

Term Information

Effective Term Spring 2026

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 3520
Course Title Historical Political Economy
Transcript Abbreviation Hist Pol Econ
Course Description Examines how economic and political institutions emerged, transformed, and endured across societies, drawing on case studies from imperial China and the early Islamic world to early modern Europe and industrial America. Students investigate how market economies took shape in specific historical contexts, and how state, religious, and commercial institutions fostered change and continuity.
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

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

Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students synthesize scholarship from multiple disciplines that evaluate the historical and intellectual forces that shaped the modern world, focusing on how economic institutions emerged, transformed, and endured across societies.

Content Topic List

- Origins of Agriculture; Origins of the State; Causes of the Industrial Revolution; Etymology of "Liberal" as a Political Adjective; Development of Railroads; Rise of Medieval Parliaments; the Reformation and Economic Development; the Dutch Golden Age

Sought Concurrence

Yes

Attachments

- CIVICLL, Historical Political Economy - Syllabus.pdf: Syllabus
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL, Historical Political Economy - GE Worksheet.pdf: GE Worksheet
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Concurrence Exchanges - Education, Law, Glenn, Arts & Sciences.pdf: Concurrence Exchanges
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Memo Regarding Submission of Historical Political Economy.pdf: Memo Regarding Submission and Concurrence
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)

Comments

Workflow Information

| Status | User(s) | Date/Time | Step |
|------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| Submitted | Fortier,Jeremy | 08/20/2025 05:51 PM | Submitted for Approval |
| Approved | Fortier,Jeremy | 08/20/2025 05:51 PM | Unit Approval |
| Approved | Reed,Kathryn Marie | 08/26/2025 09:09 AM | College Approval |
| Pending Approval | Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Hilty,Michael Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadet te Chantal Steele,Rachel Lea | 08/26/2025 09:09 AM | ASCCAO Approval |

Memo Regarding Submission of “Historical Political Economy”

The Department of Political Science withheld concurrence to consider overlap with POLITSC 3280, “The Politics of Markets.” After six weeks we have not heard anything more concrete about this issue, and we do not believe the case for overlap is compelling enough to warrant consideration for two months or more. Here is the situation as we see it:

The syllabus for POLITSC’s “Politics of Markets” available to Chase states “THIS IS NOT AN ECONOMICS COURSE!!” The Chase Center’s course is designed and taught by an Economist, specifically oriented towards economic history. This disciplinary difference is reflected in the fact that the POLITSC course can be fairly characterized as a course in economic theory – largely assigning grand theories about the relationship between markets and economics from both social scientists and humanists (e.g., Smith & Marx, Hayek & Friedman, Polanyi & Lindblom, Hobsbawm & Rostow). By contrast, the Chase Center syllabus is heavily weighted towards empirical, historical case studies by Economists (and selected from articles published in peer-reviewed Economics journals). Indeed, the POLITSC syllabus is explicitly framed as an exploration of “three major theoretical frameworks” (liberalism, Marxism, and mercantilism), whereas the Chase syllabus is framed as an exploration of historical “case studies” from Western and non-Western, modern and pre-modern, contexts. Students have much to learn from both courses, but what they learn will be substantively different in each course.

The Department of Geography initially declined to provide concurrence for this course, but after discussion with Brian Schoen revised its position to “neither concurrence nor non-concurrence.” Our response to GEOG’s initial objections is provided for the record, below.

The Department of Geography first claimed that “Historical Political Economy” is “duplicative of GEOG 3701” (“The Making of the Modern World”). The department’s claim seems to have been that if a topic is covered, in some way, by the course in Geography, then it cannot be covered by a course in Chase.

For instance, Geography claimed that there may be “duplication” between our courses in case of “Lecture 26 (The East is Red)” because “if that that lecture touches on the Russian Revolution and the geopolitics of socialism in the USSR during the 20th century, then we also cover that material.” But surely the possibility that lectures in different courses “*touch on*” (or even discuss at length!) the topics of “the Russian Revolution and the geopolitics of socialism in the USSR during the 20th century” does not establish *duplication* between those lectures (let alone the courses). It is implausible and even irresponsible to suggest that OSU students would be exposed to matters concerning “the Russian Revolution and the geopolitics of socialism in the USSR during the 20th century” only in a 3000-level elective course offered in Geography (or, for that matter, the Chase Center).

Duplication between lectures or courses requires substantial overlap between materials assigned and learning outcomes pursued. In this respect, Geography’s claim of overlap is difficult to substantiate. The department provided two different syllabi for GEOG 3701. Both syllabi overwhelmingly assign readings not included on the Chase syllabus, because the GEOG syllabi

draws on bodies of scholarship which are not even represented on the Chase syllabus (e.g., C.L.R. James, Eric Hobsbawm, Marshall Berman, Rosa Luxemburg). The selection of readings for GEOG 3701 is appropriate for a course whose learning outcomes state that students who complete the course “will be successfully be able to... define modernity dialectically as a ‘maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish’ (Berman, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air*, 1982, p. 15)”. This pedagogical objective structures the GEOG syllabi. It is not part of the Chase course design at all.

