

Term Information

Effective Term

Spring 2026

Course Change Information

What change is being proposed? (If more than one, what changes are being proposed?)

Submission to GE Foundations (Social and Behavioral Sciences)

What is the rationale for the proposed change(s)?

The course was already being reviewed for GE Foundations, and needs to get back in the queue

What are the programmatic implications of the proposed change(s)?

(e.g. program requirements to be added or removed, changes to be made in available resources, effect on other programs that use the course)?

Add GE Foundations: SBS designation to course

Is approval of the request contingent upon the approval of other course or curricular program request? No

Is this a request to withdraw the course? No

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area

Civics, Law, and Leadership

Fiscal Unit/Academic Org

Chase Center for Civics - D4260

College/Academic Group

Office of Academic Affairs

Level/Career

Undergraduate

Course Number/Catalog

2110

Course Title

American Creeds and Conflicts

Transcript Abbreviation

American Creeds

Course Description

Surveys how Americans have debated Abraham Lincoln's claim that the Declaration of Independence serves as an "electric cord" uniting citizens of different generations, descents, and circumstances. To what extent does the Declaration provide a strong foundation for American political community? Students compare answers from political leaders, constitutional theorists, and social scientists.

Semester Credit Hours/Units

Fixed: 3

Offering Information

Length Of Course

14 Week

Flexibly Scheduled Course

Never

Does any section of this course have a distance education component?

No

Grading Basis

Letter Grade

Repeatable

No

Course Components

Lecture

Grade Roster Component

Lecture

Credit Available by Exam

No

Admission Condition Course

No

Off Campus

Sometimes

Campus of Offering

Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark, Wooster

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites

Exclusions

Electronically Enforced Yes

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

Subject/CIP Code 30.0000
Subsidy Level General Studies Course
Intended Rank Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

Requirement/Elective Designation

Required for this unit's degrees, majors, and/or minors

Social and Behavioral Sciences

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Previous Value

Required for this unit's degrees, majors, and/or minors

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Describe and analyze a range of perspectives from the social sciences on the role the Declaration of Independence has played in defining the meaning of American citizenship, including the relationship between the Declaration and the Constitution

Content Topic List

- Interpreting the Declaration of Independence; the relationship between the Declaration and the Constitution; the Declaration as a civic creed; conflicts about the principles of the Declaration; principles of cooperation related to the Declaration

Sought Concurrence

Yes

Attachments

- Concurrence - Education, Law, Arts & Sciences, Public Affairs (1).pdf: Concurrence Exchanges
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2110 - Syllabus (v3).pdf: Syllabus (v3)
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2110 - GE Foundations Worksheet (v3).pdf: GE Worksheet (v3)
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Memo Regarding Second Resubmission of CIVICLL 2110.pdf: Memo Regarding Resubmission (CIVICLL 2110 - v3)
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)

Comments

- Please see feedback email sent to department 10-21-2025 RLS (by Steele,Rachel Lea on 10/21/2025 09:44 PM)

COURSE CHANGE REQUEST
2110 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Reed,Kathryn Marie
11/09/2025

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	10/17/2025 07:25 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	10/17/2025 07:25 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	10/20/2025 12:01 PM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele,Rachel Lea	10/21/2025 09:44 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	11/08/2025 12:47 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	11/08/2025 12:48 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	11/09/2025 07:06 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Steele,Rachel Lea	11/09/2025 07:06 PM	ASCCAO Approval

Memo Regarding Second Resubmission of CIVICLL 2110

Our thanks to the committee for their clear, careful, and detailed comments.

Two of the committee's contingencies can be addressed straightforwardly:

- We have added to the syllabus (p. 3) the GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes, with a brief, student-friendly paragraph explaining how the course meets those goals and ELOs.
- We have elaborated the "Course Requirements" section of the syllabus (pp. 4-5) to detail how the GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes will be central to assessments and give students a clearer sense of how they will be evaluated/graded.

A more complex matter is how the course can best serve the Social and Behavioral Sciences Foundation. We are grateful to the committee for working with us as we learn more fully the design purposes of the GEN Foundation. We also think the effort is worth making since we conceived of this course as a variant on the foundational courses offered by civics programs that are weighted towards the social sciences within the "civics universe" (e.g., the Stanford Civics Initiative, Tufts's Civic Studies major, Johns Hopkins's Civic Life minor). To that end, we have taken up the committee's suggestion **(c.i)** about how "framing questions" are used in the syllabus to frame the whole course around a question that we take to be shared by the aforementioned suite of civics courses (and the research agendas of the scholars who designed those courses): namely, *what citizens are capable of* ("civic capacity" in more technical language).

In terms of course content, this has resulted in doing more of what the committee commended with respect to Day 17 (formerly Day 15: using "the work of Booth-Chapman and Muirhead/Rosenblum to frame questions about Madison's arguments regarding human behavior"). Thus, for Day 26 we have framed the argument between Jefferson and Madison about preserving versus changing constitutions by Melton/Ginsburg/Elkins's influential study of the conditions of constitutional endurance and reform. And on Day 25 we frame Woodrow Wilson's arguments about the pragmatic "progressivism" of the Declaration of Independence and public administration with Vincent Ostrom's classic study of the subject. We have also aimed to address the committee's concern **(c.iv)** that a full day of reading is largely confined to the text of the Declaration of Independence by framing that reading (Day 6) as part of an empirical inquiry into the character, rise, and decline, of

“print cultures,” as well as using recent experiments with collective decision-making (Day 5) to encourage students to analyze the deliberative process that produced the Declaration (rather than treating it as an abstract statement of philosophic principle). Moreover, the committee’s concern **(c.iv)** that social science readings may not always be “engage[d] meaningfully” insofar as they are paired with historical primary texts has been addressed by, in several cases removing the historical texts altogether, to ensure that full focus is given to assigned social science literature (this is true for almost all of Unit 3 of the course: it’s true that some historical texts remain present on, e.g., Day 21 and 22 but note that these documents are part of the civic literacy requirement which the course is designed to fulfill – more on that point below; for present purposes we would simply stress that students are being pressed to make sense of those documents through the contributions of social science literature).

More generally, the committee’s concern **(c.iii)** that the course was “focused on historical and cultural issues rather than social science questions” has been addressed not only by pairing back assigned historical primary texts but by devoting significantly more days of the course exclusively to social science literature, and using that literature to frame the whole course around such questions as: when is cooperation possible (Day 3); what are the dynamics of political cognition and partisan affiliation (Day 4); when are people able to revise their opinions in response to evidence and argument (Day 5). And while we acknowledge that this is not primarily a methods course **(c.ii)** we have intentionally framed a full section of the course (Unit 2) around the question of what makes constitutional commitments credible, and included several readings devoted to defending methods from Economics as the most appropriate tools for making sense of those commitments (Day 13). Precisely what we want Unit 2 of the course to do is help students recognize the value of contemporary social science by understanding that what was historically labelled the “moral science” of Adam Smith, David Hume, and the Federalist Papers is today best represented and carried forward not by “moral philosophy” but by social science. This requires “teaching the controversy,” so to speak, but we have included multiple days of readings (e.g., Days 10, 13, 15, 16) that explicitly advocate social science methods as the proper heirs to those canonical theorists. To that extent, we think the course can be foundational for the social sciences by offering a justification for them against alternatives.

That said, it may be worth elaborating why we have kept several historical primary texts on the syllabus. There is a pragmatic justification: we want the course to satisfy the new civic literacy requirement, and the required documents are historical primary texts. We believe that teaching those documents effectively requires giving them some historical context, and that doing so is consistent with the Learning Outcomes for the Social and Behavioral Sciences outlined by Ohio Transfer 36 (which explicitly allows for material from History within the Social and Behavioral Sciences). But there is also a matter of principle at play here, which is that we see the course as siding with scholars in peer programs who have concluded that lessons of historical primary texts from the American civic tradition are best interpreted and applied through the social and behavioral sciences. The course redesign aims to make this clearer by foregrounding questions of “civic capacity” throughout.

We thank the committee for its careful attention, and hope to have satisfied its requests.¹

¹ We have aimed to rectify any discrepancies between the syllabus and the GE worksheet (c.v), but regarding Melissa Schwartzberg in particular: her apparent absence from the syllabus is explained by the fact that “Hugo Mercier, et al” (Day 5) refers to: Henry Farrell, Hugo Mercier & Melissa Schwartzberg, “Analytical Democratic Theory: A Microfoundational Approach,” *American Political Science Review* 117 (2023): 767-772. Incidentally, this list of co-authors may be akin to the syllabus as a whole: ecumenical but weighted towards the social sciences.

