Term Information

Effective Term	Summer 2026
Previous Value	*Spring 2026*

Course Change Information

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

Add GE Themes (Citizenship) status to the course (with revisions requested after initial GE committee review)

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

The course has been designed for GE Themes (Citizenship), and we wish to return it to the queue for consideration

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

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

Add GE Themes (Citizenship) status to the course

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

Is this a request to withdraw the course? No

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area	Civics, Law, and Leadership
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org	Chase Center for Civics - D4260
College/Academic Group	Office of Academic Affairs
Level/Career	Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog	2000
Course Title	Can We Rule Ourselves?
Transcript Abbreviation	Self-Rule
Course Description	Effective self-government has been the historical exception rather than the rule. This course surveys the origins, institutions, achievements and failures of past efforts at self-government. Students will use both primary and secondary sources to gain a better understanding of how notions of citizenship and justice have varied across time, culture, and historical context.
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

Required for this unit's degrees, majors, and/or minors
Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

Previous Value

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

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students learn to evaluate the project of self-rule as a collective, inter-generational, cross-cultural effort to realize a common human capacity for participating in shared governance, focusing on case studies that informed the American framers.

Content Topic List

- Ancient Republics; Fall of Rome and the Rise of Christianity; Medieval Origins of Representative Institutions; Renaissance Republicanism; English Interregnum; Glorious Revolution; American Revolution; French Republicanism

Sought Concurrence Yes

Attachments

- Concurrence - ASC, Glenn, Education, Law.pdf: Concurrence Exchanges

  (Concurrence. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2000 - syllabus (v3, changes highlighted).pdf: Syllabus (v3, changes highlighted)

  (Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2000 - syllabus (v3, clean copy).pdf: Syllabus (v3, clean copy)

  (Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2000 - GE Worksheet (v3).pdf: GE Worksheet (v3)

  (Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Cover Letter for resubmission of CIVICLL 2000 (v3).pdf: Cover Letter for revision of CIVICLL 2000 (v3)

  (Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)

Comments

- Updated effective term *(by Reed,Kathryn Marie on 01/08/2026 04:48 PM)*
- Please see feedback email sent to department 11-24-2025 RLS *(by Steele,Rachel Lea on 11/24/2025 08:44 PM)*

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	10/19/2025 02:40 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	10/19/2025 02:40 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	10/19/2025 05:46 PM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele,Rachel Lea	11/24/2025 08:44 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	01/08/2026 12:05 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	01/08/2026 12:10 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	01/08/2026 04:48 PM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Steele,Rachel Lea	01/12/2026 09:16 AM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	01/12/2026 09:23 AM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	01/12/2026 09:23 AM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	01/12/2026 10:16 AM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Steele,Rachel Lea	01/12/2026 10:16 AM	ASCCAO Approval

Memo Regarding Resubmission of CIVICLL 2000 (v3)

We thank the Subcommittee for its detailed attention to the course. We acknowledge that the syllabus would benefit from clarifying how students will "critique and interpret" (not just "learn about") core concepts of the GE Theme. As result, we have made extensive revisions to the syllabus.

Key revisions to the syllabus are highlighted in yellow. We have also provided a "clean copy" of the syllabus.

Our revisions elaborate how students will actively engage all Theme ELOs, using primary and secondary sources to identify strengths and weaknesses of influential interpretive frameworks, reflect on their own assumptions, and revise their positions over the course of the semester. We have made these dimensions of the coursework more explicit by flagging relevant ELOs and core concepts throughout the syllabus (including elaborating the Assignments and Grading section and adding synthetic Overarching Questions for each week of the Course Schedule).

Our most substantial revisions concern ELOs 4.1 and 4.2, to address the Subcommittee's questions regarding how students will "critique and interpret… concepts of diversity, difference and inclusion," including "how [they] intersect with cultural traditions, structures of power, or are involved in advocacy for social change." Those revisions include:

- Framing the whole course more explicitly around a key historical and conceptual puzzle, namely: *how can the ideal of collective self-rule by all citizens be made compatible with the aim of self-determination for all citizens* (in other words, how can principles of democracy and collective self-government be squared with principles of liberalism and social diversity). We have highlighted this puzzle at the outset of the course, in Week 1, and asked to students to reflect on and discuss their evolving understanding of realities of social diversity and mechanisms for political inclusion in Weeks 12 and 14.

- In between summative and synthetic points of the semester we have refined reading assignments and in-class discussion questions to address ELOs 4.1 and 4.2 more extensively, for instance by asking students to assess a scholarly argument about why ancient Athenian practices of collective self-government should be preferred to ancient Roman models, because the former provide a constructive template for acknowledging and accommodating diversity and difference in the twenty first century while the latter do not (Week 2); having students evaluate the attempts of scholars to understand a variety of lived experiences among people in the past who were ruled (not rulers, or other social-political elites), reflecting on how transformations of individual-and-group-level self-consciousness can catalyze collective campaigns of advocacy for

social change (Week 7), and suggesting how practices of political inclusion and cultural transformation from less formally democratic eras could nonetheless inform productive practices of citizenship in the twenty-first century (Week 14); critiquing contrasting attempts to invoke or interpret common cultural traditions in arguments for political inclusion (Week 8); examining expressions of a variety of lived experiences and evaluating their implications for diversity and equity by considering how minority populations have pursued projects of political inclusion through simultaneous appeals to and critiques of dominant cultural-ethical understandings of justice (Week 4, Day 2; Week 13, Day 1); analyzing the intersection of concepts of justice and difference with established structures of power and advocacy for social change by critiquing competing interpretations of the relative "radicalism" or "conservatism" of the American Revolution and debating the entanglement of racial hierarchy and enslavement with economic systems and constitutional ideals (Week 10; Week 13, Day 2); discussing the value of *participation* versus *representation* in the dynamics of political inclusion and acknowledgement of social difference (Week 11).

- We have added to the course a new set of assignments which should facilitate more fine-grained assessment of ELOs 4.1 and 4.2: primary source analysis assignments (detailed on p. 10 of the syllabus) require students to analyze and evaluate reading materials by identifying features of social context that shaped the construction of select sources and suggesting perspectives that are disproportionately weighted by (or altogether excluded from) those sources, thereby demonstrating that students are able to critique and interpret how relevant forms of diversity and difference interact with particular cultural traditions and structures of power. At the same time, the assignment asks students to reflect on how primary sources provide models for arguing about and exercising citizenship that challenge and supplement their initial assumptions about the lived experiences and social practices that can constructively inform citizens navigating the complexity of the contemporary world. Students' capacity for completing these assignments will be enhanced by the fact that throughout the semester they will be encountering and interpreting cutting-edge scholarship which addresses similar questions concerning the dynamics of diversity, difference, and inclusion in relation to some of the same primary sources students are reading (e.g., Week 2, Day 1; Week 7, Day 2; Week 13, Day 1).

In all these ways, critiquing and interpreting core concepts of ELOs 4.1. and 4.2 will be exemplified for students and practiced by them throughout the semester.

Making these changes has enhanced our execution of other ELOs, particularly ELOs 2.1 and 2.2, since we believe that students will now be more consistently challenged to reflect on their evolving understanding of citizenship and synthesize diverse perspectives in new contexts.

We have addressed additional recommendations from the Subcommittee by adjusting information about Assignments and Grading (pp. 5-7) and adding contact information for Student Life Disability Services (p. 16).

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY

CIVICLL 2000: Can We Rule Ourselves?

[Spring 2026]

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

Instructor: TBD
Email:
Office:
Office Hours:

I. Course Description

Effective self-government by citizens has been the historical exception rather than the rule. The framers of the United States Constitution were acutely aware of the fragility of experiments with self-government. This course seeks to sharpen students' awareness of that fragility by surveying arguments and case studies that informed the framing of the U.S. Constitution and founding notions of ***citizenship, justice, and diversity***. The framers' understanding of the rights and responsibilities of **citizenship**, and the role of government in securing ***justice*** for ***diverse*** peoples, did not emerge in a vacuum. They sought to apply lessons from history in the context of a rapidly globalizing world. This course will help students apply those lessons to the ***diverse*** world of the twenty-first century.