While the Geography and Chase syllabi all cover the rise of modern economies in a very broad sense, differences of approach are legion. For instance, the GEOG syllabi have readings and lectures focused on topics including Canadian residential schools, eugenics in the Second World War, the Chicago World’s Fair, and the American National Exhibition – none of which are listed as the subject of readings or lectures on the Chase syllabus. Meanwhile, the Chase syllabus has readings and lectures focused on topics including the development of railroads, the etymology of “liberal” as a political adjective, the rise of parliaments in medieval Europe, and the economies of the ancient world – none of which are listed as the subject of readings or lectures on the Geography syllabus.

To the extent that the Chase Center’s course covers topics claimed by Geography, ours does so by using very different readings, in the service of very different learning outcomes. But Geography makes no effort to claim correspondence between the readings and learning outcomes on our respective syllabi. Instead, it simply lists topics that are discussed in some broad way on both syllabi, even when those topics are weighted or approached very differently between the syllabi (for instance, Geography claims that a class session on “The Dutch Golden Age” represents material “covered” in GEOG 3701, but neither version of the GEOG syllabus has readings focused on that topic, let alone from the specific disciplinary perspective of political economy included on the Chase syllabus). The GEOG course description repeatedly emphasizes that it will explore “the *spatial* formation and transformation of the modern world”; this is appropriate for a course in Geography, and not an analytic lens favored by the Chase syllabus. The GEOG learning outcomes emphasize the analytical approach of “power as effect” will be applied to multiple topics; that approach is not used in the Chase Center’s course.

We believe that anyone who consults our syllabi side-by-side will easily recognize that the courses are not duplicating one another. Geography’s claim of “duplication” can then be taken to mean that it holds an exclusive right to discuss certain, very broad topics (e.g., the Russian Revolution or “the geopolitics of socialism during the 20th century”). This claim is untenable.

We appreciate both the approach and the topics covered in GEOG 3701 and are glad that students at Ohio State have the opportunity to take such a course, precisely because the Department of Geography’s course is very different from ours.

We also appreciate that Geography has subsequently tempered its statement of non-concurrence, but we also feel obliged to state, for the record, the standards that we believe legitimately guide the course development process.

CIVICLL 3xxx
Historical Political Economy
Spring 2026

“Such is the unity of all history that any one who endeavours to tell a piece of it must feel that his first sentence tears a seamless web.”

-- Pollock and Maitland, *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, 1895.

Format of Instruction : Lecture
Meeting Day /Time:
Classroom Location:
Contact Hours: 3

Instructor: Jacob R. Hall
Email: hall.2743@osu.edu
Office:
Office Hours:

I. Course Description

This course examines the historical and intellectual forces that shaped the modern world by tracing how economic and political institutions emerged, transformed, and endured across societies. Drawing on a global range of case studies from imperial China and the early Islamic world to early modern Europe and industrial America, it explores how cultures, traditions, and sub-cultures interact with ideologies, technologies, and environments to produce long-term transformations. Students will investigate how market economies took shape in specific historical contexts, and how state, religious, and commercial institutions fostered change and continuity. Students will engage critically with competing explanations of historical development, considering how identities and institutions were constructed, challenged, and reimagined across time and place.

II. Course Objectives

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

- Critically engage with current scholarship in economic history, political economy, and historical sociology, understanding how leading scholars interpret major political and economic transformations such as the rise of the nation-state, the Protestant Reformation, and the Industrial Revolution.
- Apply economic models and institutional typologies to examine how traditions and cultures respond to transformation across imperial China, early modern Europe, and the Islamic world.
- Use a multi-disciplinary perspective to identify and evaluate historical antecedents of contemporary institutions and economic systems
- Compare institutional development across societies.

- Analyze their reasoning and cultural assumptions against the successes and failures of historical case studies.

III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes

This course fulfills the **GE Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations**.

GEN Goals

- **Goal 1:** Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than the foundations.
- **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.
- **Goal 3:** Successful students will engage in a systematic assessment of how cultures and sub-cultures develop and interact, historically or in contemporary society.
- **Goal 4:** Successful students will engage in a systematic assessment of differences among societies, institutions, and individuals' experience within traditions and cultures.

