

Term Information

Effective Term Summer 2026

Course Change Information

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

We had the course under review for General Education Themes, and had to withdraw for course scheduling purposes, but would now like to get G.E. revisions sent back to the Themes Subcommittee

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

The course can serve curricular purposes for the G.E. Citizenship Theme (in addition to our programmatic purposes)

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 G.E. Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

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

Is this a request to withdraw the course? No

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area	Civics, Law, and Leadership
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org	Chase Center for Civics - D4260
College/Academic Group	Office of Academic Affairs
Level/Career	Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog	2420
Course Title	The Evolution of Citizenship in America, 1775-1920
Transcript Abbreviation	U.S. Citizenship
Course Description	This course surveys the evolution of citizenship in the United States from the Revolutionary War through the ratification of the 19th Amendment. Students consider how individuals and groups outside positions of formal political power worked to expand or restrict who could claim citizenship, with special attention to the relationship between constitutional law and civil society.
Semester Credit Hours/Units	Fixed: 3

Offering Information

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

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites

Exclusions

Electronically Enforced No

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

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

Requirement/Elective Designation

Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Previous Value

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Through close readings of primary and secondary sources, students will gain insight into how various individuals and groups have pushed to expand or restrict who could be a citizen and who or what had the authority to decide who was a citizen.

Content Topic List

- Citizenship; Belonging; Inclusion; Exclusion; Rights, Responsibilities; Revolutionary Era; Civil War and Reconstruction.

Sought Concurrence

Yes

Attachments

- CIVICLL 2420 - Syllabus (v2).pdf: Syllabus (v2)
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- CIVICLL 2420 Worksheet (v2).pdf: GE Worksheet (v2)
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- CIVICLL2420 Cover Letter.docx: Cover Letter for Submission of CIVICLL 2420 v2
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)
- Concurrence Exchanges - Education, Law, Glenn, Arts & Sciences.pdf: Concurrence Exchanges
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier, Jeremy)

Comments

COURSE CHANGE REQUEST
2420 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Reed, Kathryn Marie
02/26/2026

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier, Jeremy	02/24/2026 02:15 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier, Jeremy	02/24/2026 02:16 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed, Kathryn Marie	02/26/2026 11:26 AM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins, Mary Ellen Bigler Neff, Jennifer Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal Wade, Macy Joy Steele, Rachel Lea	02/26/2026 11:26 AM	ASCCAO Approval

February 12, 2026

ASC Curriculum Committee

Re: Submission of Civics, Law, and Leadership 2420 to GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for your feedback on our syllabus submission for CIVICLL 2420: The Evolution of Citizenship in America, 1775-1920. To address the comments raised, I have revised the syllabus. First, I have adjusted the course description to better reflect the Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World theme by more explicitly incorporating categories like race and gender. While this course primarily focuses on race and gender by focusing on Black Americans and women, I agree that this could be stated even more explicitly than it currently does and therefore have added several mentions throughout and edited the course description to reflect this. I have revised the syllabus to include a brief narrative summary and focus for each week, as well as example discussion post questions and exam questions, connecting these explicitly to the ELOs of the theme. This has had the positive effect of increasing the clarity on the relationship between the ELOs and course lectures, topics, and assignments, and therefore has resulted in, on the committee's recommendation, better highlighting how the course engages with the ELOs.

For the committee's convenience, I have attached:

- (1) a point-by-point response to your comments;
- (2) the revised syllabus;
- (3) the revised theme worksheet.

Thank you again for your feedback on the CIVICLL 2420 syllabus. This revised version is stronger, and I hope it now meets with your approval.

Sincerely,

Brianna Frakes

Assistant Professor
Chase Center
The Ohio State University

Responses to the Subcommittee:

- 1. The Subcommittee asks that the Center provide additional information in the syllabus and the GEN submission form regarding how the Theme is the central focus of the course. Specifically, they would like to see: 1. more evidence that the justice and diversity aspects of the Theme are an intrinsic part of the course's description (curriculum.osu.edu under "General Information" and syllabus, p. 1), readings (syllabus p. 5-8 under "Course Outline"), and topics (syllabus p. 5-8 under "Course Outline") and 2. more evidence that citizenship, justice, and diversity are centered in the course's assignments/assessments (syllabus, p. 4). The Subcommittee offers the friendly advice that the Center may wish to consider how a student, looking at the syllabus, would see the Theme "signposted" throughout. Additionally, they ask that the GEN submission form provide more details about exactly how the course will assess students' performance, with clear examples of prompts and questions that center the theme.**

I have edited the course description to more explicitly address how the Theme is the central focus of the course. Specifically, I added the useful suggestion of "signposting" to a greater extent in the description by drawing attention to the usefulness of using social categories like race and gender in determining who is (and should be) citizens, as well as how the concept of justice has evolved as citizenship has expanded and what the duties of citizens are to advance justice in society. This is reflected throughout the remainder of the syllabus through the weekly topics and readings, articulated in the brief narrative summaries for each week on the key themes and questions to guide students. Additionally, I included example discussion post questions and sample exam questions throughout to give the committee and students a greater understanding of the assessments that can inform their own readings and development over the semester.

