

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?)

Submit course for GE Themes (Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World)

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

The course has been designed for GE Themes (Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World)

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 Just and Diverse 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	2210
Course Title	Freedom and Equality in American Literature
Transcript Abbreviation	Freedom Equality
Course Description	This course examines the privileged role creative writing has had in defining the terms of American citizenship. Proceeds through close reading of key works of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry to examine how writers have sought to define freedom and equality, shaping and transforming the American understanding of these ideals.
Previous Value	Surveys how American literature has imagined the conditions of political belonging through the key tension between equality and freedom. Proceeds through close reading of key works of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry to examine how writers have sought to define freedom and equality, shaping and transforming the American understanding of these ideals and the relationship between them.
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	Never

Campus of Offering	Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark, Wooster
<i>Previous Value</i>	<i>Columbus</i>

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites	
Exclusions	
Electronically Enforced	Yes

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

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

Requirement/Elective Designation

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

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">• An advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of American literature as a wellspring of civic thought; identify, describe, and synthesize approaches to civic thought in American literature; evaluate the visions of citizenship, freedom, and equality
Content Topic List	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Freedom, Equality, American Literature, Political Belonging, Continuity and Change in American Political Imagination
Sought Concurrence	Yes

Attachments

- Concurrence Exchanges - Education, Law, Glenn, Arts & Sciences (1).pdf: Concurrence
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2210 - GE Worksheet (v3).pdf: GE Worksheet (v3)
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2210 - Cover Letter (for v3).pdf: Cover Letter (for v3)
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2210 - Syllabus (v3).pdf: Syllabus (v3)
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)

COURSE CHANGE REQUEST
2210 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Chantal
01/21/2026

Comments

- Please see feedback email sent to department 11-24-2025 RLS *(by Steele, Rachel Lea on 11/24/2025 08:43 PM)*

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier, Jeremy	10/18/2025 03:16 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier, Jeremy	10/18/2025 03:17 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed, Kathryn Marie	10/19/2025 05:43 PM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele, Rachel Lea	11/24/2025 08:43 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier, Jeremy	01/17/2026 03:28 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier, Jeremy	01/17/2026 03:33 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed, Kathryn Marie	01/20/2026 04:01 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins, Mary Ellen Bigler Neff, Jennifer Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal Wade, Macy Joy Steele, Rachel Lea	01/20/2026 04:01 PM	ASCCAO Approval

Memo Regarding Resubmission of CIVILL 2210

Thanks to the Subcommittee for its detailed and incisive feedback. We have addressed their comments and submitted a revised syllabus (**with major revisions in yellow highlight**). Our revisions can be summarized and explained as follows:

The Subcommittee found that the course did not frame citizenship for a just and diverse world in terms that made justice or diversity “an integral part of the course.” In response, we have revised the syllabus to make clear that the ideals of American citizenship which the course explores – “freedom” and “equality” – are not treated as alternative *components* of justice or diversity, but as each essential *conditions* of justice in the context of social diversity. An integral purpose of the course is therefore to illustrate that, unlike philosophers who sometimes operate with opposing conceptions of justice as freedom *or* equality (as in the famous contrast between “negative rights” versus “positive rights”), creative writers have explored freedom and equality as goods that must both be present for the attainment of justice – and the impetus for that exploration has been new expressions of social diversity and difference, with the distinct imperatives of justice and inclusion they each bring to the fore. Thus, the syllabus now explicitly:

“[C]hallenges students to understand creative writing as occupying a privileged status in the practice and evolution of American citizenship, because creative writers possess unique tools for challenging their fellow Americans to reconsider the relationship between citizenship, justice, and diversity: for instance, by devising new modes of expression that both capture and catalyze emergent forms of social difference and political inclusion (Weeks 2, 6, 10), and dramatizing both the urgent demands of justice and the intransigent obstacles to overcoming injustice (Weeks 4, 9, 13)” (p. 6)

This point is elaborated throughout the Course Schedule, partly by highlighting key terms as they occur to give students a plain visual illustration of the over-arching importance of the core concepts of the Theme throughout the course. And, most significantly, we have spelled out in far more detail how advanced scholarly literature will be used throughout the semester to apply and analyze concepts of Citizenship, Justice and Diversity, and draw connections between all three. For instance, the syllabus now informs students that they will: evaluate the scholarly claim that “poet citizens” (exemplified by Walt Whitman) were necessary to reconstruct “the Union as a just and stable polity” in the aftermath of the Civil War; critique how racial difference is emphasized or obscured through different mediums of self-expression which seek to recognize diversity in the pursuit of more equal and inclusive norms of citizenship (as pioneered through the work of Frederick Douglass); describe how changes in literary form “allowed diverse groups of people to make sense of social experience” resulting from changes to social structures and gender roles (as explored by the novels of Edith Wharton); explain how Stanley Cavell can conclude from Henry David Thoreau’s response to structural injustice that

“Education for citizenship is education for isolation”; analyze whether Orlando Patterson is correct to conclude that a hallmark of “second-class citizenship is... an acceptance of unjust conditions as inevitable.” More generally, the syllabus highlights that students will not merely be equipped to describe freedom and equality as ideals of American citizenship. Rather, students will examine and critique how American writers, *in their capacity as citizens*, have used the ideals of freedom and equality to advance particular conceptions justice within a diverse world (p. 2: “American writers have... found tools of expression and persuasion that make foundational American ideals of justice intelligible to new audiences struggling to apply those ideals amid the diversity and difference of an ever-changing nation”).

In sum: we think that by clarifying that the ideals of freedom and equality are to be examined as co-equal *conditions* of justice for a diverse world, and explaining how advanced scholarly literature will require students to evaluate relationships *between* Citizenship, Justice, and Diversity, the core concepts of the Theme have been consistently foregrounded as an integral part of the course.

In the analytical approach outlined on the syllabus, citizenship is “inseparable from self-reflection, creative experimentation, and collective learning” (p. 2). That insight shapes our response to the Subcommittee’s request for a revised approach to ELO 2.2. The Subcommittee emphasizes the need for assignments that explicitly assess students’ “critical and thoughtful reflection about their own learning.” We have addressed this request with a revised set of course assignments (outlined on pp. 5-7 of the syllabus). The first set of assignments are “Three Exercises of Close Reading and Self-Reflection,” explained this way on the syllabus:

A central goal of close reading is to counteract confirmation bias: attending carefully to an author’s exact words reveals that they may not be quite saying what we initially assume they are saying. We may be misled about an author’s meaning by preconceptions we hold about their social class or personal character, conventional wisdom about the meaning of their work, or statements they have made elsewhere, among other factors. Reading carefully compels us to update our priors, challenging ourselves to reconsider our assumptions, integrate new information, and adapt to context. This course uses close reading to compel self-reflection and self-correction by requiring students to complete submit three assignments in two stages: before the start of class, students submit a 600-1200 word interpretation of the assigned reading for that day’s class; after that reading material is covered in class, students submit a short explanation of what was wrong with their initial interpretation, identifying specific features of the text they failed to fully account for on first reading, and reflecting on the reasons they overlooked or misread something of significance in the text. This explanation should not draw primarily on information about the reading presented in lectures or secondary sources: it must be a reflection on the students’ independent reading of the text, assessing and developing themselves as learners (ELO 2.2). Students can complete these exercises at any point of their choosing during the semester. Submissions will be graded on the basis of level of detail and thoughtfulness in initial summary and subsequent reflection.

In addition, at the end of the semester students will submit a proposal for their final paper topic along with...

a reflection on challenges they are likely to encounter in executing the proposal (500-1000 words), based on their experience of interpreting and analyzing course material throughout the semester. The reflection will be graded on the basis of the level of detail and the specificity of examples a student is able to draw on from their experiences over the semester to anticipate challenges they are likely to encounter in completing their proposed final assignment (*given their distinctive qualities as learner, rather than given the particular format of and content for the final assignment*).

Taken together, these assignments will ensure that students “engage in critical and thoughtful reflection about their own learning” as “a required and assessable part of the course activity.”

Finally, we have adjusted the grading scheme to eliminate the use of pass/fail and distribute the weight of the total course grade more evenly across assignments.

We thank the Subcommittee for its attention, and for the productive impetus to develop the course’s thematic connections between Citizenship, Justice, and Diversity (particularly with the aid of advanced scholarly sources), along with its opportunities for student self-assessment.

CIVICLL 2210

Freedom and Equality in American Literature

[Semester]

Format of Instruction: Seminar

Instructor: Michael Clune

Meeting Day /Time:

Email:

Classroom Location:

Office:

Contact Hours: 3

Office Hours:

I. Course Description

The great works of American literature constitute a singularly rich and complex resource for understanding *citizenship* in a *just* and *diverse* world. This course introduces students to authors who have contributed to the nation's understanding of *citizenship* as a set of political and social ideals, as well as a legal status. Through their writings we can identify the attempt to lay claim to both freedom *and* equality as central and enduring features of American *citizenship*, and through their attempts to balance tensions between those ideals we can examine and evaluate competing visions of a *just* and *diverse* world.