GEN Expected Learning Outcomes:

Successful students are able to:

- 1.1. Engage in critical and logical thinking.
- 1.2. Engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or ideas within this theme.
- 2.1. Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.
- 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 the influence of an aspect of culture (religious belief, gender roles, institutional organization, technology, epistemology, philosophy, scientific discovery, etc.) on at least one historical or contemporary issue.
- 3.2. Analyze the impact of a "big" idea or technological advancement in creating a major and long-lasting change in a specific culture.
- 3.3. Examine the interactions among dominant and sub-cultures.
- 3.4. Explore changes and continuities over time within a culture or society.
- 4.1. Recognize and explain differences, similarities, and disparities among institutions, organizations, cultures, societies, and/or individuals.
- 4.2. Explain ways in which categories such as race, ethnicity, and gender and perceptions of difference, impact individual outcomes and broader societal issues.

How this connects to the Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations

This interdisciplinary course examines the religious and intellectual traditions that have shaped political and economic cultures across time (from ancient empires to contemporary nation-states) and across space (from the United States to South Asia). Through comparative analysis of scholarship from fields such as economics, political science, history, and law, students will explore how societies evolve, adapt, and endure amid cultural, political, and economic change.

“Historical Political Economy” pays particular attention to how political and economic traditions and cultures have contributed to long-term transformation, and vice versa: for example, students will learn about how technological shifts such as the origins of agriculture (Lecture 4), the printing press (Lecture 14), and the Industrial Revolution (Lecture 23) reshaped economic and social life. They will also consider how political ideologies such as liberalism (Lecture 22), communism (Lecture 26), and Protestant theology (Lectures 15–17) have challenged existing institutions. Additionally, students will investigate how the rise of the modern nation-state (Lectures 18–19) redefined political authority, while earlier lectures on state formation (Lectures 5–6) will help them grapple with the deep institutional roots of contemporary cultural and political orders.

IV. Course Texts

The required texts for this course are:

1. Mark Koyama and Jared Rubin, *How the World Became Rich: The Historical Origins of Economic Growth* (Polity, 2022), ISBN: 1509540237
2. Noel Johnson and Mark Koyama, *Persecution and Toleration: The Long Road to Religious Freedom* (Cambridge University Press, 2019), ISBN: 1108441165

Both books are easy to purchase in paper, electronic, or audio versions—at Barnes and Nobles and most other bookshops. All other readings will be made available on CarmenCanvas.

V. Assignments and Grading

| Assessment | Date |
|--------------------|-------------|
| Reading Report I | January 29 |
| Reading Report II | February 17 |
| Midterm Exam | February 24 |
| Reading Report III | March 10 |
| Reading Report IV | April 2 |
| Reading Report V | April 21 |
| Final Exam | TBD |

Your grade will be comprised of two exams, five reading reports, and attendance. The distribution of the assessments is shown below:

| Assessment | Percentage |
|-----------------|------------|
| Best Exam | 35% |
| Worst Exam | 30% |
| Reading Reports | 25% |
| Attendance | 10% |

- **Exams:** There will be two closed-book exams: the first on February 24 and the second on TBD. Each exam will consist of four short questions—each worth 10 points—and three essay-type questions—each worth 20 points—for a total of 100 points. As we get closer to the exam, I will present some examples of each type of question. But take note that at least one of the questions in each midterm will come from the content in the reading reports. Also, know that the final exam will not be cumulative.

With respect to your final grade for the course, your best-scored exam will be worth 40% and your worst-scored exam will be worth 35%. Those percentages are non-negotiable.

If you have a problem with the dates of the midterms, please let me know before February 12. After February 12, I will not accommodate your requests. Notice that travel, job interviews, or non-emergency family matters are not acceptable reasons to re-arrange the exam. See below for examples of acceptable reasons.

- **Reading Reports:** There are five written reading reports due at the beginning of class on the dates listed below. You should deliver the report both of two formats:
 1. In person, in printed form.
 2. In PDF format, and delivery should be done through CarmenCanvas. Please do not send the report in a format different than PDF or by email.

The reason I ask you to deliver a printed version is so I can easily mark the report. I also want you to deliver a pdf version to ensure that there is a copy of record. Also, note that I will be strict in enforcing that late reports, and you will get a zero grade unless your absence is excused (see below). The dates the reading reports are due are:

- Reading report I, January 29, Chapters 1-6, KR.
- Reading report II, February 17, Chapters 7-11, KR.
- Reading report III, March 10, Chapters 1-5, JK
- Reading report IV, April 2, Chapters 6-10, JK
- Reading report V, April 21, Chapters 11-16, JK

I will grade each report out of five points. I will drop the worst report in terms of grades and multiply the best report by two, for a total of 25 points. I will post an example of a written report to have a guideline on how to prepare it and a rubric.

Attendance Policy

Everyone is expected to come to class having completed the assigned reading. Students who do not attend class sessions will be unable to complete in-class assignments which will have a negative impact on their grade in the course. Please note the following policies:

- 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, university-sponsored events, or religious holidays does not count, but for an absence to be considered “excused,” you must contact the instructor within one week. Please reach out to the instructor with any questions about this policy.
- Consistent, high-quality participation—including respectful listening, contributing to discussion, and building on peers’ insights—is expected each week. Occasional informal writing or group exercises may be used to facilitate discussion and deepen reflection. Students will be docked 1 point of their participation grade (1/100 pts) for every day they do not bring 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.

