

## Term Information

Effective Term Summer 2026  
[Previous Value](#) [Spring 2026](#)

## Course Change Information

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

Add course back to queue for GE Themes

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

Course was in the GE Themes queue, and is being delivered back

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 Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

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	2130
Course Title	America's Foundational Debates
Transcript Abbreviation	American Debates
Course Description	This course surveys enduring debates within the American constitutional order. The course connects primary texts from the eras of the Founding and Reconstruction to subsequent debates regarding the construction of American law and society. Topics to be considered include the possibilities for constitutional amendment, and the constitutionality of college admissions policies.
<a href="#">Previous Value</a>	<a href="#">This course surveys debates about the proper design and aims of the government of the United States, focusing on the Federalist Papers and other primary texts from the founding period which set the parameters for subsequent debates about American civic life. Arguments from early texts are examined through their application to contemporary political debates and landmark Supreme Court cases.</a>
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

## 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

Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Describe and analyze a range of perspectives from the period of the American founding and the Civil War that set the principled and institutional foundations for defining American citizenship.</li></ul>
Content Topic List	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Citizenship; Justice; Democracy; Diversity; Merit; Constitutional Law; Constitutional Amendment; Comparative Constitutionalism; the Founding and Reconstruction; Institutional Legitimacy; Higher Education.</li></ul>
<a href="#">Previous Value</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><a href="#">Republicanism; democracy; constitutional law; rights; justice; institutions</a></li></ul>
Sought Concurrence	Yes

## Attachments

- Concurrence - Education, Law, Arts & Sciences, Public Affairs (1).pdf: Concurrence Exchanges  
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2130 - Syllabus (v 3.2).pdf: Syllabus (v 3.2)  
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2130 - GE Worksheet (v 3.2).pdf: GE Worksheet (v 3.2)  
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2130 - Cover Letter for v 3.2.pdf: Cover Letter Regarding Resubmission (2.3.2026)  
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)

**COURSE CHANGE REQUEST**  
2130 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Reed,Kathryn Marie  
02/05/2026

**Comments**

- Please see feedback email sent to department 11-05-2025 RLS  
Please see feedback email sent to department 12-23-2025 RLS *(by Steele,Rachel Lea on 12/23/2025 02:05 PM)*
- Sending back per email request *(by Reed,Kathryn Marie on 10/20/2025 12:00 PM)*

**Workflow Information**

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	10/17/2025 07:46 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	10/17/2025 07:46 PM	Unit Approval
Revision Requested	Reed,Kathryn Marie	10/20/2025 12:00 PM	College Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	10/20/2025 12:03 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	10/20/2025 12:03 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	10/20/2025 12:04 PM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele,Rachel Lea	11/05/2025 05:26 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	11/23/2025 05:45 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	11/23/2025 05:45 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	11/25/2025 10:31 AM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele,Rachel Lea	12/23/2025 02:05 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	02/03/2026 09:20 AM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	02/03/2026 09:21 AM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	02/05/2026 09:43 AM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Wade,Macy Joy Steele,Rachel Lea	02/05/2026 09:43 AM	ASCCAO Approval

### Memo Regarding Resubmission of CIVICLL 2130

We thank the Subcommittee for its detailed comments. In recognition of the significance of the matters raised by the Subcommittee, we have restructured the syllabus by removing one section of course material (on birthright citizenship), leaving more space for activities and assignments through which ELOs will be applied and assessed (Days 9-10, 16-19, 27-28). In the process, we have framed each section of the course around one component of the Theme (Citizenship, Justice, Diversity) in relation to a set of ELOs (see the framing paragraphs included at the start of each section of the course: pp. 10, 13-14, 16), and used the questions provided for each class day to highlight connections between the components of the Theme (so that Citizenship, Justice, and Diversity are not treated in isolation, but put in conversation with different points of emphasis throughout the semester). We believe that the result will make much clearer for students how their understanding and application of Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World will be scaffolded over the course of the semester. We have rewritten the front-matter of the syllabus (pp. 1-2) and the section on Assignments and Grading (pp. 6-9) to reflect these changes. As a result, the course continues to cover the same content (minus birthright citizenship), but with a clearer map for applying and assessing ELOs in relation to the Theme. We thank the Subcommittee for its efforts in catalyzing these constructive changes.

Our response to individual points raised by the Subcommittee can be summarized as follows:

**(c)** We have clarified the purpose of the “Reading Questions” in two ways: first, by retitling them “Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion”; second, by adding an explanatory paragraph detailing for students how the questions should guide their preparation for class (p. 9).

**(d)** We have added to the syllabus an explanatory paragraph outlining what a typical class day will look like (p. 9); and, for weeks with debates or other activities, we have added more detailed descriptions within the course schedule (pp. 13, 15-16, 18). We have aimed to clarify how the verbs of the ELOs will be accomplished with more detailed and prominent explanations throughout the syllabus: e.g., in the summary of how the Course Meets the Goals the Theme (p. 5); by summarizing, in a paragraph at the start of each section of the course, how it will implement specific ELOs (pp. 10, 13, 16); and by including the verbs in the detailed descriptions of class assignments (pp. 6-9), including the activities (debates, historical simulations) that students will engage in over the semester.

**(e)** We have reconciled the descriptions of course assignments on the syllabus and the GEN submission form (and, for clarity’s sake, largely rewritten the submission form).

(f) We have provided much more detailed descriptions of the expectations for student participation and the standards for assessment – including summaries with relevant ELOs flagged in the “Assignments and Grading” section of the syllabus (pp. 6-9), and in paragraphs inserted under class sessions where relevant activities occur (pp. 15-16). We have aimed to clarify on both the syllabus and the submission form that, for instance, students will be assessed on ELO 4.1 partly by demonstrating (through both exams and debates) that they can describe and evaluate how “diversity” as a conceptual and legal category has evolved to accommodate competing conceptions of justice – including ideals of merit and equal citizenship that can be traced to the American founding but which have also been challenged and reconceived in response to various expressions of social diversity and lived experience (as analyzed in scholarly readings assigned on Day 20, and debated in a Supreme Court decisions assigned on Day 23). We have clarified that in-class debates, and a historical simulation activity will be used to require students to “inhabit” the perspectives of people whose experiences differ from their own, and reflection papers will be used to demonstrate that students can examine and evaluate those perspectives in contrast with their own (p. 8).

(g) Relatedly, we have clarified and reconciled on the syllabus and the submission form how ELOs 3.1. and 3.2 will be incorporated into assignments and assessed – for instance, in a final exam question that requires students to analyze why conceptions of citizenship have differed across sociopolitical and historical communities (in particular, *why is it so much easier for American citizens to amend their state constitutions than the federal constitution*) (p. 9)? More generally, we have emphasized (pp. 13-14) that the second section of the course is largely focused on developing students’ skills with respect to ELOS 3.1 and 3.2 because this section of the course requires students to describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global and/or historical communities (including the ancient Roman, British Imperial, Native American, and African American), and reflect on the skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence by considering the critical-yet-constructive interaction between these competing constitutional traditions (insofar as, e.g., Native American and African American constitutionalism have both been influenced by, and contributed to, broader American constitutional traditions: Days 14 and 15). Students also consider how procedures for constitutional amendment can be constructed as mechanisms for bridging cultural differences within political communities (Days 3, 5). The competing conceptions of justice and approaches to accommodating diversity covered in this material are applied to a historical simulation activity (pp. 15-16), where students will demonstrate that they can draw on the variety of perspectives surveyed to construct critiques of (or constructive proposals for amending) American constitutional principles.

**(h)** We have provided a more detailed description of the content of the final exam to clarify how theme-specific ELOs will be assessed in the exam.

**(i)** We have corrected the error noted here (with our thanks for pointing it out).

**(j)** We have reorganized the syllabus for flow and continuity, as detailed in the first paragraph of this memo.

**(k)** We have clarified how readings should be brought to class (p. 5).

One benefit of these changes has been to elaborate how ELO 2.2 will be applied and assessed (pp. 7-8, 13, 18), and foregrounded as a primary feature of the course, characterized as follows in the “Course Description” (p. 2):

Toggling between perspectives throughout the semester – historical and contemporary, political, legal, and scholarly, familiar and forgotten – will position students to integrate insights from across traditions, cultures, and individual experiences as life-long learners, prepared to engage controversies of the American political and constitutional order whose deep roots ensure that graduates of today can expect to continue confronting them, in one form or another, through the last years of the twenty-first century.

We are pleased to have had the opportunity to make these constructive revisions and hope they have comprehensively addressed the matters raised by the Subcommittee.