CIVICLL 2110: American Creeds and Conflicts

GEN Foundation: Social and Behavioral Sciences

Semester and Year:

Meetings Times:

Location:

Format of Instruction: Lecture

Contact Hours Per Week: 3

Instructor:

Office:

Email:

Phone:

Office Hours:

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course introduces students to the development of American civic thought: the intellectual tradition of reflecting on the nature, rights, and responsibilities of American citizenship. Throughout the semester, we will consider how the Declaration of Independence has served as a lynchpin of American civic thought and action. How should we today evaluate Abraham Lincoln's claim that the Declaration can serve as an "electric cord" uniting citizens of different generations, descents, and circumstances? To what extent has the Declaration provided a strong foundation for American political community, and to what extent can it continue to do so? What are alternative grounds for this nation's civic life? Answering these questions will lead us to examine the relationship between principled and pragmatic justifications for civic life in the United States. Have Americans found shared moral commitments to support their social and political arrangements? Or have they found practical incentives for working together even when they deeply disagree? By the end of the semester, students will be able to compare the answers to these questions given by classic primary texts from the American civic tradition with the answers offered by contemporary scholars working in disciplines from across the social and behavioral sciences.

This course is broken up into three units. Each unit considers the character of the American citizenship through the prism of the Declaration of Independence:

- First, students will explore the Declaration's understanding of citizenship and its role in establishing the United States as a nation where citizenship is frequently defined with reference to a "civic creed." Research from the social sciences regarding *what citizens are capable of* will be used to help students to make sense of the Declaration, not as an object to be simply venerated or debunked, but instead appreciated as offering a distinct model for civic thinking, deliberation, and collective action.
- Second, students will examine the relationship between the Declaration and the U.S. Constitution as an illustration of dilemmas involved in squaring commitment to general principles with their practical implementation. Special consideration will be given to how institutions facilitate or inhibit cooperation among citizens with competing interests.
- Third, students will engage debates over key claims made in the Declaration, analyzing the meaning and validity of those claims. In the process, students will consider whether the Constitution itself remains sound, or ought to be changed.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course satisfies programmatic goals and learning outcomes for Civics, Law, and Leadership:

CIVICLL Learning Outcomes	Related Course Content
1. Students can appreciate and critically evaluate the primary and secondary sources necessary for understanding the key ideas, texts, events, individuals, debates, traditions, and developments that have defined American constitutionalism and civic life.	Students will study primary sources from the American civic tradition including the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Federalist Papers, not as objects to be simply venerated or debunked, but instead appreciated as offering distinct models for civic thinking, deliberation, and collective action. Students will interpret these primary sources in light of the analysis
2. Students can use a multidisciplinary perspective to identify and evaluate historical antecedents of contemporary problems, real world applications of theoretical claims, and the principled bases for practical courses of action and civic leadership within a pluralistic American polity.	Students will explore how the institutional structures of American life have attempted to realize (or obstructed the realization of) the ideals of the Declaration of Independence, including consideration of how those institutions might be reformed or reinforced in pursuit of those ideals into the future.
3. Students can analyze their experiences, reasoning, and cultural assumptions against the accumulated wisdom of inherited traditions, the successes and failures of historical case studies, and the best lessons from the behavioral, social, and natural sciences.	Students will interpret the claims of primary sources from the American civic tradition in light of scholarship from the social and behavioral sciences that test and evaluate what ordinary citizens are capable of accomplishing through independent reflection, joint deliberation, and collective action.

CIVIC LITERACY REQUIREMENT

This course fulfills the requirements for an American civic literacy course that is three credit hours, includes a study of the American economic system and capitalism, with the following reading requirements (proficiency in which will be tested through a cumulative final exam):

- The entire Constitution of the United States
- The entire Declaration of Independence
- A minimum of five essays in their entirety from the Federalist Papers
- The entire Emancipation Proclamation
- The entire Gettysburg Address
- The entirety of Martin Luther King Jr.'s Letter from a Birmingham Jail
- The writings of Adam Smith, including a study of *The Wealth of Nations*

GEN GOALS & LEARNING OUTCOMES

This course satisfies the **GEN Foundation: Social and Behavioral Sciences**.

Goals

Goal 1: Critically analyze and apply theoretical and empirical approaches within the social and behavioral sciences, including modern principles, theories, methods and modes of inquiry.

Goal 2: Recognize the implications of social and behavioral scientific findings and their potential impacts.

Expected Learning Outcomes

Successful students will be able to:

- 1.1. Articulate basic facts, principles, theories and methods of social and behavioral science.
- 1.2 Explain and evaluate differences, similarities and disparities among institutions, organizations, cultures, societies and/or individuals using social and behavioral science.
- 2.1. Analyze how political, economic, individual or social factors and values impact social structures, policies and/or decisions.
- 2.2. Appraise social and ethical implications of social scientific and behavioral research.
- 2.3. Critically evaluate and responsibly use information from the social and behavioral sciences.

How this course connects to the Foundation: Social and Behavioral Sciences

This course asks what citizens are capable of – through individual reflection, joint deliberation, and collective action – and considers answers to that question offered by classic texts in the American civic tradition (especially the Declaration of Independence) in light of findings from influential scholarship in the social and behavioral sciences. As a result, students who complete this course will be able to (1) identify analytical tools and bodies of scholarship from the social and behavioral sciences appropriate to evaluating the claims of canonical civic texts, and (2) recognize what different scholarly frameworks within the social and behavioral sciences imply about the capacity (or incapacity) of ordinary citizens for meaningful thought, discussion, and action. For instance, students will be able to: (1.1) explain how social scientists have developed notions of prices and rents to elaborate Adam Smith’s analysis of the dynamics of social cooperation; (1.2) explain and evaluate how patterns of literacy may result in the health or decline of democratic institutions (and the ability of people outside those institutions to mobilize against them), and the conditions under which national constitutions do and do not endure; (2.1) analyze when religious beliefs function as a source of social solidarity or of political fragmentation; (2.2) appraise the implications of research on the psychology of partisanship and political cognition for cultivating more optimistic or pessimistic understandings of ordinary people’s ability to contribute to politics; (2.3) assess the strengths or limitations of the methods of economics versus moral philosophy for making sense of constitutional commitments and power distributions.

COURSE MATERIALS

Required Texts: Available at Barnes and Noble and on reserve at Thompson Library.

- Danielle Allen, *Our Declaration: A Reading of the Declaration of Independence in Defense of Equality* (New York, NY: Liveright, 2014). ISBN: 978-1631490446.

All other readings will be made available on CarmenCanvas.

Course materials are selected to emphasize:

- Foundational primary texts designed to be accessible to citizens without any specialized technical expertise (e.g., the Declaration, the Constitution, the Federalist Papers). This reflects an awareness that the American civic tradition has been shaped by citizens who were self-educated (e.g., Anne Hutchinson, Frederick Douglass) no less powerfully than by those with more formal credentials and technical expertise (e.g., Supreme Court justices).
- Research by scholars working from different points of view (philosophically, methodologically, politically) who are engaged with civics programs in higher education and who are endeavoring to define a distinctively civic perspective on problems of public life (for further details, consult the [Alliance for Civics in the Academy](#)).

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Three Exams:

- *First Exam* (worth 20% of the final course grade). To be held in-class at the conclusion of Unit 1 of the course. The exam will consist of multiple choice and short answer questions testing students' grasp of basic facts, principles, and theories (e.g., Hardin versus Ostrom on the dynamics of social cooperation; Converse versus Mercier on the limits of political cognition). An essay question will ask students to explain whether the Declaration of Independence represents (in either the theories articulated by the text, or the political process that produced the text) a model for civic reflection, discussion, and action that confirms, falls short of, or productively supplements, the theories of civic life and citizenship presented in the social science theories and case studies covered in Unit 1 of the course.
- *Second Exam* (worth 20% of the final course grade). To be held in-class at the conclusion of Unit 2 of the course. The exam will consist of multiple choice and short answer questions testing students' grasp of basic facts, principles, and theories (e.g., Madison, Booth-Chapman, and Muirhead & Rosenblum on the potentially productive or dangerous features of political factionalism; Smith and Hayek on markets and the dynamics of social knowledge). An essay question will ask students to explain when constitutional commitments can be best explained in terms of calculation regarding power distributions (as argued by Russell Hardin, among other authors in Unit 2 of the course), and when in terms of pre-calculative, affective commitments (as argued by Yuval Levin, among other authors in Unit 2 of the course).