Grading Scale

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

VI. Course Schedule:

(readings are due at the beginning of the class day under which they are listed)

Lecture 1, January 13: Introduction/Administrative Details

Lecture 2, January 15: The Malthusian Economy

- Chapter 1 of Clark, Gregory. 2008. *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lecture 3, January 20: Violence and Social Orders

- North, Douglass C., John Joseph Wallis, and Barry R. Weingast. A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History. NBER Working Paper No. 12795, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w12795>.

Lecture 4, January 22: The Origins of Agriculture

- Matranga, Andrea. "The Ant and the Grasshopper: Seasonality and the Invention of Agriculture." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 139, no. 3 (2024): 1467-1504.

Lecture 5, January 27: The Origins of the State

- Mayshar, Joram, Omer Moav, and Luigi Pascali. "The Origin of the State: Land Productivity and Appropriability?" *Journal of Political Economy* 130, no. 4 (2022): 1091-1144.
- Allen, Robert C., Mattia C. Bertazzini, and Leander Heldring. "The Economic Origins of Government." *American Economic Review* 113, no. 10 (2023): 2507-2545.

Lecture 6, January 29: Ancient Empires **Report I due.**

- Fitzsimmons, Patrick, *Blood and Iron: Political Fragmentation in the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean* (2024). GMU Working Paper in Economics No. 24-38, Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4803578>

Lecture 7, February 3: Classical Greece

- Ober, Josiah. "Wealthy Hellas." In *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. 140, no. 2, pp. 241-286. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Lecture 8, February 5: Ancient Rome

- Temin, Peter. "A Market Economy in the Early Roman Empire." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 91 (2001): 169-181.
- Chapters 2–3 of Scheidel, Walter. 2019. *Escape from Rome: The Failure of Empire and the Road to Prosperity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lecture 9, February 10: Ancient and Medieval China

- Chapters 1 and 2 of Wang, Yuhua. *The Rise and Fall of Imperial China: The Social Origins of State Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2022.

Lecture 10, February 12: The Islamic World

- Chaney, Eric. "Religion and the Rise and Fall of Islamic science." Working paper. (2023)

Lecture 11, February 17: The Commercial Revolution **Report II due.**

- Greif, Avner. "Institutions and International Trade: Lessons from the Commercial Revolution." *The American Economic Review* 82, no. 2 (1992): 128–33.

Lecture 12, February 19: Feudal Political Economy I

- North, Douglass C., and Robert Paul Thomas. "The Rise and Fall of the Manorial System: A Theoretical Model." *The Journal of Economic History* 31, no. 4 (1971): 777-803.

Lecture 13, February 24: Feudal Political Economy II

- Hall, Jacob, “Itinerant Kings” (April 9, 2024). Working Paper. Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4689473>

Lecture 14, February 26: The Printing Press

- Dittmar, Jeremiah E. “Information Technology and Economic Change: The Impact of the Printing Press.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126, no. 3 (2011): 1133-1172.

..... **March 3: Midterm Exam**.....

Lecture 15, March 5: The Causes of the Protestant Reformation

- Becker, Sascha O., Steven Pfaff, and Jared Rubin. “Causes and Consequences of the Protestant Reformation.” *Explorations in Economic History* 62 (2016): 1-25.

Lecture 16, March 10: The Consequences of the Protestant Reformation

- Cantoni, Davide, Jeremiah Dittmar, and Noam Yuchtman. “Religious competition and Reallocation: The Political Economy of Secularization in the Protestant Reformation.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133, no. 4 (2018): 2037-2096.

Lecture 17, March 12: The “Counter-Reformation” and the Spanish Inquisition

- Becker, Sascha O. and Pino, Francisco J. and Vidal-Robert, Jordi. “Freedom of the Press? Catholic Censorship During the Counter-Reformation” (2021). CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP16092.

Lecture 18, March 24: The Rise of the Modern Nation-State I

- Batchelder, Ronald W., and Herman Freudenberger. “On the Rational Origins of the Modern Centralized State.” *Explorations in Economic History* 20, no. 1 (1983): 1.

Lecture 19, March 26: The Rise of the Modern Nation-State II **Report III due.**

- Johnson, Noel D., and Mark Koyama. “States and Economic Growth: Capacity and Constraints.” *Explorations in Economic History* 64 (2017): 1-20.

Lecture 20, March 31: The Development of Representative Institutions

- Van Zanden, Jan Luiten, Eltjo Buringh, and Maarten Bosker. “The Rise and Decline of European Parliaments, 1188–1789.” *The Economic History Review* 65, no. 3 (2012): 835-861.