---

**CIVICLL 2130**

***America's Foundational Debates***

[Semester]

GEN THEME: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

---

Format of Instruction:

Instructor:

Meeting Day /Time:

Email:

Classroom Location:

Office:

Contact Hours:

Office Hours:

**I. Course Description**

The terms of *Citizenship*, *Justice*, and *Diversity* are all subject to intense, ongoing debate: what are the rights of *Citizens*, and who gets to decide? Is the United States Constitution an appropriate tool for building a *Just World* in the twenty-first century, or should it be amended or abandoned in favor of an alternative? What kinds of *Diversity* should we value, and how they be weighted relative to factors such as merit, fairness, and equal opportunity in public policy decisions?

This course enables students to describe and analyze a range of perspectives on these questions by making connections between two types of materials:

- Primary texts from the Founding and Reconstruction eras which set the parameters for subsequent arguments about *Citizenship*, *Justice*, and *Diversity* in the United States, either by establishing enduring legal and political facts, or by creating conflicts and questions to be confronted by later generations (ELOs 1.1, 2.1).
- Advanced scholarship that synthesizes theoretical and legal frameworks from historical primary texts with cutting-edge research findings to illuminate how *Citizenship*, *Justice*, and *Diversity* have differed across political, cultural, national, global, and historical communities (ELOs 1.2, 3.1).

By challenging students to debate and reflect on “hot topics” in light of these materials (historical primary texts, and contemporary advanced scholarship), the course will equip students with:

- A fuller understanding of the skills and dispositions that enable *Citizens* to critique and change – *and also* appreciate, support and strengthen – the constitutional structures they are governed by (notwithstanding the reputation of the United States Constitution as functionally “unamendable”) (ELO 4.2).
- A deeper sense of their own potential for development as learners capable of responding to new and challenging contexts (ELO 2.2).

Toggling between perspectives throughout the semester – historical and contemporary, political, legal, and scholarly, familiar and forgotten – will position students to integrate insights from across traditions, cultures, and individual experiences as life-long learners, prepared to engage controversies of the American political and constitutional order whose deep roots ensure that graduates of today can expect to continue confronting them, in one form or another, through the last years of the twenty-first century (ELOs 2.1, 2.2).

The course is structured around three sets of controversies:

- Debates about constitutional amendment, which entail disagreements about the degree to which *Citizens* should be disposed to reverence or participate in changing their constitution.
- Arguments about the merit of historical and global alternatives to American constitutionalism, each rooted in competing conceptions of *Justice*.
- Examination of *Diversity* in constitutional standards for college admissions, and as a social and political value more broadly.

Examining these topics as *constitutional* controversies (including, but not limited to, Supreme Court decisions) will develop students' appreciation for the skills and dispositions necessary to negotiating deep disagreement within a shared legal and ethical framework. Moreover, by taking part in constitutional debates throughout the semester students will learn to craft persuasive arguments, gain confidence in public presentation, and navigating contentious issues.

## **II. Course Objectives**

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Describe and evaluate a range of perspectives from the period of the American Founding that set the principled and institutional framework for defining the terms of American citizenship.
2. Identify moral, legal, and political frameworks that informed early constitutional debates and explain how those frameworks were challenged and adapted at hinge points in American history, including key cases of constitutional law.
3. Describe and analyze the origins of current political controversies in public debates from the period of the Founding.

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

<b>CIVICLL Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Related Course Content</b>
1. Analyze and critically evaluate the primary and secondary sources necessary for understanding and appreciating the key ideas, texts, events, individuals, debates, traditions, and developments that have defined American constitutionalism and civic life.	Throughout the course, students will connect two types of primary texts: (i) statements of political principle from the eras of the Founding and Reconstruction (including letters, pamphlets, speeches, and essays by influential political figures from each era) (ii) landmark Supreme Court decisions. Students will be expected to demonstrate



	their grasp of how arguments from Founding-era texts remain relevant to contemporary constitutional controversies.
2. Compare and contrast their experiences, reasoning, and cultural assumptions with 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 reflect on how to assess contemporary, hot button political topics not just in terms of personal policy preferences, but as matters of principle concerning the nature of rights and the structure of government that can be traced back to the Founding era.
3. Apply a multi-disciplinary perspective to identify and draw insights from 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 learn to analyze contemporary political problems not simply in terms of abstract ideal theory, but as an evolving body of knowledge where real-world practitioners make real-time decisions shaped by the contingencies of context yet informed by constitutional principle.
4. Draw on multiple scholarly disciplines to effectively research and present arguments about civic and constitutional traditions and civic life using a variety of modes (e.g., verbal, textual, and visual), while faithfully characterizing arguments that counter their positions.	Students will engage in debates concerning constitutional controversies requiring them to develop skills of respectful, principled, and persuasive argument.

### **III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes**

CIVICLL 2130 is approved as a part of the **GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World** category.

#### **GEN Goals**

- **Goal 1:** Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than in the Foundations component.
- **Goal 2:** Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in the future.



- **Goal 3:** Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, or global citizenship and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute citizenship.
- **Goal 4:** Successful students will examine notions of justice amid difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within society, both within the United States and around the world.

### Expected Learning Outcomes:

Successful students are able to:

- 1.1. Engage in critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme.
- 1.2. Engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the theme.
- 2.1. Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences as they apply to the theme.
- 2.2. Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.
- 3.1. Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities.
- 3.2. Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.
- 4.1. Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.
- 4.2. Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power, and/or advocacy for social change.

### How this Course Meets the Goals & ELOs of Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

This course understands *Citizenship* as 1) a legal status entailing rights and responsibilities, the practical efficacy of which depends on its ability to encompass *Diverse* individuals and groups, and 2) a contested and evolving historical, philosophical, and legal category due to competing conceptions of *Justice* and the challenges of adapting enduring constitutional principles to evolving circumstances.

Through primary sources students will be introduced to perennial problems of the American civic tradition including the nature of rights, institutional design, and constitutional interpretation. Students' consideration of this material will be enriched by secondary sources that examine how arguments from early in the American tradition have reverberated within, and been reshaped by, the subsequent development of American political and social life (for instance, the rehabilitation of Anti-Federalist arguments against central power; the adequacy of the American constitutional framework for responding to citizenship claims from African Americans, Native Americans, and others; how ideals

of “equality,” “merit,” and “diversity” have been used to both catalyze and constrain social change). The course will conclude by asking students to reflect on the political, scholarly, and judicial perspectives that are most appropriate to addressing a public policy issue they all have a direct stake in: the definition of justice and diversity in college admissions. Throughout the semester, students will be required to reflect on how their initial position on this and other hot button issues are challenged or supplemented by statements of political principle from the founding era, arguments from judicial opinions, and cutting-edge scholarship.

The course serves the goals of the Citizenship theme particularly in the following ways:

- 1) Students analyze contested constitutional questions concerning ***Citizenship, Justice, and Diversity*** in light of debates from recent, cutting-edge scholarship such as the possibilities for constitutional amendment beyond the formal amendment process outlined in Article V of the Constitution.
- 2) Students integrate approaches to ***Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World*** by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge through consideration of scholarly and legal debates over the meaning of “merit” and “diversity” as applied especially to the question of college admissions.
- 3) Students explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, and global ***Citizenship*** by evaluating the American constitutional tradition in light of alternatives from the states, the world, and history, and by evaluating the constitution itself in light Native American and African American contributions to constitutionalism. Students apply the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that constitute ***Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World*** by engaging these controversial questions through in-class debates.
- 4) Students examine notions of justice and difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within society, both within the United States and around the world through contrasts between Cherokee and American understandings of ***Justice*** and ***Citizenship***; conflicting judgments of how to accommodate difference and pursue justice between Loyalists and Patriots in the American Revolution; surveying the evolution of ***Diversity*** as a legal, political, and cultural category.

#### **IV. Course Material**

John Patrick Coby, *The Constitutional Convention of 1787: Constructing the American Republic* (UNC Press, 2022). ISBN: 978-1469670881.

All other course materials will be available on CarmenCanvas. The assigned textbook should be brought to class on Class Days 16 through 19; other course readings may be brought to class either as print-outs or on a tablet.

## **V. Assignments and Grading**

### **Course grade:**

The final grade will be calculated as follows:

- Participation and Attendance: 10%
- Two In-Class Debates (held on Day 10 and 26): 20% (10% each)
- Post-Debate Reflection Papers (due on Days 11 and 28): 20% (10% each)
- Historical Simulation Activity Participation (held on Days 16-19): 10%
- Post-Historical Simulation Activity Reflection (due on Day 20): 10%
- Bookend Reflections (due at start and end of semester): 10% (5% each)
- Final Exam: 20%.