In this course, students will explore the great works of American literature as a lens into American civic thought, exploring how writers have 1) imagined the conditions of political belonging and *justice* in an increasingly *diverse* nation (ELO 4.1, 4.2) and 2) identified, synthesized, or negotiated between competing demands of freedom and equality (ELO 2.1). We will proceed through close reading and comparison of key works of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry, from authors whose motivating interests range from political to religious to artistic (ELO 3.1). Analyzing and appreciating how this *diverse* range of perspectives has contributed to Americans' understanding *citizenship* will equip students with tools of self-reflection and creativity they can use to navigate the evolving world of the twenty-first century (ELO 2.2).

Freedom and equality are sometimes cast as opposing goods, with philosophic systems constructed to defend one ideal at the expense of the other. By beginning this course with the Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards, students will be able to recognize that freedom and equality have from the earliest days represented not *alternative* ideals of American *citizenship* but rather goods that must both be present for the achievement of *justice* in a *diverse* world, though different authors have sought to realize those goods in provocatively contrasting ways.

Over the course of the semester students will explore contrasting visions of American *citizenship* by drawing on primary sources and advanced scholarship to investigate puzzles such as:

- 1) How poets including Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson, and Gwendolyn Brooks wrestle with competing demands of inclusion and coherence through experiments with literary form that expand the possibilities of freedom available to American *citizens*.
- 2) How prose writers including Frederick Douglass, Henry David Thoreau, and Claude Brown examine the relation of the individual to the state, particularly as shaped by the legacy of slavery, to interrogate the ideal and the reality of *justice* in American life.
- 3) How novelists including Hermann Melville and Edith Wharton identify social bonds that are tested or strengthened amidst the upheavals and uncertainty of an increasingly *diverse* world.

As a result, students will recognize that American writers have not only depicted and reflected on American *citizenship*. They have practiced *citizenship* in a special way, by finding tools of expression and persuasion that make foundational American ideals of *justice* intelligible to new audiences struggling to apply those ideals amid the *diversity* and difference of an ever-changing nation. This literary vantage point will introduce students to a way of engaging the terms of American *citizenship* which make it inseparable from self-reflection, creative experimentation, and collective learning.

This is a three-credit hour, graded course that meets twice a week for one hour and twenty minutes. According to Ohio State rules, one credit hour translates to three hours per week of the average student's time. In this course, students should expect to spend three hours per week on direct instruction (class sessions, for example) and up to six additional hours completing reading and assignments, as outlined in the course schedule below.

II. Course Objectives

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

CIVICLL Learning Outcomes	Related Course Content
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.	Students will describe and analyze how the ideals of freedom and equality have been understood across a range of American literary authors, genres, and periods, using the tools of close reading to explore and evaluate the role creative writing has played in defining and exercising the terms of American citizenship.



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.	Close reading will challenge students to reflect on and reconsider their expectations regarding how race, gender, class, or religion may have inflected authors' representations of the Republic's animating ideals, and enable students to compare the treatment of those ideals across the genres of poetry, the novel, the short story, and the essay.
--	---

III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes

Civics, Law, and Leadership 2210 is an approved course in the **GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Just and Diverse 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 a set of political and social ideals as well as a legal status. It also understands freedom and equality as two of the most important ideals underpinning *citizenship*, because Americans have understood both to be necessary to the achievement of *justice* in a *diverse* world. A major goal of the Themes is to provide students with the opportunity to examine a complex topic through multiple perspectives and disciplinary lenses. In this course, that complex topic is the interrelationship between civic thinking on freedom and equality through the primary disciplinary lenses of literary criticism and analysis.

“Freedom and Equality in American Literature” meets the Goals and Expected Learning Outcomes for the Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World Theme through a range of readings, class discussion, and writing assignments that provide students with an opportunity to describe and analyze how *citizenship, justice, and diversity* have been understood across a range of American literary authors, genres, and periods (ELO 2.1, 3.1). Through response papers, close reading, discussions, and writing workshops, students will describe, explore, and analyze diverse representations of *citizenship* in American literature, ranging from Jonathan Edwards' religious conception (as a Calvinist, Edwards saw civic duty, social order, and moral conduct as divine mandates), to Henry David Thoreau's individualist model (unlike Edwards, Thoreau called for moral and political resistance to unjust governments, religious institutions, and social norms, encouraging citizens to be radically self-reliant and freethinking), to Frederick Douglass's vision of free labor as central to democratic belonging, to Edith Wharton's depiction of civic ideals filtered through subtle striations of class and gender (ELO 2.1, 4.1, 4.2). In each text, students explore the rights, responsibilities, values, and vulnerabilities of the individual in relation to variously-conceived political and social orders that are at the heart of the literary work. In class discussion, students will also consider how authors' works reflect differences across three centuries, numerous regions, and authors that are diverse with respect to race, gender, and class (ELO 4.1, 4.2).

The course challenges students to understand creative writing as occupying a privileged status in the practice and evolution of American *citizenship*, because creative writers possess unique tools for challenging their fellow Americans to reconsider the relationship between *citizenship, justice, and diversity*: for instance, by devising new modes of expression that both capture and catalyze emergent forms of social difference and political inclusion (Weeks 2, 6, 10), and dramatizing both the urgent demands of justice and the intransigent obstacles to overcoming injustice (Weeks 4, 9, 13).

Taken as a whole, the course will enable students to explore and evaluate the possibility that the nation needs “poet *citizens*” to realize its foundational ideals (Week 7). The course will also enable students to develop a stronger sense of their own learning through regular exercises of self-assessment where they test their initial sense of an author’s meaning or guiding intention against contrary evidence acquired through close reading (facilitated by group reading, analysis, and debate of select passages in-class), and engagement with advanced secondary literature representing influential and cutting-edge interpretation of American literature (ELO 2.2.).

IV. Course Reading

Students should purchase the following texts, available at Barnes & Noble or online on Amazon:

Henry David Thoreau, *Walden* (Yale University Press, 2006), ISBN: 0300110081

Herman Melville, *Billy Budd* (Penguin, 1995), ISBN: 014062175X

Edith Wharton, *The Age of Innocence* (Vintage, 2008), ISBN: 0099511282

Claude Brown, *Manchild in the Promised Land* (Scribner, 2011), ISBN: 145163157X

Marilynne Robinson, *Housekeeping* (Picador, 2004), ISBN: 0312424094

These novels will be supplemented by poems by Whitman, Dickinson, and Brooks, and by selections from prose works by Edwards, Hawthorne, Tocqueville, and Douglass. They will also be supplemented by a selection of secondary source readings. All of these will be available on CarmenCanvas.

V. Assignments and Grading

Instructions for All Essay Assignments

- Papers should be double-spaced, use 12-point Times New Roman font, and be carefully edited.
- Essays will be due at 11:59pm on the due date listed in the syllabus.

1. Three Exercises of Close Reading and Self-Reflection. A central goal of close reading is to counteract confirmation bias: attending carefully to an author’s exact words reveals that they may not be quite saying what we initially assume they are saying. We may be misled about an author’s meaning by preconceptions we hold about their social class or personal character, conventional wisdom about the meaning of their work, or statements they have made elsewhere, among other factors. Reading carefully compels us to update our priors, challenging ourselves to reconsider our assumptions, integrate new information, and adapt to context. This course uses close reading to compel self-reflection and self-correction by requiring students to complete submit three assignments in two stages: before the start of class, students submit a 600-1200 word interpretation of the assigned reading for that day’s class; after that reading material is covered in class, students submit a short explanation of what was wrong with their initial interpretation, identifying specific features of the text they failed to fully account for on first reading, and reflecting on the reasons



they overlooked or misread something of significance in the text. This explanation should not draw primarily on information about the reading presented in lectures or secondary sources: it must be a reflection on the students' independent reading of the text, assessing and developing themselves as learners (ELO 2.2). Students can complete these exercises at any point of their choosing during the semester. Submissions will be graded on the basis of level of detail and thoughtfulness in initial summary and subsequent reflection. Each exercise will account for 5% of students' final grade, collectively accounting for 15% of the final course grade.

2. **Four short response papers.** There are four 1-2 page response papers due over the course of the semester. Students will be split up into two groups (A and B), and each group's papers will be due on the days indicated in the syllabus below (e.g. students in group A will turn in a paper on Week 2, 5, 8, and 12; and students in group B will turn in a paper on Week 3, 7, 10, and 15). In each response paper, students are expected to engage with the given week's focus theme (e.g. Freedom and constraint in Thoreau) and secondary source readings, using them to analyze authors' understanding of freedom and equality (ELO 1.2). The requirements for these response papers are limited, empowering students to take ownership over their own learning and focus on topics in our readings that speak most to them. These papers are designed to focus student thinking on the texts we read (ELO 1.1), to record references to particular passages of interest (ELO 2.2), and to articulate questions that will serve as a basis for class discussion (ELO 1.1). 3.1). They are also designed to foster critical and logical thinking as students evaluate the visions of citizenship, freedom, and equality expressed by important authors (ELO 1.1) and to challenge students to synthesize these diverse representations of citizenship (ELO 3.1). Each response paper will be graded, account for 5% of students' final grade, and collectively account for 20% of the final course grade.
3. **Two longer papers.** The first (4-5 page) paper will address the relation between part and whole—specifically, the individual and his/her community—in *Walden*, challenging students to combine argumentation with textual evidence to examine key features of American literature's perspective on civic questions (ELO 2.1). In consultation with the instructor, students will revise this paper, with the recorded grade being the higher of the revision or original (ELO 2.2). For the second (8-10 page) paper, students will analyze the tension between freedom and equality in a work of their choosing, developing either a comparative study of two or more texts read in class, or working on a single text and a limited number of secondary sources (ELO 2.1, 3.1). Students are expected to engage the secondary source readings in these response papers, using them to analyze authors' understanding of freedom and equality (ELO 1.2). The first paper will account for 20% of the final course grade, and the second paper will account for 30% of the final course grade.
4. **Final reflection.** To ensure that students are on track for their final paper, near the end of the semester they will submit a proposal for the topic of the paper (300-500 words). In addition, they will submit a reflection on challenges they are likely to encounter in executing the proposal (500-1000 words), based on their experience of interpreting and analyzing course material throughout the semester. The reflection will be graded on the



basis of the level of detail and the specificity of examples a student is able to draw on from their experiences over the semester to anticipate challenges they are likely to encounter in completing their proposed final assignment (*given their distinctive qualities as learner, rather than given the particular format of and content for the final assignment*). This reflection will account for 5% of the final course grade.

