

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 2300
Course Title Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy
Transcript Abbreviation Civic Friendship
Course Description How has American democracy generated friendship and dialogue among citizens, why are civic friendship and dialogue valuable even when strong differences of principle divide us, and do universities have a special role to play in helping people work together to establish a just society?
Semester Credit Hours/Units Fixed: 3

Offering Information

Length Of Course 14 Week
Flexibly Scheduled Course Never
Does any section of this course have a distance education component? No
Grading Basis Letter Grade
Repeatable No
Course Components Lecture
Grade Roster Component Lecture
Credit Available by Exam No
Admission Condition Course No
Off Campus Never
Campus of Offering Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark, Wooster

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites
Exclusions
Electronically Enforced Yes

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

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

Requirement/Elective Designation

Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students evaluate foundational texts on ideas related to civic friendship and dialogue. Students will form civic friendships and, through them, understand the foundation for why learning to live together is desirable in the first place

Content Topic List

- Civic Friendship, Civil Dialogue, Intellectual Virtues, Principles of the American Founding, Controversies of University of Life, Motives for Political Participation

Sought Concurrence

Yes

Attachments

- CIVICLL, Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy - syllabus.pdf: Syllabus
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL, How Politics Breaks Your Brain - 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)
- Civic Friendship and Dialogue_Worksheet 09-16-2025.pdf: GE Worksheet 09-16-2025
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Steele,Rachel Lea)

Comments

- Per request of the department a new GE form was uploaded due to an error with the previously submitted documents. RLS (by Steele,Rachel Lea on 09/16/2025 09:53 AM)

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	08/18/2025 05:29 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	08/18/2025 05:30 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	08/19/2025 07:35 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Hilty,Michael Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Steele,Rachel Lea	08/19/2025 07:35 PM	ASCCAO Approval

CIVICLL 2300
Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy
[Semester]

The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.

—Martin Luther King Jr., *Strength to Love*

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

Instructor: Robert Weston Siscoe
Email: siscoe.3@osu.edu
Office:
Office Hours:

I. COURSE DESCRIPTION

American democracy at its best is supported by civic friendship (the recognition among citizens that they need to work with one another, whether or not they like each other) and civil dialogue (the ability of citizens to deliberate honestly and respectfully with one another, whether or not they agree with each other). But how has American democracy generated friendship and dialogue among citizens, why are civic friendship and dialogue valuable even when strong differences of principle divide us, and do universities have a special role to play in helping people work together to establish a just society? This class takes up these issues, exploring the connections between civic dialogue, the intellectual virtues, the American Founding, and contemporary university life. Students will begin by considering the enlightenment ideals of free speech and freedom of expression that influenced the foundations of American democracy. Throughout the course, students will also engage in and lead dialogues of their own, forming them in the virtues necessary for citizenship.

II. COURSE OBJECTIVES

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

- Engage with and analyze foundational texts on ideas related to civic friendship and dialogue, the intellectual virtues, the American founding, and contemporary university life.
- Understand diverse ideas about justice, citizenship, and the role of political institutions in supporting these ideals.
- Recognize the challenges in creating healthy and thriving political communities and develop civic tools for addressing them.
- Apply the intellectual virtues they have developed in their lives as American citizens, displaying leadership in political dialogues.
- Form civic friendships and, through them, understand the foundation for why learning to live together is desirable in the first place.

III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes

This course fulfills the **GE Theme: Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World**.

GEN Goals

- **Goal 1:** Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than in the Foundations component.
- **Goal 2:** Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in the future.
- **Goal 3:** Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, or global citizenship and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute citizenship.
- **Goal 4:** Successful students will examine notions of justice amid difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within society, both within the United States and around the world.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

Successful students are able to:

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

How this connects to the Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

This is a multidisciplinary course exploring the role of free speech, intellectual virtue, and civil discourse in a pluralistic American civic and university life, developing both their understanding of the historical foundations of, as well as their ability to participate as citizens in, the American Project.