Throughout the semester, students will survey the origins, institutions, achievements and failures of efforts at self-government, and use those examples to question, debate, and revise their initial assumptions about the contribution citizens can make to systems of collective self-government. Students will use both primary and secondary sources to gain a fuller understanding of how notions of ***citizenship*** and ***justice*** have varied across time, culture, and historical context within the Western Tradition. The design of the course is inspired by and provides an updated version of the historically sweeping, inter-disciplinary survey courses that used to be a staple of general education programs in higher education. It is not a course in general cultural literacy, but it familiarizes students with basic problems that have preoccupied American political leaders and constitutional theorists from the founding era through to the present day.

II. Course Objectives

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

CIVICLL Learning Outcomes	Related Course Content

1. Appreciate and critically evaluate the primary texts and secondary sources necessary to understand the key ideas, events, individuals, debates, traditions, and developments that have shaped the American constitutional order, civic life, and society.	Students will learn that American ideas and institutions did not emerge in an arbitrary or capricious manner, but as a direct and detailed reflection on previous experiments with and arguments about self-government. Students will be exposed to primary texts from relevant periods, and secondary literature that synthesizes and interprets historical information. The course emphasizes breadth of knowledge, showing students how ideas interact and evolve between historical contexts. At the same time, the course familiarizes students with a bank of knowledge Americans once held in common, even as they disagreed on how it should be cashed out with regard to public policy and real-time decision-making.
2. Analyze their experiences, reasoning, and cultural assumptions against the accumulated wisdom of inherited traditions and texts, the successes and failures of historical case studies, and the best lessons from the behavioral, social, and natural sciences.	Students will learn to evaluate the project of self-rule as a task which concerns not merely our "selves" (reflecting personal preferences or local customs) nor necessarily, "ruling" (attaining and exercising power), but as a collective, inter-generational, cross-cultural effort to realize a common human capacity for participating in shared governance, as assessed in contrasting ways by theorists, leaders, and researchers.
3. Use a multi-disciplinary perspective to identify and evaluate historical antecedents of contemporary problems, real-world applications of theoretical claims, and the principled bases for practical courses of action within the pluralistic American polity.	Students will learn which historical case studies have been especially important to American leaders and why; consider how practical reality has informed principled theorizing; examine how illiberal or preliberal political orders have managed social pluralism.

III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes

CIVICLL 2000 is an approved course in the **GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World** category.

GEN Goals

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

Expected Learning Outcomes

Successful students will be 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 they interact with cultural traditions, structures of powder, and/or advocacy for social change.

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

This course understands ***citizenship*** as an evolving legal status and cultural concept shaped by unique factors of historical context, universal philosophic claims about ***justice*** in the relationship between individuals and their governments, and the enduring challenge of constructing political and legal regimes that are responsive to ***diversity*** as it emerges through the facts of social pluralism and global networks of ideas and economics, people and power.

Students in this class will explore themes of ***citizenship, diversity, and justice*** at a more advanced level than in the Foundations. Placing the American Republic within its historical and intellectual context, the course challenges students to consider how ideas about self-government and ***citizenship*** interact and evolve between ***diverse*** historical and cultural contexts. Throughout the semester, students will learn that American ideas and institutions did not emerge in an arbitrary or capricious manner, but as direct and comprehensive responses to prior experiments in self-government. Moreover, students will learn to evaluate the project of self-rule as a task which concerns not merely our "selves" (reflecting personal preferences or local customs) nor necessarily, "ruling" (attaining and exercising power), but as a collective, inter-generational, cross-cultural pursuit of ***just government*** and effort to realize a common human capacity for participating in shared governance.

The course requires students to reflect on ***citizenship***, ***justice***, and ***diversity*** at an advanced level through comparisons of primary sources that clarify what was once innovative, challenging, and contentious about now-famous authors and familiar categories, and framing those sources within the context of ongoing, cutting-edge scholarly debates about the proper practice of ***citizenship***, understanding of ***justice***, and acknowledgement or accomodation of ***diversity*** in complex societies. Students will be immersed not in a survey of basic facts about, for instance, ancient Greek versus Roman republicanism, or the English versus French revolutions, but rather in an exploration of and critical reflection on how those historical examples have been invoked, debated, contrasted, and challenged by leaders, scholars, and ordinary ***citizens*** in subsequent eras, throughout American history and into the twenty-first century.

By introducing students to primary texts from key historical periods, and secondary literature that synthesizes and interprets historical information, the course will familiarize students with a bank of knowledge that Americans once held in common, even as they disagreed on how it should be cashed out with regard to public policy and real-time decision-making. At the same time, by requiring students to regularly reflect on, debate, and revise their writing assignments (taking into account cutting-edge scholarly debates as they do so), the course will compel students to synthesize and integrate new information in challenging contexts, equipping them with a stronger sense of their ability to learn about a shared history without relying on conventional wisdom or ideological assumptions.

As a result, students who complete this course will be able to:

1) Explain how the legal definition of citizenship has varied across time and place, considering points of divergence (e.g. between Greek and Roman republicanism: Week 2, Day 1) and points of influence (e.g., between Roman and American republicanism: Week 2, Day 3) **(ELO 1.1)**, as well as how scholars have debated the correct interpretation and long-term implications of specific citizenship regimes (e.g., the English and American revolutions as "radical" or "conservative": Weeks 8, 10) **(ELO 1.2)**
2) Integrate approaches by identifying and synthesizing different disciplinary and philosophic interpretations of key case studies (e.g., challenges to Roman republican practices of citizenship from the natural environment, social pluralism, and competing conceptions of justice: Week 3, Day 2; explanations of England's Glorious Revolution in terms of normative

political philosophy and economic models of public choice: Week 9) **(ELO 2.1)**, and by using historical examples and contemporary scholarly controversies to scrutinize and debate their own assumptions about how citizenship should be practiced in the twenty-first century (Weeks 6, 12) (**ELO 2.2)**.

3) Explore a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship by analyzing arguments about how it has been productively practiced despite different degrees of enfranchisement, and the practices or institutions that have remedied or challenged political exclusion (e.g., in medieval Europe: Week 7, Day 2; the nineteenth century United States: Week 14, Day 1) **(ELO 3.1)**, particularly via skills and dispositions conducive to inter-cultural competence (e.g., in the development and deployment of universal ideals by minority populations: Week 4, Day 2; Week 10, Day 2) and global contexts (e.g., prior to the development of the nation-state: Week 5, Day 1) **(ELO 3.2)**
4) Examine how notions of justice and difference interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship by evaluating the attempts of scholars to make sense of the self-awareness of those who were ruled in earlier epochs (e.g., through the use of primary and secondary sources representing diverse lived experiences in Weeks 7 and 8) **(ELO 4.1)** and by identifying, interpreting, and critiquing attempts to make *self-rule by all citizens* compatible with *self-determination for all citizens* (e.g., in tensions between the principles of democracy and principles of liberalism: Week 1, Day 2; or between representative and direct democracy: Week 11, Day 2, debated in-class in Week 12) **(ELO 4.2)**

IV. Course Materials

All course materials will be available on CarmenCanvas.

V. Assignments and Grading

The final grade will be calculated as follows:

- Participation and Attendance — 20%
- Primary Source Analysis – 20% (10% each)
- Mid-Term Assessment Sequence 1 (Exam, Reflection Paper, Discussion) — 20%
- Mid-Term Exam Assessment Sequence 2 (Reflection Paper, Discussion) — 20%
- Final Exam — 20%

1. Participation and Attendance — 20%

a. Students are expected to attend every class session. For each unexcused absence from class, students will be docked 5% of their participation grade. Students who miss 25% or more of the class sessions will receive a 0 for this component of the course. Missing classes for illness, university-sponsored events, and religious holidays does not count, but for an absence to be considered excused, you must contact the instructor within one week of the absence. Please reach out to the instructor with any questions about this policy.

b. 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 to the instructor.

c. Be sure to arrive on time for class. Excessive tardiness will lead to a reduction in your participation grade. There will be a three-day grace period (meaning that there will be no grade penalty for the first three days a student is late to class), but after that, you will be docked 1 point of your participation grade (1/100) for each day you come to class late.