#### **1. Participation and Attendance**

- Students are expected to attend every class session. For each unexcused absence from class, students will be docked 5% of their participation grade. Students who miss 25% or more of the class sessions will receive a 0 for this portion of the course. Missing classes for illness or religious holidays does not count, but for an absence to be considered “excused,” you must contact the instructor within one week. Please reach out to the instructor with any questions about this policy.
- Consistent, high-quality participation—including respectful listening, contributing to discussion, and building on peers’ insights—is expected each week. Occasional informal writing or group exercises may be used to facilitate discussion and deepen reflection. Students will be docked 1 point of their participation grade (1/100 pts) for every day they do not bring a printed copy of their assigned text *or* do not speak up in class. If you are struggling to participate in discussion, please come to office hours or reach out to the instructor.
- Please reflect on the listed discussion questions as you complete your assigned reading. Grappling with these questions will help you not only participate actively in discussion but also engage at a deep level with our texts.
- Be sure to arrive on time for class. Excessive tardiness will lead to a reduction in your participation grade. There will be a three-day grace period (meaning that there will be no grade penalty for the first three days a student is late to class), but after that, you will be docked 1 point of your participation grade (1/100) for each day you come to class late.

#### **In-Class Debates and Reflection Papers**

- Students will engage in two debates where they are required to defend or contest scholarly arguments and Supreme Court opinions. They will be graded based on use of evidence, organization of argument, oral presentation skills, and civility of discourse. Debates will particularly require students to identify, describe, and synthesize how secondary sources and judicial opinions draw on and deploy the primary sources students are covering in the course.



They will also require students to reflect on competing conceptions of justice and citizenship and how these conceptions interact with evolving legal and social understandings of diversity and inclusion (ELOs 1.2, 4.1, 4.2). As one example, students will debate the proposition: An easily amendable constitution is more conducive to citizenship for a diverse and just world. As they craft their arguments, students will be expected to draw on our readings to argue whether or not the U.S. Constitution should be more susceptible to amendment and if so, how.

- For each debate, students will be broken up into two groups: one arguing for, and one arguing against the proposition. Debates will last 45 minutes and include three components: opening statements, a rebuttal period, and closing statements. The instructor will assign each student a role on the class before the debate, ensuring equal participation and taking into consideration student personality, learning needs, and interests. Workshops will occur on a pre-debate day, providing students the chance to work with their groups and the instructor to designate tasks, research their evidence, hone their arguments, and prepare cogent statements (ELO 1.1, 1.2). This exercise will require students to take ownership over their own learning, practice civic leadership and democratic deliberation within the classroom, and speak empathetically and persuasively across difference (ELO 3.2). The debates themselves will challenge students to practice civil discourse, evidence-based logical reasoning, and communication skills (ELO 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.2).
- Following the debates, students will submit a reflection (ca. 1200 words) identifying (a) *how* the in-class discussion has affected their thinking, and, more importantly, (b) *why* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, in light of that self-analysis, (c) the features of discussion and debate which are most likely to challenge or change their thinking, in general. This reflection will challenge students to develop metacognitive skills, reflecting on their learning and their individual growth (ELO 2.2).

#### “Reacting to the Past” Historical Simulation Activity and Reflection Paper

- During Days 16-19 of the semester, students will engage in a historical simulation activity on the most foundational political-legal moment in U.S. history: the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Students will each be assigned a delegate and faction (Nationalists, Moderate Nationalists, Confederalists, and Moderate Confederalists) for the entirety of the simulation. Working alongside other members of their faction, they will be required to step into the shoes of historical decision-makers and practice constitution-making and amending for themselves. They will be charged with the task of the convention’s 55 delegates who gathered in Philadelphia in the sweltering summer of 1787: write a new constitution, or amending the existing one, the Articles of Confederation (ratified in 1781).
- The major issue up for debate will be Issues 1&2: the character and size of the House of Representatives. Throughout the simulation, students will also consider more generally how the American Constitution can simultaneously empower the government and safeguard individual liberty.
- Students are expected to come to class each day of the simulation having read their character sheet and the summary of the issue up for debating (in the Coby workbook). They are also encouraged to meet with members of their faction outside of class to hone their strategy and construct arguments to forward their interests. Class sessions during the simulation will involve: 1) meeting with factions to discuss their positions and finalize speeches; 2) students sharing 1-2 minute speech in defense of their position (each student will be required to deliver



one speech over the course of the simulation); and 3) 3-4 minutes of open debate after each speech is delivered, with the Gamemaster (the teacher) moderating. On the final day of the simulation, and on Day 4 of the simulation, students will reach a decision on the constitutional character and size of the House of Representatives by taking a vote on each issue.

- This “Reacting to the Past” activity has been proven to increase student engagement with American history and core texts in the American tradition such as the U.S. Constitution, the Articles of Confederation, and the Federalist Papers. It will require students to take ownership over their learning and practice public speaking, civic leadership, political strategizing, and communication. It will also require students to describe and analyze a range of Founding perspectives on the desirable constitutional procedures for ***Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World***, and to recognize the ways that regional cultures and political interests (small vs. large states, nationalists vs. confederalists) affected these varying perspectives (especially, Country Republicanism and Court Republicanism) (ELO 3.1). Providing students the chance to participate in the contentious deliberations of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 will help them recognize the diverse stakeholders in the American experiment—then and now (ELO 3.2).
- Following the simulation, students will submit a short (ca. 1200 word) reflection explaining whether or not they agree with their character’s position on Issues 1&2. In this paper (due at midnight on the day of the next class session), students will be expected to reflect on the differences between their decision-making processes and those of the character they were assigned, explaining why facts or principles which might be compelling for them were not for their character (or vice versa) (ELOs 2.1, 2.2, 3.2).
- Students’ grade for the role play activity will be determined by their active participation during class sessions as well as their written reflection at the end of the simulation.
- Please see John Patrick Coby’s *The Constitutional Convention of 1787: Constructing the American Republic* for a more detailed explanation of this simulation activity. Students will also be provided comprehensive character sheets and participation rubrics before the simulation begins.

#### Bookend Reflections

- On the first day of the semester, students will be provided with short editorials from *The New York Times* (or a similar current affairs outlet) regarding topical debates including the role of the Supreme Court in the American constitutional order, birthright citizenship, and diversity in college admissions. Students will note their agreement or disagreement with the editorials in an online journal on Carmen Canvas during the first week of classes. Then, at the end of the semester, students will write a 500 word reflection in the same online journal, identifying and explaining the strongest argument *against* their original position based on the course material covered. They also will also be asked to draw on their own life experience and best reasoning to identify challenges for ***Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World*** which the assigned material fails to resolve, and which would benefit from the consideration of additional perspectives or policy change (ELOS 2.1, 2.2, 4.2).

#### Final Exam:

- The final exam will be cumulative and will consist of questions circulated on the last day of class. The essay questions will require students to evaluate how cutting-edge scholarship has engaged and clarified constitutional debates regarding the issues of constitutional amendment





or college admissions, identifying dimensions of the issues that scholars have clarified more effectively than the Supreme Court. Students will also be asked to analyze how notions of **Justice** and **Diversity** developed (and have been debated) in Supreme Court jurisprudence and in relation to (and/or tension with) understandings of rights and justice developed in the constitutional debates of the Framing and Reconstruction eras (ELOs 1.1, 1.2, 4.2). Exam questions will ask students to analyze why conceptions of citizenship have differed across sociopolitical and historical communities (e.g. why is it so much easier for **Citizens** to amend their state constitutions than the federal constitution?), and evaluate the role of institutions of higher education in setting the terms of American **Citizenship**, particularly with regard to **Justice** and **Diversity** (ELOs 3.1, 4.2). Exam questions will also challenge students to reflect on how to assess contemporary, hot button political topics not just in terms of personal policy preferences, but as matters of principle concerning the nature of rights and the structure of government that can be traced back to the Founding era (for example, they might be asked how primary source readings from this course changed their perspective on a particular policy issue they care about. These political reasoning skills will prepare students to participate thoughtfully as citizens in their local, national, and global communities (ELO 3.2).

### Grading scale

93% – 100%	A
90% – 92.9%	A-
87% – 89.9%	B+
83% – 86.9%	B
80% – 82.9%	B-
77% – 79.9%	C+
73% – 76.9%	C
70% – 72.9%	C-
67% – 69.9%	D+
60% – 66.9%	D
Below 60%	E

## VI. Course Schedule

*Note on Reading Questions:* The “Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion” listed with each day are intended to guide students as they read assigned texts and prepare participate in class discussion, which will be grounded in these questions. The questions are also designed to clarify connections with the Goals of the Theme, and facilitate student learning, by asking students to identify, describe, and synthesize diverse approaches to political, legal, and scholarly texts, and recognize their implications for understanding **Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World**.

*Note on Typical Class Sessions:* A typical class session will include a five-to-ten-minute introductory activity to get students thinking about the themes and questions we will be focusing on—and how they relate to popular culture and students’ individual lives. This will include activities such as having students view a short clip from a movie or TV show that relates to our readings and then critically respond to a provocative question about it in groups. The rest of class will then involve a combination of lecture, primary source reading, and discussion. Classes before debates will always include writing workshops, which will encourage students to synthesize and articulate their learning. In their discussions and debates, students will examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion.