IV. COURSE TEXTS

Students will not need to purchase any texts for this class. This course uses CarmenCanvas for all course materials, communication, and grade tracking.

V. ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

COURSE REQUIREMENTS	
Foundational Skills	
Civic Friendship	5%
Intellectual Virtue	10%
Dialogue Leader	10%
Daily Assessments	
Annotated Texts	10%
Reading Quizzes	10%
In-Class Writing	10%
Beyond the Classroom	
Unify America College Bowl	10%
Challenging Conversation	10%
Testing Your Knowledge	
Midterm Exam	10%
Changing Your Mind Essay (Final Exam)	15%

Foundational Skills

Civic Friendship

Civic dialogue does not merely take place as an abstract, theoretical ideal but is an embodied practice that requires students to navigate friendships and community relationships. To fully experience this aspect of civic dialogue, students will put into practice Aristotle's reflections on friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Books VIII and IV and form virtue-seeking friendships of 4-5 students that will run the length of the semester. Friendship groups will then form the basis of in-class discussions, civil dialogues, and outside of class activities. Students will self-assess their participation in friendship groups at the end of the semester, based on a rubric provided at the beginning of the course.

Dialogue Leader

The goal of a classroom civic dialogue is to build a focused community where, over the course of the semester, students can better understand their views on a range of political and ethical issues. In their dialogue groups, students will team up with a partner to lead one dialogue session, first completing a lesson plan a week in advance of the dialogue session that you and your partner will be leading. By completing this assignment, you will be able to ask strong questions designed to learn about another person's philosophical viewpoint. You will also be able to actively listen and incorporate personal evidence into your own philosophical insights. Students will self-assess their performance as dialogue leaders based on a provided rubric.

Intellectual Virtue

Benjamin Franklin famously kept a journal containing his self-reflections about his growth in virtue, a practice that we will also adopt in this class. Along with the gaining theoretical knowledge concerning virtue, students will each select an intellectual virtue that they would like to practice in their everyday lives. Possible intellectual virtues to choose from include humility, justice, courage, curiosity, open-mindedness, and autonomy. Students will receive a short reading list containing philosophical works focusing on their chosen virtue. After completing the reading list, students will then formulate a plan to grow in this virtue, journaling about their experiences and progress. This assignment will be due before the mid-term examination. This portion of the grade will be graded pass/fail.

Daily Assessments

Annotated Texts

Before class, students will create an annotated version of the course reading to aid them on the regular reading quizzes and in-class writing assignments. They will upload their annotations to CarmenCanvas before class. This will be graded on a pass/fail basis.

Reading Quizzes

Students will complete regular exams to assess their understanding of basic concepts and ideas.

In-Class Writing

Students will complete regular in-class writing to further their understanding of the course texts. This will be graded on a pass/fail basis. If a student missed class for a university-sanctioned event (e.g. a student athlete traveling for a competition), they will be asked to email the instructor with a paragraph reflection on the assigned writing within a week of their absence.

Beyond the Classroom

Unify America College Bowl Participation and Reflection

In this course, students will not only build the foundational virtues of civic dialogue inside the classroom, but they will also learn to practice those skills beyond the classroom as well. For this assignment, students will work with the nationally-recognized Unify America College Bowl program to be virtually matched with another student to have a one-hour conversation about challenging political issues. Students will share their points of view, find common ground, and discover that they can have a respectful conversation in the face of potential conflict. Students will be asked to write a two-page reflection on what they learned from the experience. Papers should be double-spaced, use 12-point Times New Roman font, and be carefully edited. Students also need to submit them before Week 13 in the semester.

Challenging Conversation

In the next assignment that asks students to take their skills beyond the classroom, students will plan and initiate a discussion on a controversial political topic with someone that they know, perhaps a parent, sibling, roommate, or friend, considering who might be open to having such a conversation. In preparing for this conversation, students will create questions to guide the discussion, making sure to choose questions that are creative and open-ended in helping to learn the views of the other



person, only sharing their own perspective once they have a full grasp of the other person's viewpoint. Students will be asked to write a two-page reflection on what they learned from the experience. Papers should be double-spaced, use 12-point Times New Roman font, and be carefully edited. Students also need to submit them before Week 13 in the semester.