5. **Participation.** The class relies on the active participation of students in discussion. Accordingly, students should come to class well-prepared, having done all the reading, noted passages of interest, and formulated some questions to bring to discussion (ELO 1.1). Please note the following course policies:
- 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 (ELO 1.1, 2.2). Such participation will help students develop the intercultural competency necessary for national and global citizenship (ELO 3.2). 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 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.
 - 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.

Statement on Appropriate Uses of AI

All students have important obligations under the Code of Student Conduct (see below) to complete all academic and scholarly activities with fairness and honesty. Specifically, students are not to use unauthorized assistance from Artificial Intelligence the laboratory, on field work, in scholarship, or on a course assignment unless such assistance has been authorized specifically by the course instructor. For this course, no generative AI products are to be used in the completion of writing assignments. In addition, students are not permitted to submit work completed for another course for this course’s assignments.

Course grade

The final grade will be calculated as follows:

- Participation: 10%
- Three Exercises of Close Reading and Self-Reflection: 15%
- Four Response Papers: 20%
- Paper 1 (revision grade, if higher, will replace initial grade): 20%
- Paper 2: 30%
- Final Reflection: 5%

Grading Scale

All assignments will be graded out of a 100-point scale and then converted into the final grade (also on a 100-point scale) using percentages outlined below. Your letter grade will be determined using the following ranges.

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

(listed readings must be completed by the first class day of each week)

Week 1: Read Jonathan Edwards, excerpt from “A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God” (Focus theme: Calvinist Vision of Freedom and Equality)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion; Initial Reflection Paper Due

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.1 (students will be able to explain how the logic of Edwards’s Calvinism shaped his vision of a **just** world), 3.1 (students will be able to describe why Edwards’s Calvinism entails a distinctive view of the rights and responsibilities of **citizenship**)

Week 2: Read Hawthorne, “Wakefield”; secondary reading: selection from Theo Davis, *Formalism and the Making of American Literature*. Response group A (Focus theme: Hawthorne’s conception of relation between individual and community)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response Papers

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: According to Davis, how did American notions of **citizenship** shift from the “abstract” and “universal” in the eighteenth century to something more self-consciously “personal and national” in the nineteenth century, and how does Hawthorne exemplify a new kind of literature that emerged to suit this new notion of **citizenship**? (ELOs 1.1, 1.2).

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 (students will compare Hawthorne’s vision of the relation among **citizens** to Edwards, and then explore Davis’s interpretation of Hawthorne’s attempt to respond to, and articulate, aspects of social **diversity** emerging from a world of evolving religious self-awareness and social pluralism); 4.2 (students will consider how social-cultural context has shaped competing conceptions of **justice** and **citizenship**)

Week 3: Read Thoreau, *Walden* (Chapter 1: “Economy,” Chapter 2: “Where I Lived, and What I Lived For,” and Chapter 5: “Solitude”) B (Focus Theme: Freedom and constraint in Thoreau)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response papers

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.1 (students will be able to explain the logic and normative appeal of Thoreau’s freethinking individualism in contrast with Edwards’s vision of **civic** duty and moral

constraints); 3.1 (students will describe and analyze how Thoreau and Edwards's different religious commitments and cultural contexts result in different conceptions of what constitutes ***citizenship*** and ***justice***); 4.2 (students will analyze and critique the relationship to political authority, and the scope for social protest and civil disobedience, in Thoreau versus Edwards)

Week 4: Read *Walden* (Chapter 11: "Higher Laws," Chapter 14: "Former Inhabitants; and Winter Visitors," and Chapter 18, "Conclusion"); secondary reading: selection from Stanley Cavell *The Senses of Walden*. (Focus Theme: Part and whole in Thoreau)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Writing workshop: focus—thesis statements

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: How does Cavell find in Thoreau the apparently paradoxical suggestion that "Education for ***citizenship*** is education for isolation," and on this understanding how should ***citizens*** react to ***unjust*** actions on the part of their governments (ELOs 1.2, 4.2)?

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 (students will explore Thoreau's influence on traditions of thinking about ***citizenship*** and ***justice*** by considering the analysis and appropriation of his thought in the scholarly work of Stanley Cavell); 4.1 (students will examine, critique, and evaluate how Thoreau's social position shaped his anxieties about institutional dependency and social conformity)

Week 5: Read Tocqueville, selections from *Democracy in America* A (first papers due Day 1). (Focus theme: Tocqueville's view of Equality)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response Papers

Expected Learning Outcomes: 2.1 (students will be able to describe how Tocqueville's analysis identifies competing and sometimes contradictory cultural traditions as collectively contributing to distinctively American practices of ***citizenship*** and democratic conceptions of ***justice***); 3.2 (students will identify and reflect on the skills and dispositions that enabled Tocqueville to speak impactfully as a Frenchman to Americans, and about Americans to the French, exploring the intercultural competence essential to a ***diverse*** world)

Week 6: Read Douglass, excerpts from *The Autobiography*; secondary reading: Henry Louis Gates, “Representing the Antislave.” (Focus themes: Slavery, writing, and emancipation)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion; Revision Workshop

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: According to Gates, why did Ralph Waldo Emerson’s depictions of the “anti-slave... erase racial **difference**,” while Douglass’s autobiographical accounts of did not do so? And how did Douglass use different multiple mediums of self-expression (written and visual) to accentuate social **difference** and also advance social **inclusion** (ELOs 4.1, 4.2)?

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 (students will engage with Henry Louis Gates’s scholarly exploration of Douglass representation of himself as both enslaved and an American **citizen**); 2.1 (students will be able to describe how Douglass’s understanding of **justice** emerged from his lived experience of **injustice**); 3.1 (students will be able to analyze Douglass’s emphasis on free labor as essential to a sense of **justice** among citizens); 4.2 (students will use Gates’s analysis of Douglass on representing the enslaved to reflect on how conceptions of **justice**, difference, citizenship interact with cultural traditions, structures of power, and/or advocacy for social change)

Week 7: Read Whitman, “Crossing Brooklyn Ferry”; secondary reading: Allen Grossman “The Poetics of Union in Lincoln and Whitman.” **B** (Focus theme: Analogies of Literary and Political Order in Whitman’s poetics)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response Papers

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: Grossman characterizes Whitman as a “poet **citizen**” and Lincoln as a “**citizen** president”? According to Grossman, what characteristics of **citizenship** are shared by poets and presidents, why were both necessary to the reconstruction of “the Union as a **just** and stable polity,” and do you think that “poet **citizens**” might have a constructive role to play in the world of the twenty-first century (ELOs 1.1, 1.2, 3.1)?

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.1 (students will be able to explain and analyze the logic of Whitman’s analogies between literary and political order); 1.2 (students will explore a scholarly analysis of the political implications of Whitman’s poetry); 4.1 (students will examine and evaluate how the concern with political union shapes the scope of **diversity** and inclusion in the rhetorical context and literary imagination of the Civil War era)

Week 8: Read Dickinson, selected poems. (Focus Theme: Freedom and Constraint in Dickinson's poetics)

Day 1. Lecture

Day 2: Discussion

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.1 (students will unearth from Dickinson's sometimes elusive poetics the logic her understanding of the lure of freedom and the obstacles to it); 2.2 (students will discuss their reactions to Dickinson's poetic mode of expression in contrast to the more conventional or didactic authors covered previously, reflecting on the relative strengths and challenges different modes of communication among free and equal citizens); 4.1 (students will analyze experiments with literary form as a mechanism for expressing and exploring a *diversity* of lived experiences)

Week 9: Read Melville, *Billy Budd*; secondary reading: Larry Reynolds, "Billy Budd and American Labor Unrest." A (Focus Themes: Equality, Envy and Justice in Melville)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response Papers

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: According to Reynolds, *Billy Budd* reflects both Melville's commitment to affirming the "inherent dignity and equality" of the working classes and his conviction that "*justice* itself can cause the faithful and the innocent to suffer." In your analysis, is Melville too pessimistic about the ability of advocates for social change to advance *justice* against entrenched structures of social and economic power (ELO 4.2)?