- 2. The Subcommittee requests that the Center more clearly articulate in the syllabus how the course will ask students to "Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences" (ELO 4.1) and "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" (ELO 4.2). While they appreciate the several class sessions focused on marginalized populations, it is unclear if/how students will be expected to analyze, critique, and evaluate the concepts presented in the readings and synthesize them with ideas presented in other parts of the course. For example, the Subcommittee notes that the Course Objectives (syllabus, p. 2) state that students will be able to "analyze how individuals' identities-as well as their political, cultural, religious, and national contexts-have influenced conceptions of citizenship". However, this description (and indeed all of course objectives) leaves out any mention of gender, race, or class – issues that are central to ELOs 4.1 and 4.2.**

I appreciate the committee drawing attention to the importance of ELOs 4.1 and 4.2. While the course engages with these learning objectives, I agree that they could be stated more explicitly and more directly linked back to the ELOs

themselves. To that end, I have highlighted in the syllabus the area of focus for each lecture as well as provided example discussion post questions and exam questions in the appropriate weeks and their corresponding ELOs. In the course description, I make mention of race and gender—the primary focus of this course—and incorporate class where it appropriately fits (specifically, weeks 1, 9, 12). For ELO 4.2, I have shown how each week engages with this learning objective through the short narrative summary of each week’s topics. With this ELO, the goal is for students to engage with and ask questions about justice, difference, citizenship and their interactions after careful consideration of the week’s readings and the historical context. This will allow for students to inquire more deeply about how varying lived experiences affected by race, class, and gender impact conceptions of justice as they relate to citizenship.

- 3. The Subcommittee requests that the Center include in the course some additional modern (i.e. “cutting-edge”) scholarship. For example, they note that the readings in the first two weeks of the course were all originally published between 1975 and 1999 (with one that was updated in 2005), and they encourage the Center to contrast these historical readings with some of the excellent scholarship in the field that has been produced in the last 10-15 years.**

To satisfy this point, I have added in three additional readings for weeks 1 and 2 that will help students contrast the older work with newer scholarly work. Specifically, Edmund Morgan’s *American Slavery, American Freedom* has been paired with Alan Taylor’s *The Internal Enemy* to provide students with a contrasting work and to also gain insight into how historical scholarship evolves over time as new evidence and new lenses of analysis come to light.

- 4. The Subcommittee asks that the Center provide examples of exam questions and discussion board prompts so that they can better evaluate how students will be assessed on their mastery of the GEN Theme Goals and ELOs. Since 80% of students’ final grade for the course comes from these elements, it is important that the Subcommittee be able to see how the Center will make the Theme the focus of these assessments.**

At each appropriate week, I have added in example discussion post questions (weeks 3, 6, 9, 11, 13). I have also included example exam questions for the in-class midterm exam (week 7) and their corresponding ELOs.

- 5. The Subcommittee asks that the Center incorporate into the course schedule opportunities for students to demonstrate their “developing sense of self as a learner” (ELO 2.2) in an assessable manner. While the Subcommittee notes and appreciates the presence of in-class activities and writing assignments that focus on student’s perceptions about citizenship, this ELO is focused on students’ awareness of their own learning and reflection on/analysis of the ways that their thinking has changed over the duration of the course. While the Subcommittee acknowledges that there are many methods for assessing this ELO, they offer the friendly suggestion that asking students to complete a graded reflection on course topics at the beginning,**

mid-point, and end of the semester can be a simple and effective way to meet this ELO.

I thank the committee for this suggestion on how to effectively meet ELO 2.2 while also offering students several opportunities to reflect on their own development as thinkers and citizens. To this end, I have incorporated many opportunities for students to reflect on their developing sense of self as a learner: two “low-stakes” reflective assignments (week 4 and week 10); a mid-semester self-reflection essay (week 8); and a final learning narrative/reflective essay (week 14).

- 6. The Subcommittee asks that the Center re-phrase the statement which describes the way in which this course fits into the new General Education Curriculum (syllabus pg. 2 under “General Education Category and Expected Learning Outcomes”). Since this is a 3-credit hour course, it does not, in and of itself, “fulfill” the GEN Theme. As the requirement is for students to earn 4-6 credit hours in this category, stating that a single course fulfills the requirement can be confusing or misleading for students. Instead, the reviewing faculty suggest wording such as “Civics, Law, and Leadership 2420 is an approved course in the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World category.”**

I have adjusted this language to better reflect that the course is an “approved course” within the Theme, and thank the committee for pointing this out.