Oxford Union Debate and Dinner Party

Finally, students will attend a debate between presenters arguing for both sides of a controversial issue along with a dinner party that I will host. The structure is meant to loosely approximate the structure of an Oxford Union Debate, bringing together both the skills students have built throughout the course along with an emphasis on community and friendship as the basis of healthy and productive civil discourse. ***This will be optional, and participation will not calculate into your final grade.***

Testing Your Knowledge

Midterm Exam

An exam at the midpoint of the semester testing both students content knowledge and their ability to apply a critical perspective to texts and viewpoints presented in class.

Changing Your Mind Essay (Final Exam)

This essay assignment is the capstone project for the course and will draw on both students' analytical and narrative skills as well as the theoretical knowledge they develop throughout the course. Most importantly, the assignment will highlight one way in which students have *changed their mind* during the course. This can either be a complete change in viewpoint (Example: I used to think there should be no limits on free speech but now I think there should be principled limits) or a change in the reasons you have for holding a particular viewpoint (Example: I still think there should be no limits on free speech, but my reasons for thinking so have changed). The writing assignment will proceed in several stages. For the first stage, students will explain what their viewpoint was at the beginning of class and the arguments and experiences which shaped it. In the second stage of the assignment, students will detail how their perspective has changed, articulating the reasons and arguments that led them to adjust their view and discussing the role that the course readings played in that shift. For the final stage of the assignment, students will consider three objections that could arise for their new perspective, thoroughly responding to those objections. The essay should be eight to ten pages, double-spaced, use 12-point Times New Roman font, and be carefully edited. It will be due at 11:59pm on the date listed in the syllabus.



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

Class Policies

Late Work Policy

Late work will be assessed a 10% penalty for each day that it is late. An extension may be requested beforehand if a student anticipates that their work will not be turned in on time.

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.

- For each unexcused absence from class, students will be docked 5% of their participation grade. Students who miss 25% or more of the class sessions will receive a 0 for this portion of the course. Missing classes for illness or religious holidays does not count, but for an absence to be considered “excused,” you must contact the instructor within one week. Please reach out to the instructor with any questions about this policy.
- Consistent, high-quality participation—including respectful listening, contributing to discussion, and building on peers’ insights—is expected each week. Occasional informal writing or group exercises may be used to facilitate discussion and deepen reflection. Students will be docked 1 point of their participation grade (1/100 pts) for every day they do not bring 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.

Generative AI Policy

The use of generative AI tools (e.g. ChatGPT, Dall-e, etc.) is permitted **outside of class** for the following activities:

- Brainstorming and refining your ideas.
- Fine tuning your research questions.
- Finding information on your topic.
- Drafting an outline to organize your thoughts;
- Checking grammar and style.

The use of generative AI tools is not permitted in this course for the following activities:

- Any activity during class
- Writing a draft of a writing or presentation assignment.
- Writing entire sentences, paragraphs, or papers to complete class assignments.

If you use generative AI for any tasks in completing an assignment outside of class, you must include a statement in the assignment summarizing your use.

Technology Policy

No laptop or cell phone use will be permitted during class sessions without permission from the instructor. If you need to send a text or take a phone call, you should leave the classroom to do so.