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 (explore themes of social unrest as it relates to shared terms of *citizenship* and competing conceptions of *justice* in Melville's literary depiction and Reynolds's scholarly analysis of authorial tensions in Melville's account) 4.2 (critically evaluate Melville's critique of criminal *justice* as a prism through which to evaluate the intersection between different conceptions of *justice* and *citizenship* and structures of social power; compare Melville and Reynolds on competing strategies of advocacy for social change).

Week 10: Read Wharton, *The Age of Innocence* (Book 1); secondary reading: excerpt from Nancy Armstrong's *Desire and Domestic Fiction*. B (Focus themes: Gender and Power in Wharton)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion of Response papers

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: According to Nancy Armstrong, nineteenth century novels reflect “changes that allowed **diverse** groups of people to make sense of social experience,” especially concerning women’s changing social-political status. Evaluate Armstrong’s claim by explaining how the characterizations of women in Wharton’s novel compares with the characterizations of women in the earlier novels we’ve read (ELO 4.1).

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 and 2.1 (students will identify, describe, and synthesize how emerging concerns surrounding social issues such as immigration, urbanization, and poverty are reflected in Wharton’s depiction of the **just** or **unjust** dynamics of civic belonging and social standing within a stratified yet fluid class structure); 3.1 (students will analyze how the perspectives on citizenship change or remain static between Wharton’s account of Old New York and the New York City of the 1870s).

Week 11: Read Wharton, *The Age of Innocence* (Book 2). (Focus themes: Class and Nationality in Wharton)

Day 1: Discussion

Day 2: Writing workshop—final paper topics

Expected Learning Outcomes: 3.2 (what does Wharton suggest about the difference between social class structures in Europe and the United States, and how are conceptions of **citizenship** and **justice** translated or transformed across nationalities); 4.1 (students will examine and evaluate interconnections between different forms of social difference and **diversity** as explored in the novel through individual experiences of class and gender, and the protagonist’s ambiguous conception of equality)

Week 12: Read Brown, *Manchild in the Promised Land* (Chapters 1-3) A (Focus themes: Freedom and the State in Brown’s Harlem)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.1 (students will use Brown’s novel to engage in critical reflection regarding the relationship between the individual and the state as a fulcrum point for competing

conceptions of ***citizenship***); 2.1 (students will identify and synthesize Brown with Thoreau on the relationship between the individual and the state as a fulcrum point for competing conceptions of ***justice***); 4.1. (students will use Brown's account to reflect to examine and critique the relationship between race and class as different forms of social difference and ***diversity*** shaping or impinging on ***citizenship***, equity, and inclusion)

Week 13: Read Brown, *Manchild in the Promised Land* (Chapters 7-10); secondary reading, excerpt from Orlando Patterson, *The Cultural Matrix* (final paper topics due, day 1.) (Focus theme: Freedom and Slavery in Brown's treatment of Addiction)

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Discussion

Advanced Scholarly Analysis: Patterson suggests that a hallmark of "second-class ***citizenship*** is... an acceptance of ***unjust*** conditions as inevitable." Evaluate this claim by suggesting how consistently it is borne out (or contradicted) by the literary depictions of subordinated citizens in the material we have covered in the course, and by your own experience or observations (ELOs 1.1, 4.2)?

Expected Learning Outcomes: 1.2 (students will explore Patterson's scholarly account of ***injustice*** oppression and the obstacles to freedom with Brown's); 2.2 (students will reflect on the utility or shortcomings of scholarship and novels as tools to analyze the demands of ***citizenship*** for a ***just*** and ***diverse*** world, considering the semester synoptically to produce a synthetic assessment of why different modes of communication have been favored or disfavored at different periods of American history)

Week 14: Read Brooks, selected poems (Focus theme: poetic form and civil order in Brooks).

Day 1: Lecture

Day 2: Concluding Lecture departing from Brooks

Expected Learning Outcomes: 2.1 (students will be able to identify, describe, and synthesize suggestions from Brooks and Whitman regarding the relationship between political efficacy and literary form) 3.1 (students will be able to describe and analyze Brooks's use language in comparison with Brown's as a mode of representing ***citizenship*** in the Black inner city)

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.

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

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

Disability Statement (with Accommodations for Illness)

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

students should make arrangements with their instructors as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that accommodations may be implemented in a timely fashion.

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

Grievances and Solving Problems

According to University Policies, if you have a problem with this class, you should seek to resolve the grievance concerning a grade or academic practice by speaking first with the instructor or professor. Then, if necessary, take your case to the department chairperson, college dean or associate dean, and to the provost, in that order. Specific procedures are outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-8-23.

Grievances against graduate, research, and teaching assistants should be submitted first to the supervising instructor, then to the chairperson of the assistant's department.

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

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

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

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

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



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

Religious Accommodations

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

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

A student's request for time off shall be provided if the student's sincerely held religious belief or practice severely affects the student's ability to take an exam or meet an academic

requirement **and** the student has notified their instructor, in writing during the first 14 days after the course begins, of the date of each absence. Although students are required to provide notice within the first 14 days after a course begins, instructors are strongly encouraged to work with the student to provide a reasonable accommodation if a request is made outside the notice period. A student may not be penalized for an absence approved under this policy.

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

Policy: Religious Holidays, Holy Days and Observances

Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

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

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

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

Intellectual Diversity

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

GE 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)

Please see responses in the Appendix below.

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
ELO 1.1 Engage in critical and logical thinking.	
ELO 1.2 Engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or ideas within this theme.	
ELO 2.1 Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.	
ELO 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.	

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

ELO 1.1 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>ELO 2.1 <i>Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.</i></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>ELO 2.2 <i>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.</i></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: The Paris Commune, an 1871 socialist uprising violently squelched by conservative forces</i></p>

	<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></p> <p><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></p> <p><i>The Marais, a vibrant Paris neighborhood inhabited over the centuries by aristocrats, then Jews, then the LGBTQ+ community, among other groups.</i></p>
--	--

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
ELO 3.1 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.	
ELO 3.2 Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.	
ELO 4.1 Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.	
ELO 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.	

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

ELO 3.1 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>ELO 3.2 <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>ELO 4.1 <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>ELO 4.2 <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>

Freedom and Equality in American Literature Worksheet Responses

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

This course understands *citizenship* as a set of political and social ideals as well as a legal status. It also understands freedom and equality as two of the most important ideals underpinning *citizenship*, because Americans have understood both to be necessary to the achievement of *justice* in a *diverse* world. The course challenges students to understand creative writing as occupying a privileged status in the practice and evolution of American *citizenship*, because creative writers possess unique tools for challenging their fellow Americans to reconsider the relationship between *citizenship*, *justice*, and *diversity*: for instance, by devising new modes of expression that both capture and catalyze emergent forms of social difference and political inclusion (Weeks 2, 6, 10), and dramatizing both the urgent demands of justice and the intransigent obstacles to overcoming injustice (Weeks 4, 9, 13). Taken as a whole, the course will enable students to explore and evaluate the possibility that the nation needs “poet *citizens*” to realize its foundational ideals (Week 7). The course will also enable students to develop a stronger sense of their own learning through regular exercises of self-assessment where they test their initial sense of an author’s meaning or guiding intention against contrary evidence acquired through close reading (facilitated by group reading, analysis, and debate of select passages in-class), and engagement with advanced secondary literature representing influential and cutting-edge interpretation of American literature (ELO 2.2.).

ELO 1.1

Through lectures, reading assignments, class discussion, and 4 response papers focused on the weekly close reading of key texts, students will engage in critical and logical thinking as they evaluate the visions of citizenship, freedom, and equality expressed by important authors. Specifically, students will engage in logical and critical thinking about citizenship for a just a diverse world through the following activities:

- Close reading: Course readings have been chosen carefully to reflect the diversity of American citizens and conceptions of American citizenship. Authors include poets such as Walt Whitman (Week 7), Emily Dickinson (Week 8), and Gwendolyn Brooks (Week 14), who have wrestled with the competing ideals of inclusion and coherence at the level of literary form. It also includes prose writers such as Henry David Thoreau (Weeks 3 and 4) to Claude Brown (Weeks 12 and 13), who have examined the relation of the individual to the state and the legacy of slavery.

- 4 response papers: in these 1-2 page papers, students will analyze the week’s reading in terms of the week’s focus theme. For example, in Week 5, students will be asked to critically explore Alexis de Tocqueville’s perception of and depiction of equality in *Democracy in America*. These papers are designed to focus student thinking on the texts we read, to record references to particular passages of interest, and to articulate questions that will serve as a basis for class discussion.

- The completion of two longer papers: Both papers emphasize close reading, careful

argumentation, and strong thesis statements in literary analysis. The first (4-5 page) paper will address the relation between part and whole in *Walden*. For the second (8-10 page) paper, students will analyze the tension between freedom and equality in a work of their choosing, developing either a comparative study of two or more texts read in class, or working on a single text and a limited number of secondary sources.

ELO 1.2:

Throughout the semester, students will engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of American literature as a wellspring of civic thought. With a focus on key ideals of freedom and equality, readings, lectures, and discussion will challenge students to grapple with American literature's contribution to civic thought. Specifically, students will reach this learning outcomes through:

Lectures: Each week typically begins with a lecture in which the instructor will introduce students to conceptual tools (e.g., poetic devices such as symbolism, allusion and personification) and the week's focus theme (e.g., the Calvinist vision of freedom of equality in Week 1 and analogies of literary and political order in Walt Whitman's poetics in Week 7). Students will approach the assigned reading with this conceptual and historical knowledge in mind, investigating how authors utilize literary devices to communicate messages about civic freedom, equality, and diversity.