- *Third Exam* (worth 40% of the final course grade). The final exam will consist of one section testing students' proficiency in the documents prescribed the civics literacy requirement (a passing grade in this section of the exam is a condition of passing the course). A second section of the exam will consist of an essay asking to students to evaluate whether the American constitution ought to be retained, rejected, amended, or interpreted more rigorously in light of its original intention (as argued by various authors in Unit 3 of the course, although students will be expected to defend their answer in part by referencing the theories of civic life covered throughout the whole semester).
- 2. *Class attendance and participation* (worth 20% of the final course grade). Students are expected to complete readings before class and should come to each session prepared to discuss them. They should review the reading questions provided in the syllabus as part of this preparation. Students are expected to attend every class session and contribute to class discussion at least once a week. If students are struggling to speak up in class, they are encouraged to visit office hours to discuss weekly readings and brainstorm strategies for increased participation. Attending office hours is not a replacement for contributing to class discussion, and students should be ready to be called on to discuss the assigned material when there is a lull in discussion. One or two absences throughout the semester are understandable and not a cause for explanation; absences beyond that will affect students' participation grade. If students are facing exceptional circumstances—medical or otherwise—they need to consult with the instructor so that appropriate accommodations can be made.

COURSE SCHEDULE

UNIT 1: CREEDS AND CITIZENSHIP

Day 1 (Tuesday, August 26) – COURSE INTRODUCTION

Day 2 (Thursday, August 28) – WHAT CITIZENS DO

Required Reading

- Peter Levine, *What Should We Do? A Theory of Civic Life*, chapter 1 (“The Citizen’s Fundamental Question”)

Reading Questions

- If you want to solve a problem as a *citizen*, why do you need different information, and a different perspective on the world around you, than you need as a philosophy major, or as an economics major, or simply as a student at Ohio State, or as a member of your family or a voluntary association?
- Reflect on Levine’s deceptively simple question: *what should we do?* Why does each word in this question matter, and how should we “weight” each of the words relative to the others (in other words, if you were constructing the syllabus for this course, would you focus on determining what we *should* do, or who *we* are, or *what* we can realistically *do*...).

Day 3 (Tuesday, September 2) – WHAT CITIZENS CAN AND CAN'T DO

Required Reading

- Garrett Hardin, excerpts from *The Tragedy of the Commons*
- Elinor Ostrom, "Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms"
- Elinor Ostrom, "Crowding Out Citizenship"

Reading Questions

- If we need to solve a social problem, should we be more focused on centralizing power and authority or with empowering local, independent actors?
- Why is the scope for meaningful action by citizens fairly limited according to Hardin, but more extensive according to Ostrom? What does each author suggest about the social and political conditions that must be in place for ordinary people to act constructively with one another? Which position seems right to you?
- According to Ostrom, how and why does scholarship in the social sciences need to be conducted to facilitate the contributions ordinary citizens can make to the social and political environments they share with one another?

Day 4 (Thursday, September 4) – WHAT CITIZENS CAN AND CAN'T DO: THINK

Required Reading

- Philip Converse, excerpts from "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics"
- James Ceasar, *Nature and History in American Political Development*, chapter 1
- Verlan Lewis, *Ideas of Power: The Politics of American Party Ideology Development*, chapter 1

Reading Questions

- Do most people have political beliefs that are worth respecting? Do their public policy positions or partisan affiliations reflect well-considered attempts to make sense of the world, or are they an incoherent mish-mash of assumptions, impressions, and biases?
- Is Converse right that people generally don't have coherent political beliefs? If not, is there any point to explaining political disagreements using categories such as "left" versus "right," or "liberal" versus "conservative"?
- Is Ceasar right that political partisanship is grounded in deeply principled disagreements about the meaning of American political ideals and institutions? Or is Lewis persuasive that ostensibly principled partisan positions ("left" versus "right", "liberal" versus "conservative") are rationalizations of a more basic and ideologically flexible competition for power?

Day 5 (Tuesday, September 9) – WHAT CITIZENS CAN AND CAN'T DO: TALK

Required Reading

- Peter Levine, "People Are Not Points in Space: Network Models of Beliefs and Discussions"
- Michael Neblo, et al, "The Need for a Translational Science of Democracy"
- Hugo Mercier, et al, "Analytical Democratic Theory: A Microfoundational Approach"



Reading Questions

- When people are politically divided, is there any point to getting them together to talk things through?
- According to Neblo et al, and Mercier et al, *when* can group discussions cut through partisanship and pre-existing biases rather than reinforcing them? And how should research in the social sciences go about identifying the contexts where people are able to answer “the citizen’s fundamental question”: *what should we do?*
- Why does Levine think that methods of survey research common in the social sciences, along with philosophic assumptions influential among social critics (including many academics and political journalists), make constructive discussion among citizens seem much more difficult than it really is? And what do Levine’s experiments suggest about how discussion of political problems is different (better? worse?) among college students at a small private institution such as Tufts versus a large public institution such as Kansas State?

Day 6 (Thursday, September 11) – WHAT CITIZENS CAN AND CAN’T DO: READ OR WRITE

Required Reading

- Elizabeth Einstein, excerpts from *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*
- OECD, “Adult Skills in Literacy and Numeracy Declining or Stagnant in Most OECD Countries”
- Daniel Carpenter, “Recruitment by Petition: American Antislavery, French Protestantism, English Suppression”
- Maggie Blackhawk, et al, “Congressional Representation by Petition: Assessing the Voices of the Voteless in a Comprehensive New Database, 1789-1949”

Reading Questions

- Why might collective action as exercised through the written word be an especially valuable tool of civic action?
- According to Einstein, what makes “print cultures” historically distinct, and how did they skills of reading and writing they fostered contribute to the development of liberal democratic governments? To the extent that those skills are stagnant or in decline in today’s culture (as suggested by the OECD report), is that a problem of liberal democracy in the twenty first century?
- What do the case studies analyzed by Carpenter et al and Blackhawk et al suggest about how “print culture” in the form of petitions was used to exercise or contest the boundaries of citizenship in nineteenth century American democracy? And what does that history suggest about how collective action by people outside of power (and even outside the legal boundaries of citizenship) can exert a powerful influence on politics?

Day 7 (Tuesday, September 16) – WHAT THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE DID

Required Reading

- Declaration of Independence
- Danielle Allen, *Our Declaration*, Part II (“Who Wrote the Declaration of Independence”), Part III (“The Art of Democratic Writing”), Epilogue



Reading Questions

- Is the Declaration of Independence a good model for civic deliberation and civic action? In particular, how does the Declaration of Independence model constructive forms of thinking, talking, reading and writing among citizens?
- How does the Declaration of Independence itself understand citizenship? What sources of authority does the Declaration refer to as a justification for its understanding of the rights and duties citizens are endowed with?
- According to Danielle Allen, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and why does it matter who the “real” author is? What does the process that produced the Declaration teach us about the specific practices of writing and reading that are conducive to citizenship? In particular, how did the authors of the Declaration struggle with and try to solve puzzles of civic life such as disagreement among individuals or groups who need to act in pursuit of a common goal?
- Why does Allen think that the punctuation of the Declaration matters so much? How does the punctuation of the text affect how we interpret its meaning?
- The Declaration of Independence can be read as a statement of principle (a set of claims about what’s right and wrong, irrespective of context), and as a pragmatic action (a strategy for influencing the context the signatories operate within). How does Allen evaluate the text along each of these dimensions? And how do you think we should evaluate the text: as principled, or as pragmatic?

Day 8 (Thursday, September 18) – CIVIC USES OF THE DECLARATION

Required Reading

- Excerpts from Samuel Goldman, *After Nationalism: Being American in an Age of Division*; Philip Gorski, *American Covenant: A History of Civil Religion from the Puritans to the Present*; Jonathan Gienapp, *The Second Creation: Fixing the American Constitution in the Founding Era*

Reading Questions

- Goldman argues that at different times Americans have understood their Declaration of Independence as a “covenant,” “crucible,” or “creed.” What are the differences between these understandings of the Declaration, and what conception of citizenship does each entail?
- What do Goldman, Gorski, and Gienapp see as the virtues and vices of an American “civil religion” rooted in particular interpretations of the Declaration of Independence?