VI. COURSE SCHEDULE & READINGS

UNIT 1: CIVIC DIALOGUE & THE INTELLECTUAL VIRTUES

Week 1- COURSE INTRODUCTION

- Monday, January 12th – Civic Dialogue and the Search for Truth
 - Reading: Plato, The Allegory of the Cave
 - Syllabus Review
- Wednesday, January 14th – Foundational Skills: Civic Friendship
 - Reading: Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, Books VIII & IV
 - Example Civic Dialogue: The Norm-Setting Conversation

Week 2 - COURSE INTRODUCTION (CONTINUED)

- Monday, January 19th: No Class – Martin Luther King Jr. Day
- Wednesday, January 21st – Foundational Skills: Dialogue Leader
 - Example Civic Dialogue: The Norm-Setting Conversation

Week 3- INTELLECTUAL HUMILITY AND PRIDE

- Monday, January 26th – Foundational Skills: The Intellectual Virtues
 - Reading: Chapter 9 of Robert Roberts and William Jay Wood, 2007, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.
 - Reading: Whitcomb, Dennis, Heather Battaly, Jason Baehr, and Daniel Howard-Snyder. 2015. "Intellectual Humility: Owning Our Limitations." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 94.3: pp. 509-539.
- Wednesday, January 28th – Socialism vs. Capitalism, Day 1
 - Reading: Chapter 1 of G.A. Cohen, 2010, *Why Not Socialism?* Princeton University Press.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Socialism vs. Capitalism 1

Week 4 - INTELLECTUAL COURAGE AND COWARDICE

- Monday, February 2nd – Foundational Skills: The Intellectual Virtues



- Reading: Chapter 8 of Robert Roberts and William Jay Wood, 2007, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.
- Reading: Chapter 9 of Jason Baehr, 2011, *The Inquiring Mind: On Intellectual Virtues and Virtue Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.
- Wednesday, February 4th – Socialism vs. Capitalism, Day 2
 - Reading: Chapter 2 of Jason Brennan, 2014, *Why not Capitalism?*. Routledge.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Socialism vs. Capitalism 2

Week 5 - INTELLECTUAL AUTONOMY AND DEPENDENCE

- Monday, February 9th – Foundational Skills: The Intellectual Virtues
 - Reading: Grasswick, Heidi. "Epistemic Autonomy in a Social World of Knowing." In *Routledge Handbook of Virtue Epistemology*. Edited by Heather Battaly. Routledge.
 - Reading: Chapter 10 of Robert Roberts and William Jay Wood, 2007, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.
- Wednesday, February 11th – What We Owe to Others
 - Reading: Singer, Peter. "Famine, Affluence, and Morality." *Applied Ethics*. Routledge, 2017. 132-142.
 - Reading: Chapter 6 of Jason Brennan, 2020, *Why It's Okay to Want to Be Rich*. Routledge.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – What We Owe to Others

UNIT 2: AMERICAN FOUNDATIONS & FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Week 6 – ENLIGHTENMENT TOLERATION AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

- Monday, February 16th –
 - Reading: John Locke, *Letter concerning Toleration*, in idem, *Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Mark Goldie (Oxford, 2016), pp. 123–168.
- Wednesday, February 18th – Student-Led Dialogue: Freedom of Speech, Day 1
 - Reading: Denis Diderot, Articles from *The Encyclopaedia*, in *The Enlightenment*, ed. David Williams (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 291–306 (*Political Authority; City; Citizen; Natural Law*).
 - Reading: John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, in *Princeton Readings in Political Thought*, ed. Cohen, pp. 375–388.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Freedom of Speech 1

Week 7 – ENLIGHTENMENT TOLERATION AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH 2

- Monday, February 23rd –
 - Reading: David Hume, 'The Liberty of the Press', in *Political Essays*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–3.
 - Jean Louis de Lolme, 'The Constitution of England (1777)', ed. David Lieberman (Indianapolis, 2007), pp. 199–213.
- Wednesday, February 25th – Student-Led Dialogue: Freedom of Speech, Day 2
 - Reading: Joseph Priestly, *Essay on the First Principles of Government* (1771), pp. 1–10.
 - Reading: Walter Bagehot, 'The Metaphysical Basis of Toleration' (1874), in *Literary Studies*, ed. Richard Holt Hutton (1891), II, pp. 422–437.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Freedom of Speech 2