## Day 1 – COURSE INTRODUCTION

This first day of class will be spent going over the syllabus, having an initial discussion on the relationship between the U.S. Constitution, and completing a preliminary assessment. The teacher-guided, but student-led discussion will not only help the professor begin assessing students' background knowledge on American Constitutionalism but also personally engage students in the course material. Students will be encouraged to draw on their prior, diverse experiences as they share their perspectives on whether the U.S. Constitution does or does not advance *Citizenship for a Diverse and Just world*. This conversation will encourage students to bring a spirit of curiosity and passion to the class, and will set a precedent of civil and open dialogue in our conversations throughout the semester. In the last 15 minutes of class, students will then be provided with short editorials from *The New York Times* (or a similar current affairs outlet) regarding topical debates such as the virtues or vices of the American constitutional order (and/or a variety of global alternatives), or the criteria for college admissions (including the place of “diversity” and “merit” in admissions policy). Students will note their agreement or disagreement with the editorials in an online journal on Carmen Canvas which they will revisit later in the semester (as detailed in the paragraph on “Bookend Reflections” under “Assignments and Grading,” above).

## I. AMENDMENTS

### How the Procedures for Constitutional Amendment Shape The Practice of American *Citizenship*

*Expected Learning Outcomes:* In this section of the course students will think critically and logically about a nations' procedures of constitutional amendment as tools for practicing *Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World*, in particular by identifying how legal and political mechanisms for constitutional amendment reflect competing assessments of the skills and dispositions appropriate to *Citizenship* (ELO 1.1). This includes in-depth engagement with cutting-edge scholarship analyzing prospects for constitutional amendment outside the formal amendment procedures outlined in Article V of the United States Constitution, and evaluating the degree to which the Reconstruction Amendments changed the legal and moral meaning of American *Citizenship* (ELO 1.2). In addition, students will identify and describe differences between the formal amendment procedures of the United States Constitution and alternatives from the state level and from around the world, understanding how these reflect competing conceptions of *Justice* and frameworks for accommodating *Diversity*, and synthesizing approaches to consider how American *Citizens* might maintain or remake their constitutional culture in the twenty-first century (ELO 2.1).

## Day 2 – AMENDMENT AT THE FOUNDING

### Required Reading

- Federalist Papers, No. 49, 84
- Centinel 2
- U.S. Bill of Rights
- Richard Henry Lee, Proposed Amendments to the Constitution
- Thomas Jefferson, “Letter to James Madison”
- James Madison, “Letter to Thomas Jefferson”





Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- How should *Citizens* balance a disposition to *respect* structures of power with the practical ability to *change* them? Where do Jefferson and Madison stand on this question, and where do you stand between them?
- What are the advantages of making a constitution relatively rigid (difficult to amend) or flexible (easy to amend)? Why did Anti-Federalists (such as Centinel and Richard Henry Lee) think that the United States Constitution would benefit from amendment?

Day 3 – AMENDMENT AROUND THE WORLD

Required Reading

- U.S. Constitution, Article V
- Ohio Constitution, Article XVI
- Indian Constitution, Article 368
- German Constitution, Article 79
- South African Constitution, Section 74

Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- How do the amendment procedures in the United States Constitution compare to the amendment procedures in the constitutions of Ohio, India, Germany, and South Africa? What does each constitutional text suggest about the principles of *Justice* informing the amendment procedures favored by the Constitution?
- Does Ohio's procedure for constitutional amendment suggest practices of *Citizenship* (and an ideal of the relationship between citizens and their governments) that is closer to Jefferson or Madison, Federalists or Anti-Federalists?

Day 4 – AMENDMENTS AT RECONSTRUCTION

Required Reading

- 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, & 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments (1865, 1868 & 1870)
- Selection from Congressional debates on the adoption of the Fourteenth amendment (1866)
- Selections from Freedmen's Conventions (1865 and 1866)
- Freedman's Bureau Act (1865)
- Civil Rights Acts of 1866

Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Reviewing these documents, what do they suggest about the essential rights and freedoms necessary to the exercise of equal *Citizenship*? To what extent are those rights specific to the historical circumstances of Reconstruction, and to what extent are they equally important at all times and places?
- How can primary sources such as the records of congressional debates or the freedman's conventions help us to understand the *Diversity* of lived experiences among citizens subject to the Constitution (and to what extent might these records give us only a partial or misleading understanding)? More broadly: what is the moral or legal relationship between citizens in the nineteenth century and citizens in the twenty first?



## Day 5 – INTERPRETING THE AMENDMENTS

### Required Reading

- Christopher Eisgruber, “The Fourteenth Amendment’s Constitution”
- Michael Zuckert, “Completing the Constitution: The Fourteenth Amendment and Constitutional Rights”

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Did the Fourteenth Amendment merely “complete” the original constitution, or transform it in some way? What sort of information would one need to answer the question (the text of the documents, statements from their authors or ratifiers, the record of their impact on politics and jurisprudence)?
- Why does Eisgruber think that the constitutional tradition “lacked any clear articulation of United States *Citizenship*” until Reconstruction and the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment? Is he right about that?

## Day 6 – WHAT MAKES AMENDMENT DIFFICULT?

### Required Reading

- Tom Ginsburg & James Melton, “Does the Constitutional Amendment Rule Matter At All? Amendment Cultures and the Challenges of Measuring Amendment Difficulty,” *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 13 (2015): 686-713.

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Why do Ginsburg & Melton believe that a “flexible constitution” (i.e., one that is easier to amend) should enjoy strong commitment from among its *Citizens* than a constitution than less flexible constitutions? Does the example of the United States support or undermine their thesis?
- What are the “cultural” factors that Ginsburg & Melton think constrain the prospects for constitutional amendment in the United States? Do they have a persuasive account of what facilitates or inhibits the reorganization of structures of social, political, and constitutional power?

## Day 7 – HOW DOES AMENDMENT HAPPEN?

### Required Reading

- Akhil Amar, “Philadelphia Revisited: Amending the Constitution Outside Article V,” *University of Chicago Law Review* (1998): 1043-1104.

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Is constitutional amendment possible outside the formal amendment process? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages of amending a constitution in this more informal way?
- According to Amar, what skills and dispositions give *Citizens* legitimate authority over the Constitution, and how are those qualities to be fostered within a citizenry?



## Day 8 – MODELS OF AMENDMENT

### Required Reading

- Richard Albert, *Constitutional Amendments: Making, Breaking, and Changing Constitutions* (Oxford University Press, 2019), 224-245

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- According to Albert, how do different national models of constitutional amendment shape the relationship of *Citizens* to their constitution? Is the American model of amendment an inevitable consequence of its constitution, or could a different model of amendment fit within the country's constitutional framework?

## Day 9 – IN-CLASS DEBATE PREPARATION/ WORKSHOP

### Day 10 – IN-CLASS DEBATE #1

During class students will draw on material from Days 2 – 8 to debate the strongest reasons for or against making a constitution easy to amend. In particular, students will be expected to explain whether the U.S. Constitution should be more susceptible to amendment and if so, how. In their arguments, students will also be expected to discuss how *Citizens* should be disposed to their constitutions: should they respect and revere it, as it is? Or see themselves as responsible for modifying or transforming it? And is the difficulty of amending the United States Constitution a symptom of civic health, or civic weakness?

After the class session, students will submit a short (ca. 1200 word) reflection explaining how they would revise (supplement, clarify, or otherwise improve) their remarks from class. In particular, students will be expected to identify (a) *how* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, more importantly, (b) *why* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, in light of that self-analysis, (c) the features of discussion and debate which are most likely to challenge or change their thinking, in general (ELO 2.2). This reflection will challenge students to develop metacognitive skills, reflecting on their learning and their individual growth. This assignment be due by midnight on the day of the next class session.

## II. ALTERNATIVES

### How American Constitutionalism Interacts With Other Approaches to Building

#### *A Just World*

*Expected Learning Outcomes:* In this section of the course students will describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global and/or historical communities (including the ancient Roman, British Imperial, Native American, and African American (ELO 3.1), and reflect on the skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence by considering the critical-yet-constructive interaction between these competing constitutional traditions (ELO 3.2). The over-arching theme of these cross-cultural contrasts is the principled and pragmatic conditions of a *Just World*: whether in the arguments for small-and-homogenous versus large-and-heterogenous republics (Day 11); the effects of the American Revolution on religious and racial minorities throughout the Americas (Day 12); the ideals of community and sovereignty in Native American *Citizenship* claims (Day 13); the role of race in



structuring the rights and responsibilities of **Citizenship** and redressing **Injustice** (Day 14); the importance of upholding law in pursuing **Justice** (Day 15). By considering how this range of alternatives to the American constitutional tradition has each influenced (and been influenced *by*) the American constitutional tradition, students will be positioned to examine and evaluate various expressions of **Diversity** and possibilities for inclusion (ELO 4.1).