Day 9 (Tuesday, September 23) – **FIRST EXAM**

UNIT 2: COOPERATION AND CONSTITUTIONS

Day 10 (Thursday, September 25) – WHAT CONSTITUTIONS DO (part one)

Required Reading

- Brook Manville & Josiah Ober, *The Civic Bargain: How Democracy Survives*, chapter 6 (“Patterns in Democratic Bargaining and Survival”)



Reading Questions

- According to Manville and Ober's historical survey, how do constitutions compromise on principles (e.g., the "creed" of the Declaration of Independence) while making the realization of those principles more feasible in practice?
- What do Manville and Ober mean by a "civic friend," and how does it differ from a regular friend? Is "civic friendship" a distinctive ideal that has a realistic chance of alleviating social division and blind partisanship?

Day 11 (Tuesday, September 30) – WHAT CONSTITUTIONS DO (part two)

Required Reading

- Yuval Levin, *American Covenant: How the Constitution Unified Our Nation – And Could Again*, chapter 1 ("What is the Constitution?")

Reading Questions

- How does Levin's account of constitutionalism differ from Manville & Ober? In particular, why does the Declaration of Independence play a greater role in Levin's account of the American Constitution?
- Is a country more likely to unify around a shared set of "thick" moral principles, or a common recognition of pragmatic incentives for cooperation? Which picture of the purpose of constitutionalism do you find more compelling?

Day 12 (Thursday, October 2) – PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION (take one)

Required Reading

- David Hume, "Of the Original Contract"; "Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth"

Reading Questions

- Does Hume's theory of the incentives for social cooperation and the principles of legitimate government authority have more in common with Yuval Levin, or with Josiah Ober & Brook Manville?
- How might Hume propose reconciling the pragmatic realism of the first essay with the principled utopianism of the second?

Day 13 (Tuesday, October 7) – PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION (take two)

Required Reading

- Russell Hardin, "Why a Constitution?"
- James Buchanan, "Politics Without Romance"

Reading Questions

- According to Hardin, what is the difference between treating a constitution as a morally-binding "contract" versus a contextually appropriate "coordination" mechanism, and why is Hume's position closer to the latter? Does Hardin's characterization of Hume's position seem accurate?
- According to Buchanan, how do the tools of economics help to make sense of political decision making and institution building, and how did the American constitutional tradition anticipate those insights? Based on what we've seen in the course so far, can Buchanan's



characterization of American politics make sense of the Declaration of Independence, and its place in the American constitutional tradition? Or does it suggest that the Declaration isn't really very important to that tradition?

Day 14 (Thursday, October 9) – PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION (take three)

Required Reading

- Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, Part I, chapters 1-3 and 10-11

Reading Questions

- What are the key features of human nature that make productive social cooperation possible, according to Smith? And what features of human nature threaten a sound social order?
- Is Smith's understanding of the incentives for social cooperation more "optimistic" than Hume's, or less so?

Day 15 (Tuesday, October 15) – PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION (take four)

Required Reading

- F.A. Hayek, "The Uses of Knowledge in Society"
- Anne Krueger, "The Political Economy of the Rent Seeking Society"

Reading Questions

- In Hayek's analysis, what is the pricing system in a market economy, and how do prices facilitate effective social cooperation? In Krueger's analysis, what is rent-seeking, and how does it inhibit effective social cooperation?
- Reflecting on Smith, Hayek, and Krueger's analyses of market society, what do they each suggest about when government might serve as a cause of productive social cooperation, and when it functions as an obstacle?

Day 16 (Tuesday, October 21) – A PROPOSAL FOR COOPERATION (part one)

Required Reading

- Federalist Papers, 1-9
- Barry Weingast & Sonia Mittal, "Self-Enforcing Constitutions: With an Application to Democratic Stability in America's First Century"

Reading Questions

- What criteria does the Federalist suggest for judging a government legitimate or illegitimate? How does its understanding of the principles of social cooperation dovetail with or differ from the four authors we have just covered?
- According to Weingast & Mittal, what was the American constitution originally designed to accomplish, and how closely does their account align with the account offered by the Federalist? In their account, what role do normative commitments play in the success of a constitutional order?

Day 17 (Thursday, October 23) – A PROPOSAL FOR COOPERATION (part two)

Required Reading

- Federalist Papers 10, 51



- Emilee Booth-Chapman, “An Ideal of Nonfactionalism for Party Politics”
- Russell Muirhead & Nancy Rosenblum, “The Political Theory of Parties and Partisanship”

Reading Questions

- To what extent does James Madison’s argument in Federalist 10 and 51 suggest that politics can “solve” social problems? What sort of social conflict is Madison optimistic about deeply mitigating, and what sort of conflict is he resigned to merely managing?
- Why do Muirhead & Rosenblum see factionalism and partisanship as an inevitable and sometimes desirable feature of politics to be managed, while Booth-Chapman sees it as a contingent and undesirable pathology to be transcended? What might James Madison find to approve of or disagree with in either argument?

Day 19 (Tuesday, October 28) – A TEMPLATE FOR COOPERATION

Required Reading

- Constitution of the United States

Reading Questions

- To what extent should we read the mission of the Constitution as an extension of the mission of the Declaration of Independence? Should the Declaration guide our interpretation of the Constitution? Does the Constitution read as an implementation of the principles of the Declaration? Or do these documents serve very different purposes?

Day 20 (Thursday, November 4) – **SECOND EXAM**

UNIT 3: CONFLICT AND CHANGE

Day 21 (Thursday, November 6) - “ALL MEN ARE CREATED **EQUAL**”

Required Reading

- Abraham Lincoln, Gettysburg Address, Emancipation Proclamation, Electric Cord speech
- Christina Starman, Mark Sheskin & Paul Bloom, “Why People Prefer Unequal Societies”

Reading Questions

- According to Lincoln, what makes the claim to human equality in the Declaration of Independence meaningful even if people are not equal in all respects? How might Lincoln respond to Starman, Sheskin & Bloom’s argument that people are not really all that interested in being recognized as equal? What do the differences between Lincoln and Starman, et al, suggest about how the politically relevant sense of equality shifted in the popular imagination from 19th to the 21st centuries?

Day 22 (Thursday, November 13) – “ALL MEN ARE **CREATED** EQUAL”

Required Reading

- Robert D. Woodberry, “The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy”



- James Davison Hunter, *Democracy and Solidarity: On the Cultural Roots of America's Political Crisis*, chapter 6

Reading Questions

- To what extent does understanding the design of the United States's foundational political institutions require understanding (or even sharing) the religious beliefs of early Americans? How do Woodberry and Hunter each understand the relationship between religious, cultural, and political beliefs?

Day 23 (Tuesday, November 18) – “ALL **MEN** ARE CREATED EQUAL”

Required Reading

- Elizabeth Cady Stanton, speech at Seneca Falls and “Declaration of Sentiments”
- Susan B. Anthony, “Constitutional Argument”
- Elizabeth Beaumont, *The Civic Constitution*, chapter 6

Reading Questions

- To what extent do Stanton and Anthony present themselves as extending the United States's founding principles, and to what extent do they present themselves as critics? How does Beaumont distinguish between the rhetoric and the reality of their politics?

Day 24 (Thursday, November 20) – “**ALL** MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL”

Required Reading

- Martin Luther King Jr., “The Future of Integration”; “Letter from a Birmingham Jail”; “The Ethical Demands of Integration”; “The Drum Major Instinct”
- Albert O. Hirschmann, *Shifting Involvements: Private Interest and Public Action*, chapter 5

Reading Questions

- What are the political rights and social arrangements necessary to make civic equality meaningful for all? Do King's answers change in important ways? To what extent does King see his answers as consistent with the American political tradition, or as a correction of it?
- For King, what drives people to combat injustice, and what discourages them from doing so? How do King's answers compare to Hirschman's? What (if any) sound counsel does either author offer to the would-be political activist?

Day 25 (Tuesday, November 25) – “TO ALTER OR ABOLISH IT”

Required Reading

- Woodrow Wilson, “What is Progress?” and excerpts from *Congressional Government*
- Vincent Ostrom, excerpts from *The Intellectual Crisis in Public Administration*

Reading Questions

- Why does Wilson see the original design of the United States Constitution as self-defeating and inadequate to the interests of human progress advocated by the Declaration of Independence?

- Why does Ostrom object to the normative conclusion of Wilson's argument, but accept its descriptive account of the self-undermining character of the American constitutional order?

Day 26 (Tuesday, December 2) – “INSTITUTE NEW GOVERNMENT”?

Required Reading

- Federalist Papers, #49
- Correspondence between James Madison & Thomas Jefferson
- James Melton, Tom Ginsburg & Zachary Elkins, *The Endurance of National Constitutions*, chapters 1-2

Reading Questions

- Should it be easier or more difficult for Americans to change their constitution? What are the strengths and weaknesses of a rigid (i.e. difficult to amend) or flexible (i.e. easily amendable) constitution? How would you know if it was time to change the constitution?