Week 8 – FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

- Monday, March 2nd –
 - Reading: Jonathan Mayhew, *A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers* (1750), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 43–52.
 - Reading: Samuel Adams, *The Rights of the Colonists* (1772), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 108–113.
 - Reading: Jonathan Boucher, *On Civil Liberty, Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance* (1774), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 113–118.
- Wednesday, March 4th – Student-Led Dialogue: Problems for Freedom of Speech, Day 1
 - Reading: John Adams, *Thoughts on Government* (1776), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 88–94.
 - Reading: Henry Sacheverell, *The Communication of Sin* (1709), pp. 3–16.
 - Student-led Dialogue – Worries about Freedom of Speech 1

Week 9 – MIDTERMS

- Monday, March 9th –
 - Intellectual Virtues Presentation
 - Midterm Exam Review
- Wednesday, March 11th –
 - MIDTERM EXAM

Week 10 – SPRING BREAK

Week 11 – FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN LIBERTY 2

- Monday, March 23rd –
 - Reading: *Declaration of Independence* (1776), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 115–118.
 - Reading: Thomas Jefferson, *A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom* (1777), in *American Political Thought*, eds. Kramnick and Lowi, pp. 295–297.
 - Reading: Thomas Jefferson, ‘A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge’, in *Foundations of Education in America*, eds. James Wm. Noll and Sam P. Kelley (New York, 1970), pp. 143–147.
- Wednesday, March 25th – Student-Led Dialogue: Problems for Freedom of Speech, Day 2
 - Reading: Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay, *The Federalist*, ed. Lawrence Goldman (Oxford, 2008), pp. 1–4, 35–46 (*Federalist 1, 9–10*).
 - Reading: James Madison, ‘A Memorial and Remonstrance’, in *Foundations of Education in America*, eds. Noll and Kelley, pp. 148–153.
 - Reading: Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop Mansfield (Chicago, 2000), pp. 172–180, 235–263, 403–410, 661–672.
 - Student-led Dialogue – Worries about Freedom of Speech 2

UNIT 3: THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

Week 12 – ANCIENT GROUNDWORK

- Monday, March 30th –



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

- Reading: Plato, *The Republic*, in *Foundations of Education in America*, eds. James Wm. Noll and Sam P. Kelley (New York, 1970), pp. 19–31.
 - Reading: Aristotle, *The Politics*, trans. T.A. Sinclair (London, 1992), pp. 451–459.
 - Unify America College Bowl Assignment Due
- Wednesday, April 1st – Student-Led Dialogue: Affirmative Action, Day 1
 - Reading: Pojman, Louis. 1998. “The Case Against Affirmative Action.” *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 12.1 (1998): 97-105.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Affirmative Action 1

Week 13 – FOUNDATIONS FOR THE MODERN UNIVERSITY 1

- Monday, April 6th –
 - Reading: John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, 1996), pp. 14– 24, 76–90, 166–177.
 - Reading: John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York, 1916), pp. 94–116.
- Wednesday, April 8th – Student-Led Dialogue: Affirmative Action, Day 2
 - Reading: Boonin, David. 2011. “Chapter 5: Two Cheers for Affirmative Action.” In *Should Race Matter?: Unusual Answers to the Usual Questions*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-187.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Affirmative Action 2
 - Challenging Conversation Assignment Due

Week 14 – FOUNDATIONS FOR THE MODERN UNIVERSITY 2

- Monday, April 13th –
 - Reading: T.S. Eliot, *Notes Towards a Definition of Culture* (London, 1948), pp. 13–32.
 - Reading: Robert Maynard Hutchins, “The Conflict in Education,” in *Foundations of Education in America*, eds. James Wm. Noll and Sam P. Kelley (New York, 1970), pp. 351–356.
 - Reading: Robert Maynard Hutchins, *Education for Freedom* (Baton Rouge, 1944), pp. 19–64.
- Wednesday, April 15th – Student-Led Dialogue: Institutional Neutrality, Day 1
 - Reading: McGuire, Steven. 2024. “It took years, but elite colleges are learning the value of institutional neutrality.” *The Hill*.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Institutional Neutrality 1