## Day 11 – ANCIENTS AND MODERNS

### Required Reading

- Federalist Papers 1, 9-11, 15-22, 38-39

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- What failings of ancient republics does the Federalist aim to solve through the constitutional design of the United States? To what extent does the Federalist think its constitutional design can resolve age-old conflicts over the character of **Justice**? And why does the Federalist think the American design accommodates **Diversity** in a way unknown to older republics?

### **-First Debate Reflection Paper due by midnight-**

## Day 12 – LOYALISTS AND PATRIOTS

### Required Reading

- Gregg Frazer, *God Against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy's Case Against the American Revolution*, chapter 1
- Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*, chapter 1

### Question to Prepare for Class Discussion

- To what extent did loyalty to the British Empire reflect a principled, alternative ideal of **Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World** (and the role of the Empire in securing **Justice** and accommodating **Diversity**), and to what extent did it reflect simply different material interests and competing political coalitions?
- Is it possible that a Loyalist victory could have resulted in a more **Diverse and Just World**?

## Day 13 – NATIVE AND AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

### Required Reading

- Gregory Ablavsky & Tanner Alread, “We the (Native) People? How Indigenous Peoples Debated the U.S. Constitution”
- Aaron Kushner, “Citizenship and the Good Life: Cherokee and American Regimes in Conflict”

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Could the American constitution conceivably be applied or amended to accommodate Native American understandings of **Citizenship** and **Justice** (as characterized by Kushner)? Or does the **Diversity** of worldviews and demands for **Justice** at issue require distinct national and tribal sovereignty?



- According to Ablavsky & Alread, how have Native Americans operated as “actors, not just subjects, in constitutional debates,” and what does that history suggest about the avenues for action and advocacy for change within the constitutional framework of American *Citizenship*?

#### Day 14 – AFRICAN AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM

##### Required Reading

- Liberian Declaration of Independence (1847)
- Liberian Constitution (1847)
- Jordan Cash, “‘A Purer Form of Government’: African American Constitutionalism in the Founding of Liberia”

##### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- What does Cash mean when he contends that “the Liberians seemed to have explicitly constitutionalized a photo-negative of the restrictive *Citizenship* found in the USA,” and how does that framework reflect a coherent conception of *Justice*?
- According to Cash, how does Liberian constitutional tradition offer evidence of the “*Diversity* and adaptability of American political thought”?

#### Day 15 – PRESERVATION AND CHANGE

##### Required Reading

- Abraham Lincoln, “The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions” (1838)
- Lucas Morel, *Lincoln’s Sacred Effort*, chapter 2

##### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- How does Lincoln argue that *Justice* must be pursued through law, rather than in opposition to it?
- What does Lincoln mean when he refers to “order loving citizens”? Is the “love of law and order” required to perpetuate political institutions compatible with reforming them, and if so, how? And what generates or justifies *love* of law and order (rather than mere respect for it)?
- Is Morel right that Lincoln’s argument establishes a coherent distinction between “democracy” and “mobocracy” (characterized by Morel as “a zeal for the immediate gratification of a community’s desire for *Justice*”)?

#### Day 16 – CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION SIMULATION (Day 1)

##### Required Reading

- John Patrick Coby, *The Constitutional Convention of 1787* [Skim pp. 31-43 and 46-65]
- Character Sheet Recommendations

Today’s class will focus on preparing students for a three-day historical simulation activity on the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The first half of the class will include a lecture setting up the historical context of the Convention and connecting it with students’ learning from the past two weeks by identifying how the appropriate role for *Citizens* in making or respecting their own Constitution,

competing conceptions of a *Just World*, and the institutional mechanisms for accommodating social *Diversity* were all at issue in deliberations at the Convention. There will also be time allocated to going over the format for the Convention simulation, and explaining student responsibilities during the simulation. During the second half of the class, students will have the chance to meet with their factions to strategize for the ensuing debates over Issues 1&2.

#### DAY 17 – CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION SIMULATION (Day 2)

##### Required Reading

- Character Sheet Recommendations

For today's class students will debate Issue 1: House of Representatives Character.

#### DAY 18 – CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION SIMULATION (Day 3)

##### Required Reading

- Character Sheet Recommendations

For today's class students will debate Issue 2: House of Representatives Size

#### DAY 19 – CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION SIMULATION (Day 3)

Closing statements, final vote, and debrief

At the conclusion of the simulation, students will be asked to submit a short (ca. 1200 word) reflection explaining whether or not they agree with their character's position on Issues 1&2. In this paper (due at midnight on the day of the next class session), students will be asked to reference at least one of their assigned readings from Day 11-15. Students will also be expected to reflect on the differences between their decision-making processes and those of the character they were assigned, explaining why facts or principles which might be compelling for them were not for their character (or vice versa).

### III. ADMISSIONS

#### How American Ideals of *Citizenship* and *Justice* Fit With the Interests Of *Diversity*

*Expected Learning Outcomes:* In this section of the course students will examine and evaluate how “diversity” as a conceptual and legal category has evolved to accommodate competing conceptions of *Justice*, including ideals of merit and equal *Citizenship* that can be traced to the American founding but which have been challenged and reconceived in response to various expressions of social diversity and lived experience (ELO 4.1). Special attention will be given to how conceptions of *Justice* and *Citizenship* interact with structures of power in the form of access to institutions of higher education, enabling students to analyze and critique how institutions of higher education offer not only “Education for *Citizenship*” but embody and empower different ideals of *Citizenship* (ELO 4.2).



## Day 20 – NATURAL ARISTOCRACY

### Required Reading

- John Adams, excerpts from Discourse on Davila
- Correspondence between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson
- Joseph Kett, *Merit: The History of a Founding Ideal from the American Revolution to the Twenty-First Century*, chapter 1

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- What do Adams and Jefferson each have in mind when they distinguish between “natural aristocracy” and “artificial aristocracy”? How can a society have the former without the latter?
- How, according to Kett’s survey, did early American institutions aim to recognize both equality and merit? And how did those institutions accommodate the fact the United States was “a society where all *Citizens*... claimed to be meritorious”?

**-Constitutional Convention Reflection Paper due at the end of class today-**

## Day 21 – MODERN MERITOCRACY

### Required Reading

- Michael Sandel, *The Tyranny of Merit*, chapters 1 and 2

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- What is the difference between modern “meritocracy,” as discussed by Sandel, and the kind of “natural aristocracy” discussed by Adams and Jefferson? Is one better than the other?
- Why does Sandel see the ideal of “Contributive *Justice*” as a superior to the ideal of “meritocracy,” particularly for a *Diverse* society?

## Day 22 – JUSTICE AND DIVERSITY

### Required Reading

- Lyndon Baines Johnson, Commencement Address at Howard University (1965)
- *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978)

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- LBJ’s Howard address was followed by his first executive order on “affirmative action” policies; the Bakke case upheld such policies as applied to college admissions. That said, how similar are the rationales for affirmative action offered by LBJ and the Court in *Bakke*?
- According to Powell’s opinion in *Bakke*, what kind of *Diversity* “furthers a compelling state interest”? How does Powell’s explanation fit with your sense of how the word “*Diversity*” is generally used?
- How does the Court in *Bakke* connect the public policy problem of college admissions to the challenge of defining the terms of equal *Citizenship* in the broader context of American history?





## Day 23 – DIVERSITY AND MERIT

### Required Reading

- *Students for Fair Admission v. Harvard*

### Questions to Prepare for Class Discussion

- In *Bakke*, the term “**Diversity**” was used in passing, and “merit” hardly at all. In *SFFA v. Harvard* the terms are used constantly and analyzed in detail. To what extent do these terms – “diversity” and “merit” – capture the considerations that ought to factor in to establishing a just world through the organization of educational institutions?

## Days 24 & 25 – DIVERSITY AND CITIZENSHIP

### Required Reading

- Justin Driver, *The Fall of Affirmative Action*, chapter 1
- Richard Vedder, *Let Colleges Fail*, chapter 1

### Question to Prepare for Class Discussion

- Both Driver and Vedder identify, behind the debate over **Diversity** in college admissions, a broader understanding of higher education’s role in setting the terms of **Citizenship** in the United States. Analyze and critique why Driver thinks that the **Diversity** of the United States is served by participation *within* existing institutions of higher education, while Vedder thinks it requires transforming or dismantling those institutions.

## Day 26 – IN-CLASS DEBATE PREPARATION/ WORKSHOP

### Day 27 – IN-CLASS DEBATE #2

Students will draw on material from Days 21 – 25 to debate the appropriate constitutional policies surrounding college admissions for a **diverse and just world**. Day 27’s debate will center around two propositions, specifically: 1) affirmative action is constitutional, and 2) affirmative action is just.