- Angelucci, Charles, Simone Meraglia, and Nico Voigtlander. "How Merchant Towns Shaped Parliaments: From the Norman Conquest of England to the Great Reform Act." *American Economic Review* 112, no. 10 (2022): 3441-3487.

Lecture 21, April 2: The Dutch Golden Age

- Gelderblom, Oscar. "The Golden Age of the Dutch Republic." In *The Invention of Enterprise: Entrepreneurship from Ancient Mesopotamia to Modern Times*, edited by David S. Landes, Joel Mokyr, and William J. Baumol, 156–182. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Lecture 22, April 7: The Origins of Political Liberalism

- Klein, Daniel B. "'Liberal' as a Political Adjective (in English), 1769–1824." *Journal of Contextual Economics–Schmollers Jahrbuch* (2024): 1-23.

Lecture 23, April 9: The British Industrial Revolution

- Crafts, Nicholas. "Explaining the First Industrial Revolution: Two Views." *European Review of Economic History* 15, no. 1 (2011): 153-168.

Lecture 24, April 14: Catching Up, Falling Behind I **Report IV due.**

- Donaldson, Dave, and Richard Hornbeck. "Railroads and American Economic Growth: A 'Market Access' Approach." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131, no. 2 (2016): 799-858.

Lecture 25, April 16: Catching Up, Falling Behind II

- Roy, Tirthankar. "Economic History and Modern India: Redefining the Link." In *The Rise and Fall of Modern Empires, Volume III*, pp. 235-256. Routledge, 2017.

Lecture 26, April 21: The East is Red

- Zhuravskaya, Ekaterina, Sergei Guriev, and Andrei Markevich. "New Russian Economic History." *Journal of Economic Literature* 62, no. 1 (2024): 47-114.
- Meng, Xin, Nancy Qian, and Pierre Yared. "The Institutional Causes of China's Great Famine, 1959–1961." *The Review of Economic Studies* 82, no. 4 (2015): 1568-1611.

Lecture 27, April 28: America in the Twentieth Century **Report V due.**

- Nelson, Richard R., and Gavin Wright. "The Rise and Fall of American Technological Leadership: The Postwar Era in Historical Perspective." *Journal of Economic Literature* 30, no. 4 (1992): 1931-1964.

..... TBD: **Final Exam**

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 Services (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: Traditions, Cultures, & Transformations

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 (Traditions, Cultures, & Transformations)

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)

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>Completion 3 assignments which build skills in connecting individual experiences with broader population-based patterns (Assignments #1, #2, #3)</p> <p>Completion of 3 quizzes in which students demonstrate comprehension of the course readings and materials.</p> |
| <p>ELO 2.1 Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.</p> | <p>Students engage in advanced exploration of each module topic through a combination of lectures, readings, and discussions.</p> <p><u>Lecture</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Reading</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Discussions</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>Some examples of events and sites: The Paris Commune, an 1871 socialist uprising violently squelched by conservative forces</p> |

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

Goals and ELOs unique to Traditions, Cultures, & Transformations

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 engage in a systematic assessment of how cultures and sub-cultures develop and interact, historically or in contemporary society.

GOAL 4: Successful students will engage in a systematic assessment of differences among societies, institutions, and individuals’ experience within traditions and cultures.

| | Course activities and assignments to meet these ELOs |
|--|--|
| ELO 3.1 Describe the influence of an aspect of culture (religious belief, gender roles, institutional organization, technology, epistemology, philosophy, scientific discovery, etc.) on at least one historical or contemporary issue. | |
| ELO 3.2 Analyze the impact of a “big” idea or technological advancement in creating a major and long-lasting change in a specific culture. | |
| ELO 3.3 Examine the interactions among dominant and sub-cultures. | |
| ELO 3.4 Explore changes and continuities over time within a culture or society. | |
| ELO 4.1 Recognize and explain differences, similarities, and disparities among institutions, organizations, cultures, societies, and/or individuals. | |
| ELO 4.2 Explain ways in which categories such as race, ethnicity, and gender and perceptions of difference, impact individual outcomes and broader societal issues | |

Historical Political Economy Worksheet Responses

Briefly describe how this course connects to or exemplifies the concept of this Theme (Traditions, Cultures & Transformations)

This interdisciplinary course examines the religious and intellectual traditions that have shaped political and economic cultures across time (from ancient empires to contemporary nation-states) and across space (from the United States to South Asia). Through comparative analysis of scholarship from fields such as economics, political science, history, and law, students will explore how societies evolve, adapt, and endure amid cultural, political, and economic change. “Historical Political Economy” pays particular attention to how political and economic traditions and cultures have contributed to long-term transformation, and vice versa: for example, students will learn about how technological shifts such as the origins of agriculture (Lecture 4), the printing press (Lecture 14), and the Industrial Revolution (Lecture 23) reshaped economic and social life. They will also consider how political ideologies such as liberalism (Lecture 22), communism (Lecture 26), and Protestant theology (Lectures 15–17) have challenged existing institutions. Additionally, students will investigate how the rise of the modern nation-state (Lectures 18–19) redefined political authority, while earlier lectures on state formation (Lectures 5–6) will help them grapple with the deep institutional roots of contemporary cultural and political orders.