CIVICLL 2420
THE EVOLUTION OF CITIZENSHIP IN AMERICA, 1775-1920
[Spring 2026]

Course Location: [Location]
Course Meeting Time: [Days/Times]
Contact Hours: 3
Format of Instruction: Lecture

Professor Brianna Frakes
Email: Frakes.21@osu.edu
Office Hours: [Days/Times, Location]
Office Hours

I. Course Description

This course explores the evolution of **citizenship** in the United States from the Revolutionary War through the ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920, which granted women the right to vote. **Citizenship** and the rights that stem from it are foundational to our country. Yet the idea of **citizenship** has evolved considerably since the country's founding through heated debates, political and social movements, and even armed conflict. Who is a citizen, and who or what has the power and authority to decide? Should social categories like race and gender determine who is and who is not a citizen? We will also ask how law and policy produced unequal membership, how **diverse peoples** living on the margins of formal **citizenship** articulated belonging, and how movements for change used constitutional ideals to demand **justice and inclusion**. Throughout this class, we will interrogate how various individuals and groups pushed to expand or restrict who could claim the mantle of citizen in the United States during the crucial and foundational first 150 years of the nation.

Students will engage with both primary and secondary sources, immersing themselves in the context of the time to evaluate the debates over American citizenship and the evolution of the concept throughout some of the nation's most challenging times. Students will also consider what methods or approaches historical actors took—and what actions they themselves can take in their own communities today—to advance **citizenship** in our **diverse** nation and how those actions moved the United States toward (or further from) being a more **just** society. *What are the duties of citizens to advance justice*, and how have notions of justice evolved over time just as citizenship has?

This course will examine the evolution of citizenship in America from a multidisciplinary approach to encourage students to think broadly about how the concept of citizenship has evolved and how it continues to evolve even today. Students will work toward an understanding of how the study of American citizenship is not relegated to one discipline or approach but rather is best studied through a variety of lenses.

II. About the Instructor

Brianna Frakes is a historian of the Civil War era and an assistant professor in the Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society at The Ohio State University. She earned her B.A. from Gettysburg College, and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Virginia. Professor Frakes's research and teaching interests center around how Americans understand the change that inevitably comes after conflict. Her first book examines this by focusing on the on-the-ground experience of military occupation in Virginia during the Civil War and Reconstruction years.

III. Course Objectives:

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

- Articulate how conceptions of U.S. **citizenship** have changed, stayed the same, and been contested over time.
- Apply logical and historical reasoning to articulate what **citizenship** was, is, and can be.
- Analyze how individuals' **diverse** identities, specifically race and gender (as well as their political, cultural, religious, and national contexts) have influenced conceptions of **citizenship**.
- Draw on their prior experiences to consider what it means to be a U.S. citizen—and what rights and responsibilities come with it.
- Understand the historical experiences of a **diverse** set of Americans who thought, reflected on, debated, and fought for varying degrees of **citizenship**.
- Appreciate and critically evaluate the primary and secondary sources necessary for understanding the key ideas, events, individuals, debates, traditions, and developments that have defined American constitutionalism and civic life.
- Analyze their experiences, reasoning, and cultural assumptions against the accumulated wisdom of inherited traditions, the successes and failures of historical case studies, and the best lessons from the behavioral, social, and natural sciences.
- Identify and evaluate historical antecedents of contemporary problems, real-world applications of theoretical claims, and the principled bases for practical courses of action within a pluralistic society.

IV. General Education Category and Expected Learning Outcomes

This is an approved course in the **GE Theme: Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World**.

GEN Goals

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

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

GEN Expected Learning Outcomes:

Successful students are able to:

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

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

This course examines the evolution of **citizenship** in the United States from the Revolutionary era through the early twentieth century when women gained the right to vote. During these approximately 150 years, Americans engaged in debates over who could claim the mantle of **citizen**, resulting in political and social movements and even armed conflict. Students will gain insight into how **diverse** individuals and groups have pushed to expand or restrict who could be a citizen and who or what had the authority to decide who was a citizen. In the process, they will also reflect on their assumptions about what constitutes **citizenship** and develop evidence-based perspectives on how to cultivate **citizenship for a just and diverse world**.