Week 15 – CONTEMPORARY EXPRESSIONS

- Monday, April 20th –
 - Reading: Harvard University, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, MA, 1945), pp. 42–78, 204– 230.
 - Reading: Selections from the University of Chicago, *Kalven Report* (1967)
 - Reading: Selections from the University of Chicago, *Report on the Committee on Free Expression* (2014).
- Wednesday, April 22nd – Student-Led Dialogue: Institutional Neutrality, Day 2
- Student-Led Dialogue – Institutional Neutrality 2
 - Wood, Peter. 2024. “The Illusion of Institutional Neutrality.” *National Association of Scholars*.
 - Student-Led Dialogue – Institutional Neutrality 2



- Monday, April 27th –
 - Final Exam Review
 - The Oxford Union Debate & Dinner Party

VII. University Policy Statements

Academic Misconduct

- It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee ([Faculty Rule 3335-5-48.7 \(B\)](#)). For additional information, see the [Code of Student Conduct](#).

Disability Services

- The university strives to maintain a healthy and accessible environment to support student learning in and out of the classroom. If you anticipate or experience academic barriers based on your disability (including mental health, chronic, or temporary medical conditions), please let me know immediately so that we can privately discuss options. To establish reasonable accommodations, I may request that you register with Student Life Disability Services. After registration, make arrangements with me as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that they may be implemented in a timely fashion.
- If you are ill and need to miss class, including if you are staying home and away from others while experiencing symptoms of a viral infection or fever, please let me know immediately. In cases where illness interacts with an underlying medical condition, please consult with Student Life Disability Services to request reasonable accommodations. You can connect with them at slds@osu.edu; 614-292-3307; or slds.osu.edu.

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](#)).

Intellectual Diversity

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

(enter text here)

Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy: Worksheet Responses

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

This course understands citizenship not only as a legal status but also as a political and social activity that demands rigorous, informed, and thoughtful debate, participation in political processes, and forging civic friendships across lines of difference. “Civic Friendship and Dialogue in American Democracy” is a multidisciplinary course that helps students explore these themes—specifically, the foundational role of civic friendship and dialogue in sustaining American democracy. Over the course of the semester, students will engage with and analyze foundational texts on ideas related to civic friendship and dialogue, the intellectual virtues, the American founding, and contemporary university life. They will develop their understanding of the historical and philosophical foundations of the American project and improve their ability to participate as civic leaders in it. Students will also form civic friendships and, through them, understand the foundation for why learning to live together is desirable in the first place.

ELO 1.1

This course will build skills needed to engage in critical and logical thinking about the place of civic friendship and dialogue in American democracy through:

- Daily reading assignments consisting of primary sources such as Plato’s *The Allegory of the Cave*, Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, and John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*) and secondary sources such as Robert Roberts and William Jay Wood’s *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* and Dennis Whitcomb, Heather Battaly, Jason Baehr, and Daniel Howard-Snyder’s “Intellectual Humility: Owning Our Limitations.”
- “Annotated Text” daily assignments that ask students to annotate the assigned texts according to their argument structure.
- Weekly in-class writing assignments that require students to critically evaluate the strength of the argument from the assigned readings, formatting the argument and raising objections. For example, during week 3, students will be asked to draw on Chapter 2 of Jason Brennan’s *Why Not Capitalism?* and develop an evidence-based argument for why either socialism or capitalism is a preferable economic system.
- Weekly in-class discussion groups requiring students to defend positions on a number of politically relevant public policy issues (for example, Affirmative Action in Week 12 and 13)
- Completion of a midterm and final exam in which students demonstrate comprehension of the course materials and readings. Exams will include questions such as “explain the meaning and significance of intellectual humility, drawing on specific examples and concepts from our readings.”