After the class session, students will submit a short (ca. 1200 word) reflection explaining how they would revise (supplement, clarify, or otherwise improve) their remarks from class. In particular, students will be expected to identify (a) *how* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, more importantly, (b) *why* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, in light of that self-analysis, (c) the features of discussion and debate which are most likely to challenge or change their thinking, in general (ELO 2.2). This reflection will challenge students to develop metacognitive skills, reflecting on their learning and their individual growth. This assignment be due by midnight on the day of the next class session.

### Day 28 – REVIEW

Discuss how students’ initial perspectives on questions concerning the role of Courts, birthright citizenship, and college admissions have evolved over the course of the semester, and review materials for final exam (to be held during final exam period).

**–Second Debate Reflection Paper #1 due by midnight–**



## **VII. 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.

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools should not be used in the completion of course assignments unless an instructor for a given course specifically authorizes their use, and then only in the ways allowed by the instructor. 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 their own. These requirements apply to all students, whether undergraduate, graduate, and professional.

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.

### **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](#)

## 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.

Columbus

Lima

Mansfield

Marion

Newark

Wooster

## 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.

## 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](mailto: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.

# GE Theme course submission worksheet: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

## Overview

---

Courses in the GE Themes aim to provide students with opportunities to explore big picture ideas and problems within the specific practice and expertise of a discipline or department. Although many Theme courses serve within disciplinary majors or minors, by requesting inclusion in the General Education, programs are committing to the incorporation of the goals of the focal theme and the success and participation of students from outside of their program.

Each category of the GE has specific learning goals and Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) that connect to the big picture goals of the program. ELOs describe the knowledge or skills students should have by the end of the course. Courses in the GE Themes must meet the ELOs common for **all** GE Themes and those specific to the Theme, in addition to any ELOs the instructor has developed specific to that course. All courses in the GE must indicate that they are part of the GE and include the Goals and ELOs of their GE category on their syllabus.

The prompts in this form elicit information about how this course meets the expectations of the GE Themes. The form will be reviewed by a group of content experts (the Theme Advisory) and by a group of curriculum experts (the Theme Panel), with the latter having responsibility for the ELOs and Goals common to all themes (those things that make a course appropriate for the GE Themes) and the former having responsibility for the ELOs and Goals specific to the topic of **this** Theme.

Briefly describe how this course connects to or exemplifies the concept of this Theme (Citizenship)

---

In a sentence or two, explain how this class “fits” within the focal Theme. This will help reviewers understand the intended frame of reference for the course-specific activities described below.

*(enter text here)*  
See responses in the Appendix below.

## **Appendix – America’s Foundational Debates Worksheet Responses**

### **Briefly describe how this course connects to or exemplifies the concept of this Theme (Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)**

This course understands Citizenship as 1) a legal status entailing rights and responsibilities, the practical efficacy of which depends on its ability to encompass Diverse individuals and groups, and 2) a contested and evolving historical, philosophical, and legal category due to competing conceptions of Justice and the challenges of adapting enduring constitutional principles to evolving circumstances. Through primary sources students will be introduced to perennial problems of the American civic tradition including the nature of rights, institutional design, and constitutional interpretation. Students’ consideration of this material will be enriched by secondary sources that examine how arguments from early in the American tradition have reverberated within, and been reshaped by, the subsequent development of American political and social life (for instance, the rehabilitation of Anti-Federalist arguments against central power; the adequacy of the American constitutional framework for responding to citizenship claims from African Americans, Native Americans, and others; how ideals of “equality,” “merit,” and “diversity” have been used to both catalyze and constrain social change).

The course will conclude by asking students to reflect on the political, scholarly, and judicial perspectives that are most appropriate to addressing a public policy issue they all have a direct stake in: the definition of justice and diversity in college admissions. Throughout the semester, students will be required to reflect on how their initial position on this and other hot button issues are challenged or supplemented by statements of political principle from the founding era, arguments from judicial opinions, and cutting-edge scholarship.

#### **1.1 Engage in critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme.**

Students will engage in critical and logical thinking about citizenship for a just and diverse world through readings, discussions, debates, and exams.

Students will examine primary texts from the Founding and Reconstruction eras which set the parameters for subsequent arguments about Citizenship, Justice, and Diversity in the United States, either by establishing enduring legal and political facts, or by creating conflicts and questions to be confronted by later generation. In particular, students will identify how legal and political mechanisms for constitutional amendment reflect competing assessments of the skills and dispositions appropriate

to Citizenship. Students will also be asked to analyze how notions of Justice and Diversity developed (and have been debated) in Supreme Court jurisprudence and in relation to (and/or tension with) understandings of rights and justice developed in the constitutional debates of the Framing and Reconstruction eras.

Students will demonstrate their mastery of this material through debates and historical simulations that require them to practice evidence-based logical reasoning, and inhabit the worldviews of historical actors representing a variety of points of view.

## **1.2 Engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the theme.**

Students will engage cutting-edge scholarship analyzing prospects for constitutional amendment outside the formal amendment procedures outlined in Article V of the United States Constitution (Days 7-8). Students will study not only constitutional texts (e.g, the Reconstruction Amendments and the Liberian Constitution of 1847), but scholarly debates about the meaning of those texts (e.g., the extent to which the Reconstruction Amendments changed the legal and moral meaning of American Citizenship – Day 5; the degree to which Liberian constitutionalism was both indebted to, and a critique of, American constitutionalism – Day 14).

The scholarly sources students engage emphasizes (and disputes) the skills and dispositions necessary for citizenship: for instance, the value of direct political participation in practicing citizenship (Day 6); paradigms of citizenship from national or cultural traditions outside the United States (Days 3, 12, 13); the role of institutions of higher education in shaping broader cultures of citizenship (Days 24, 25).

Students will be expected to draw on and fairly characterize these perspectives as part of in-class debates on topics including constitutional amendment (Days 9-10) and college admissions (Days 26-27), and they will be tested on their knowledge of this material through short answer questions on their final exam.

## **2.1. Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences as they apply to the theme.**

Throughout the semester, students will toggle between perspectives: historical and contemporary, political, legal, and scholarly, familiar and forgotten. This will position students to integrate insights from

across traditions, cultures, and individual experiences as life-long learners. For instance, students will identify and describe differences between the formal amendment procedures of the United States Constitution and alternatives from the state level and from around the world, understanding how these reflect competing conceptions of justice and frameworks for accommodating diversity, and synthesizing approaches to consider how American citizens might maintain or remake their constitutional culture in the twenty-first century (Day 8). Students will be able to describe how Native American and Liberian constitutionalism can be both opposed to prominent feature the American constitutional tradition and synthesize aspects of it within an alternatives (Days 13 and 14).

Students will practice and be evaluated on skills of description and synthesis through a historical simulation activity where apply different conceptions of citizenship and justice, as surveyed in the first two sections of the course, to a historical simulation activity proposing an original constitutional settlement (Days 16-19).

Students will also synthesize approaches through the following bookend reflection exercise: on the first day of the semester, students will be provided with short editorials from *The New York Times* (or a similar current affairs outlet) regarding topical debates including the role of the Supreme Court in the American constitutional order, birthright citizenship, and diversity in college admissions. Students will note their agreement or disagreement with the editorials in an online journal on Carmen Canvas during the first week of classes. Then, at the end of the semester, students will write a 500 word reflection in the same online journal, identifying and explaining the strongest argument *against* their original position based on the course material covered. They also will also be asked to draw on their own life experience and best reasoning to identify challenges for Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World which the assigned material fails to resolve, and which would benefit from the consideration of additional perspectives or policy change.

## **2.2. Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.**

Following in-class debates, students will submit a reflections papers identifying:

- (a) *How* the in-class discussion has affected their thinking, and, more importantly,
- (b) *Why* the in-class discussion affected their thinking, and, in light of that self-analysis,
- (c) The features of discussion and debate which are most likely to challenge or change their thinking,



in general.

This reflection will challenge students to develop metacognitive skills, reflecting on their learning and their individual growth. The aim of these assignments is to combine in-class discussion of and subsequent private reflection over “hot topics” (e.g., the virtues or vices of the American constitution relative to global alternatives; diversity, justice, and merit in college admissions) to spur students’ to recognize not only what opinions they hold strongly, and why, but what might make them disposed to reconsidering an opinion they hold strongly, and why. Since students will write these reflections after several successive in-class activities (at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester), their reflections will be assessed partly on the basis of their ability to identify persistent features of their thinking, which characteristically shape their responses to challenging discussions, or subjects where they are likely to have strong opinions.