Day 27 (Thursday, December 4) – “DESTRUCTIVE OF THESE ENDS?”

Required Reading

- Robert Dahl, *How Democratic is the American Constitution?*, chapter 3
- Steven Calabresi, “On Originalism in Constitutional Interpretation”

Reading Questions

- Is the original American constitution a good constitution? Or does it need radical change? Should American citizens feel free to ask the question?

Day 28 (Tuesday, December 9) – REVIEW AND CONCLUSION

THIRD EXAM TO BE HELD DURING FINAL EXAM PERIOD

University Policy Statements

Academic Misconduct

Academic integrity is essential to maintaining an environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research, and other educational and scholarly activities. Thus, The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the University's Code of Student Conduct, and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Students must recognize that failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the University's Code of Student Conduct and this syllabus may constitute Academic Misconduct.

The Ohio State University's Code of Student Conduct (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University or subvert the educational process. Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and

possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's Code of Student Conduct is never considered an excuse for academic misconduct, so please review the Code of Student Conduct and, specifically, the sections dealing with academic misconduct.

If an instructor suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course, the instructor is obligated by University Rules to report those suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If COAM determines that a student violated the University's Code of Student Conduct (i.e., committed academic misconduct), the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in the course and suspension or dismissal from the University.

If students have questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, they should contact the instructor.

Disability Statement (with Accommodations for Illness)

The university strives to maintain a healthy and accessible environment to support student learning in and out of the classroom. If students anticipate or experience academic barriers based on a disability (including mental health and medical conditions, whether chronic or temporary), they should let their instructor know immediately so that they can privately discuss options. Students do not need to disclose specific information about a disability to faculty. To establish reasonable accommodations, students may be asked to register with Student Life Disability Services (see below for campus-specific contact information). After registration, students should make arrangements with their instructors as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that accommodations may be implemented in a timely fashion.

If students are ill and need to miss class, including if they are staying home and away from others while experiencing symptoms of viral infection or fever, they should let their instructor know immediately. In cases where illness interacts with an underlying medical condition, please consult with Student Life Disability Services to request reasonable accommodations.

Grievances and Solving Problems

According to University Policies, if you have a problem with this class, you should seek to resolve the grievance concerning a grade or academic practice by speaking first with the instructor or professor. Then, if necessary, take your case to the department chairperson, college dean or associate dean, and to the provost, in that order. Specific procedures are outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-8-23. Grievances against graduate, research, and teaching assistants should be submitted first to the supervising instructor, then to the chairperson of the assistant's department.

Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct

The Ohio State University is committed to building and maintaining a welcoming community. All Buckeyes have the right to be free from harassment, discrimination, and sexual misconduct. Ohio State does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity or expression, genetic information, HIV/AIDS status, military status, national origin, pregnancy (childbirth, false pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, or recovery therefrom), race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or protected veteran status, or any other bases under the law, in its activities, academic programs, admission, and employment. Members of the university community

also have the right to be free from all forms of sexual misconduct: sexual harassment, sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking, and sexual exploitation.

To report harassment, discrimination, sexual misconduct, or retaliation and/or seek confidential and non-confidential resources and supportive measures, contact the Civil Rights Compliance Office (CRCO):

- Online reporting form: <http://civilrights.osu.edu/>
- Call 614-247-5838 or TTY 614-688-8605
- civilrights@osu.edu

The university is committed to stopping sexual misconduct, preventing its recurrence, eliminating any hostile environment, and remedying its discriminatory effects. All university employees have reporting responsibilities to the Civil Rights Compliance Office to ensure the university can take appropriate action:

- All university employees, except those exempted by legal privilege of confidentiality or expressly identified as a confidential reporter, have an obligation to report incidents of sexual assault immediately.
- The following employees have an obligation to report all other forms of sexual misconduct as soon as practicable but at most within five workdays of becoming aware of such information: 1. Any human resource professional (HRP); 2. Anyone who supervises faculty, staff, students, or volunteers; 3. Chair/director; and 4. Faculty member.

Religious Accommodations

Ohio State has had a longstanding practice of making reasonable academic accommodations for students' religious beliefs and practices in accordance with applicable law. In 2023, Ohio State updated its practice to align with new state legislation. Under this new provision, students must be in early communication with their instructors regarding any known accommodation requests for religious beliefs and practices, providing notice of specific dates for which they request alternative accommodations within 14 days after the first instructional day of the course. Instructors in turn shall not question the sincerity of a student's religious or spiritual belief system in reviewing such requests and shall keep requests for accommodations confidential.

With sufficient notice, instructors will provide students with reasonable alternative accommodations with regard to examinations and other academic requirements with respect to students' sincerely held religious beliefs and practices by allowing up to three absences each semester for the student to attend or participate in religious activities. Examples of religious accommodations can include, but are not limited to, rescheduling an exam, altering the time of a student's presentation, allowing make-up assignments to substitute for missed class work, or flexibility in due dates or research responsibilities. If concerns arise about a requested accommodation, instructors are to consult their tenure initiating unit head for assistance.

A student's request for time off shall be provided if the student's sincerely held religious belief or practice severely affects the student's ability to take an exam or meet an academic requirement **and** the student has notified their instructor, in writing during the first 14 days after the course begins, of the date of each absence. Although students are required to provide notice within the first 14 days after a course begins, instructors are strongly encouraged to work with the student to provide a reasonable accommodation if a request is made outside the notice period. A student may not be penalized for an absence approved under this policy.

If students have questions or disputes related to academic accommodations, they should contact their course instructor, and then their department or college office. For questions or to report discrimination or harassment based on religion, individuals should contact the [Civil Rights Compliance Office](#).

Policy: [Religious Holidays, Holy Days and Observances](#)

Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

There has been a significant increase in the popularity and availability of a variety of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools, including ChatGPT, Sudowrite, and others. These tools will help shape the future of work, research and technology, but when used in the wrong way, they can stand in conflict with academic integrity at Ohio State.

All students have important obligations under the Code of Student Conduct to complete all academic and scholarly activities with fairness and honesty. Our professional students also have the responsibility to uphold the professional and ethical standards found in their respective academic honor codes. Specifically, students are not to use unauthorized assistance in the laboratory, on field work, in scholarship, or on a course assignment unless such assistance has been authorized specifically by the course instructor. In addition, students are not to submit their work without acknowledging any word-for-word use and/or paraphrasing of writing, ideas or other work that is not your own. These requirements apply to all students undergraduate, graduate, and professional.

To maintain a culture of integrity and respect, these generative AI tools should not be used in the completion of course assignments unless an instructor for a given course specifically authorizes their use. Some instructors may approve of using generative AI tools in the academic setting for specific goals. However, these tools should be used only with the explicit and clear permission of each individual instructor, and then only in the ways allowed by the instructor.

Intellectual Diversity

Ohio State is committed to fostering a culture of open inquiry and intellectual diversity within the classroom. This course will cover a range of information and may include discussions or debates about controversial issues, beliefs, or policies. Any such discussions and debates are intended to support understanding of the approved curriculum and relevant course objectives rather than promote any specific point of view. Students will be assessed on principles applicable to the field of study and the content covered in the course. Preparing students for citizenship includes helping them develop critical thinking skills that will allow them to reach their own conclusions regarding complex or controversial matters.

GE Foundation Courses

Overview

Courses that are accepted into the General Education (GE) Foundations provide introductory or foundational coverage of the subject of that category. Additionally, each course must meet a set of Expected Learning Outcomes (ELO). Courses may be accepted into more than one Foundation, but ELOs for each Foundation must be met. It may be helpful to consult your Director of Undergraduate Studies or appropriate support staff person as you develop and submit your course.

This form contains sections outlining the ELOs of each Foundation category. You can navigate between them using the Bookmarks function in Acrobat. Please enter text in the boxes to describe how your class meets the ELOs of the Foundation(s) to which it applies. Because this document will be used in the course review and approval process, you should use language that is clear and concise and that colleagues outside of your discipline will be able to follow. Please be as specific as possible, listing concrete activities, specific theories, names of scholars, titles of textbooks etc. Your answers will be evaluated in conjunction with the syllabus submitted for the course.

Accessibility

If you have a disability and have trouble accessing this document or need to receive the document in another format, please reach out to Meg Daly at daly.66@osu.edu or call 614-247-8412.