ELO 1.2:

This course will help students engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the theme by requiring students to do in-depth annotations of course readings that consider foundational ideas about:

The intellectual virtues, including intellectual humility and pride (Chapter 9 of Robert Roberts and William Jay Wood, 2007, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology*. Oxford University Press), intellectual courage and cowardice (Chapter 9 of Jason Baehr, 2011, *The Inquiring Mind: On Intellectual Virtues and Virtue Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.), and intellectual autonomy and dependence (Grasswick, Heidi. "Epistemic Autonomy in a Social World of Knowing." In *Routledge Handbook of Virtue Epistemology*. Edited by Heather Battaly. Routledge.)

Free speech and toleration (John Locke, Letter concerning Toleration, in idem, *Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Mark Goldie (Oxford, 2016), pp. 123–168.)

And the mission of the university (John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, 1996), pp. 14–24, 76–90, 166–177., John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York, 1916), pp. 94–116.)

ELO. 2.1:

Students will identify, describe, and synthesize approaches to and experiences of civic friendship and dialogue through a combination of lectures, readings, and discussions:

Reading

Students will explore a wide range of approaches to and perspectives on civic friendship and dialogue by reading a diverse set of texts: contemporary work in philosophy on the intellectual virtues (e.g. Chapter 9 of Jason Baehr, 2011, *The Inquiring Mind*), historical documents from the American founding (e.g., Thomas Jefferson, *A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom* (1777), and the work of Enlightenment thinkers who influenced the Constitution (John Locke, *Letter concerning Toleration*).

Lecture

Once they have completed the readings, lectures will bring together the diverse subject matter of the course, challenging students to think about what it means to be a citizen and strive to achieve justice in a diverse society. Lectures will feature diverse experiences of civic friendship and dialogue across time and place. For example, in Week 1 lectures, students will learn about Plato and Aristotle's understanding of and experience of civic discourse at the Academy in ancient Greece. In Weeks 13 and 14, lectures will learn about John Henry Newman and John Dewey's conception of the university as a seedbed for character formation and citizenship education.

Civic Dialogue Discussions

Students put all of what they are learning—from the readings, lectures, and assignments—into action during our civic dialogue discussions. These discussions draw on the foundational skills developed in the class, including civic friendship, the intellectual virtues, and leadership to have productive conversations about challenging political issues. Dialogue Example: During Week 13 of the class, we will discuss affirmative action in our dialogue groups, drawing on the reading (Boonin, David. 2011. “Chapter 5: Two Cheers for Affirmative Action.” In *Should Race Matter?: Unusual Answers to the Usual Questions*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-187). This will give students the opportunity to discuss arguments for and against affirmative action, understanding the plurality on viewpoints on this important and challenging political issue.

ELO 2.2:

Students will complete a capstone project for the course that will challenge them to draw on both their analytical and narrative skills as well as the theoretical knowledge they develop throughout the course. Most importantly, the assignment will highlight one way in which students have changed their mind during the course. This can either be a complete change in viewpoint (Example: I used to think there should be no limits on free speech but now I think there should be principled limits) or a change in the reasons you have for holding a particular viewpoint (Example: I still think there should be no limits on free speech, but my reasons for thinking so have changed). The writing assignment will proceed in several stages. For the first stage, students will explain what their viewpoint was at the beginning of class and the arguments and experiences which shaped it. In the second stage of the assignment, students will detail how their perspective has changed, articulating the reasons and arguments that led them to adjust their view and discussing the role that the course readings played in that shift. For the final stage of the assignment, students will consider three objections that could arise for their new perspective, thoroughly responding to those objections. This activity will demand self-reflection, creativity, and grappling with prior experience, helping students develop a sense of themselves as learners and citizens.