1. Students will analyze concepts of **citizenship**, specifically American **citizenship**, at an more advanced and in-depth level than in a Foundations course. Through primary source analysis activities, they will assess well-known and foundational documents such as drafts of the Declaration of Independence and letters written by Abigail Adams as well as lesser-known primary sources such as pamphlets, addresses, court cases, and political writings, alongside modern historical scholarship (1.1). While critically exploring these materials, students will be challenged to assess how **diverse** definitions of **citizenship**

were constructed, enforced, and challenged over time, and how lived experiences of **inclusion** and **exclusion** shaped broader civic debates. Students will learn how to read this array of material closely and with a critical eye, interpreting the lives of a diverse group of actors (both well-known and unknown) to best contextualize their experiences and to analyze their roles in shaping the new and growing United States (1.1). Alongside modern historical scholarship, students will assess how citizenship operated as both an **inclusive** ideal and an **exclusionary** practice. They will evaluate how legal regimes, political institutions, war, labor systems, and state power shaped definitions of **citizenship**, and how lived experiences of **inclusion** and **exclusion** informed broader civic debates.

Students will then write in-depth interpretations of these sources in discussion boards, through primary source analysis assignments, and on their exams, presenting their conclusions to their fellow classmates in Socratic discussion (1.2). Additionally, in their discussion boards and through exam questions, students will engage with and assess the scholarly interpretations of Americans lived experiences from 1775 to 1920 through a variety of new and cutting-edge scholarship mixed with a small number of scholarship older than 15 years. This aims to help students actively see how historical interpretations evolve and change over time as well as situate their own intellectual inquiry, development, and conceptualizations of citizenship and belonging in this wider tradition of analysis (1.2).

2. Students will identify, describe, and synthesize a wide range of historical experiences of citizenship and exclusion across the long nineteenth century by examining how **race**, **gender**, **class**, **immigration status**, and **indigeneity** shaped lived experiences of civic membership and political participation (2.1). Through comparative analysis in class discussion, primary source analysis assignments, and exam questions, students will evaluate how different communities encountered the same laws, institutions, and political developments in **unequal** ways, and how structural **inequalities** produced divergent citizenship outcomes across regions and historical moments (2.1). These assignments will also require students to integrate perspectives from multiple social groups and time periods into coherent analytical arguments, deepening their understanding of citizenship as a contested and uneven social practice rather than a uniform legal status (2.1). Students will also make detailed connections about how **race**, **class**, and **gender** shaped the experiences and identities of these social groups and actors (2.1). At the same time, students will demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through structured reflection, self-assessment, and analytical writing that prompts them to evaluate how their understanding of **citizenship**, **justice**, and **belonging** evolves over the course of the semester (2.2). By building on prior academic knowledge and personal experiences while engaging with new historical evidence and challenging perspectives, students will develop metacognitive awareness of their growth in historical thinking and analytical skills (2.2). Through sustained reflection on how exposure to **diverse** historical experiences reshapes their assumptions about civic membership and inequality, students will cultivate greater intellectual autonomy, confidence, and self-directed engagement as learners (2.2). Students will complete a series of low-stakes reflective response memos that will prompt them to connect course readings to their prior knowledge, track moments

of intellectual challenge, and assess how new historical evidence reshapes their assumptions (2.2). In addition, a midterm self-assessment and a final reflective essay will require students to identify growth in their analytical skills and historical reasoning as well as their capacity for self-learning and self-reflection, articulate areas of continued difficulty, and set goals for future learning and confidence as learners (2.2). Please see below for a more comprehensive explanation of these assignments.

3. In class discussion, their discussion board posts, and on exams, students will describe and analyze a broad range of perspectives on citizenship by examining how different historical actors and communities articulated competing definitions of rights, membership, and belonging in the United States across political, cultural, national, global, and historical communities (3.1). Please see the course schedule below for examples of these questions and their relationship to the Theme. This course's assigned reading foregrounds the experiences and viewpoints of enslaved and free Black Americans, Indigenous peoples, women, immigrants, workers, and political elites, allowing students to assess how historical context shaped political identities and civic claims across social, regional, and temporal boundaries (3.1). Through discussion, comparative analysis, and writing, students will evaluate how citizenship functioned differently for various groups and how these differences reveal the complexity and contested nature of civic life (3.1). At the same time, students will identify, reflect on, and apply knowledge and skills associated with **intercultural competence** by analyzing how cultural difference and social hierarchy shaped access to citizenship and participation (3.2). By examining how **race, gender** norms, **class** structures, religion, and national origin influenced civic inclusion and exclusion, students will analyze how historical actors understood themselves and others within diverse and unequal civic communities (3.2). Assignments will require students to reflect on how difference was constructed and managed through law, custom, and political practice, deepening their understanding of pluralism and inequality and supporting informed, historically grounded civic awareness (3.2).