GE Rationale: Foundations: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills **all** the expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity, please answer the following questions for each ELO.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational for the study of Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity.

Course Subject & Number: _____

B. Specific Goals of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity

GOAL 1: Successful students will engage in a systematic assessment of how historically and socially constructed categories of race, ethnicity, and gender, and possibly others, shape perceptions, individual outcomes, and broader societal, political, economic, and cultural systems.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to describe and evaluate the social positions and representations of categories including race, gender, and ethnicity, and possibly others. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to explain how categories including race, gender, and ethnicity continue to function within complex systems of power to impact individual lived experiences and broader societal issues. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3: Successful students are able to analyze how the intersection of categories including race, gender, and ethnicity combine to shape lived experiences. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications of studying race, gender, and ethnicity. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

GOAL 2: Successful students will recognize and compare a range of lived experiences of race, gender, and ethnicity.

Expected Learning Outcome 2.1: Successful students are able to demonstrate critical self- reflection and critique of their social positions and identities. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 2.2: Successful students are able to recognize how perceptions of difference shape one's own attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 2.3: Successful students are able to describe how the categories of race, gender, and ethnicity influence the lived experiences of others. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met.

GE Rationale: Foundations: Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course **all** expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Social and Behavioral Sciences, please answer the following questions for each ELO.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Course Subject & Number: _____

B. Specific Goals of Social and Behavioral Sciences

GOAL 1: Successful students will critically analyze and apply theoretical and empirical approaches within the social and behavioral sciences, including modern principles, theories, methods, and modes of inquiry.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to explain basic facts, principles, theories and methods of social and behavioral science. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to explain and evaluate differences, similarities, and disparities among institutions, organizations, cultures, societies, and/or individuals using social and behavioral science. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

GOAL 2: Successful students will recognize the implications of social and behavioral scientific findings and their potential impacts.

Expected Learning Outcome 2.1: Successful students are able to analyze how political, economic, individual, or social factors and values impact social structures, policies, and/or decisions. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 2.2: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications of social scientific and behavioral research. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 2.3: Successful students are able to critically evaluate and responsibly use information from the social and behavioral sciences. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

GE Rationale: Foundations: Historical or Cultural Studies (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills the expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Historical and Cultural Studies, please answer the following questions for each ELO. Note that for this Foundation, a course need satisfy **either** the ELOs for Historical Studies **or** the ELOs for Cultural Studies.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of History **or** Cultures.

Course Subject & Number: _____

B. Specific Goals of Historical *or* Cultural Studies

Historical Studies (A) Goal: Successful students will critically investigate and analyze historical ideas, events, persons, material culture and artifacts to understand how they shape society and people.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1A: Successful students are able to identify, differentiate, and analyze primary and secondary sources related to historical events, periods, or ideas. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2A: Successful students are able to use methods and theories of historical inquiry to describe and analyze the origin of at least one selected contemporary issue. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3A: Successful students are able to use historical sources and methods to construct an integrated perspective on at least one historical period, event or idea that influences human perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4A: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications in historical studies. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Cultural Studies (B) Goal: Successful students will evaluate significant cultural phenomena and ideas to develop capacities for aesthetic and cultural response, judgment, interpretation, and evaluation.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1B: Successful students are able to analyze and interpret selected major forms of human thought, culture, ideas or expression. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and identify the *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2B: Successful students are able to describe and analyze selected cultural phenomena and ideas across time using a diverse range of primary and secondary sources and an explicit focus on different theories and methodologies. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3B: Successful students are able to use appropriate sources and methods to construct an integrated and comparative perspective of cultural periods, events or ideas that influence human perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4B: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications in cultural studies. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met.

GE Rationale: Foundations: Writing and Information Literacy (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills **all** expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Writing and Information Literacy, please answer the following questions for each ELO.

Course Subject & Number: _____

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of Writing and Information Literacy.

B. Specific Goals of Writing and Information Literacy

GOAL 1: Successful students will demonstrate skills in effective reading, and writing, as well as oral, digital, and/or visual communication for a range of purposes, audiences, and context.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to compose and interpret across a wide range of purposes and audiences using writing, as well as oral, visual, digital and/or other methods appropriate to the context.

Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. Explain how the course includes opportunities for feedback on writing and revision. Furthermore, please describe how you plan to insure sufficiently low instructor-student ratio to provide efficient instruction and feedback. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to use textual conventions, including proper attribution of ideas and/or source, as appropriate to the communication situation. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. Is an appropriate text, writing manual, or other resource about the pedagogy of effective communication being used in the course? (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3: Successful students are able to generate ideas and informed responses incorporating diverse perspectives and information from a range of sources, as appropriate to the communication situation. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications in writing and information literacy practices. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

GOAL 2: Successful students will develop the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind needed for information literacy.

Expected Learning Outcome 2.1: Successful students are able to demonstrate responsible, civil, and ethical practices when accessing, using, sharing, or creating information. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 2.2: Successful students are able to locate, identify and use information through context appropriate search strategies. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 2.3: Successful students are able to employ reflective and critical strategies to evaluate and select credible and relevant information sources. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

GE Rationale: Foundations: Literary, Visual, or Performing Arts (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills **all** expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Literary, Visual, and Performing Arts, please answer the following questions for each ELO.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of Literary, Visual, or Performing Arts.

B. Specific Goals

Goal 1: Successful students will analyze, interpret, and evaluate major forms of human thought, cultures, and expression; and demonstrate capacities for aesthetic and culturally informed understanding.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to analyze and interpret significant works of design or visual, spatial, literary or performing arts. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to describe and explain how cultures identify, evaluate, shape, and value works of literature, visual and performing art, and design. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3: Successful students are able to evaluate how artistic ideas influence and shape human beliefs and the interactions between the arts and human perceptions and behavior. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications in literature, visual and performing arts, and design. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Goal 2: Successful students will experience the arts and reflect on that experience critically and creatively.

Expected Learning Outcome 2.1: Successful students are able to engage in informed observation and/or active participation within the visual, spatial, literary, or performing arts and design. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 2.2: Successful students are able to critically reflect on and share their own experience of observing or engaging in the visual, spatial, literary, or performing arts and design.

Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

GE Rationale: Foundations: Natural Science (4 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills **all** expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Natural Sciences, please answer the following questions for each ELO.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of Natural Science.

Course Subject & Number: _____

B. Specific Goals for Natural Sciences

GOAL 1: Successful students will engage in theoretical and empirical study within the natural sciences, gaining an appreciation of the modern principles, theories, methods, and modes of inquiry used generally across the natural sciences.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to explain basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern natural sciences; describe and analyze the process of scientific inquiry. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to identify how key events in the development of science contribute to the ongoing and changing nature of scientific knowledge and methods. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate specific activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3: Successful students are able to employ the processes of science through exploration, discovery, and collaboration to interact directly with the natural world when feasible, using appropriate tools, models, and analysis of data. Please explain the 1-credit hour equivalent experiential component included in the course: e.g., traditional lab, course-based research experiences, directed observations, or simulations. Please note that students are expected to analyze data and report on outcomes as part of this experiential component. *(50-1000 words)*

Course Subject & Number: _____

GOAL 2: Successful students will discern the relationship between the theoretical and applied sciences, while appreciating the implications of scientific discoveries and the potential impacts of science and technology.

Expected Learning Outcome 2.1: Successful students are able to analyze the inter-dependence and potential impacts of scientific and technological developments. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 2.2: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications of natural scientific discoveries. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 2.3: Successful students are able to critically evaluate and responsibly use information from the natural sciences. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/ assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

GE Rationale: Foundations: Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis) (3 credits)

Requesting a GE category for a course implies that the course fulfills **all** expected learning outcomes (ELOs) of that GE category. To help the reviewing panel evaluate the appropriateness of your course for the Foundations: Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis), please answer the following questions for each ELO.

A. Foundations

Please explain in 50-500 words why or how this course is introductory or foundational in the study of Mathematical & Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis).

B. Specific Goals for Mathematical & Quantitative Reasoning/Data Analysis

Goal: Successful students will be able to apply quantitative or logical reasoning and/or mathematical/statistical analysis methodologies to understand and solve problems and to communicate results.