ELO 3.1:

Notions of civic friendship and dialogue necessarily have to do with notions of citizenship. In this course, students will not only be challenged to develop civic friendships through their “Challenging Conversation” assignment and practice civic dialogue through their “Unify American College Bowl” assignment; students will also learn to describe and analyze perspectives on citizenship from a range of sources:

In Unit 2, students will read about the historical evolution of the idea of citizenship and its relationship to freedom of expression, reading and annotating the following texts -- John Locke, Letter concerning Toleration, in *idem*, *Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Mark Goldie (Oxford, 2016), pp. 123–168, Denis Diderot, Articles from *The Encyclopaedia*, in *The Enlightenment*, ed. David Williams (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 291–306 (Political Authority; City; Citizen; Natural Law), John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, in *Princeton Readings in Political Thought*, ed. Cohen, pp. 375–388, David Hume, ‘The Liberty of the Press’, in *Political Essays*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–3, and Walter

Bagehot, 'The Metaphysical Basis of Toleration' (1874), in *Literary Studies*, ed. Richard Holt Hutton (1891), II, pp. 422–437.

Then, in Unit 3, students will consider how universities play a part in forming citizens both in knowledge and virtue by considering the idea of the university in the following authors -- Plato, *The Republic*, in *Foundations of Education in America*, eds. James Wm. Noll and Sam P. Kelley (New York, 1970), pp. 19–31, Aristotle, *The Politics*, trans. T.A. Sinclair (London, 1992), pp. 451–459, John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, 1996), pp. 14–24, 76–90, 166–177, and John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York, 1916), pp. 94–116.

In students' exams, in-class writing assignments, and reading quizzes, they will be asked to describe and analyze how these authors' national, global, and historical communities have shaped their perspective on what constitutes citizenship. For example, how did John Henry Newman's Catholic faith and English identity affect his conception of civic education and the purposes of the university? How did World War I, World War II, and the rise of modernism shape T.S. Eliot's conception of civic culture?

ELO 3.2:

At the core of this course is the formation of students as global citizens who are able to enter into civic dialogue and navigate competing ideas about justice, citizenship, and democracy. Students will learn how to identify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for intercultural competency through: (1) daily discussion, reading quizzes, and the annotated text activity will challenge students to identify and reflect on diverse ideas about justice, citizenship, and the role of educational and political institutions in supporting these ideals (see Week 15, which focuses on the relationship between education and freedom in society); (2) class discussions and "friendship groups" that will give students the chance to not only practice intercultural competency and the intellectual virtues but also to understand the foundation for why learning to live together is desirable in the first place; and (3) "Beyond the Classroom" activities that will equip students to be civic leaders. In these activities, they will practice civil discourse outside the classroom with students from other universities (The Unify America College Bowl), their friends and relatives (The Challenging Conversation), and visiting speakers and dialogue partners (The Oxford Union Debate).

ELO 4.1:

Through the historical and contemporary readings and discussions, students will have numerous opportunities to examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as a variety of lived experiences. In our civic dialogues, we will not only discuss issues that directly connect with these concerns—for example, topics on capitalism (Wednesday, February 4), socialism (Wednesday, January 28), affirmative action (Wednesday, April 1), and the risks of freedom of expression (Week 6)—but in the midst of these conversations all students will also have the opportunity to describe and share their lived experience, putting a human face on what can sometimes be abstract political issues. For example, during the discussion of the risks of freedom of expression, we will discuss how diverse minorities can often be the target of cruel and demeaning language, creating a barrier to full participation in their political communities. Thus, the reasons and arguments that will come

out of our discussions will draw on these lived experiences, bringing students face-to-face with challenging political realities.

ELO 4.2:

Throughout the course, students will be asked to analyze and critique the concepts of citizenship, difference, and justice as they relate to institutions and traditions and consider how they can develop their foundational skills outside the classroom. This will become most prominent at the end of the course, as the final unit not only considers what it means for the university to form citizens, but whether or not universities should be in the business of forming citizens in the first place. Students will be asked to confront whether or not universities should be institutionally neutral by reading works such as Robert Maynard Hutchins's *Education for Freedom* and Harvard University's *General Education in a Free Society*.

Engaging with these sorts of texts and discussing them with their peers will require students to confront how we should think of citizenship moving forward, pushing them to both consider how they have been formed as citizens and how we should plan to shape those of future generations.

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>
---	---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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](#)"