Class Discussion: In class discussion, students will analyze the similarities and differences between the organization of literary works and the organization of political communities. For example, in Weeks 10 and 11, students will be asked to consider what Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence* can tell us about themes of gender, class, and nationality in upper-class, 1870s New York City. What social anxieties does Wharton capture surrounding immigration, urbanization, and poverty? How do the urban elite respond to these anxieties—both in Wharton's fictionalized Old New York and in 1870s New York City.

Primary Source Readings: Beginning with a consideration of the religious interpretation of freedom and equality in Jonathan Edwards, we will proceed through close reading of key works of fiction (Herman Melville's *Billy Budd*), nonfiction (Frederick Douglass, *The Autobiography*), and poetry (Emily Dickinson's "I'm Nobody! Who are you?") to examine how writers have sought to define freedom and equality and to understand the tensions between them.

Secondary Source Readings: Students will be challenged to engage with a variety of scholarly sources on freedom and equality in American literature (e.g. Stanley Cavell's *On Walden* in Week 4, Theo Davis's *Formalism and the Making of American Literature* in Week 2, and Orlando Patterson's *The Cultural Matrix* in Week 13). Students will be asked to directly engage with these sources in their response papers, using the secondary literature to unpack authors' unique perspectives on freedom and equality in America.

2 Longer Essays: These essays will challenge students to articulate their interpretations of important works with the support of evidence. For example, in the second (8-10 page) paper, students will analyze the tension between freedom and equality in a work of their choosing,

developing either a comparative study of two or more texts read in class, or working on a single text and a limited number of secondary sources.

ELO 2.1:

This course will challenge students to identify, describe, and synthesize approaches to American literature. Course readings have been chosen carefully to reflect the diversity of American citizens and conceptions of American citizenship. Authors include poets such as Walt Whitman (Week 7), Emily Dickinson (Week 8), and Gwendolyn Brooks (Week 14), who have wrestled with the competing ideals of inclusion and coherence at the level of literary form. It also includes prose writers such as Henry David Thoreau (Weeks 3 and 4) to Claude Brown (Weeks 12 and 13), who have examined the relation of the individual to the state and the legacy of slavery.

In-class discussions will challenge students to describe the ways that these authors' works reflect their diverse experiences as American citizens or foreigners. For example, students will consider how Alexis de Tocqueville's status as a Frenchman influenced his portrayal of American democracy. Students will also consider how Henry David Thoreau's class, gender, and historical context shaped his anxieties about institutional dependency and social conformity. In Week 6, students will also consider how Frederick Douglass's experience as a slave influenced his conception of American citizenship—and the gaps between American ideals of freedom and equality and the dehumanizing institution of slavery in the antebellum South.

Writing assignments will provide students with the chance to synthesize authors' approaches to civic themes of equality and freedom. The longer papers for the course, for example, are structured as a sequence through which the students learn to combine argumentation with textual evidence to examine key features of American literature's special perspective on civic questions. In addition to lectures, the disciplinary practice of close reading furnishes our basic method. This tool—introduced in lecture and then practiced in discussion and papers—provides a flexible framework in which the visions of civic life generated by diverse authors in different genres and eras can be compared, critiqued, and synthesized.

ELO 2.2:

Essay revision and writing workshops will challenge students to take ownership of their learning and develop as writers and civic leaders. For example, students will work with the instructor to revise their first longer paper, with the recorded grade being the higher of the revision or original.

Students' final papers will also build on the work of their first paper, as well as their work in revising that paper through a workshop and instructor feedback and individual meetings. They will select either to compare different works on a given topic, or analyze a single work with a limited number of secondary sources. Here is one example of a possible student paper topic: Analyzing Edith Wharton's representation of covert female agency in "The Age of Innocence" against the male protagonist's ambiguous conception of equality. This creative assignment will give students the chance to reflect on and demonstrate their growth as a learner. Through

discussion throughout the semester, they will also be challenged to consider how their prior experiences shape their analysis of our texts.

In addition, students will complete “Three Exercises of Close Reading and Self-Reflection,” explained this way: A central goal of close reading is to counteract confirmation bias: attending carefully to an author’s exact words reveals that they may not be quite saying what we initially assume they are saying. We may be misled about an author’s meaning by preconceptions we hold about their social class or personal character, conventional wisdom about the meaning of their work, or statements they have made elsewhere, among other factors. Reading carefully compels us to update our priors, challenging ourselves to reconsider our assumptions, integrate new information, and adapt to context. This course uses close reading to compel self-reflection and self-correction by requiring students to complete submit three assignments in two stages: before the start of class, students submit a 600-1200 word interpretation of the assigned reading for that day’s class; after that reading material is covered in class, students submit a short explanation of what was wrong with their initial interpretation, identifying specific features of the text they failed to fully account for on first reading, and reflecting on the reasons they overlooked or misread something of significance in the text. This explanation should not draw primarily on information about the reading presented in lectures or secondary sources: it must be a reflection on the students’ independent reading of the text, assessing and developing themselves as learners. Students can complete these exercises at any point of their choosing during the semester. Submissions will be graded on the basis of level of detail and thoughtfulness in initial summary and subsequent reflection.

Near the end of the semester students will submit a proposal for their final paper topic along with a reflection on challenges they are likely to encounter in executing the proposal (500-1000 words), based on their experience of interpreting and analyzing course material throughout the semester. The reflection will be graded on the basis of the level of detail and the specificity of examples a student is able to draw on from their experiences over the semester to anticipate challenges they are likely to encounter in completing their proposed final assignment (*given their distinctive qualities as learner, rather than given the particular format of and content for the final assignment*).

ELO 3.1:

Through response papers, close reading, discussions, and writing workshops, students will describe, explore, and analyze diverse representations of citizenship in American literature, ranging from Jonathan Edwards' religious conception (as a Calvinist, Edwards saw civic duty, social order, and moral conduct as divine mandates), to Henry David Thoreau's individualist model (unlike Edwards, Thoreau called for moral and political resistance to unjust governments, religious institutions, and social norms, encouraging citizens to be radically self-reliant and freethinking), to Frederick Douglass's vision of free labor as central to democratic belonging, to Edith Wharton's depiction of civic ideals filtered through subtle striations of class and gender. In each text students explore, the rights, responsibilities, values, and vulnerabilities of the individual in relation to a variously-conceived political and social orders are at the heart of the literary work. In class discussion, students will also consider how authors’ works reflect differences across three centuries, numerous regions, and authors that are diverse with respect to race,

gender, and class.

Students will apply their knowledge of these diverse representations of citizenship through four shorter response papers and two longer papers. For example, in the second (8-10 page) paper, students will analyze the tension between freedom and equality in a work of their choosing, developing either a comparative study of two or more texts read in class, or working on a single text and a limited number of secondary sources.

ELO 3.2:

This course supports the cultivation of "intercultural competence as a global citizen" through the examination of the different values (e.g. self-reliance, human dignity, emancipation) and cultural assumptions (e.g. Calvinist predestination and individualism) embedded in literary works that vary widely in terms of the era, identity, and politics of the author. Through active participation in discussion, students will also practice communicating with classmates who think differently—and are different—from them. Students will identify, reflect on, and apply intercultural skills as they respond to these sorts of questions in lecture and discussion: How do American writers from Edwards to Douglass to Whitman to Wharton understand the difference between American and European civic, literary, and social orders? How does the language used by Claude Brown and Gwendolyn Brooks differ with respect to their shared project of representing the nature of citizenship in the Black inner city?

ELO 4.1:

In its focus on the different interpretations of the ideal of equality and freedom in American literature, the course enables students to examine, critique, and evaluate the implications of the legacy of slavery (Frederick Douglass, Henry David Thoreau), the lived experience of persons oppressed due to race, class, or gender (Claude Brown, Gwendolyn Brooks, Edith Wharton), and the vision of inclusive literary forms and civic orders (Walt Whitman, Herman Melville, Alexis de Tocqueville). Various assignments will challenge students to critically reflect on the lived experience of authors. For example, in one of their four 1-2 page response papers, students will have to explore how Frederick Douglass's experience of slavery shaped his civic thought. In addition, students will critique how racial difference is emphasized or obscured through different mediums of self-expression which seek to recognize diversity in the pursuit of more equal and inclusive norms of citizenship (as pioneered through the work of Frederick Douglass); describe how changes in literary form "allowed diverse groups of people to make sense of social experience" resulting from changes to social structures and gender roles (as explored by the novels of Edith Wharton).

ELO 4.2:

The course involves careful exploration of works that have played a significant role in how Americans have thought about the intersection of justice, difference, and citizenship. Students will analyze the relationship between these concepts and historical structures of power through reading assignments that reflect diverse representations of citizenship in American literature,

ranging from Jonathan Edwards' religious conception (as a Calvinist, Edwards saw civic duty, social order, and moral conduct as divine mandates), to Henry David Thoreau's individualist model (unlike Edwards, Thoreau called for moral and political resistance to unjust governments, religious institutions, and social norms, encouraging citizens to be radically self-reliant and free thinking), to Frederick Douglass's vision of free labor as central to democratic belonging, to Edith Wharton's depiction of civic ideals filtered through subtle striations of class and gender. In class discussions, short response papers, and longer papers, students will have the chance to critically investigate Edwards' influence on abolitionism, Thoreau's vision of civil disobedience, Douglass's indictment of slavery, and Melville's critique of criminal justice. In addition, students will explain how Stanley Cavell can conclude from Henry David Thoreau's response to structural injustice that "Education for citizenship is education for isolation"; analyze whether Orlando Patterson is correct to conclude that a hallmark of "second-class citizenship is... an acceptance of unjust conditions as inevitable." More generally, the syllabus highlights that students will not merely be equipped to describe freedom and equality as ideals of American citizenship.