ELO 1.1

Students will engage in critical and logical thinking about a host of different societies’ traditions, cultures, and transformations over time and space. They will do this through: active listening during course lectures, which are clearly marked with the concepts, time periods, and societies that students will be engaging with that day; six reading reports, which will challenge students to critically investigate their readings; and the midterm and final exam, which will provide students the chance to synthesize their learning over the course of the semester through short answer questions such as: “compare Ronald Batchelder and Herman Freudenberger’s perspective on the rise of the modern nation state with Noel Johnson and Mark Koyama’s. How do their methodological approaches differ, and what do they each see as the primary motor of the nation-state?” See below for some more specific examples:

Lectures: Lectures introduce students to models and frameworks drawn from economics, political science, and institutional history. For example, Lecture 2 (The Malthusian Economy) asks students to critically apply a formal model of population dynamics to diverse historical contexts. Lecture 3 (Violence and Social Orders) introduces a typology of social organization that students revisit across case studies. Comparative lectures—such as on imperial China (Lecture 9) and the Islamic world (Lecture 10)—challenge students to apply those frameworks across cultural and temporal settings.

Reading Reports: Reading reports require students to evaluate and respond to scholarly arguments, using evidence to assess competing explanations. For example, students must weigh

causal claims about economic growth in *How the World Became Rich* (Reports I–II) and engage with arguments about religious toleration and institutional development in *Persecution and Toleration* (Reports III–V). These assignments cultivate logical reasoning and the capacity to critique and defend interpretations.

ELO 1.2

Course lectures will engage students with current scholarship in economic history, political economy, and historical sociology. Students examine how major transformations—such as the rise of the state (Lectures 5–6), the Protestant Reformation (Lectures 15–17), and the Industrial Revolution (Lecture 23)—are interpreted by leading scholars through empirical and theoretical lenses. These sessions build depth by requiring students to trace arguments, assess methodological approaches, and situate historical developments within broader traditions of inquiry.

In addition to the lecture materials, students will conduct in-depth scholarly explorations through 5 structured reading reports tied to key texts on economic and institutional history. These reports (which will touch on culture, state organization, and economic growth, and more) require close engagement with scholarship and historical evidence across various cases, and will anchor the course’s scholarly engagement. Reports I and II focus on *How the World Became Rich*, guiding students through debates on the origins of modern economic growth. Reports III–V shift to *Persecution and Toleration*, where students evaluate arguments about institutional change, religious conflict, and cultural transformation in early modern Europe. These assignments require direct engagement with scholarly texts, encouraging students to develop their own interpretations grounded in evidence and theory.

This course’s two closed-book exams will include questions that challenge students to apply their knowledge of economic and political traditions, cultures, and transformations. For example, students will be asked to draw on course content to articulate the historical roots and economic underpinnings of the modern nation-state, to present an argument either for and against political liberalism, and to explain the development of representative institutions.

ELO 2.1

The tools used and the materials chosen for the course introduce a breadth of perspectives on the topic of traditions, cultures, and traditions from multiple disciplines—including economics, political science, law, and history. Students will apply economic models (Lecture 2) and institutional typologies (Lecture 3) to examine how traditions and cultures respond to transformation across cases like imperial China, early modern Europe, and the Islamic world. Lectures on state formation (5–6), religion (10, 15–17), and legal institutions (20) will highlight how enduring cultural frameworks shape and are shaped by economic and political change.

The course draws on approaches from economics, political science, history, and law to explain institutional and cultural transformation. Students use these tools to interpret a range of cases, including Classical Greece's political experimentation (Lecture 7) and Rome's integration of markets, slavery, and law (Lecture 8). Models introduced in Lectures 2–3 are re-applied throughout the course, helping students compare institutional development across societies as different as the Islamic world (Lecture 10) and early modern Europe (Lectures 18–20).

The reading reports will also train students to move between abstract theoretical frameworks and specific historical contexts. In Reports I–II, students work through competing economic explanations for the rise of modern growth. In Reports III–V, students grapple with theories linking cultural and religious ideas to political and institutional development. These assignments cultivate the ability to integrate diverse disciplinary approaches to explain cultural and institutional change.