### **3.1. Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities.**

Students will describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global and/or historical communities (including the ancient Roman, British Imperial, Native American, and African American: Days 11-14)). Students will be able to describe and analyze how the amendment procedures in the United States Constitution compare to the amendment procedures in the constitutions of Ohio, India, Germany, and South Africa (Day 3). Students will also compare debates on changes to the legal meaning of citizenship at the time of Reconstruction that occurred in Congress, on the one hand, and the Freedman’s Conventions, on the other (Day 4).

A historical simulation activity will require students to confront and enact a range of political and cultural communities that came together at the American constitutional conventions, while final exam question ask students to analyze why conceptions of citizenship have differed across sociopolitical and historical communities (e.g. why is it so much easier for citizens to amend their state constitutions than the federal constitution?), and evaluate the role of institutions of higher education in setting the terms of American citizenship, particularly with regard to representing or drawing on the strengths of the fully diverse array of American communities.

### **3.2. Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.**

Students will reflect on the skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence by considering the critical-yet-constructive interaction between competing constitutional traditions (both global and trans-national, and sub-national yet cross-cultural). The over-arching theme of these cross-cultural contrasts is the principled and pragmatic conditions of a just world: whether in the arguments for small-and-homogenous versus large-and-heterogenous republics (Day 11); the effects of the American Revolution on religious and racial minorities throughout the Americas (Day 12); the ideals of community and sovereignty in Native American citizenship claims (Day 13); the role of race in structuring the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and redressing injustice (Day 14); the importance of upholding law in pursuing justice (Day 15).

Students will apply and demonstrate their facility in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions conducive to intercultural competence through in-class debates and historical simulations that require them to speak empathetically and persuasively across difference, and in subsequent reflection papers show their ability to empathize with (even if not approve of) worldviews and decisions different from their own.

### **4.1. Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.**

Students will examine notions of justice and difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within society, both within the United States and around the world through contrasts between Cherokee and American understandings of justice and citizenship; conflicting judgments of how to accommodate difference and pursue justice between Loyalists and Patriots in the American Revolution; surveying the evolution of diversity as a legal, political, and cultural category. By considering how this range of alternatives to the American constitutional tradition has each influenced (and been influenced *by*) the American constitutional tradition, students will be positioned to examine and evaluate various expressions of Diversity and possibilities for inclusion. Students will also be asked to evaluate how historical sources are used to reconstruct the lived experiences of diverse individuals at other times and places (e.g., Day 12), and consider how arguments supporting the recognition of individual excellence interact with the need to make democratic institutions responsive to and inclusive of diverse excellences and equitable recognition of a range of relevant social contributions (Days 20, 21).

In the final section of the course students will examine and evaluate how “diversity” as a conceptual and legal category has evolved to accommodate competing conceptions of justice, including ideals of merit and equal citizenship that can be traced to the American founding but have been challenged and reconceived in response to various expressions of social diversity and lived experience. In-class discussion of these controversial questions, and an in-class debate at the conclusion of the semester, will require students to examine and critique how terms that for many people today presumptively have a specific political or ethical valence (e.g., diversity) have been heard or deployed rather differently in different social-political contexts, as can be illustrated by tracing the evolution of some of these terms through the development of Supreme Court jurisprudence. Students debate statements and final exam questions will be evaluated partly by the degree to which they demonstrate awareness of and sensitivity to this range of meanings, and thereby to the diversity of lived experiences informing them.

#### **4.2. Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power, and/or advocacy for social change.**

The course is designed to enable students to identify and analyze the skills and dispositions that enable citizens to critique and change – and also appreciate, support and strengthen – the constitutional structures they are governed by (notwithstanding the reputation of the United States Constitution as functionally “unamendable”) (e.g., Days 2, 6, 9, 15).

Students will analyze and critique how evolving legal and social understandings of diversity and inclusion have changed the nation’s understanding of justice and citizenship as reflected in its jurisprudence (Days 22-24), and critique that jurisprudence by engaging contrasting scholarly assessments of its evolution (Days 25-26). While surveying this range of legal and scholarly perspectives, students will also use reflection papers that draw on their own life experience and best reasoning to identify challenges for Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World which the assigned material fails to resolve, and which would benefit from the consideration of additional perspectives or policy change.

The third section of the course gives special attention to how conceptions of justice and citizenship interact with structures of power in the form of access to institutions of higher education, enabling students to analyze and critique how institutions of higher education offer not only “Education for

Citizenship” but embody and empower different ideals of citizenship. Students will also discuss how different cultural traditions carry different conceptions of citizenship, including: the modes of political belonging offered by the British Empire, and the possibility that it might have offered particular advantages to racial and religious minorities (Day 12); Native American constitutionalism as both an internal critic of and contributor to American citizenship (Day 13); the efforts of constitutional design to encompass and accommodate various forms of cultural diversity and social difference (Day 3). Students will demonstrate their facility with this material partly through their ability to draw on it in debates over the strengths and weaknesses of the American constitutional tradition (Days 9-10); discussion of the duty citizens have to perpetuate their institutions in ways that are not incompatible with projects of reform (Day 15); and debates concerning the justice and constitutionality of affirmative action in college admissions (Days 26-27).

## Connect this course to the Goals and ELOs shared by *all* Themes

---

Below are the Goals and ELOs common to all Themes. In the accompanying table, for each ELO, describe the activities (discussions, readings, lectures, assignments) that provide opportunities for students to achieve those outcomes. The answer should be concise and use language accessible to colleagues outside of the submitting department or discipline. The specifics of the activities matter—listing “readings” without a reference to the topic of those readings will not allow the reviewers to understand how the ELO will be met. However, the panel evaluating the fit of the course to the Theme will review this form in conjunction with the syllabus, so if readings, lecture/discussion topics, or other specifics are provided on the syllabus, it is not necessary to reiterate them within this form. The ELOs are expected to vary in their “coverage” in terms of number of activities or emphasis within the course. Examples from successful courses are shared on the next page.

**Goal 1:** Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than the foundations. In this context, “advanced” refers to courses that are e.g., synthetic, rely on research or cutting-edge findings, or deeply engage with the subject matter, among other possibilities.

**Goal 2:** Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in future.

	Course activities and assignments to meet these ELOs
<b>ELO 1.1</b> Engage in critical and logical thinking.	
<b>ELO 1.2</b> Engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or ideas within this theme.	
<b>ELO 2.1</b> Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.	
<b>ELO 2.2</b> Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.	

*Example responses for proposals within “Citizenship” (from Sociology 3200, Comm 2850, French 2803):*

<b>ELO 1.1</b> Engage in critical and logical thinking.	<i>This course will build skills needed to engage in critical and logical thinking about immigration and immigration related policy through: Weekly reading response papers which require the students to synthesize and critically evaluate cutting-edge scholarship on immigration; Engagement in class-based discussion and debates on immigration-related topics using evidence-based logical reasoning to evaluate policy positions; Completion of an assignment which build skills in analyzing empirical data on immigration (Assignment #1)</i>
---	---

	<p><i>Completion 3 assignments which build skills in connecting individual experiences with broader population-based patterns (Assignments #1, #2, #3)</i></p> <p><i>Completion of 3 quizzes in which students demonstrate comprehension of the course readings and materials.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 2.1</b> Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.</p>	<p><i>Students engage in advanced exploration of each module topic through a combination of lectures, readings, and discussions.</i></p> <p><u>Lecture</u>  <i>Course materials come from a variety of sources to help students engage in the relationship between media and citizenship at an advanced level. Each of the 12 modules has 3-4 lectures that contain information from both peer-reviewed and popular sources. Additionally, each module has at least one guest lecture from an expert in that topic to increase students' access to people with expertise in a variety of areas.</i></p> <p><u>Reading</u>  <i>The textbook for this course provides background information on each topic and corresponds to the lectures. Students also take some control over their own learning by choosing at least one peer-reviewed article and at least one newspaper article from outside the class materials to read and include in their weekly discussion posts.</i></p> <p><u>Discussions</u>  <i>Students do weekly discussions and are given flexibility in their topic choices in order to allow them to take some control over their education. They are also asked to provide information from sources they've found outside the lecture materials. In this way, they are able to explore areas of particular interest to them and practice the skills they will need to gather information about current events, analyze this information, and communicate it with others.</i></p> <p><i>Activity Example: Civility impacts citizenship behaviors in many ways. Students are asked to choose a TED talk from a provided list (or choose another speech of their interest) and summarize and evaluate what it says about the relationship between civility and citizenship. Examples of Ted Talks on the list include Steven Petrow on the difference between being polite and being civil, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's talk on how a single story can perpetuate stereotypes, and Claire Wardle's talk on how diversity can enhance citizenship.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 2.2</b> Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.</p>	<p><i>Students will conduct research on a specific event or site in Paris not already discussed in depth in class. Students will submit a 300-word abstract of their topic and a bibliography of at least five reputable academic and mainstream sources. At the end of the semester they will submit a 5-page research paper and present their findings in a 10-minute oral and visual presentation in a small-group setting in Zoom.</i></p> <p><i>Some examples of events and sites:</i>  <i>The Paris Commune, an 1871 socialist uprising violently squelched by conservative forces</i></p>

	<i>Jazz-Age Montmartre, where a small community of African-Americans—including actress and singer Josephine Baker, who was just inducted into the French Pantheon—settled and worked after World War I.</i> <i>The Vélodrome d'hiver Roundup, 16-17 July 1942, when 13,000 Jews were rounded up by Paris police before being sent to concentration camps</i> <i>The Marais, a vibrant Paris neighborhood inhabited over the centuries by aristocrats, then Jews, then the LGBTQ+ community, among other groups.</i>
--	---

## Goals and ELOs unique to Citizenship for a **Diverse and Just World**

Below are the Goals and ELOs specific to this Theme. As above, in the accompanying Table, for each ELO, describe the activities (discussions, readings, lectures, assignments) that provide opportunities for students to achieve those outcomes. The answer should be concise and use language accessible to colleagues outside of the submitting department or discipline. The ELOs are expected to vary in their “coverage” in terms of number of activities or emphasis within the course. Examples from successful courses are shared on the next page.