2. Two Primary Source Analysis Assignments – 20% (10% each) **(ELOs 1.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2)**

a. Twice during the semester, students will choose a primary source listed on the syllabus and analyze it in a 800-1,000-word essay, following the guidelines on a provided rubric.

b. In your response, please devote at least one paragraph to addressing each of the following areas:

i. **Agenda**: Who is the author? What factors are motivating them? What is their intent in creating this historical artifact? What message does the author wish to communicate about self-governance—and specifically, ***citizenship, justice, and/or diversity***? How do they use this source to advance their point? (ELOs 1.1)

ii. **Audience:** Who is the intended audience?

iii. **Absences:** What does this source not tell us? What (and whose) perspectives does it exclude or ignore?

c. In your last paragraph, reflect on two points: first, how specific arguments and language in the text challenged your own conception of citizenship and the appropriate relationship between governments and individuals, and second, how this close-reading activity aided you in appreciating ***diverse*** perspectives on local, national, or global ***citizenship***. What did you uncover about this source and our course themes that you might have missed had you just skimmed the text? How might you apply close-reading and primary source analysis in your civic life to improve your capacity to self-govern?

3. Midterm Assessment 1: Exam, Reflection Paper, and Discussion — 20% **(ELOs 2.1, 2.2)**

a. Following Week 5, students will write an in-class exam covering the first half of the course material. The exam will include (a) a multiple-choice component testing their knowledge of basic information from the first five weeks of the course, (b) an analytical essay section that asking students to identify constituent elements of the contemporary American ***conception of justice and citizenship*** (whether at the level of institutional design or popular imagination) that might plausibly be shared with (or have been directly influenced by) the pre-modern, pre-liberal sources covered in the first five

weeks of the course, and suggest how American principles and practice fundamentally diverge from those sources. The essay will be graded for its evidence (has the student identified precise, appropriate examples from primary sources and historical case studies assigned?) and persuasiveness (can students accurately describe the arguments of secondary literature while evaluating those arguments?). At the following class session students will engage in a group discussion and debate where they (a) present the answers provided in their in-class essay (b) discuss and debate which historically neglected ideas or practices might usefully be revived to advance ***justice*** and accommodate ***diversity*** in an increasingly globalized world (c) write a short reflection paper explaining how the in-class discussion changed (or reinforced) their perspective on the ideals and institutions that can serve ***citizenship*** in the United States. The in-class exam will be worth 10% of the student's final course grade, and the in-class discussion and reflection paper components will be worth 5% each.

4. Midterm Assessment 2: Reflection Paper, and Discussion — 20% **(ELOs 2.1, 2.2)**

    a. Following Week 11, students will submit a short reflection paper (approximately 1200 words) identifying valuable mechanisms of ***citizen*** activity outside the realm of direct voting rights, and be asked to state their view of whether contemporary democracy would benefit most from emphasizing the importance of voting (as defended by some of the cutting-edge scholarship assigned), or by emphasizing alternative means of advancing ***justice*** (as defended in other assigned scholarship). This exercise will require students to demonstrate familiarity with the examples of political protest and collective action illustrated by English, American, and French revolutionaries, *and* recent scholarly interpretations of the political significance of those events. After submitting their reflection paper students will collectively debate their answers to this question, in the process identifying the models of ***citizenship, principles of justice, and mechanisms for expressing the interests of social diversity***, most worth protecting in the twenty first century. The short reflection paper will be worth 15% of the final course grade, and informed, active participation in the class discussion will be worth 5%. **(ELOs 2.1, 2.2)**

5. Final Exam — 20% (ELOs 1.2, 3.1, 3.2)

    a. There will be a cumulative final exam made up of combination of multiple choice and short answer essays. In one of these essays, students will be asked to apply conceptual material from the semester to an analysis of a case study covered in class, while defending a claim about how historical ideas and examples can (or cannot) help advance the cause of ***citizenship for a just and diverse world*** in the twenty first century (in the process demonstrating their ability to engage knowledgably, logically, and critically the arguments of recent, cutting-edge scholarship that enlists historical ideas and examples in the service of contemporary causes of citizenship and justice).

Grading Scale

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

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

VI. Course Schedule

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

Week 1: Citizens Who Rule: The Puzzle of Collective Self-Government

Day 1: General Course Introduction

Day 2: Democracy: Citizen Rulers

Readings: Herodotus, *Histories*, 3.80-82

Josiah Ober, *Demopolis: Democracy Before Liberalism*, chapters 1 and 2

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will learn to distinguish the principles of democracy from those of liberalism, identifying the different rights or powers each system of government accords to ordinary citizens. They will see how the virtues of ***democratic citizenship*** are defined in one of the oldest sources, Herodotus (ELO 1.1) and then analyze Ober's argument that the problems of ***citizenship*** in the twenty-first century United States can be best addressed by looking to pre-modern systems of government that developed democratic practices without the aid of modern liberal principles, thereby demonstrating that *democratic citizenship* as a historical, political, and normative ideal is distinct from *liberal democratic* citizenship (ELOs 1.2, 3.1). This argument introduces a crucial puzzle to be considered over the course of the semester, namely: whether the ideal of collective self-government, separated from liberal principles of inherent, inalienable, human rights, is compatible with accommodating facts of ***social diversity and difference*** as these interact with local cultural traditions and established structures of power (ELOs 4.1, 4.2). **Overarching Question:** Is a system of collective self-government, in which all have a right to participate, compatible with self-determination by all of those who are governed?

Week 2: Ancient Republics: Greece versus Rome

Day 1: Greek Republics

Readings: Plutarch, *Lives*, Lycurgus, Solon, Alcibiades
Ryan Balot, *Greek Political Thought* (Wiley-Blackwell 2006), pp. 48-63

Day 2: The Rise of the Roman Republic

Readings: Plutarch, *Lives*, Numa, Ceasar, Cicero
Jack Ferguson, "The Ciceronian Origins of American Law and Constitutionalism," 48 *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 181 (2025)

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will be able to describe how republicanism represents a distinct approach to the ideal of self-rule (distinct from democracy but related to it) (ELO 1.1), explaining how the institutional arrangements of different ancient republics attempted put that ideal into practice (ELO 1.2), identifying the specific political or social roles each institutional arrangement accorded to ***citizens*** in the project of collective self-government (ELO 3.1), and how those classical models were incorporated into and synthesized by the American model of republicanism (ELO 2.1). Students will be asked to analyze and evaluate Balot's argument to the effect that the Athenian practice of ***citizenship*** simultaneously required the subordination of private interests to a common good and allowed for the public articulation of competing conceptions of justice, criticism of structures of power, and advocacy for social change, thereby accommodating differences within the citizenry in ways Roman republicanism could not, making Greek democracy a more suitable model for citizenship in the twenty first century (ELO 4.2). **Overarching Question:** How can the ***civic obligation to serve a common good*** be compatible with recognition of and respect for ***differences*** among citizens?