Midterm and final exam questions will test students' ability to apply theoretical frameworks to historical phenomena and events. For example, students will be asked to choose a specific historical transformation—the rise of agriculture, the fall of Rome, the rise and fall of the Manorial system, the Protestant Reformation, or the British Industrial Revolution (among other options)—and analyze it through the lens of Douglass North, John Wallis, and Barry Weingast's "A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History" (Week 2). As a part of this question, students will be asked to describe the strengths and weaknesses of this conceptual framework.

ELO 2.2

Through lectures and reading reports students will expand their understanding of historical case studies and analytical tools (ie. Malthusian models (Lecture 2), frameworks of social and institutional order (Lecture 3), and the political economy of religion and state (Lectures 10, 15–17)). The reading reports will require them to grapple directly with scholarly arguments and evidence, pushing them to reflect, assess, and refine their understanding. This cumulative structure supports growth and confidence in applying ideas to new and challenging contexts. The exam will offer students the opportunity to creatively demonstrate their growth as a learner, reflecting on and assessing how their understanding of historical political economies expanded throughout the semester.

Lectures: The course develops chronologically, allowing students to accumulate a broad base of historical reference points—from agrarian empires and religious transformations to industrialization and modern ideologies. As students progress, they will gain more tools and comparisons to apply to unfamiliar cases and to reflect on contemporary institutions. For example, lectures on ancient governance (Lectures 5–6), religious change (Lectures 15–17), and 20th-century development trajectories (Lectures 24–27) allow students to test and refine their understanding across time and place.

Reading Reports: Reading reports require students to articulate arguments in their own voice and respond directly to complex scholarly work. As the course advances, students revisit and apply earlier ideas and frameworks to more challenging material. This cumulative process fosters self-assessment and intellectual confidence, helping students develop a more coherent personal perspective on cultural and institutional change.

ELO 3.1

This course's content will help students develop skills to describe the links between cultural variables and historical and contemporary outcomes. This is in fact a key aspect of the course. Lecture 10 examines the role of Islamic belief systems in shaping science and governance. Lectures 15–17 trace how religious change during the Reformation influenced politics and markets. Lecture 8 explores Roman slavery as a culturally embedded economic system. In addition, Reading Reports 3–5 draw from *Persecution and Toleration*, which explores the development of religious toleration, in fits and starts, in Western Europe.

Lectures: Students examine how cultural systems—religious, technological, ideological, and institutional—influence historical outcomes. Essentially, the entire course is about such matters. Some particular examples include: Lecture 10 explores how Islamic belief shaped scientific and political development. Lectures 15–17 analyze how Protestant theology reshaped European institutions. Lecture 14 addresses how the printing press enabled cultural and religious change. Lecture 22 introduces liberalism as a cultural and political idea; Lecture 26 examines communism's cultural and institutional consequences. Lectures 23–24 consider how industrial and transportation technologies, like the railroad, transformed economic and cultural life in Britain, Germany, the United States, and India..

Reading Reports: Reports I–II, based on *How the World Became Rich*, require students to engage directly with the argument that cultural beliefs and norms—such as attitudes toward commerce, innovation, and state authority—played a central role in explaining the rise of sustained economic growth. Reports III–V, based on *Persecution and Toleration*, ask students to assess how shifting religious beliefs and norms influenced institutional development in Western Europe. Across all reports, students analyze how cultural worldviews—especially around authority, difference, and moral order—shaped the trajectory of political and economic institutions.

ELO 3.2

Through lectures, students will learn how technological shifts such as the origins of agriculture (Lecture 4), the printing press (Lecture 14), and the Industrial Revolution (Lecture 23) reshaped economic and social life. In reading reports and lectures, they will also analyze how big ideas like liberalism (Lecture 22), communism (Lecture 26), and Protestant theology (Lectures 15–17) challenged existing institutions. Students will also investigate how the rise of the modern nation-state (Lectures 18–19) redefined political authority, while earlier lectures on state formation

(Lectures 5–6) will help them grapple with the deep institutional roots of cultural and political order.

Lectures: The course explores how major ideas and technologies reshape cultures over time. Students examine the transformative impact of the agricultural revolution (Lecture 4), the printing press (Lecture 14), and the Industrial Revolution (Lecture 23), each of which restructured economic life and social norms. Big ideas like liberalism (Lecture 22), communism (Lecture 26), Protestant theology (Lectures 15–17), and the spread of Islam (Lecture 10) are treated as catalysts for institutional and cultural upheaval. The rise of the modern nation-state (Lectures 18–19) offers another example of how abstract ideas about sovereignty and governance led to enduring cultural reorganization.

Reading Reports: Reports I–II, based on *How the World Became Rich*, engage students with major theories behind the Industrial Revolution and the Great Divergence, including the roles of science, institutions, culture, and geography in driving long-term transformation. Reports III–V, based on *Persecution and Toleration*, examine how changes in political institutions and the development of state capacity enabled the emergence of religious toleration in Western Europe. Across these assignments, students assess how big ideas and technologies reshaped the structure and values of societies.