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 at 2:19:43 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Snyder, Anastasia
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Hello. I've heard back from everyone in EHE and there are no concurrence concerns about the course syllabi you forwarded. Best of luck with your new academic programs.

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 8:20 AM
To: Snyder, Anastasia <snyder.893@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Tasha,

I wanted to reach out regarding the concurrence requests below, because while the exigencies of building a new program compel Brian Schoen I to press ahead in the concurrence process, we also had constructive discussions with several units last week, and hope to do the same with Education this week if it would be helpful. I don't want to burden your calendar, but let us know if we can answer any questions over the next few days.

All best,

Jeremy

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

Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 at 10:30 AM

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

Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

Thank you for your email. I will share these syllabi with the relevant programs to get their feedback and concurrence. I will follow up when I hear back from them. Being summer time, many faculty are slow to respond to email since they are off-duty. I will request a review as soon as possible though.

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

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

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:54 PM

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

Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Tasha,

This summer, I've been working with the Chase Center's incoming faculty and Associate Director Brian Schoen (copied on this e-mail) to develop a suite of courses for a Civics, Law, and Leadership degree Chase will be offering (CIVICLL). The result is the twelve syllabi attached to this e-mail. The courses cover a lot of territory in terms of subject matter and disciplinary approaches, but the course titles should give you a good sense of which syllabi may be most

relevant to the College of Education and Human Ecology for concurrence purposes.

Let me know if we can answer any questions as the concurrence process moves forward. I know there's a lot to dig into here, but we're eager to move forward with some exciting courses as we build a new program.

All best,

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, July 15, 2025 at 11:07:58 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Ralph, Anne
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian
Attachments: image001.png, image003.png

Jeremy and Brian,

We have had the chance to review the syllabi you sent. Law is pleased to grant concurrence.

As you may know, Law is hoping to have an undergraduate course that fulfills the new American Civic Literacy requirement. I hope we can count on your partnership and support in that endeavor going forward.

Thanks,
Anne



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

From: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, July 14, 2025 at 3:08 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi, Jeremy and Brian,
Thanks for your email. We are partway through reviewing these, and I will get our concurrence note to you as soon as I can.
AER

Anne E. Ralph

Morgan E. Shipman Professor in Law

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Strategic Initiatives

Michael E. Moritz College of Law

55 West 12th Avenue | Columbus, OH 43210

614-247-4797 Office | ralph.52@osu.edu

Pronouns: she/her/hers

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, July 14, 2025 at 8:18 AM
To: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Anne,

I wanted to reach out regarding the concurrence requests below, because while the exigencies of building a new program compel Brian Schoen I to press ahead in the concurrence process, we also had constructive discussions with several units last week, and hope to do the same with Moritz this week if it would be helpful. I don't want to burden your calendar, but let us know if we can answer any questions over the next few days.

All best,

Jeremy

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 at 11:59 AM
To: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Anne,

This summer, I've been working with the Chase Center's incoming faculty and Associate Director Brian Schoen (copied on this e-mail) to develop a suite of courses for a Civics, Law, and Leadership degree Chase will be offering (CIVICLL). The result is the twelve syllabi attached to this e-mail (more to follow down the road).

The courses cover a lot of territory in terms of subject matter and disciplinary approaches, but the course titles should give you a good sense of which syllabi may be most relevant to the Moritz College of Law for concurrence purposes.

Let me know if we can answer any questions as the concurrence process moves forward. I know there's a lot to dig into here, but we're eager to move forward with some exciting courses as we build a new program.

All best,

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: Friday, July 18, 2025 at 12:16:50 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Greenbaum, Rob
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian, Clark, Jill
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Hi Jeremy,

The Glenn College is pleased to provide concurrence for the following eight classes:

American Religions
American Witch-Hunts
Freedom and Equality in American Literature
God and Science
Historical Political Economy
Love and Friendship
Shakespear's Lessons in Leadership
Pursuit of Happiness

While we do not necessarily have concerns about the remaining four,
Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy
How Politics Breaks your Brain
Presidential Crises in War and Peace
Evolution of Citizenship

we would prefer to have the relevant faculty in the college review the syllabi when they are back from summer break. Those are all proposed new GE classes, but I don't think our waiting until August does anything now to slow their getting into the queue for GE review.

I've also copied my colleague Jill Clark, who chairs our undergraduate studies committee.

Sincerely,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

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

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

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

Pronouns: he/him/his

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:03 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Rob,

This summer, I've been working with the Chase Center's incoming faculty and Associate Director Brian Schoen (copied on this e-mail) to develop a suite of courses for a Civics, Law, and Leadership degree Chase will be offering (CIVICLL). The result is the twelve syllabi attached to this e-mail (more to follow down the road).

The courses cover a lot of territory in terms of subject matter and disciplinary approaches, but the course titles should give you a good sense of which syllabi may be most relevant to the Glenn College for concurrence purposes.

Let me know if we can answer any questions as the concurrence process moves forward. I know there's a lot to dig into here, but we're eager to move forward with some exciting courses as we build a new program.

All best,

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: Friday, August 15, 2025 at 2:52:08 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Schoen, Brian
To: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette, Martin, Andrew, Fortier, Jeremy
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png, image003.png, image001.png

Thank you Bernadette.



Brian Schoen
Associate Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society
The Ohio State University
614-247-0672 | (c) 740-517-6967
Faculty and Associate Director for Academic Affairs
Settling Ohio: First Peoples and Beyond, National Book Festival, Allen G. Noble Book Award
Continent in Crisis: The Civil War in North America

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 at 2:31 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>, Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hello all,

I do not have any information that contradicts what we have below. So to the best of my knowledge, it's all accurate to me.

Thanks,
Bernadette

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>; Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Sure, I think we are on the same page, but do take a look.

Andrew W. Martin

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

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>; Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and all,

Would you like me to look over all this to make sure it syncs with what I have? Or if you feel comfortable that you already have the necessary information, please let me know. I am happy to do whatever. But if you want me to double-check, please give me a bit of time this morning since it is, as everyone has noted, a bit messy and complex.

Many thanks,
Bernadette

Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

Assistant Dean, Curriculum
College of Arts and Sciences
114F University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
<http://asccas.osu.edu>

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:34 AM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Brian should follow up with you shortly (I know that he's always happy to engage departments but hasn't heard anything direct from PSYCH over the past month, including in the two weeks since we received the specific claim regarding overlap with PSYCH 2303 – which looks like a great course!).

Thanks for bearing with us. The system we've established for the second round of courses should be easier to manage...

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 at 8:17 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
<vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Ok, this is helpful. Brian, would you mind pinging psychology one more time, say early next week, and cc me? I can then ask them to respond more substantively.

Best
Andrew



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

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:15 AM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
<vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew –

Thanks for this. Responses regarding three outstanding issues below (I should emphasize I don't mean to litigate the substance of these issues here, just clarifying the state of play for everyone's sake).

Let me know if I can add anything further.

All best,

Jeremy

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 at 7:21 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
<vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy

Below are my responses in red, Berandette may have additional feedback. Broadly (with a couple of minor exceptions) I think we are in agreement where things are at.

We'll continue to update you on the most recent round of courses. I agree that this new process is working well.

Best

Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Professor of Sociology

114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall

Columbus, OH 43210

614-247-6641 Office

martin.1026@osu.edu

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

Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 2:47 PM

To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>

Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Here are my notes on where each course we submitted on 6/2 currently stands within ASC. Correct or clarify as appropriate:

- “American Religion(s).” Initial non-concurrence from SOCIOL and HISTORY. We have worked with SOCIOL to address their concerns (Cynthia Colen approved a revised syllabus this week, not sure if she’s been in touch with you). HISTORY continues to deny concurrence (Brian Schoen and Scott Levi have been in extensive and even productive discussions about these matters, but some deadlock appears inevitable).

ASC understood this course was delayed. Could you send Sociology’s concurrence?

Cynthia Colen emailed Brian Schoen and I on 8/12 to note that changes to the course satisfied SOCIOL’s concerns. You may want to follow up with her to confirm that this results in formally withdrawing non-concurrence.

- “American Witch-Hunts.” Non-concurrence from COMPSTD. This seems like a deadlock (Brian Schoen reached out to Hugh Urban, but hasn’t heard back in a while).

This is ASC’s understanding too. Feel free to cc me if you reach out to Hugh again.

- “Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy.” Initial concerns from CEHV have been addressed to everyone’s satisfaction.

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

- “Freedom and Equality in American Literature.” ENGLISH’s initial non-concurrence on our courses dealing with American literature has moved to “neither concurrence nor non-concurrence” (which we gather will remain their policy for our courses dealing with American literature, at least in the near future).