Week 3: The Decline of Roman Republicanism

Day 1: Roman Constitutionalism

Readings: Polybius, *The Histories*, Book VI, section 2 through 18
Andrew Lintott, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (Clarendon Press, 1999), pp.. 40-65, 214-232

Day 2: Roman Resilience and Decay

Readings: Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War*, trans. G.A. Williamson, pp. 27–32, 133–178, 374–386
Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, Book XIX
Kyle Harper, *The Fate of Rome: Climate, Disease, and the End of an Empire* (Princeton University Press, 2017), pp. 6-22

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will consider the logic of the Roman constitution as a framework for self-rule (ELO 1.1), using both Polybius and Lintott to explore how the facts of Roman republicanism have been interpreted to generate ***different ideals of citizenship*** (ELO 1.2), which have been deployed in subsequent historical periods to support specific conceptions of ***justice*** and projects of institutional reform (ELO 4.2). After considering Polybius's "internal" perspective on the limits of Roman republicanism, students will examine the "external" perspectives of Josephus and Augustine, focusing on how religious, cultural, and political experiences of communities on the margins of the Roman world generated competing conceptions of ***justice*** and ***citizenship*** (ELOs 3.1, 4.1). At the

same time, students will consider Harper's argument that our understanding of Rome's expansion, survival, and demise is currently being transformed by research regarding the global, ecological context it was a part of and thereby identify and reflect on the knowledge and skills required for managing cross-cultural, global problems (ELO 2.1, 3.2). **Overarching Question:** In what respects were Roman institutions flexible and responsive to ***social difference and competing conceptions of justice***, and in what respects were they unable to accommodate or adapt to changed circumstances?

Week 4: Christianity's Challenge to Roman Law

Day 1: Christianity's Challenge to Roman Law

Readings: Jerome, letter 14; Pliny the Younger, letter 10; Tertullian, Apology, 39.1–6; Theodosian Code 16.2.6; Constantine, Letter to Anulinus; Eusebius, Life of Constantine 3.48

Day 2: Christianity's Transformation of Law

Readings: Larry Siedentop, *Inventing the Individual: Inventing the Western Individual* (Harvard University Press, 2014), pp. 51-78

Luke Timothy Johnson, "Law in Early Christianity" in *Christianity and Law: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 53-70

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will consider the development of Christianity from a fringe persecuted faith to the center of Roman politics as a case study of how new conceptions of justice can draw new boundaries of ***citizenship***, considering especially how universal principles of ***justice*** interact with the reality of entrenched structures of power (ELOs 4.2.). At the same time, students will engage Siedentop's scholarly case that Christianity fundamentally and permanently transformed the world's principles of ***justice and citizenship*** (ELO 1.2), and critically evaluate Johnson's argument that by establishing a practical counterweight to Roman law, the universality of Christian legal thinking facilitated the expression and protection of a greater variety of lived experiences (ELO 3.2). **Overarching Question:** How did the emergence of competing sources of legal authority transform the relationship between ***citizens*** and rulers?

-Primary Source Analysis 1 Due by 6pm on Friday of this Week–

Week 5: Medieval Law and Institutions

Day 1: Institutions and Citizenship

Readings: Anna Gryzmala-Busse, "Beyond War and Contracts: The Medieval and Religious Roots of the European State," *Annual Review of Political Science* 23 (2020): 19-36.

Maarten Prak, *Citizens Without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World, c. 1000-1789* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 27-49

Day 2: Law and Justice

Readings: Deborah Boucoyannis, *Kings as Judges: Power, Justice, and the Origin of Parliaments* (Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 1-84

Harold Berman, *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition*, pp. 120-155

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration (by Gryzmala-Busse and Prak) of how medieval law and institutions developed to buttress the claims

of ***citizens*** against rulers even as ***the formal definition of citizenship*** varied considerably from place to place (ELO 1.2). The political developments will be framed in the context of cross-national comparisons (by Berman and Boucoyannis) of how medieval institutions increasingly embodied common conceptions of law and ***justice*** even as the formal rights they accorded ***citizens*** differed (ELO 3.1). This historical background will enrich students' ability to think critically and logically about how political institutions advance the interests of citizens against government authority (ELO 1.1). **Overarching Question:** What are the indirect mechanisms of law and institutional design that give citizens power over their rulers even when they have no rights to democratic rule?

Week 6: Review and Reflection

Day 1: Continuation and Review

Day 2: In-Class Exam

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will meet ELO 2.2. in three stages. First, writing an in-class exam covering the first half of the course material that includes (a) a multiple-choice component testing their knowledge of basic information from the first five weeks of the course, (b) an analytical essay section that asking students to identify constituent elements of the contemporary American conception of ***justice and citizenship*** (whether at the level of institutional design or popular imagination) that might plausibly be shared with (or have been directly influenced by) the pre-modern, pre-liberal sources covered in the first five weeks of the course, and suggest how American principles and practice fundamentally diverge from those sources. The essay will be graded for its evidence (has the student identified precise, appropriate examples from primary sources and historical case studies assigned?) and persuasiveness (can students accurately describe the arguments of secondary literature while evaluating those arguments?). At the following class session (Week 7, Day 1), students will engage in a group discussion and debate where they (a) present the answers provided in their in-class essay (b) discuss and debate which historically neglected ideas or practices might usefully be revived to advance ***justice*** and accommodate ***diversity*** in an increasingly globalized world (c) write a short reflection paper explaining how the in-class discussion changed (or reinforced) their perspective on the ideals and institutions that can serve ***citizenship*** in the United States. As a part of their reflection, students will identify specific events, arguments, or experiences that have challenges their own conception of citizenship and of the appropriate relationship between individuals and governments, and draw on examples from the course material in their own lives as ***citizens***.

Week 7: Discussion, Petition, Reformation

Day 1: In-Class Discussion

Day 2: Popular Politics Under Monarchy

Readings: David Zarnet, "Petitions and the Creation of Public Opinion in England," *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (1996): 1497-1555.

Petitions to Edward I and his parliament

Expected Learning Outcomes: Following in-class discussion and the submission of a short reflection paper (described in relation to ELO 2.2., under Week 6, above), students will use both primary and secondary sources to examine how religious and technological change transform the

politics of social pluralism, mechanisms for expressing individual and group experience, and the impact of these developments on advocacy for social change through petitions and the creation of public opinion in the context of the English Civil War, and the possibilities of popular politics under monarchy more generally (ELOs 1.1, 1.2). Students will be pressed to evaluate (a) how technological and cultural change impacts a variety of lived experiences through the development of new forms of individual-and-collective consciousness, and (b) how available source materials shape the attempts of contemporary scholars to reconstruct the diversity of lived experiences of people from the past. **Overarching Question:** How can scholars examine and evaluate transformations in the self-awareness of people in the past who were ruled (not rulers)?

Week 8: The Short Life of English Republicanism

Day 1: The Death of a King and the Birth of the English Republic

Readings: The Putney Debates
Agreement of the Free People of England
Milton, "The Easy and Ready Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth"

Day 2: What Was the English Republic Really About?

Readings: Christopher Hill, *A World Turned Upside Down*, pp. 39-51, 361-286
Eric Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic*, pp. 23-56

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students begin by critically and logically assessing arguments concerning the rights and responsibilities of ***citizenship*** advanced by ***diverse*** socially-positioned actors in the context of the English Civil War (ELOs 1.1, 4.2) and then assessing different interpretations of those arguments at an advanced level by comparing scholarly analysis from competing perspectives (Hill reading the material through a Marxist lens; Nelson reading it through a theological lens) (ELO 1.2.). In the process, students will consider the potential intersection of local cultural traditions with radical conceptions of justice and advocacy for social change (ELO 4.2, as well as the potential for "ideological" appropriations of historical artifacts within the context of "culture wars" particular to the period in which scholars happen to operate. **Overarching Question:** How were appeals to shared history and tradition used to build a case for a people's right to rule themselves in the creation of an English Republic?

Week 9: England's Glorious Revolution: For What? And for Whom?

Day 1: Radical Revolutionaries?

Readings: English Bill of Rights
Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton University Press, 1994), 3-22
Melinda Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (Penn State Press, 1999), pp. 1-36

Day 2: Conservative Revolutionaries?