ELO 3.3

Students will explore how dominant institutions interact with sub-cultures across time. Lecture 10 examines religious orthodoxy and intellectual dissent in the Islamic world. Lectures 15–17 analyze how Protestant minorities challenged Catholic hegemony. Lecture 17 also addresses censorship and suppression during the Counter-Reformation. Lecture 8 considers slavery as a legally enforced subordination within Roman society.

Lectures: Students examine how dominant institutions contend with or suppress alternative cultural systems. Lecture 10 analyzes the relationship between Islamic orthodoxy and intellectual dissent. Lectures 15–17 explore how Protestant reformers challenged Catholic dominance and how states responded through repression and institutional adaptation. Lecture 17 focuses specifically on censorship during the Counter-Reformation. Lecture 8 examines Roman slavery as a system of legally enforced subordination embedded within broader political and economic structures. Throughout the course, students also consider why some societies developed inclusive institutions while others remained extractive—an inquiry that highlights the role of institutional structure in shaping the experiences of dominant and marginalized cultural groups.

Reading Reports: Reports III–V require students to assess how early modern states dealt with religious pluralism, often balancing pragmatic toleration against demands for orthodoxy. Students consider how state capacity, institutional incentives, and social pressures shaped interactions between dominant religious-political institutions and minority groups. Students

analyze cases in which sub-cultures were tolerated, excluded, or integrated, and consider the broader consequences for institutional development and cultural transformation.

ELO 3.4

This course emphasizes both continuity and change across long historical arcs, providing students the chance to explore both. For example, Lectures 8, 18–19 explore Rome and the nation-state as two moments in the evolution of state power. Lectures 10, 15–17 trace the contested evolution of religious institutions. Lectures 23–27 show divergence and convergence in industrial development across societies.

Lectures: The entire set of lectures tells the story of economic growth or stagnation across time and space. Lectures 5–8, 12–13, 18–19 highlight the evolution of state power, from the early formation of states and ancient empires to feudal structures and the emergence of the modern nation-state. Lectures 10, 15–17 examine shifting religious institutions and ideas across centuries, while Lectures 23–27 track how societies responded differently to industrialization and modern development. This structure encourages students to assess both the durability and malleability of cultural systems over time.

Reading Reports: Across all five reports, students are asked to situate major institutional and cultural changes within broader historical trajectories. In *How the World Became Rich* (Reports I–II), they analyze how gradual and contingent developments led to rapid economic change in some societies. In *Persecution and Toleration* (Reports III–V), they assess how older religious institutions adapted—sometimes reluctantly—to changing political and social conditions.

ELO 4.1

The course is comparative by design. The reading reports require students to grapple with competing theories about why some nations grew wealthy while others did not. In lectures, students examine institutional differences across empires (Lectures 6, 8–9), religions (Lectures 10, 15–17), and political systems—from fragmented feudal Europe to centralized modern states (Lectures 12, 18–19). Lectures 24–27 highlight disparities in industrialization and development across regions, including India, China, Russia, and the United States.

Lectures: The course is explicitly comparative, asking students to assess why some societies developed inclusive, growth-promoting institutions while others did not. Lectures 6, 8–9 compare empires across Europe and Asia, while Lectures 10, 15–17 examine religious institutions and the divergent paths of Catholic and Protestant societies. Lectures 12, 18–19 contrast fragmented feudalism with centralized modern states. Lectures 24–27 highlight disparities in industrialization and development across India, China, Russia, and the United States.

Reading Reports: Reports I–II require students to work through competing explanations for the global divergence in economic outcomes. They must compare institutional, geographic, and

cultural theories to explain uneven growth. Reports III–V explore how different political configurations led to distinct patterns of toleration, persecution, and institutional development across the globe.

ELO 4.2

The course addresses how institutional structures mediate difference. For example, Lecture 8 considers the legal and economic foundations of slavery in Rome. Lectures 15–17 explore religious discrimination and the contested boundaries of inclusion in early modern Europe. The reading reports and lectures encourage students to explain and reflect on how cultural and institutional systems shape unequal outcomes across societies—in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender.

Lectures: The course addresses how institutional structures mediate social hierarchies and perceptions of difference. Lecture 8 examines Roman slavery as a culturally sanctioned system of legal and economic subordination. Lectures 15–17 explore the contested inclusion of religious minorities in early modern Europe and the mechanisms—like censorship and legal exclusion—used by states and institutions to police cultural boundaries and enforce norms of inclusion and exclusion.

Reading Reports: Reports III–V, based on Persecution and Toleration, require students to examine how institutions shaped outcomes for minority groups. Students assess how differences in power, identity, and belief were managed by early modern states, and how those arrangements produced unequal access to rights, participation, and protection.

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](#)"