4. Students will examine, critique, and evaluate expressions of **diversity, equity, and inclusion** by analyzing how historically constructed ideas of **race, gender, and class** shaped citizenship outcomes and produced unequal access to rights and protections (4.1). By centering lived experiences of **inclusion and exclusion** through petitions, testimony, and claims-making by marginalized groups, students will be introduced the justice implications of citizenship regimes across different historical moments and connect abstract ideals of equality to concrete historical experiences of injustice (4.1). In their discussion board responses, primary source analysis assignments, exam questions, and discussions, they will be asked to assess these implications and connections. Building on this foundation, students will analyze and critique the intersection of **justice, difference, and citizenship** by examining how these concepts operated within structures of power and movements for social change (4.2). Through sustained analysis of abolitionism, Reconstruction politics, women's rights activism, labor reform, and immigration debates,

students will evaluate how cultural traditions, legal frameworks, and political authority shaped competing efforts to redefine civic membership (4.2). Assignments will require students to compare the effectiveness and limitations of advocacy for social change and to evaluate competing justice claims advanced by state actors and marginalized communities, deepening their understanding of citizenship as a dynamic and contested site of power (4.2).

V. Course Texts: Required Readings

There will be readings assigned for most classes, from one of the course books or from articles/chapters uploaded to Carmen (marked with a *). Readings are to be completed for the day they are listed on the syllabus.

Students should purchase the following books, which are available at Barnes & Noble, on Amazon, and on other online outlets:

Martha Jones, *Birthright Citizens* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), ISBN: 9781316577165
Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* (Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005), ISBN: 1593083572

Louis Masur, *A Concise History of the Civil War* (Oxford University Press, 2011), ISBN: 9780199740482

Eric Foner, *The Second American Founding* (W.W. Norton, 2019), ISBN: 0393652572

A Note on Sources

Primary sources are first-hand accounts, often created by participants or witnesses of events, and sometimes created by the first recorders of events. Examples include, but are not limited to, letters, speeches, account books, and contemporary newspaper accounts. Secondary sources are sources created by people who did not participate or witness events, but they often have the benefit of perspective. They typically draw from a variety of sources to create a nuanced and complex history that can account for multiple interpretations. Examples include books, journal articles, and discussions from this course.

VI. Assignments and Grading

Attendance and Participation: 15%

Self-Reflection Assignments: 15%

a. (Memos: 5%; Mid-Semester Reflective Assessment: 5%; Final Reflective Essay: 5%)

Primary Source Analysis Assignments: 20% (10% each)

Discussion Boards on Carmen: 20% (4% each)

In-Class Midterm Exam: 15%

Final Exam: 15%

Attendance and Participation: Student attendance, engagement, and preparation are critical to this course. It is expected that each student will come to class having completed all readings and

is prepared to discuss the material and participate in a productive discussion when appropriate. Attendance will be taken each day. Students should notify the instructor at least 24 hours in advance of an anticipated absence; it will be the student's responsibility to find out what was covered during the missed class. A belated excuse for an absence and/or poor or late work will not suffice. Please note the following course policies:

- For each unexcused absence from class, students will be docked 5% of their participation grade. Students who miss 25% or more of the class sessions will receive a zero (0) for this portion 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. Please reach out to me with any questions about this policy.
- Consistent, high-quality participation—including respectful listening, contributing to discussion, and building on peers’ insights—is expected each week. Occasional informal writing or group exercises may be used to facilitate discussion and deepen reflection. Students will be docked 1 point of their participation grade (1/100 pts) for every day they do not speak up in class. If you are struggling to participate in discussion, please come to office hours or reach out to me to discuss and brainstorm ways to build your confidence to participate.

Self-Reflection Assignments: Students will complete a series of short reflective writing assignments, one mid-semester learning assessment, and one final learning narrative. These reflections are not summaries of course material. Instead, they ask you to think *about your own learning*—how you interpret evidence, respond to new ideas, revise assumptions, and develop historical and analytical skills over time. These self-reflection assignments are designed to help you take ownership of your learning. By making your thinking visible and intentional, you will develop greater confidence, autonomy, and awareness of how historical knowledge is constructed—and how you, as a learner, engage with complex and contested ideas over time (ELO 2.2).

A. Memos: At two (2) during the semester, students will submit brief reflective memos (1–2 pages) responding to prompts tied to recent readings, discussions, or assignments. These memos will ask you to:

- Identify ideas, arguments, or sources that challenged or complicated your prior understanding of citizenship
- Reflect on moments of confusion, disagreement, or intellectual growth
- Connect new historical evidence to prior knowledge, coursework, or personal assumptions
- Evaluate how your analytical or interpretive skills are developing

These memos are exploratory and informal. They are graded on thoughtful engagement and reflection, not on having “correct” answers.