Readings: Steven Pincus & James Robinson, "What Really Happened During the Glorious Revolution?" in *Institutions, Property Rights, and Economic Growth*, eds. Galini & Sened (Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will be able to identify and describe different scholarly assessments of the driving motives and political consequences of the Glorious Revolution (ELOs 1.2, 2.1), analyzing especially how a shared rhetoric of freedom and revolution can conceal competing conceptions of ***justice, citizenship, and the desirability of social change*** (ELO 4.2). **Overarching Question:** What did the Glorious Revolution seek to conserve and what did it aim to change?

Week 10: American Revolutionaries

Day 1: How Revolutionary Was the American Revolution?

Readings: Gordon Wood, "The Radicalism of the American Revolution"
Eric Nelson, "Patriot Royalism: The Stuart Monarchy in American Political Thought"

Day 2: Feudalism in the Founding?

Readings: Holly Brewer, "Reconsidering John Locke and the Origins of American Slavery," *American Historical Review* 122 (2017): 1038-1078.
Keidrick Roy, "Racial Feudalism," *Modern Intellectual History* 21 (20240: 296-327.

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will be presented with two scholarly debates concerning the meaning and implications of the American Revolution: Wood's interpretation of the Revolution as radical and participatory and Nelson's interpretation of it as conservative and monarchical (ELO 1.2). The broader of implication of this debate concerns the degree to which the Revolution was entangled with, or endeavored to separate itself from, "old World" institutions of hierarchy and enslavement and the degree to which it created a framework that would undermine those practices in pursuit of a more ***just*** world (ELO 2.1). By analyzing these scholarly debates students will be equipped to analyze and evaluate how cultural traditions are invoked both to maintain and to change established ***structures of power***, and how lived experiences of those subject to those structures have contributed to constrictively critiquing them (ELOs 4.1, 4.2). **Overarching Question**: To what extent was the American Revolution an extension of established ideals of self-rule and to what extent did it establish new ideals?

Week 11: The First French Republic

Day 1: Competing Conceptions of Citizenship

Readings: Sieyes, *What is the Third Estate?*; Rousseau, *The Social Contract*

Day 2: Active and Passive Citizens

Readings: Richard Tuck, *Active and Passive Citizens* (Princeton University Press, 2024), pp. 13-70

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will explore competing conceptions of ***citizenship*** ("active" and "passive") represented in the French Revolution (ELO 3.1) and explore a recent scholarly defense of one of these as most appropriate to the challenges of the twenty first century (ELO 1.2). A continuing puzzle that comes into focus here is how (or the extent to which) a system of self-rule can legitimately claim to ***include*** and speak on behalf of all those who are ruled (ELO 4.1). **Overarching Questions:** Is the aim of self-rule fulfilled by being represented by in government by participating in government?

-Primary Source Analysis 2 Due by 6pm on Friday of this Week–

Week 12: Discussion and Reflection

Day 1: Continuation and Review

Day 2: Reflection Paper

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will meet ELO 2.2 in two stages. Prior to Day 2, students will submit a short reflection paper (approximately 1200 words) identifying valuable mechanisms of ***citizen*** activity outside the realm of direct voting rights, and be asked to state their view of whether contemporary democracy would benefit most from emphasizing the importance of voting (as defended by some of the cutting-edge scholarship assigned), or by emphasizing alternative means of advancing justice (as defended in other assigned scholarship). This exercise will require students to demonstrate familiarity with the examples of political protest and collective action illustrated by English, American, and French revolutionaries, *and* recent scholarly interpretations of the political significance of those events. After submitting their reflection paper students will collectively debate their answers to this question, in the process identifying the ***models of citizenship, principles of justice, and mechanisms for expressing the interests of social diversit***y, most worth protecting in the twenty first century.

Week 13: Self-Government in Nineteenth Century America

Day 1: Race within the Republic

Readings: David Walker, *An Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World*

Melvin Rogers, "David Walker and the Political Power of Appeal," *Political Theory* 45 (2015): 208-233

Day 2: States within the Republic

Readings: Samuel B. Chase, majority opinion in *Texas v White*

Randy Barnett, "From Antislavery Lawyer to Chief Justice: The Remarkable But Forgotten Career of Samuel B. Chase," *Case Western Reserve Law Review* 63 (2013).

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will be able to explain David Walker's case for characterizing the enslaved as "***citizens***" even though they lacked that legal status (ELO 1.1), and explore and evaluate Melvin Rogers's case for placing Walker's position with the larger tradition of Republican political thought (ELOs 1.2, 3.1), thereby identifying a language of ***citizenship*** and ***political belonging*** suitable to ***intercultural*** contexts (ELO 3.2), while explaining Samuel Chase's assessment of claims concerning the rights of states within the Union as consistent or inconsistent with the exercise of self-government among free ***citizens*** (ELO 1.1), and use excerpts of Randy Barnett's scholarly assessment of Chase's career to analyze whether uncompromising principles of ***justice*** are essential to effective advocacy for social change (ELO 4.2). **Overarching Question:** Which familiar principles and practices (as surveyed over the course of this semester) contributed to the extension and development of self-rule in the nineteenth century United States?

Week 14: Wrapping Up

Day 1: Popular Politics in the Nineteenth-Century

Readings: Daniel Carpenter, *Democracy by Petition* (Harvard University Press, 2021), chapter 15

Day 2: Preparation for Final Exam

Expected Learning Outcomes: Students will be able to describe and analyze petitioning and other tools of popular politics as avenues for ***citizenship*** in the nineteenth century United States, for both what it shares with and how it differs from the Europeans examples covered in Weeks 6 to 8 (particularly with regard to who or what is petitioned on behalf of, and the relevant forms of political identity in the United States as opposed to Europe), examining and evaluating the various expressions of individual and group experience represented in these first-person statements (ELO 4.1), while exploring Carpenter's scholarly case for identifying this somewhat neglected mode of politics as essential to democratic ***citizenship*** (ELO 1.2). **Overaching Question:** Does the nineteenth century United States provide practices of citizenship – including with respect to the pursuit of justice, political inclusion, and representation of social diversity – that Americans would benefirt from recovering in the twenty first century?

VII. University Policy Statements

Academic Misconduct

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

The Ohio State University's Code of Student Conduct (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University or subvert the educational process. Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's Code of Student Conduct is never considered an excuse for academic misconduct, so please review the Code of Student Conduct and, specifically, the sections dealing with academic misconduct.

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

Disability Services (with Accommodations for Illness)

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

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

Students may contact the Student Life Disability Services Office through one of the following:

- Email: **slds@osu.edu**
- Website: **slds.osu.edu**
- Address: 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Ave
- Phone: 614-292-3307

Grievances and Solving Problems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Religious Accommodations

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

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

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

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

Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

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

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

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

Intellectual Diversity

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

(enter text here)

Please see responses in the Appendix below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

***ELO 1.1** Engage in critical and logical thinking.*	*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)*

	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*

	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. *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* *The Marais, a vibrant Paris neighborhood inhabited over the centuries by aristocrats, then Jews, then the LGBTQ+ community, among other groups.*

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 and 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,*	*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.*

national, global, and/or historical communities.	*Throughout the class students will be required to engage with questions about what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across contexts.* *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.*
ELO 3.2 *Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.*	*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.*

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

	*"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.*

Appendix.

In a sentence or two, explain how this class "fits' within the focal Theme.
This course understands ***citizenship*** as an evolving legal status and cultural concept shaped by unique factors of historical context, universal philosophic claims about ***justice*** in the relationship between individuals and their governments, and the enduring challenge of constructing political and legal regimes that are responsive to ***diversity*** as it emerges through the facts of social pluralism and global networks of ideas and economics, people and power. This course specifically centers around the philosophies and civic ideals underpinning the American experiment, and conceptions of the rights and responsibilities of American citizenship.