Expected Learning Outcome 1.1: Successful students are able to use logical, mathematical and/or statistical concepts and methods to represent real-world situations. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/ assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.2: Successful students are able to use diverse logical, mathematical and/or statistical approaches, technologies, and tools to communicate about data symbolically, visually, numerically, and verbally. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.3: Successful students are able to draw appropriate inferences from data based on quantitative analysis and/or logical reasoning. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Course Subject & Number: _____

Expected Learning Outcome 1.4: Successful students are able to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, logical argumentation, and/or data analysis. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Expected Learning Outcome 1.5: Successful students are able to evaluate social and ethical implications in mathematical and quantitative reasoning. Please link this ELO to the course goals and topics and indicate *specific* activities/assignments through which it will be met. (50-700 words)

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Sunday, April 6, 2025 at 1:03:36 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Ralph, Anne
To: Fortier, Jeremy
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Jeremy, thanks for your email and the new syllabi. The College of Law is pleased to grant concurrence in these courses. Please let me know if there is anything else we can do to assist.
Sincerely,
Anne

The Ohio State University

Anne E. Ralph
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Strategic Initiatives
Morgan E. Shipman Professor in Law
Michael E. Moritz College of Law
55 West 12th Avenue | Columbus, OH 43210
614-247-4797 Office | ralph.52@osu.edu
Pronouns: she/her/hers

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, April 4, 2025 at 9:52 AM
To: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

As a quick follow-up to our earlier concurrence request: I'm attaching three syllabi, the first one wholly new, and the next two you've already seen but now include learning outcomes (plus a few additional small changes). Only the first requires attention (the other two are for your reference).

This is the last we'll be sending you for a while – thanks for bearing with us as we work through building a curriculum!

All best - Jeremy

From: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 3:19 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi, Jeremy,
Thanks for your email. The College of Law is pleased to grant concurrence in these two courses.

They look great. Please let me know if there is anything else the College of Law can do to support the courses.

Best,
Anne



Anne E. Ralph

Morgan E. Shipman Professor in Law
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Strategic Initiatives
Michael E. Moritz College of Law
55 West 12th Avenue | Columbus, OH 43210
614-247-4797 Office | ralph.52@osu.edu
Pronouns: she/her/hers

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, March 24, 2025 at 1:26 PM
To: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi,

I'm attaching syllabi for two courses the Chase Center would like to offer in the fall (a third should be forthcoming). Given the timetable, we're hoping to hear back from folks on Friday. Let me know if there's anything we do to be helpful on that front (including reaching out to individual units as appropriate).

Happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your time! - Jeremy

--



Jeremy Fortier
Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society
The Ohio State University
Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 at 10:37:41 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Snyder, Anastasia
To: Fortier, Jeremy
Attachments: image002.png, image003.png

Hi Jeremy,

Thank you for the reminder email and I apologize for my late reply. I meant to email you on Monday, but the day got away from me.

I reviewed the syllabi you sent and do not see any problems with concurrence with existing EHE courses. Thank you for checking with me,

Sincerely,
Tasha



Anastasia R. Snyder
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
College of Education and Human Ecology
The Ohio State University
Snyder.893@osu.edu
614-688-4169

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 9:09 AM
To: Snyder, Anastasia <snyder.893@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

With apologies for the nuisance, I wanted to reach out to ensure that the concurrence request below is moving forward, as we're working with a fairly compressed timetable...

Let me know if I can be helpful in any respect. Thanks - Jeremy

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, April 4, 2025 at 9:56 AM

To: Snyder, Anastasia <snyder.893@osu.edu>

Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi,

I'm attaching syllabi for three courses the Chase Center would like to offer in the fall. This is projected as a decriminalized introductory course – each syllabus shares similar goals, but we want to try out different approaches to getting there. Given the timetable, we hope to hear from folks about concurrence as soon as feasible. That said, don't hesitate to let me know if I can provide any information that might be helpful in the meantime.

Thanks! - Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society

The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 at 10:53:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Greenbaum, Rob
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Strang, Lee
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Hi Jeremy,

Thank you for adding the learning outcomes to the syllabi.

The John Glenn College of Public Affairs is pleased to provide concurrence for the two syllabi you shared earlier.

American Civic Tradition – Then and Now
American Civic Tradition – Foundational Debates

We look forward to seeing additional syllabi as you continue to develop them.

Sincerely,

Rob Greenbaum



Robert T. Greenbaum
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs
Office of Academic Affairs
Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum
John Glenn College of Public Affairs
350E Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-9578 Office / 614-292-2548 Fax
<https://glenn.osu.edu/rob-greenbaum>
Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 9:48 AM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

I'm attaching three syllabi, the first wholly new, and the next two you've already seen but now include learning outcomes (plus a few additional small changes).

I've built on language OSU already has about learning outcomes but tweaked that to

clarify the mission of both the individual courses and the relationship between the three (we have related goals for the courses, but want to try out different approaches to getting there). I'm delighted to engage on the substance of the syllabi as much as you find helpful (I enjoy discussing curriculum, and I'm still learning about OSU, so that's all to the good), but we also aim to separate substantive curricular questions from the essential questions of concurrence in the interests of acting expeditiously. Let me know if anything else would be helpful for the time being.

Thanks! - Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 8:15 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Super – thanks!

Rob

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:14 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Good, I'll send you revisions with learning objectives on Monday. Thanks.

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:09:09 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

Correct – that is not an obstacle to concurrence. We would, however, still like to see the course learning objectives added to the syllabi. That's a key signal to the students about what they should expect to get out of the class.

Lee – great event this afternoon! I'm sorry I had to leave early, but we had a yield event for admitted students I had to run to.

Rob

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Thanks, Rob.

These are intended as intro-level courses. Your suggestions are well-taken (and your colleague's proposed revision is astute - thanks!), but I assume not an obstacle to concurrence. That said, delighted to engage on the substance as appropriate moving forward.

Thanks for your timely attention on this!

All best - Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:23 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

Thank you for sharing these syllabi. They look like they will be good classes.

To help us evaluate these two classes, though, it would be useful to know more about the level they are being offered at and to see clear learning objectives.

Whoever offers the classes will want to add more detail about things like the grading scale.

Also, one of my colleagues suggested that on the second syllabus, for Days 11 and 12, it would be useful to add "How can the Constitution be interpreted?" to the question "How should the Constitution be interpreted?" But that is also obviously left to the discretion of whoever teaches the class.

All the best,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs
Office of Academic Affairs
Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum
John Glenn College of Public Affairs

350E Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-9578 Office / 614-292-2548 Fax
<https://glenn.osu.edu/rob-greenbaum>
Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 1:27 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi,

I'm attaching syllabi for two courses the Chase Center would like to offer in the fall (a third should be forthcoming). Given the timetable, we're hoping to hear back from folks on Friday. Let me know if there's anything we do to be helpful on that front (including reaching out to other folks within the Glenn College as appropriate).

Happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your time! - Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society

The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 at 10:12:52 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Greenbaum, Rob
To: Fortier, Jeremy
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Hi Jeremy,

I appreciate the desire to get this course approved, but without clear criteria to evaluate the course nor a process yet, we cannot offer appropriate feedback.

I understand that there will be a forthcoming meeting to discuss OSU's approach to offering the course, including how we approach the exam requirement.

What time is the event on the 25th? I'm a Bard alum. It's a tiny college, so it's always exciting when there is a visit from a Bard scholar.

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

350E Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210

614-292-9578 Office / 614-292-2548 Fax

<https://glenn.osu.edu/rob-greenbaum>

Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:56 AM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Rob –

After consultation with Lee, I need to circle back on the “Creeds, Conflicts, and Cooperation” course.

Of our three proposed courses, this one is probably the most essential to our mission, and it experiments with curricular pathways Chase will need to pursue in the future, for reasons

detailed in the 4/8 email below (by the way, if anyone from Glenn College would like to attend the symposium on the 25th where we'll have scholars discussing curricular initiatives related to the course design, I'm happy to invite them).

The concern about approaches to state civics requirements is understandable, but a somewhat distinct issue (as I understand it, many units are preparing courses to meet those requirements – in fact, I've sent concurrence for several – but those requirements are not really a determining factor in the course design).

That said, since it would be useful for everyone to know how those requirements would be addressed moving forward, I would be happy to meet with Glenn, Randy Smith, and any others to determine how we can offer this course without stepping on any toes, so to speak (I could certainly tweak the syllabus).

Let me know what would make most sense from your point of view.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Jeremy

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 at 8:57 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Thanks, Rob.

On the most recent syllabus I'd like to clarify that the course is designed to meet goals that are both specific to the Chase Center and part of a larger national conversation, in the following ways:

- It is structured around recent literature by scholars from civics programs at Tufts, Stanford, UT Austin, and Arizona State.
-
- It is informed by a [proposal](#) for a new curriculum in "Civic Thought" from AEI (on the 25th the Chase Center is holding a symposium with an author-meets-critics panel to discuss that proposal, with scholars from Dartmouth, Bard College, the University of Richmond, and UT Austin, mostly affiliated with political economy programs).
-

- The course design is based on a template I developed at Colgate a couple years ago, and refined after an exchange with a colleague from George Washington University (who had independently hit upon a similar course design).