B. Mid-Semester Self-Assessment: At the midpoint of the semester, you will write a structured self-assessment (2–3 pages) evaluating your progress as a learner. You will be asked to assess your strengths and areas for growth in historical thinking, close reading, and argumentation; reflect on how your approach to evidence, discussion, or writing has changed; and identify specific strategies you will use to improve in the second half of the course. This assignment emphasizes metacognitive awareness—your ability to think critically about how you learn.

C. Final Learning Narrative: At the end of the semester, you will submit a final reflective essay (3–4 pages) that synthesizes your reflections across the course. This narrative should trace how your understanding of citizenship, justice, and inequality has evolved; discuss how exposure to diverse historical experiences reshaped your assumptions; reflect on your development as a reader, writer, and historical thinker; and articulate what you have learned about yourself as a learner and how you will apply these skills moving forward.

Discussion Boards on Carmen: At five points during the semester, students will write short essays (~750 words) responding to a prompt (for example, “How did the spirit of the Revolution and the war itself force a reevaluation of citizenship?” And “Discuss how slavery and freedom could co-exist during the Revolutionary era.” Students will also respond to and engage with at least two other students’ posts, challenging them to engage with the diverse perspectives of their classmates (~350 words). In order to develop the skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen, as a part of this exercise, students will be asked to do the following: 1) paraphrase their peer’s response, 2) respectfully share their reaction to their peer’s response, and 3) pose at least two follow up questions (ELO 3.2). Specific prompts will be shared approximately one week prior to the due date. Students should draw on class discussions and readings in their responses and make connections to the broader course goals and learning outcomes. Namely, these questions will require them to analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship, assess how conceptions of citizenship differ across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities (ELO 3.1), and consider the justice implications of citizenship regimes across different historical moments (4.1).

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

In your response, please 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 **citizenship, justice, and diversity**? How do they use this source to advance their point? (ELOs 1.1)
- **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 as a citizen (ELO 2.2., 4.1, 4.2)?

In-Class Midterm Exam: This exam, held during a class period, will ask students to draw on course materials to date to answer several questions in different formats (short answer, long essay, etc.). See the course schedule below for example questions.

Final Exam: The final exam will ask you to draw on materials from the entire course and its major takeaways and respond to questions in both short answer and long essay. See the course schedule below for example questions.

Grading Scale

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

VII. Course Outline

Week 1: What is Citizenship and Who Defines It?

This week explores these two central questions of what citizenship is and who defines it. As a class, students will discuss the various parameters for evaluating citizenship, how it is currently defined and how it *should be* defined. Students will also be prompted to address *who* or *what* defines citizenship—the law, the government, the people, a combination of these, or something entirely else. How are debates over citizenship playing out in our current moment? Students will then take a citizenship test to analyze how well this test assesses would-be citizens’ preparedness and capacity for effective citizenship. What does a citizenship test do and not do well? What biases does it include in regard to race, class, and gender? What should comprise a citizenship test to begin with?

Class 1: First Meeting—Introductions; Syllabus Review; Course Goals

Class Activity: Take Citizenship Test

Class 2: What is Citizenship? Who Defines It?

Readings: Rogers Smith, *Civic Ideals*, TBD*

Paul Quigley, “Introduction,” *The Civil War and the Transformation of American Citizenship**

Week 2: Slavery and Freedom during the Revolutionary Era

This week focuses on the central paradox of America's revolutionary years: the growing spirit of freedom and the entrenchment of slavery. How did—and how could—these two realities exist and grow together? What does the fact that they could reveal to us about the nature of America's founding and who was envisioned to be a part of this new enterprise? Students will examine and discuss these contradictions at our nation's founding and its longstanding implications for enslaved peoples, for creating a just society, and for how 'citizen' was defined in the Revolutionary period.

Class 3: A Strange Paradox, pt. 1

Readings: Edmund Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*, TBD*
Alan Taylor, *The Internal Enemy: Slavery and War in Virginia 1772-1832*, Introduction*
Primary Source: TBD

Class 4: A Strange Paradox, pt. 2

Readings: *American Slavery, American Freedom*, TBD
Taylor, *The Internal Enemy*, Ch. 1*
Primary Source: Drafts of the Declaration of Independence

Week 3: Women and the Revolutionary Experiment

This week's topic centers on the role women—white and Black—took on during the Revolutionary War and its aftermath. Students will explore the indispensable role women played during this formative moment despite not having many or any legal rights. How does a political movement spark a reevaluation of who should be considered a citizen? What role does war play in that reevaluation?

