this study, it is not the case in Religion this round. Given the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Religion, we might expect to see a continued decline in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in this discipline.

**Table REL6: Number of Juniors and Seniors with Declared Major in Religion in HDS-1 Departments as of the Beginning of the Fall 2012 Term**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. "No  $\delta$ " indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Primarily Undergraduate	245	14.9 <i>Down 0.7 to 10.0</i>	3,660
Comprehensive	154	18.3 <i>Down 1.2 to 9.8</i>	2,820
Primarily Research	103	25.9 <i>Down 2.4 to 29.4</i>	2,670
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Bachelor's	404	17.4 <i>Down 3.0 to 10.4</i>	7,035
Master's	61	19.2 No $\delta$	1,170
Doctorate	37	25.5 No $\delta$	945
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>18.2</b> <i>Down 4.0 to 14.6</i>	<b>9,150</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

There were no statistically significant changes in the average number of students in each department completing a minor in Religion. These data are detailed in Table REL7. During the 2011 – 2012 academic year, Religion departments awarded, on average, about 10 bachelor's degrees per department and had about 10 students per department earn a minor in the field.

**Table REL7: Number of Students Completing a Minor in Religion in HDS-1 Departments during the 2011-12 Academic Year**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Primarily Undergraduate	245	7.7 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,880
Comprehensive	154	8.1 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,240
Primarily Research	103	16.1 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,660
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Bachelor’s	404	9.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	3,625
Master’s	61	8.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	485
Doctorate	37	18.1 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	670
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>9.5</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>4,780</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As shown in Table REL8, there were approximately 3,000 graduate students enrolled in programs in Religion departments during the Fall 2012 term. Over half of these students were in departments that awarded a doctorate.



**Table REL8: Number of Graduate Students in Religion in HDS-1 Departments during Fall 2012 Term**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students (per department that offers graduate degree)	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Primarily Undergraduate	245	33.3 No $\delta$	500
Comprehensive	154	29.7 No $\delta$	920
Primarily Research	103	30.9 Down 1.1 to 6.9	1,610
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Bachelor's*	404	0.0 No $\delta$	40
Master's	61	23.9 No $\delta$	1,460
Doctorate	37	41.4 No $\delta$	1,530
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>30.9</b> No $\delta$	<b>3,030</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

\*This is per department since none of these departments currently offers a graduate degree. These students are likely students who started when the department did offer a graduate degree, but the department has since lost degree-granting status.

Overall, about three-fourths of the students enrolled in undergraduate introductory Religion courses are taught by a full-time faculty member, and 2% are taught by graduate students. These data are presented in Table REL9. The differences indicated by the asterisk (\*) in the table means that the proportion of students taught by that rank faculty member in that type of department differs significantly from the other comparable types of department (either by Carnegie Classification, by highest degree offered, or by form of control). A student in a department housed in a Primarily Undergraduate institution (by Carnegie Classification) is more likely to be taught by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. The same is also true for a student in a department housed in a private institution.

It must again be noted that statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem

to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

**Table REL9: Instructor of Record for Undergraduate Introductory Courses in Religion in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	63%*	17%	20%	0%*
Comprehensive	53%	15%*	32%*	0%*
Primarily Research	52%	20%	19%	10%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor’s	58%	17%*	25%*	0%*
Master’s	50%	21%*	23%*	5%*
Doctorate	56%	13%	12%	19%
By Form of Control				
Public	54%	18%	21%	7%
Private	58%*	17%	25%*	0%*
<b>All Institutions</b>	57%	17%	24%	2%*

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table REL10 presents results for the instructor of record for all other (non-introductory) classes in Religion. Students in departments housed in Primarily Undergraduate institutions (Carnegie classification) are more likely to be taught by full-time faculty members than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. There is little difference by form of control.

Finally, Table REL11 summarizes the results for the instructor of record in graduate courses. There is very little difference for graduate courses. At private institutions, students are less likely to be taught by full-time faculty members and more likely to be taught by part-time faculty members.

**Table REL10: Instructor of Record for All Other Undergraduate (Non-Introductory) Courses in Religion in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	70%*	13%	17%*	0%*
Comprehensive	64%	13%	23%*	0%*
Primarily Research	60%	16%	20%	5%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	66%*	14%	20%	0%*
Master's	61%	15%	23%*	1%*
Doctorate	61%	13%	16%	9%
By Form of Control				
Public	64%	14%	19%	3%
Private	66%	14%	20%	0%*
<b>All Institutions</b>	<b>65%*</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>20%*</b>	<b>1%</b>

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

**Table REL11: Instructor of Record for All Graduate Courses in Religion in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	74%	16%	10%	0%
Comprehensive	79%	13%	8%	0%
Primarily Research	78%	14%	8%	1%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	77%	16%*	7%	0%
Master's	78%	15%*	7%	0%
Doctorate	81%	10%	8%	1%
By Form of Control				
Public	82%	11%	6%	0%
Private	76%*	14%	9%*	0%
<b>All Institutions</b>	79%	13%	8%*	0%

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level.

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table REL12 presents the results for the assessment of undergraduate student learning in Religion departments. Learning outcomes assessment is an aggregate assessment which attempts to measure the effectiveness of a program or institution by examining the competence of a given cohort of students. We did not ask about the assessment of individual students; we asked respondents to tell us whether or not they assessed undergraduate student learning.