**GOAL 3:** Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, or global citizenship, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute citizenship.

**GOAL 4:** Successful students will examine notions of justice amidst difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within societies, both within the US and/or around the world.

	Course activities and assignments to meet these ELOs
<b>ELO 3.1</b> Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship <u>and</u> how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities.	
<b>ELO 3.2</b> Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.	
<b>ELO 4.1</b> Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.	
<b>ELO 4.2</b> Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power and/or advocacy for social change.	

*Example responses for proposals within “Citizenship” (Hist/Relig. Studies 3680, Music 3364; Soc 3200):*

<b>ELO 3.1</b> Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship <u>and</u> how it differs across political, cultural,	<i>Citizenship could not be more central to a topic such as immigration/migration. As such, the course content, goals, and expected learning outcomes are all, almost by definition, engaged with a range of perspectives on local, national, and global citizenship.</i>
---	---

<p><i>national, global, and/or historical communities.</i></p>	<p><i>Throughout the class students will be required to engage with questions about what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across contexts.</i></p> <p><i>The course content addresses citizenship questions at the global (see weeks #3 and #15 on refugees and open border debates), national (see weeks #5, 7-#14 on the U.S. case), and the local level (see week #6 on Columbus). Specific activities addressing different perspectives on citizenship include Assignment #1, where students produce a demographic profile of a U.S.-based immigrant group, including a profile of their citizenship statuses using U.S.-based regulatory definitions. In addition, Assignment #3, which has students connect their family origins to broader population-level immigration patterns, necessitates a discussion of citizenship. Finally, the critical reading responses have the students engage the literature on different perspectives of citizenship and reflect on what constitutes citizenship and how it varies across communities.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 3.2</b> <i>Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.</i></p>	<p><i>This course supports the cultivation of "intercultural competence as a global citizen" through rigorous and sustained study of multiple forms of musical-political agency worldwide, from the grass-roots to the state-sponsored. Students identify varied cultural expressions of "musical citizenship" each week, through their reading and listening assignments, and reflect on them via online and in-class discussion. It is common for us to ask probing and programmatic questions about the musical-political subjects and cultures we study. What are the possibilities and constraints of this particular version of musical citizenship? What might we carry forward in our own lives and labors as musical citizens Further, students are encouraged to apply their emergent intercultural competencies as global, musical citizens in their midterm report and final project, in which weekly course topics inform student-led research and creative projects.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 4.1</b> <i>Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.</i></p>	<p><i>Through the historical and contemporary case studies students examine in HIST/RS 3680, they have numerous opportunities to examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as a variety of lived experiences. The cases highlight the challenges of living in religiously diverse societies, examining a range of issues and their implications. They also consider the intersections of religious difference with other categories of difference, including race and gender. For example, during the unit on US religious freedom, students consider how incarcerated Black Americans and Native Americans have experienced questions of freedom and equality in dramatically different ways than white Protestants. In a weekly reflection post, they address this question directly. In the unit on marriage and sexuality, they consider different ways that different social groups have experienced the regulation of marriage in Israel and Malaysia in ways that do not correspond simplistically to gender (e.g. different women's groups with very different perspectives on the issues).</i></p> <p><i>In their weekly reflection posts and other written assignments, students are invited to analyze the implications of different regulatory models for questions of diversity, equity, and inclusion. They do so not in a simplistic sense of assessing which model is</i></p>



	<p><i>"right" or "best" but in considering how different possible outcomes might shape the concrete lived experience of different social groups in different ways. The goal is not to determine which way of doing things is best, but to understand why different societies manage these questions in different ways and how their various expressions might lead to different outcomes in terms of diversity and inclusion. They also consider how the different social and demographic conditions of different societies shape their approaches (e.g. a historic Catholic majority in France committed to laicite confronting a growing Muslim minority, or how pluralism *within* Israeli Judaism led to a fragile and contested status quo arrangement). Again, these goals are met most directly through weekly reflection posts and students' final projects, including one prompt that invites students to consider Israel's status quo arrangement from the perspective of different social groups, including liberal feminists, Orthodox and Reform religious leaders, LGBTQ communities, interfaith couples, and others.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 4.2</b> <i>Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power and/or advocacy for social change.</i></p>	<p><i>As students analyze specific case studies in HIST/RS 3680, they assess law's role in and capacity for enacting justice, managing difference, and constructing citizenship. This goal is met through lectures, course readings, discussion, and written assignments. For example, the unit on indigenous sovereignty and sacred space invites students to consider why liberal systems of law have rarely accommodated indigenous land claims and what this says about indigenous citizenship and justice. They also study examples of indigenous activism and resistance around these issues. At the conclusion of the unit, the neighborhood exploration assignment specifically asks students to take note of whether and how indigenous land claims are marked or acknowledged in the spaces they explore and what they learn from this about citizenship, difference, belonging, and power. In the unit on legal pluralism, marriage, and the law, students study the personal law systems in Israel and Malaysia. They consider the structures of power that privilege certain kinds of communities and identities and also encounter groups advocating for social change. In their final projects, students apply the insights they've gained to particular case studies. As they analyze their selected case studies, they are required to discuss how the cases reveal the different ways justice, difference, and citizenship intersect and how they are shaped by cultural traditions and structures of power in particular social contexts. They present their conclusions in an oral group presentation and in an individually written final paper. Finally, in their end of semester letter to professor, they reflect on how they issues might shape their own advocacy for social change in the future.</i></p>

---

**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](mailto:ralph.52@osu.edu)  
Pronouns: she/her/hers

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Friday, April 4, 2025 at 9:52 AM  
**To:** Ralph, Anne <[ralph.52@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:ralph.52@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 3:19 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:ralph.52@osu.edu)  
Pronouns: she/her/hers

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Monday, March 24, 2025 at 1:26 PM  
**To:** Ralph, Anne <[ralph.52@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:Snyder.893@osu.edu)  
614-688-4169

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 9, 2025 9:09 AM  
**To:** Snyder, Anastasia <[snyder.893@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Friday, April 4, 2025 at 9:56 AM

**To:** Snyder, Anastasia <[snyder.893@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 4, 2025 9:48 AM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 8:15 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>  
**Subject:** RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Super – thanks!

Rob

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:14 PM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 8:09:09 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:58 PM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:23 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 24, 2025 1:27 PM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto: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 25<sup>th</sup>? 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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2025 8:56 AM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto: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 25<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 8, 2025 at 8:57 PM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>

**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>

**Subject:** RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Super – thanks!

Rob

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>

**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:58 PM  
**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:greenbaum.3@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:23 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>

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

**To:** Greenbaum, Rob <[greenbaum.3@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2025 3:15 PM  
**To:** Martin, Andrew <[martin.1026@osu.edu](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)>; Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Smith, Randy <[smith.70@osu.edu](mailto:smith.70@osu.edu)>; Schoen, Brian <[schoen@ohio.edu](mailto: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](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2025 2:28:28 PM  
**To:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>; Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Smith, Randy <[smith.70@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)

---

**From:** Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 18, 2025 1:33 PM

**To:** Martin, Andrew <[martin.1026@osu.edu](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)>; Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Smith, Randy <[smith.70@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)>  
**Date:** Friday, April 18, 2025 at 1:16 PM  
**To:** Strang, Lee <[strang.69@osu.edu](mailto:strang.69@osu.edu)>, Fortier, Jeremy <[fortier.28@osu.edu](mailto:fortier.28@osu.edu)>  
**Cc:** Smith, Randy <[smith.70@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:martin.1026@osu.edu)