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

- “God and Science.” COMPSTD and PHILOS both provided non-concurrence. We have withdrawn the course.

This was ASC’s understanding too

- “Shakespeare’s Lessons in Leadership.” ENGLISH provided non-concurrence. We are reworking the proposal, which if it proceeds will not include Shakespeare in the title, and the course content will also be reconceived. So right now, this one is on the shelf but will come back in terms that ENGLISH should find more acceptable.

Also understood that Theatre had concerns regarding overlap with THEATRE 5771.10

Right, I should have noted this, but since we’re reworking the course, it’s not a pressing matter.

- “Presidential Crises in War and Peace.” We have reworked this syllabus substantially, and gather that the revision have satisfied POLITSC. They have also made progress with HISTORY, but full concurrence seems to require revising the syllabus further to a degree that we think constitutes “micro-management” of our curriculum (changing specific readings and case studies). We can’t agree to this (particularly since the course instructor has already gone a long way towards making the course material more inter-disciplinary, in the service of his initial learning objectives). So here as elsewhere, we’re deadlocked with HISTORY.

Thanks for the update on this, ASC knew about concerns from History and PS, thanks for letting us know about the latter

- “Love and Friendship.” This course appears broadly acceptable.

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

- “How Politics Breaks Your Brain.” This course appears broadly acceptable.

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

- “Historical Political Economy.” GEOG’s initial non-concurrence has shifted to “neither concurrence nor non-concurrence” (as communicated to Brian Schoen via email).

Understood that Political Science saw this as overlapping some with their POLITSC 3280 course, The Politics of Markets. If PS has concurred, please let us know

- “The Evolution of Citizenship.” HISTORY does not concur.

This was ASC’s understanding too

- “The Pursuits of Happiness.” We addressed initial concerns from CLASSICS, PSYCH has dropped its initial non-concurrence, and HISTORY does not concur.
Can you send us Psychology’s concurrence (last we saw was non-concurrence from them)

I may have over-stated here. We submitted the course on 7/2; on 7/17 PSYCH requested extension until 9/15 to review Pursuits of Happiness; on 7/31 PSYCH denied concurrence based on claim of overlap with PSYCH 2303, with syllabus for that course attached; later that same day Brian Schoen sent detailed response regarding overlap between those courses to Sarah Schoppe-Sullivan and Lisa Cravens-Brown, but did not receive a response then; Brian followed up on 8/12 with no response. So it seems that PSYCH is denying concurrence based on a particular point of claimed overlap, but is not responsive regarding the details of that claim.

In short: there are points of deadlock with HISTORY and COMPSTD. Other initial concerns have been allayed (albeit to varying degrees). Am I missing anything key?

Thanks again for your time with this (I think the system we’ve established for courses moving forward will be more efficient...)

All best,

Jeremy

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 12:47 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Good idea! Can you send me what you have? I’ve been keeping a record of where I think we are at. We could then compare notes,

The Ohio State University
Andrew W. Martin
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor of Sociology
614-247-6641 Office
martin.1026@osu.edu

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:14:01 PM

To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

Would it be possible to send us an updated statement of where concurrence stands in Arts & Sciences for our initial set of course submissions?

I know the original submission procedure was a bit unwieldy (and I'm pleased we've settled on a more efficient procedure for courses moving forward), but there have been updates regarding the first set of courses, so it would be helpful to summarize where things stand with the various units (e.g., I know that we've worked with SOCIOL to navigate their initial concerns re: "American Religion(s)", but HISTORY's non-concurrence is probably still standing, etc).

If it's helpful, I could send you a summary of my understanding of where things stand on each course, and you could confirm or clarify.

I apologize for the burden! Thanks for your time with this. - Jeremy

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 at 6:58 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy and Brian

Do you mind if I share this with the units that have denied concurrence, such as History and comparative studies (You may already have done so, but I wanted to make sure they were aware of your perspective on the courses). Again, if units continue to consider the course to be overlapping to a substantial degree to their existing offering, then that will be a matter for OAA to adjudicate.

Thanks
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

Sent: Saturday, August 2, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Thanks, Andrew. I've responded to your questions in bold font below – just let me know if I can clarify further.

Let me add that although we've reached certain points of deadlock, this has been a learning process, and we will continue to work to engage everyone constructively moving forward.

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 at 4:01 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy

Thanks for sharing this detailed response, this is very helpful. Couple of quick questions/updates for you:

1. It sounds like Chase has had some conversations with units like History and Comp Studies, but that you disagree about the concerns they've raised with potential overlap. That is of course your right. My question is, do you foresee any additional conversation with those units? Typically when there is disagreement and a solution cannot be found Randy Smith will get involved to adjudicate the matter.

Our engagement with these units will be ongoing (and, in fact, we've already been in touch with them about courses in the pipeline). However, we don't expect to reach agreement about our first slate of courses. Among the courses at issue, we have made some modifications to several syllabi and even removed one from consideration. If these changes are not satisfactory, we're at a deadlock.

2. As you know, a number of units have asked for more time to review courses. Fortunately, many of the larger units with more courses have already provided feedback. That being said, we do have a few remaining departments (many that are smaller with faculty performing multiple service roles) that have asked for more time. I will reach out to them and ask if, from the existing set of courses, are there any that raise immediate concerns about potential overlap and to share that feedback.

Our position is unchanged. We can't delay until the Fall. We recognize that we're making some big asks, but It's not feasible to build a new academic program by taking summers off. We also didn't anticipate that circulating courses over the summer would pose an insuperable obstacle since the College of Arts & Science's Concurrence Request [Form](#), and ASC's Curriculum and Assessment Operations [Manual](#), refer only to a two-week timeline (not qualified by time of year). OAA's Academic Organization, Curriculum, and Assessment [Handbook](#) also indicates no restrictions about sending courses for concurrence

over the summer. Brian Schoen's diligent research of previous program proposals indicated that constructive work can happen over the summer and that concurrence has been assumed when the two week limit has passed. I also received repeated requests for extra time during the concurrence process in the spring semester. So at some point we're just obligated to press ahead, and we're at that point.

I would add: we have been generous already and in effect gone well over two weeks beyond the original deadline and in another instance, we're going yet further where a unit has presented clear, constructive claims to us. Cases where we are pressing ahead involve syllabi where we believe the prima facie case against overlap is overwhelming, so that the burden of explanation reasonably falls on the units requesting more time. We are not trying to foreclose conversation, but we are balancing competing imperatives.

3. The Civic Friendship and How Politics Breaks Your Brain courses have indeed drawn little comment. We are asking Political Science and Philosophy to alert us quickly to any possible reservations. I'm hoping that will happen quite soon

We have been in touch with both departments, and have not received objections, and so we think concurrence should be assumed (as we take to be standard practice when details are not provided within the official two-week timeline).

4. On the political science front, they were a unit that did ask for more time, but have been providing some initial feedback (it looks like Marcus highlighted potential areas of overlap). Have you had a chance to engage with Marcus about these courses? A more definitive response from Political Science would be helpful, and I've nudged Marcus (as in the case of the two courses above).

We met with Marcus and our assessments of the courses did not seem far apart, but we have not had a more official statement from Political Science beyond that. The memo I provided on Friday gives a detailed account of how our courses are distinct from offerings in POLITSC, if that helps to produce a definitive statement from the department.

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

Sent: Friday, August 1, 2025 3:43 PM

To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>

Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

The Chase Center has spent the past several weeks consulting with individual departments in the College of Arts and Sciences about our first slate of course proposals. Those consultations have led to constructive adjustments in several courses, withdrawal of select proposals, and deadlock on several others which we are obligated to press ahead with.

Here is the state of play for each course submitted, followed by some remarks about the general principles that have guided our work in this process. Moreover, attached to this email you will find Word and PDF versions of a file which includes the information provided below, plus detailed, individualized responses regarding each ASC unit that provided a statement of non-concurrence.

- **“American Religion(s)”**. We are holding off on this course for another week, in order to revise in response to constructive discussions with SOCIOL. COMPSTD’s initial non-concurrence has been tempered if not rescinded after email exchanges, as detailed in the attached file; HISTORY’s objections are not germane, for reasons explained at length in the attached file.
- **“American Witch-Hunts.”** COMPSTD objects, on grounds we cannot agree to, for reasons detailed in the attached file.
- **“Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy.”** Initial concerns from CEHV have been resolved following consultations with that unit.
- **“Freedom and Equality in American Literature.”** Following extensive engagement between our units, the ENGLISH department has settled on providing neither concurrence nor non-concurrence for this course. We will proceed with the course, and will continue to engage with ENGLISH’s concerns moving forward.
- **“God and Science.”** COMPSTD objects, and we have decided to withdraw this course from the submission process, in order to study Ohio State’s full slate of course offerings more extensively. We may revisit this course in the future.
- **“Shakespeare’s Lessons in Leadership.”** ENGLISH and THEATRE both object. We do not fully assent to the rationales provided by these units, but we found our engagement with ENGLISH constructive and have opted to withdraw this course from our current round of submissions, and will subsequently submit a related but substantially revised course with a new title, that will survey culturally significant depictions of leadership. We gather that this procedure should at least partly allay ENGLISH’s concerns.
- **“Presidential Crises in War and Peace.”** HISTORY objects and POLITSC has tentative reservations. We have made some modifications to the syllabus in response, but do not find either unit’s claims compelling enough to prevent proceeding with the course proposal, for reasons detailed in the attached file.