Class 5: War as a Social Catalyst, pt. 1

Readings: Excerpts from Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters**
Primary Source: Abigail Adams to John Adams, March 31, 1776
<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/04-01-02-0241>

Class 6: War as a Social Catalyst, pt. 2

Readings: Excerpts from Rosemarie Zagari, *Revolutionary Backlash**
Carmen Discussion Post Due

Example Discussion Post Questions:

- How did the spirit of the Revolution and the war itself force a reevaluation of citizenship?
- Discuss how slavery and freedom could co-exist during the Revolutionary era.
- Why does the Declaration's most iconic phrase—"all men are created equal"—fit into this paradox at the nation's founding? How do the secondary readings (Morgan, Taylor, Norton, Zagari) and the primary sources (Declaration, Abigail Adams) complicate this phrase?

Week 4: Was the Revolution revolutionary?

This week will ask student to consider how revolutionary the American Revolution was in the first half of the nineteenth century, specifically as it pertains to citizenship questions with African Americans and women. Did the Revolution change much for these groups of Americans, and how much if so? How have the definitions of citizenship stretched and expanded since the Revolution's end? Did the Revolution go far enough in its claims of freedom and equality? Students will also complete the first of three self-reflection and self-evaluation assessments geared toward helping them identify areas of excellence as well as areas of growth/improvement in their classroom participation, their written work, and the development of their thinking on citizenship-related issues.

Class 7: Women and Politics

Readings: excerpts from Elizabeth Varon, *We Mean To Be Counted**

Primary Source: Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Declaration of Sentiments"*

Class 8: Slavery and Politics

Readings: Louis Masur, "Origins," in *Concise History of the Civil War*
Martha Jones, *Birthright Citizens* (chapters TBD)

Primary Source: John C. Calhoun, "Slavery as a Positive Good"*

Thomas Jefferson to John Holmes, April 20, 1820*

Self-Reflection Memo #1 Due

Week 5: Native Americans, Immigration, and Nativism

This week's topic focuses on questions and issues of Native citizenship, immigration, and American identity. These are issues relevant to our society today as we grapple with the place of immigration and immigrant communities in our nation, a resurgence of nativism and anti-immigrant sentiment, and the very question of who can lay claim to being an American citizen. This week will introduce students to the historical antecedents of these modern-day debates by examining how Native peoples and immigrants in the mid-nineteenth century sought to capitalize on the ideals of freedom to expand the definition of citizen and the steep resistance they faced in doing so. Students will address how citizenship was seen largely through race and gendered lenses and continue analyzing and working to answer *who* or *what* determines the bounds of citizenship.

Class 9: Native Peoples and the Quest for Citizenship

Readings: Aaron Kushner, *Cherokee Nation Citizenship: A Political History*, Ch. 1-2*

Primary Source: Jackson's Message to Congress on Indian Removal, December 6, 1830*

Class 10: Immigration and Nativism in Nineteenth-Century America

Readings: Kevin Kenny, "Mobility and Sovereignty: The Nineteenth-Century Origins of Immigration Restriction," *Journal of American History*, September 2022*

Primary Source: Know-Nothing Party Platforms*

-Primary Source Analysis Essay 1 Due by Midnight on the day of Class 10-

Week 6: Slavery and Citizenship, Part I

In this week, students will address how slavery and citizenship became even more intertwined. By reading Frederick Douglass's autobiography and excerpts from *Birthright Citizens* and building on previous weeks, students will discuss how our nation continued to advance freedom and expand westward while continuing to enslave human beings. Students will use Douglass, a central figure to American life, as a window into the various arguments for extending the rights of citizens to Black Americans and how Douglass envisions a more free and just society. Students will then explore how these efforts evolved from the Revolutionary era and have continued to evolve even today, discussing whether words help advance causes (like Douglass) or whether violence does (like *Field of Blood*).

Class 11: American Slavery

Readings: Frederick Douglass, excerpts from *Autobiography*
Martha Jones, *Birthright Citizens* (chapters TBD)

Class 12: The Dilemma of the 1850s

Readings: excerpt from Joanne Freeman, *Field of Blood**
Martha Jones, *Birthright Citizens* (chapter TBD)
Primary Sources: Douglass, "What to the slave is the Fourth of July?"*
Carmen Discussion Post Due

Example Discussion Post Questions:

- Describe how notions of citizenship and justice intersect from the Revolution through the 1850s.
- How do conceptions of "other" factor into how American citizenship is defined?
- Analyze the effectiveness of the verbal and written word (as exhibited by Douglass) and the effectiveness of physical violence (as read in Freeman).