Students in this class will explore themes of ***citizenship, diversity, and justice*** at a more advanced level than in the Foundations. Placing the American Republic within its historical and intellectual context, the course challenges students to consider how ideas about self-government and ***citizenship*** interact and evolve between ***diverse*** historical and cultural contexts. Throughout the semester, students will learn that American ideas and institutions did not emerge in an arbitrary or capricious manner, but as direct and comprehensive responses to prior experiments in self-government. Moreover, students will learn to evaluate the project of self-rule as a task which concerns not merely our "selves" (reflecting personal preferences or local customs) nor necessarily, "ruling" (attaining and exercising power), but as a collective, inter-generational, cross-cultural pursuit of ***just government*** and effort to realize a common human capacity for participating in shared governance.

The course requires students to reflect on ***citizenship***, ***justice***, and ***diversity*** at an advanced level through comparisons of primary sources that clarify what was once innovative, challenging, and contentious about now-famous authors and familiar categories, and framing those sources within the context of ongoing, cutting-edge scholarly debates about the proper practice of ***citizenship***, understanding of ***justice***, and acknowledgement or accommodation of ***diversity*** in complex societies. Students will be immersed not in a survey of basic facts about, for instance, ancient Greek versus Roman republicanism, or the English versus French revolutions, but rather in an exploration of and critical reflection on how those historical examples have been invoked, debated, contrasted, and challenged by leaders, scholars, and ordinary ***citizens*** in subsequent eras, throughout American history and into the twenty-first century.

ELO 1.1:
Throughout the semester, students will develop critical and logical thinking skills as they survey the origins, institutions, achievements and failures of historical efforts at ***self-government***. Through close analysis of primary sources (e.g. Polybius's *The Histories*) and secondary sources (e.g. Andrew Lintott's analysis of Polybius's influence on American constitutionalism), students will consider ***diverse*** interpretations of ***citizenship, justice, and self-rule***. In-class discussions will challenge students to reflect on the topics raised in their readings (e.g. the appropriate size and nature of government for a ***just and diverse world***, and limits of ***self-rule***), consider open areas of inquiry, and articulate the relationship between ***American civic ideals*** and their intellectual precedents. For example, in Week 1 students will learn to distinguish "***democratic citizenship***" from "***liberal citizenship***" (or even "liberal democratic citizenship" and consider reasons for favoring the former as a stand-alone basis for organizing social and political life. Subsequently, they will use logical reasoning to debate whether and how medieval politics provided a groundwork for modern representative institutions. Students will also be required to evaluate the plausibility of scholarly arguments to the effect that the arguments of abolitionists in the United States can fit within the often more exclusionary definitions in the tradition of Republican political thought. Students' grasp of the historic definition of such terms (democracy

and liberalism, republicanism and representation) will be tested through in-class exams, while reflection papers, in-class discussions, and essay questions will require them to explain why historical concepts and practices are suitable or not suitable for addressing dilemmas of ***citizenship, justice, and diversity*** in the twenty first century. Essay questions will ask students to synthesize—and engage in logical thinking about—their learning throughout the semester. For example: "Explain how the legal definition of ***citizenship*** has varied across time and place, considering points of divergence (e.g. between Greek and Roman republicanism: Week 2, Day 1) and points of influence (e.g., between Roman and American republicanism: Week 2, Day 3)."

ELO 1.2:
Students will engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of ***citizenship, justice, and diversity*** through a variety of course activities. Weekly lectures on topics ranging from Roman Republicanism to the English Civil War will engage students with the ***diverse civic traditions*** that informed the American Founding. Close analysis essays of primary sources such as Plutarch's *Lives* will help students develop analytical skills and a robust understanding of experiments in self-government.

Most importantly, reading secondary sources such as Jacob Levy's *Rationalism, Pluralism, and Freedom* will enrich students' understanding of these primary sources, helping them place them within their historical context and identify their overarching, still-relevant themes. In class discussion and in their midterm and final exams, students will be asked to articulate how scholars have debated the correct interpretation and long-term implications of specific ***citizenship*** regimes (e.g., the English and American revolutions as "radical" or "conservative": Weeks 8, 10). Exam questions and in-class discussions will also provide students the opportunity to synthesize their knowledge of these themes through short answer questions such as: "Identify important evidence from primary sources, and compelling arguments from secondary sources, supporting the interpretation of the American Revolution as a radical, democratizing break from tradition OR as more conservative, elite-driven, and continuous with millennia-old traditions of Republican politics"; or "Does Richard Tuck's discussion of the conceptual opposition between 'active' and 'passive' ***citizens*** in the French Revolution persuade you that the act of voting in a majoritarian democracy should continue to be considered the touchstone of democratic ***citizenship*** in the twenty first century, OR do you find more practically feasible and normatively appealing Daniel Carpenter's identification of pathways for ***civic action*** and ***advancing justice*** outside voting booths in nineteenth century America?"

ELO. 2.1:
By introducing students to primary texts from relevant periods, and secondary literature that synthesizes and interprets historical information, this course will familiarize students with a bank of knowledge that Americans once held in common, even as they disagreed on how it should be cashed out with regard to public policy and real-time decision-making. Through close readings, lectures, and discussions, students will learn how to identify and describe which historical case studies have been especially important to American leaders and why. Through exams, they will also be challenged to synthesize not only these ***diverse*** approaches to self-rule but also ***diverse*** scholarly perspectives on them. For example, in week 8, "The Rise and Fall of the English Republic," students will survey primary texts representing statements of republicanism and radicalism in the English Civil War, and then consider secondary sources interpreting that history from influential but ***different perspectives*** (Hill reading it through Marxist lens; Nelson reading it through religious lens). This material will be leveraged as a vehicle for considering "ideological" appropriations of historical artifacts in the twenty first century, in pursuit of competing conceptions of ***justice*** and responding to ***social pluralism***. This will include in-class discussions and written reflections on "***democracy***" versus "liberalism" as competing frameworks for structuring ***citizen action*** and adapting to ***social diversity***.

ELO 2.2:
Throughout this course, students will be empowered to develop as learners through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work. This metacognitive component of the course differentiates it from any Foundations-level counterpart. Please see below for examples of course activities that will help students demonstrate their developing sense of self as learners, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts:

Activity 1: Exam reflection

Following Week 5, students will write an in-class exam covering the first half of the course material. During the following class session, students will engage in a group discussion and debate where they (a) present the answers provided in their in-class essay (b) discuss and debate which historically neglected ideas or practices might usefully be revived to ***advance justice and accommodate diversity in an increasingly globalized world***, and c) write a short reflection paper explaining how the in-class discussion changed (or reinforced) their perspective on the ideals and institutions that can serve ***citizenship for a just and diverse world*** in the United States.

Activity 3: Primary Source Analysis Assignment

Twice during the semester, students will choose a primary source listed on the syllabus and analyze it in a 800-1,000-word essay. In their responses, students will be asked to reflect on how the text—and the assignment altogether—affected their own conception of ***citizenship*** and ***the appropriate relationship between governments and individuals***. They will also be asked to meditate on the influence of the assignment on their own development as learners through responding to the following questions: how did this close-reading activity aid you in appreciating ***diverse*** perspectives on local, national, or global ***citizenship***? What did you uncover about this source and our course themes that you might have missed had you just skimmed the text? How might you apply close-reading and primary source analysis in your ***civic life*** to improve your capacity to ***self-govern***?

These are just a few examples of the myriad ways this course will help students reflect on their development as learners. Indeed, a significant component of the class involves challenging students to apply their historical learning to their individual lives and ***the landscape of citizenship, justice, and diversity in the twenty-first century***. Throughout the course—in discussion, exam questions, and reflection papers—students will be asked to integrate historical texts, events, and ideas with their own experiences and perspectives. In class discussion, students will be asked to put themselves in the shoes of historical characters ranging from Athenian citizens, Roman leaders, early and Medieval Christian dissidents, English and American rebels, evaluating the ***similarities and differences between their conceptions of civic rights and responsibilities.*** In these discussions, students will be asked to build on their prior experiences, sharing how these historical characters' perspectives on civic rights and responsibilities comport with their own. Exam questions will also ask them to use historical examples and contemporary scholarly controversies to scrutinize and debate their own assumptions about how ***citizenship*** should be defined and practiced in the twenty-first century. Such self-reflection on their preconceptions and growth as learners will help students develop metacognitive skills that they can carry with them into whatever career they pursue.