- **“Love and Friendship.”** This course appears to be broadly acceptable, so we will proceed with it as is.
- **“How Politics Breaks Your Brain.”** This course appears to be broadly acceptable, so we will proceed with it as is.
- **“Historical Political Economy.”** GEOG initially objected, and then revised its position to neither concurrence nor non-concurrence. POLITSC expressed more tentative reservations. We respond to both units in detail in the attached file and will be proceeding with the course.
- **“The Evolution of Citizenship.”** HISTORY has declined to provide concurrence. We have made some modifications to the syllabus in response, but do not find HISTORY’s claims compelling enough to prevent proceeding with the course proposal, for reasons detailed in the attached file
- **“The Pursuit of Happiness.”** Initial concerns from CLASSICS were addressed via revisions to the syllabus. HISTORY objects more strongly, and PSYCH more tentatively. We have made some modifications to the syllabus in response, but do not find either unit’s claims compelling enough to prevent proceeding with the course proposal, for reasons detailed in the attached file.

As this summary indicates, we have made several substantive changes to our courses during this process. No less importantly, the concurrence process has driven our development of programmatic learning goals and outcomes for the Chase Center (listed on p. 10 of the attached file). These principles – which will be included with all our syllabi moving forward – should help to clarify, for students and faculty, what is distinct about the Chase Center’s curriculum.

Our development of programmatic learning goals and outcomes is partly a response to the inevitable conundrum that while the Chase Center is an intentionally interdisciplinary unit, “interdisciplinarity” is often more of a generally agreeable slogan than well-defined curricular approach. The Chase Center’s work is exciting and necessary because it promises to approach and define multi-disciplinarity in a more precise way, which does not replicate the distinct expertise of the disciplines housed in the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, but rather gives students and faculty incentives to engage with disciplines they might have otherwise not engaged. Our engagement with individual units in Arts & Sciences has sharpened our thinking about how to address this challenge most constructively.

That said, precisely because our work is interdisciplinary, we take it as axiomatic that particular topics, texts, or analytical tools cannot be claimed as the sole or even primary preserve of any one unit. Such a position would be inconsistent with standard curricular practices (particularly in the Arts & Sciences), at odds with the standards for concurrence we gather to be controlling from the Office of Academic Affairs (which emphasizes distinctness of learning outcomes and the overall objectives of a course, rather than the intricacies of day-to-day lectures and reading assignments), and fail to fulfill the Chase Center’s legislative mission (which directs us towards inter-disciplinarity).

It would be impossible to fulfill our mandate – and nor do we think it is in the general curricular interest of Ohio State – if particular topics, texts, or analytical tools are treated as the presumptive property of any unit. And notwithstanding the explicit or implicit premise of

comments we received from a few units, standard practices support our position. For instance: at Ohio State, students are regularly offered HISTART 2007, “Buddha to Bollywood: The Arts of India” and SASIA 3625 “Understanding Bollywood, Knowing India” – courses in different units that draw on shared artifacts in the service of distinct curricular objectives. Similarly, in the upcoming Autumn semester, students will be able to enroll in both POLITSCI 4553, “Game Theory for Political Scientists” and ECON 5001, “Game Theory in Economics” – courses which explore how shared analytical tools are used to address the interests of different disciplines. Moreover, in the past OSU’s Department of Political Science has offered a course in urban politics using as its primary text HBO’s *The Wire*. This was a common practice in Political Science departments during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. But *The Wire* certainly could be (and at many institutions has been) used as a primary “text” for courses in Sociology, Film & Television Studies, American Studies, or English, since there is a substantial body of scholarship on *The Wire* emerging from each of these disciplines. As this example indicates, building an inter-disciplinary curriculum which respects the distinctive expertise of different departments is a challenge for all of us, and reflects the reality that disciplinary boundaries are always being contested (both within disciplines and between them), while knowledge production and dissemination is an inherently interdisciplinary process. The Chase Center’s aim is to develop a well-defined and mutually beneficial approach to this curricular challenge (which certainly will not preclude alternative approaches to interdisciplinarity).

This is a learning process that we hope will continue, but we cannot make further progress without moving forward with our curriculum. We believe that the changes we have made so far provide a reasonable basis for moving forward with our curriculum.

The attached file provides more detailed responses to statements of non-concurrence from individual units, organized alphabetically.

From: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>

Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 at 11:12 AM

To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>

Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy and Brian

Attached please find ASC’s response to the Chase request for concurrence for 12 courses. As indicated, a number of units did either grant concurrence or did not respond. However, there are also a number of units that either indicated non-concurrence due to course overlap, or requested an extension until early Autumn semester when faculty are back on duty. So, given this, ASC cannot provide concurrence for the proposed courses.

I will note that the units that raised concerns about course overlap indicated a desire to engage with Chase to ensure that the proposed courses do not duplicate ASC offerings.

Note that we asked for a deadline of tomorrow for feedback, so it is possible that additional comments will be sent our way by then. We will be sure to forward them to you.

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 7:52 AM
To: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>; Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Bernadette and Andrew (who I think is back on the grid this week),

Over the last week Brian Schoen and I have benefited from the opportunity to discuss our concurrence requests with some departmental representatives, leading us to see more clearly paths forward for both the courses in question and for our larger curricular initiatives. It's genuinely rewarding to think through these issues with people who've done so much brilliant work on related matters, and our own work is better off for it.

This constructive work confirms the importance of the timeline considerations detailed in my earlier email. We can't position ourselves to build a new academic program by taking summers off (so to speak). Everything from the practical exigencies of offering courses to the principled substance of designing those courses within the context of a coherent curricular vision requires making tangible progress on matters large and small. To that end we're bound to forge ahead but hope to engage constructively with others along the way.

I mention all this because Brian will be occupied with conference travel on Thursday and Friday, and although I'm happy to field any queries as might be helpful, discussion with Brian earlier in the week promises to be most productive.

Andrew – I apologize for welcoming you back with this fresh stack of requests, but that's the state of the work ahead of us...

All best,

Jeremy

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 at 1:53 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Dear Jeremy,

I am afraid that it is routine practice to grant extensions & this is especially not uncommon during the Summer months. For example, we are currently waiting for a concurrence from the Dept of Computer Information Science (in Engineering) and they have told us that they cannot provide a response until the beginning of the Fall semester. About the concurrences for the Chase Center courses, we have already heard from 3 ASC departments who have indicated that they cannot fully respond until their faculty are back after August 15. (On the other hand, we have received full concurrences from three other depts.)

As an aside, I do know that Beth Hewitt (Chair of English) has a meeting planned with Brian Schoen this week & will share some of her concerns then.

Best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, Curriculum
College of Arts and Sciences
114F University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
<http://asccas.osu.edu>

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:33 PM
To: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>; Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Thanks, Bernadette.

I am afraid that a Fall concurrence deadline is not feasible for us, given the deadlines for getting on the spring course schedule and proceeding with General Education submissions, as well as our interests in working with new faculty and thinking through possibilities for degree design.

I am obliged to note that, as a procedural matter, we didn't anticipate circulating courses over the summer to pose a problem since the College of Arts & Science's Concurrence Request [Form](#), and ASC's Curriculum and Assessment Operations [Manual](#), refer only to

two-week timeline (not qualified by time of year). OAA's Academic Organization, Curriculum, and Assessment [Handbook](#) also indicates no restrictions about sending courses for concurrence over the summer. It may be worth adding that when circulating concurrence requests in the spring I was asked by one department to delay until after the final exam period – so it seems like some calendar conflicts are unavoidable one way or another.

In short: the Chase Center can't accede to a Fall term concurrence deadline, though I expect that Brian Schoen I would both be happy to use this time to confer with department chairs who have 12-month appointments.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Jeremy

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 at 9:33 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>, Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Dear Jeremy,

At least one of our departments (I suspect more will have the same request) has requested a deadline of early Fall term for the concurrences. Our regular 9-month faculty are off duty until August 15, and thus robust departmental conversations about possible overlap with their own courses cannot happen until those faculty are back on campus. This is especially important given the number of syllabi that need to be reviewed.

My best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, Curriculum
College of Arts and Sciences
114F University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
<http://asccas.osu.edu>

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:51 PM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>; Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Dear Jeremy,

I will send out the request for concurrences now (Andrew is taking some time off). Please know that I will start by giving our units a due date of Friday, July 18. It is possible/likely that this being the middle of the summer some units will ask for more time. I will keep you posted.

My best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

Assistant Dean, Curriculum
College of Arts and Sciences
114F University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
<http://asccas.osu.edu>

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:06 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

This summer, I've been working with the Chase Center's incoming faculty and Associate Director Brian Schoen (copied on this e-mail) to develop a suite of courses for a Civics, Law, and Leadership degree Chase will be offering (CIVICLL). The result is the twelve syllabi attached to this e-mail (more to follow down the road).

The courses cover a lot of territory in terms of subject matter and disciplinary approaches, but the course titles should give you a good sense of which syllabi may be most relevant to the College of Arts and Sciences for concurrence purposes.

Let me know if we can answer any questions as the concurrence process moves forward. I know there's a lot to dig into here, but we're eager to move forward with some exciting courses as we build a new program.

All best,

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](#)"