In sum: while you're right that the course aims to satisfy state requirements, it serves purposes that precede and go well beyond those requirements.

All best - Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 8:34 PM

To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

I'll send you another email in a minute providing concurrence to the two classes we saw earlier so you can keep that process going.

It looks like this new class is designed to satisfy the new civics course requirements that will be mandated by the state. Before we review that syllabus for concurrence, I would like more clarity regarding what the university's approach to offering the class (including course approval) will be. I have no doubt that the Chase Center will be a central part of that plan, and we also hope to collaborate with the Chase Center on those plans.

All the best,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

350E Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210

614-292-9578 Office / 614-292-2548 Fax

<https://glenn.osu.edu/rob-greenbaum>

Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 9:48 AM

To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

I'm attaching three syllabi, the first wholly new, and the next two you've already seen but now include learning outcomes (plus a few additional small changes).

I've built on language OSU already has about learning outcomes but tweaked that to clarify the mission of both the individual courses and the relationship between the three (we have related goals for the courses, but want to try out different approaches to getting there). I'm delighted to engage on the substance of the syllabi as much as you find helpful (I enjoy discussing curriculum, and I'm still learning about OSU, so that's all to the good), but we also aim to separate substantive curricular questions from the essential questions of concurrence in the interests of acting expeditiously. Let me know if anything else would be helpful for the time being.

Thanks! - Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 8:15 PM

To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Super – thanks!

Rob

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:14 PM

To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Good, I'll send you revisions with learning objectives on Monday. Thanks.

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:09:09 PM

To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

Correct – that is not an obstacle to concurrence. We would, however, still like to see the course learning objectives added to the syllabi. That's a key signal to the students about what they should expect to get out of the class.

Lee – great event this afternoon! I’m sorry I had to leave early, but we had a yield event for admitted students I had to run to.

Rob

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Thanks, Rob.

These are intended as intro-level courses. Your suggestions are well-taken (and your colleague's proposed revision is astute - thanks!), but I assume not an obstacle to concurrence. That said, delighted to engage on the substance as appropriate moving forward.

Thanks for your timely attention on this!

All best - Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:23 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

Thank you for sharing these syllabi. They look like they will be good classes.

To help us evaluate these two classes, though, it would be useful to know more about the level they are being offered at and to see clear learning objectives.

Whoever offers the classes will want to add more detail about things like the grading scale.

Also, one of my colleagues suggested that on the second syllabus, for Days 11 and 12, it would be useful to add “How can the Constitution be interpreted?” to the question “How should the Constitution be interpreted?” But that is also obviously left to the discretion of whoever teaches the class.

All the best,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

350E Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210

614-292-9578 Office / 614-292-2548 Fax

<https://glenn.osu.edu/rob-greenbaum>

Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 1:27 PM

To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>

Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi,

I'm attaching syllabi for two courses the Chase Center would like to offer in the fall (a third should be forthcoming). Given the timetable, we're hoping to hear back from folks on Friday. Let me know if there's anything we do to be helpful on that front (including reaching out to other folks within the Glenn College as appropriate).

Happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your time! - Jeremy

--



Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society

The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Subject: RE: Concurrence for proposed Chase Center courses
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 at 3:18:40 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Martin, Andrew
To: Fortier, Jeremy, Strang, Lee
CC: Smith, Randy, Schoen, Brian
Attachments: image001.png

Hi Jeremy

That's great and your continued engagement with History as the courses move forward for Autumn 2025 is much appreciated.

I will send you some other minor comments for the courses soon (unrelated to concurrence).

Best

Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor of Sociology
114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
614-247-6641 Office
martin.1026@osu.edu

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 3:15 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Cc: Smith, Randy <smith.70@osu.edu>; Schoen, Brian <schoen@ohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Concurrence for proposed Chase Center courses

Hi Andrew,

As I discussed with Scott last week, I'm eager to engage with colleagues in History and other units about course designs when folks have bandwidth. There's a lot we can learn from each other so I appreciate the affirmation of ongoing good faith dialogue.

That said, I'm also excited to move forward with our courses as discussed with Randy and Brian last Friday, and so far as I can see there's every reason to proceed adding them to the catalog for us to get offer in the fall. (that should provide lots of fodder for future dialogue).

Thanks again for your time and consideration.

All best,

Jeremy

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 2:28:28 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>; Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Cc: Smith, Randy <smith.70@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Concurrence for proposed Chase Center courses

Hi Jeremy

Below is a message from Scott Levi, chair of the History Department. I spoke with Scott yesterday and he looks forward to chatting with you about possible ways to prevent duplication as the courses get fleshed out.

Best
Andrew

Hi Andrew,

After more discussion, my colleagues continue to have a difficult time reaching a conclusion regarding the concurrence request from the Chase Center. A critical problem is that the syllabi clearly engage in subjects that are historical in nature and that we invariably discuss in several of our courses. At the same time, the Chase Center's mission will require it to engage in some of those same subjects yet my colleagues do not feel that the syllabi are sufficiently fleshed out to identify exactly where the specific overlap may be.

In the end, I think the best thing to do is to land on providing neither concurrence nor non-concurrence, and to repeat our good-faith offer to discuss overlaps/potential replications as we move forward.

Please let me know if you, Randy, or the Chase Center would like to schedule additional conversations at this time.

Best,
Scott



Andrew W. Martin
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor of Sociology
114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
614-247-6641 Office
martin.1026@osu.edu

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2025 1:33 PM

To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Cc: Smith, Randy <smith.70@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Concurrence for proposed Chase Center courses

Thanks, Andrew. Two notes:

My understanding of the conversation between Political Science and us is that they are open to cross-listing courses, but Chase will also be running courses independently (in other words, a “both-and” approach); this has not occasioned any objection that I’m aware of (my assumption has been that once the courses are approved in general, we’ll work through specific opportunities for cross-listing). We’re certainly excited to work with Political Science as a general matter, but in all correspondence that I’ve seen that does not preclude independent course offerings.

Regarding History: I spoke with Scott Levi this morning, and raised the matter with Randy subsequently. It does not seem like there is any grounds for holding up the process on that front, because History is not able to specify precise points of overlap (or, in fact, to identify which courses conflict with which). There are apparently requests for more time to do so, but there has been three weeks already (at least for two of the courses), so while we’ve earnestly attempted to engage with specific concerns about duplication, none have been offered to engage.

Thanks for your work on this, Andrew. I appreciated everyone’s efforts.

All best - Jeremy

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, April 18, 2025 at 1:16 PM
To: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>, Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Smith, Randy <smith.70@osu.edu>
Subject: Concurrence for proposed Chase Center courses

Hi Lee and Jeremy (cc’ing Randy so he is aware)

I’m following up with you both regarding Arts and Science’s response to the request for concurrence for the three courses being developed by the Chase Center.

The following units have offered concurrence (they see no substantial overlap with their existing course offerings):

Design
East Asian Languages and Literature
Spanish and Portuguese
International Studies
Philosophy
Sociology
Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Culture
English

Psychology
Design
Art
Music
History of Art
Advanced Computing Center for Arts and Design
Comparative Studies
Women, Gender, and Sexuality
Classics
Germanic Languages and Literature

As you know, Political Science has indicated that they do see overlap with their courses, but Marcus and Lee are in discussions regarding the cross listing of those courses. As Jeremy is aware, the Department of History does not yet grant concurrence as they see potential overlap with their course offerings. I believe Scott Levi will be reaching out to discuss this matter further, and I'm happy to help as well. I understand the desire to move these courses forward, but given the nature of the proposed courses and the expansive catalog of existing courses in Arts and Sciences, overlap was likely. Again, I will continue to facilitate conversations in the college around concurrence.

Because of the issues raised by the Department of History regarding potential overlap, the College of Arts and Sciences does not yet offer concurrence for these courses. I'm not aware of any other concurrence concerns in the college, and I have asked units to provide feedback by today (if I do hear anything else by the end of the day, I will pass that information on, but again, I don't anticipate that will happen).

As Jeremy is aware, units provided other feedback for the courses, which I have shared (and thanks Jeremy for responding, I have passed that information on to the units).

Best

Andrew Martin



Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor of Sociology
114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
614-247-6641 Office
martin.1026@osu.edu