See *Midterm Assessment 2 - Reflection Paper* for another example:

Following Week 11, students will submit a short reflection paper (approximately 1200 words)

identifying valuable mechanisms of ***citizen activity*** outside the realm of direct voting rights, and be asked to state their view of whether ***contemporary democracy*** would benefit most from emphasizing the importance of voting (as defended by some of the cutting-edge scholarship assigned), or by emphasizing alternative means of ***advancing justice*** (as defended in other assigned scholarship). This exercise will require students to demonstrate familiarity with the examples of political protest and collective action illustrated by English, American, and French revolutionaries, *and* recent scholarly interpretations of the political significance of those events. After submitting their reflection paper, students will collectively debate their answers to this question, in the process identifying the models of ***citizenship, principles of justice, and mechanisms for giving voice to the interests of social diversity*** most worth protecting in the twenty first century.

ELO 3.1:
Students will describe and analyze a range of historical perspectives on what constitutes ***citizenship*** and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities. For example, students will use primary and scholarly sources to analyze the religious antecedents of modern political ideals (e.g., ***toleration, equality, justice***), and how the conceptual frameworks and institutional design of Roman republicanism help to explain the design of the American Constitution or the arguments of abolitionists in nineteenth century United States. Relatedly, students will examine how ***illiberal*** or preliberal political orders have managed ***social pluralism*** (e.g. reading chapter 1 and 2 of Josiah Ober's *Demopolis: Democracy Before Liberalism* in Week 1 and exploring notions of representation in Medieval Europe by reading Wim Blockman's "The Medieval Origins of Constitutional Representation" Week 5). Through lectures, readings, and influential scholarly sources (e.g., Eric Nelson, Gordon Wood), students will learn that American ideas and institutions did not emerge in an arbitrary or capricious manner, but as a direct and comprehensive response to previous arguments about and experiments in self-government. Exam questions will require students to analyze these diverse arguments and describe how they affected the American Founding—and American civic life today (e.g. "explain two ways that American Founders recycled the ideas of Polybius").

ELO 3.2:
This course will challenge students to evaluate ***the project of self-rule*** as a task which concerns not merely our "selves" (reflecting personal preferences or local customs) nor necessarily, "ruling" (attaining and exercising power), but as a collective, inter-generational, cross-cultural effort to realize a common human capacity for participating in shared governance. Through readings and lectures about civic and intellectual traditions across time and space (e.g. Roman republicanism, the rise of Christianity in the Roman world, and church and state relations in medieval Europe), students will develop ***the intercultural competency required for global citizenship***. And through in-class discussions, students will reflect on and practice the civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for global citizens. This will include recognizing how social reformers in different times and places (e.g., sixteenth century England, eighteenth century France, the nineteenth century United States) have shared conceptual frameworks (e.g., of Roman republicanism) and practical tools (e.g., petitions) yet deployed them differently, in terms intelligible across cultures yet adapted to the distinct exigencies of each.

ELO 4.1:
Through close analysis of primary and secondary sources, students will gain a better understanding of how notions of ***citizenship and justice*** have varied across time, culture, and historical context. One way they will do this is by evaluating the attempts of scholars to make sense of the self-awareness of those who were ruled in earlier epochs (e.g., through the use of primary and secondary sources representing diverse lived experiences in Weeks 7 and 8). As another example, Week 2's readings and

activities, will challenge students to evaluate the characteristics and characters of the ancient republican world through the biographic accounts of Plutarch and consider how self-government necessarily raises the question of who counted as ***citizen*** and who did not (enslaved, foreigners, etc.). Through in-class discussion and exam questions, students will have the chance to reflect on the successes and failures of experiments in self-government, and their historical implications for marginalized peoples (e.g. the sometimes radical flux of inclusion-and-exclusion from ***the boundaries of citizenship*** within the context of the English Civil War, with its implications for reconsidering the desirability of social pluralism, gender relations, and class structures). Students will be particularly encouraged to reflect on whether defenses of democracy that emphasize "majoritarian" democracy as the primary site of ***civic activity*** (as offered in scholarship by, e.g., Josiah Ober and Richard Tuck) are necessarily at odds with the accommodation of ***social diversity***, fostering of ***inclusive***-and-just bonds of social solidarity, or a meaningful sense of agency among ***individual citizens***.

Activity Example 1: Primary Source Analysis Assignment. Twice during the semester, students will choose a primary source listed on the syllabus and analyze it in a 800-1,000-word essay. In their responses, students will devote at least one paragraph to addressing each of the following areas: **Agenda**: Who is the author? What factors are motivating them? What is their intent in creating this historical artifact? What message does the author wish to communicate about self-governance—and specifically, ***citizenship, justice, and/or diversity***? How do they use this source to advance their point? **Audience:** Who is the intended audience? **Absences:** What does this source not tell us? What (and whose) perspectives does it exclude or ignore? In your last paragraph, reflect on two points: first, how specific arguments and language in the text challenged your own conception of citizenship and the appropriate relationship between governments and individuals, and second, how this close-reading activity aided you in appreciating ***diverse*** perspectives on local, national, or global ***citizenship***. What did you uncover about this source and our course themes that you might have missed had you just skimmed the text? How might you apply close-reading and primary source analysis in your civic life to improve your capacity to self-govern? Responding to these questions will directly challenge students to examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of ***diversity, equity, and inclusion***—namely, how dominant conceptions of who does and does not belong in a political community have influenced the lived experiences of ***diverse*** peoples. Moreover, this activity will challenge students to question their own assumptions about peoples and texts, teaching them the power of critical, thoughtful analysis in fostering ***toleration of*** difference and compassion towards others.

Activity Example 2: Midterm Assessment 2 - Reflection Paper

Following Week 11, students will submit a short reflection paper (approximately 1200 words) identifying valuable mechanisms of ***citizen activity*** outside the realm of direct voting rights, and be asked to state their view of whether contemporary democracy would benefit most from emphasizing the importance of voting (as defended by some of the cutting-edge scholarship assigned), or by emphasizing alternative means of ***advancing justice*** (as defended in other assigned scholarship). This exercise will require students to demonstrate familiarity with the examples of political protest and collective action illustrated by English, American, and French revolutionaries, *and* recent scholarly interpretations of the political significance of those events. After submitting their reflection paper students will collectively debate their answers to this question, in the process identifying the ***models of citizenship, principles of justice***, ***and mechanisms for giving voice to the interests*** of ***social diversity***, most worth protecting in the twenty first century.

ELO 4.2:

Readings, lectures, and assignments such as students' primary source analyses will challenge students to analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of ***justice, difference, citizenship***, and how they interact with cultural traditions and structures of power. There are several examples: Students will identify, interpret, and critique attempts to make *self-rule by all citizens* compatible with *self-determination for all citizens* (e.g., in tensions between the principles of democracy and principles of liberalism: Week 1, Day 2; or between representative and direct democracy: Week 11, Day 2, debated in-class in Week 12). In Week 9, students will engage with the politics of the late seventeenth century, examining the ways that both ***self-government and unfreedom*** emerged within the British Empire, including the role of the Royal African Company, while in Week 13 students will consider how institutional structures of power in the nineteenth century United States were challenged or defended in the name of influential conceptions of ***justice, social difference, and inclusive citizenship***. Midterm and final exam short answer questions will ask students to reflect on the limits of experiments in self-government—namely, the peoples who have been excluded from them. In class discussion and exams, students will also be asked to explore the ways republican governments (and their ***citizens***) can better actualize ideals such as ***civic friendship and social justice***.