**Table REL12: Assessment of Overall Undergraduate Student Learning in Religion in HDS-1 Departments as of the Fall 2012 Term**

	All Institutions	Carnegie Classification			Form of Control	
		Primarily Undergraduate	Comprehensive	Primarily Research	Public	Private
No Departmental Assessment	14%	14%	5%	30%	20%	13%
Departmental Assessment for All Majors	77%	76%	88%	66%	73%	79%
Departmental Assessment for Majors in Honors Program Only	2%	2%	0%	5%	0%	2%
Departmental Assessment for Some Other Group of Students	17%	16%	23%	11%	23%	16%

Note: The sum of the four rows in any column may exceed 100% because respondents could select multiple choices.

The “assessment” referenced is an aggregate assessment based on examining the results from a given cohort of students in an attempt to examine the effectiveness of a program.

For Religion, 65% of the department view publications as either essential or very important in tenure decisions; 73% of all of the departments in the study view publications this way. The importance of teaching and of service is about the same in Religion departments as in all other disciplines combined. The views of Religion departments on the importance of public humanities are also similar to that for all disciplines combined. Details for Religion departments are shown in Table REL13.

**Table REL13: Considerations in Tenure Decisions in Religion in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012**

	CC*	Essential	Very Important	Important	Marginally Important	Unimportant
Publications (research, scholarship, and creative work)	All	<b>48%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	PUG	36%	23%	21%	17%	2%
	Comp	40%	13%	38%	9%	0%
	PRes	89%	7%	2%	0%	2%
Teaching	All	<b>80%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	PUG	91%	6%	2%	0%	0%
	Comp	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%
	PRes	48%	36%	16%	0%	0%
Service to the department or institution	All	<b>34%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>
	PUG	38%	34%	23%	2%	2%
	Comp	40%	36%	24%	0%	0%
	PRes	16%	25%	43%	16%	0%
Public humanities (making the humanities and/or humanities scholarship accessible to the general public)	All	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>24%</b>
	PUG	0%	9%	34%	30%	28%
	Comp	9%	16%	13%	44%	18%
	PRes	0%	7%	27%	41%	25%

\*CC – Carnegie classification and PUG – Primarily Undergraduate, Comp – Comprehensive, & PRes – Primarily Research

**Table REL14: Faculty Tenure Decisions and New Hires in HDS-1 Departments**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

	<b>Number in Remaining HDS-1 Departments*</b>	<b>Relative to ...</b>
Tenured Faculty Members as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	2,310	48% of total faculty members No $\delta$
Tenure-Track Faculty Members (not yet tenured) as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	720	15% of total faculty members No $\delta$
Tenure-Track Faculty Members Granted Tenure per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	75 per year	10% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No $\delta$
Faculty Members Denied Tenure or Leaving Prior to Tenure Decision per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	25 per year	3% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No $\delta$
Tenured, Tenure-Track and Permanent Faculty Members Hired for 2012-13 (2007-08)	230	7% of full-time faculty members No $\delta$

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As seen in Table REL14, there are no significant changes in the faculty tenure decisions and new hires in Religion departments.

About nine Religion departments (or the institutions in which they are housed) in ten (89%) provide support for research for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members; this is comparable to all disciplines combined. It appears that the proportion of full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty and of part-time faculty members in Religion departments receiving research support is comparable to that in other disciplines. The data are presented in Table REL15.

**Table REL15: Availability of Institutional or Departmental Support for Research in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012**

	<b>% of Institutions or Departments Providing Support</b>
For Full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty members	89%
For full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members	70%
For part-time faculty members	22%

When looking at all disciplines, about one department in three (33%) offers a fully online course, and about one in five (19%) offers a hybrid course. Religion departments appear to be equally likely to offer fully online courses and may be slightly less likely to offer hybrid courses. At the departments where

The 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments

these courses are offered, it appears that there are fewer fully online or hybrid courses offered than for all the disciplines combined. The details are shown in Table AH16.

**Table REL16: HDS-1 Religion Departments Offering Online Courses by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control, 2011-12 Academic Year**

	Departments Offering Fully Online Courses	Average Number of Fully Online Courses Offered	Departments Offering Hybrid Courses	Average Number of Hybrid Courses Offered
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	25%	3.8	14%	2.8
Comprehensive	46%	3.1	18%	1.9
Primarily Research	34%	4.5	3%	2.0
By Form of Control				
Public	43%	4.1	7%	2.0
Private	31%	3.5	14%	2.4
<b>All Institutions</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Religion departments overall are less likely to offer a seminar focused on digital methods for teaching and research than all disciplines combined. The proportion of Religion departments with formal guidelines for evaluating digital publications for tenure and promotions is comparable to all disciplines combined. These results are summarized in Table REL17.

**Table REL17: Engagement with Digital Humanities by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control in HDS-1 Departments as of Fall 2012**

	Offered Seminar Focusing on Digital Methods for Research and Teaching	Have Formal Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Publications for Tenure and Promotion
By Carnegie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate	2%	10%
Comprehensive	5%	5%
Primarily Research	11%	24%
By Form of Control		
Public	6%	19%
Private	5%	9%
<b>All Institutions</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11%</b>