Activity Example: Following Week 5, students will write an in-class exam covering the first half of the course material. The exam will include (a) a multiple-choice component testing their knowledge of basic information from the first five weeks of the course, (b) an analytical essay section that asking students to identify constituent elements of the contemporary ***American conception of justice, diversity, and citizenship*** (whether at the level of institutional design or popular imagination) that might plausibly be shared with (or have been directly influenced by) the pre-modern, pre-liberal sources covered in the first five weeks of the course, and suggest how American principles and practice fundamentally diverge from those sources. The essay will be graded for its evidence (has the student identified precise, appropriate examples from primary sources and historical case studies assigned?) and persuasiveness (can students accurately describe the arguments of secondary literature while evaluating those arguments?). In the following class session, students will engage in a group discussion and debate where they (a) present the answers provided in their in-class essay (b) discuss and debate which historically neglected ideas or practices might usefully be revived to ***advance justice and accommodate diversity in an increasingly globalized world***, directly addressing ELO 4.2.

Subject: RE: concurrence for most recent courses
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 2:21:05 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Martin, Andrew
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Attachments: image001.png

Yes, this aligns with what I have as well.

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 21, 2025 2:19 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>
Cc: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: concurrence for most recent courses

Thanks again, Andrew. For book-keeping purposes, let me note in one place…

Full concurrence is provided by five relevant units in ASC, for four courses:

- Can We Rule Ourselves?
- Profiles in American Leadership
- The Art of Statesmanship
- Toleration and Its Discontents

For one course, "The Great American Novel," ENGLISH provides neither concurrence nor non-concurrence (as expected, on the basis of extensive consultations between ENGLISH and Chase).

"Christianity, Law, and Government" remains to be addressed with COMPSTD. This is the only outstanding concurrence issue among the six courses under discussion.

Apologies for crowding your inbox today, just trying to keep everyone's records as straightforward as possible…

Best - Jeremy

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

Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 10:47 AM
To: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>, Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Subject: concurrence for most recent courses

Hi Brian and Jeremy
I have now heard back from all the departments queried in the most recent concurrence request (the six courses you set over last week). CEHV, Leadership, History, Political Science, and Philosophy all grant concurrence (as you are aware, English neither granted nor denied concurrence on the Great American Novel course). As you know, there is a faculty member in Comp Studies, Isaac Weiner, who teaches a course that might be similar to the Christianity, Government and Law course. I've asked him to provide feedback by next week, but I might request a few extra days on that course. But that's the only real outstanding issue; I would consider the concurrence request completed for the other five. I know that the Can we Rule Ourselves course was a high priority, so definitely move forward with that.
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

Subject: RE: Chase Courses for Concurrence
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 12:42:53 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Greenbaum, Rob
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian, Clark, Jill
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Hi Jeremy,

Thanks for reaching back out. As of late this morning, we've now heard back from our relevant faculty.

We are pleased to provide concurrence with the most recent six classes you sent us:

- Can We Rule Ourselves?
- The Art of Statesmanship
- Christianity, Government, and Law
- The Great American Novel
- Toleration and Its Discontents
- Profiles in American Leadership

The Profiles in American Leadership class does contain some overlap with our 2130 – Leadership in the Public and Nonprofit Sectors class, but the two classes approach leadership in different ways. The Profiles class is a bit more political leadership and theory focused, while ours is aimed more towards the practice of managerial or administrative leadership.

Likewise, there is some overlap between the Can We Rule Ourselves class and our PUBAFRS 2500 Guardians of Democracy: Public Servants over Time course, but, again, the approach is very different.

Good luck with the approval process.

Rob

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Robert T. Greenbaum
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: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:51 AM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Courses for Concurrence

Hi Rob,

I wanted to circle back regarding the six courses we circulated on 8/11. All six are important but one of them ("Can We Rule Ourselves") is paramount. As a result, we're wedded to the two-week concurrence window but hope we can address any questions or concerns in the interim.

All best,

Jeremy

From: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 9:42 AM
To: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Chase Courses for Concurrence

Hi Jeremy,

Thanks for sharing these additional classes.

Rob

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

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

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 8:47 PM
To: Greenbaum, Rob <greenbaum.3@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Courses for Concurrence

Hi Rob,

I'm obligated to ramp up the new semester early by sending you a bundle of courses the Chase Center is circulating for concurrence. Attached to this email are syllabi for:

- Can We Rule Ourselves?
- The Art of Statesmanship
- Christianity, Government, and Law
- The Great American Novel
- Toleration and Its Discontents
- Profiles in American Leadership

We'll be adding a few more courses yet), but is enough for now!

Thanks for your time and effort with this,

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 Courses for Concurrence
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 11:45:21 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Snyder, Anastasia
To: Fortier, Jeremy
Attachments: image001.png, image.png

Hi Jeremy,

Thanks for following up on your 8/11 email. I apologize for my late reply. EHE has no concurrence issues with any of these courses. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Tasha

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Anastasia R. Snyder
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
College of Education and Human Ecology
The Ohio State University
snyder.893@osu.edu
Office: 614-688-4169 / Cell: 614-256-8959

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:44 AM
To: Snyder, Anastasia <snyder.893@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Courses for Concurrence

Hi Tasha,

I'm obliged to circle back regarding the courses circulated for concurrence on 8/11, partly because we need to add a sixth ("Profiles in American Leadership" – attached to this email), and because while all of the original five are important, one of them ("Can We Rule Ourselves") is of highest priority, so we aim to upload it to curriculum.osu.edu as soon as the two-week window allows. That said, please don't hesitate to let me know if we can be helpful in the meantime!

Thanks so much for your time at the start of the new semester…

All best - Jeremy

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 at 8:17 AM
To: Strang, Lee <strang.69@osu.edu>
Subject: Fw: Chase Courses for Concurrence

From: Fortier, Jeremy
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 5:53:43 PM
To: Snyder, Anastasia <snyder.893@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Courses for Concurrence

Hi Tasha,

I'm obligated to ramp up the new semester early by sending you a bundle of courses the Chase Center is circulating for concurrence. Attached to this email are syllabi for:

- Can We Rule Ourselves?
- The Art of Statesmanship
- Christianity, Government, and Law
- The Great American Novel
- Toleration and Its Discontents

We'll be adding a couple more courses later this week (or early next), but five is enough for now!

Thanks for your time and effort with this,

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"

Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 2:08:25 PM Eastern Daylight Time

---

Subject: Re: Chase Center Courses for Concurrence
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 11:28:51 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Ralph, Anne
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

Jeremy and Brian,

Thanks for meeting this week and for the coffee! It was great to hear more about your plans.

On the five courses you sent for concurrence (listed in your email), the College of Law is pleased to grant concurrence. The courses all look like great additions.

On the minor, Dean Barnett and the associate deans at Moritz all reviewed the proposal. We are supportive, but also have a question about naming that I would like to discuss with you—namely, whether Chase would consider a different name for the minor that does not include "Law." We are concerned about creating confusion with the new Minor in Law and Public Policy offered by Moritz and Glenn. We also noted that a student could complete the minor without completing any of the courses in the American Constitutionalism track. We hope this might be a "friendly amendment." Please let me know if we may discuss.

I also wanted to be sure to let you know that, as you add new Chase courses that might fit well within the Law and Public Policy minor, we would be glad to consider adding those to the list of approved electives that students can count towards the minor. The list of electives currently eligible for the minor are listed in a drop-down on this page.

Will look forward to speaking more!

Thanks,
Anne

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

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, August 11, 2025 at 6:55 PM
To: Ralph, Anne <ralph.52@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Chase Center Courses for Concurrence

Hi Anne,

Thanks for your time to chat with Brian and I this morning! As discussed, I'm attaching new a bundle of courses the Chase Center is circulating for concurrence. Attached to this email are syllabi for:

- Can We Rule Ourselves?
- The Art of Statesmanship
- Christianity, Government, and Law
- The Great American Novel
- Toleration and Its Discontents

We'll be adding a couple more courses later this week (or early next), but five is enough for now!

Thanks for your time and effort with this,

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"