Week 7: Slavery and Citizenship, Part II

Class 13: The Dred Scott Decision

Readings: Martha Jones, *Birthright Citizens*, chapter 8
Primary Sources: Roger Taney's Opinion*
Reactions to the Decision*

Class 14: In-Class Midterm Exam

Example Exam Questions:

- Discuss the role of race and gender in understandings of citizenship. How have these issues played a central role in constructing definitions of citizenship and our perceptions of who is a citizen? (ELO 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2)
- Drawing on readings and class discussions, assess the ways in which groups have pushed for the expansion or the restriction of who is considered a citizen. How have major singular events, like the Revolution, and longstanding questions, like slavery, Native peoples, and immigration, influenced how 'citizen' is defined? (ELO 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2)

Week 8: The Civil War, Part I

This week's topics focus on how politics and civil dialogue broke down and resulted in secession and war. The Civil War, in many ways, was a crisis in citizenship. Southern states seceded in protest of Abraham Lincoln's election, but in reality, because of the prospect of slavery's abolition, emancipation, and Black men and women gaining rights previously denied to them. The early war years forced an evaluation of *who* was a loyal citizen and what *makes* a person a loyal citizen during the Civil War. Students will begin evaluating how both free and enslaved African Americans articulated their loyalty to the Union through words and armed service, arguing for the rights of citizenship in return. They will also contend whether Southerners were or were no longer citizens of the United States, the various legal arguments deployed by them and by Lincoln on this issue, and the connotations it had for when the war would inevitably end. Students will also complete the second of three self-reflection and self-evaluation assessments geared toward helping them identify areas of excellence as well as areas of growth/improvement in their classroom participation, their written work, and the development of their thinking on citizenship-related issues.

Class 15: Disunion!

Readings: Louis Masur, "1861," in *Concise History of the Civil War*;
Fleche, *Revolution of 1861*, Chapter 2
Primary Sources: Lincoln's, July 4, 1861 message to Congress

Mid-Semester Self-Reflection Due

Class 16: Who is a loyal citizen?

Readings: Jonathan White, *Abraham Lincoln and Treason in the Civil War* (chap. TBD)*
William Blair, *With Malice Toward Some*, chapter 2*
Primary Source: Francis Lieber's writings & Code.

Week 9: The Civil War, Part II

This week, students will continue evaluating how free and enslaved African Americans leveraged the constitutional and legal crises of the Civil War to push for emancipation and the continued efforts to gain citizenship. When did Lincoln and the Union cause begin to support the idea of slavery's abolition? What debates erupted—in governments and in the public square—over the implications of emancipation, and how did that impact the debates and arguments surrounding Black citizenship? Students will engage with writings from Black Americans who took up arms in defense of the Union to further demonstrate their loyalty and commitment to the United States. Students will draw on discussions from earlier in the semester on the historical precedent for gaining rights during wartime and how the Lincoln administration approached this. They will also examine the growing public reactions to emancipation, such as the New York City Draft Riots, and the intersections of race, class, labor, immigration, and nativism.

Class 17: Debates over Emancipation

Readings: Louis Masur, "1862" and "1863" in *Concise History of the Civil War*

Brian Taylor, *Fighting for Citizenship*, chapter 3

Class 18: Emancipation at Last!

Reading: Eric Foner, *The Second Founding*, introduction and chapter 1

Primary Sources: excerpts from Jonathan White, *To Address You As My Friend:*

*African American Letters to Abraham Lincoln**

13th Amendment*

Carmen Discussion Post Due

Example Discussion Post Questions:

-Analyze the effectiveness of debates over equality and emancipation in government versus the public square as it pertains to citizenship issues. Which one, in your view, is the most effective and the least convincing?

-How do race and class intersect on emancipation? How does this work to restrict or expand access to citizenship?

Week 10: The War's End, Reconstruction's Beginning

This week will ask students to continue thinking, discussing, and asking questions about how war shapes and reshapes debates and conversations surrounding citizenship. Similar to the Revolution, students will consider how progressive the Civil War actually was as it pertains to citizenship questions with African Americans. Additionally, questions of loyalty and treason influenced notions of citizenship in the Civil War's aftermath. Did the Civil War settle citizenship questions, or did it complicate them? How much of an impact did this war have, and did it change much for these groups of Americans? Similar to the Revolution, did the Civil War go far enough in its claims of freedom and equality? Students will continue articulating how definitions of citizenship have stretched and expanded since the Civil War's opening and its subsequent ending, and the continued efforts by Black Americans to tie equal rights with citizenship and civil rights.

Class 19: "Suffrage is the legal sequence of emancipation"

Reading: Louis Masur, "1865 and After" in *Concise History of the Civil War*

Primary Source: "Equal Suffrage: Address from the Colored Citizens of Norfolk, VA, to the People of the United States"*

Class 20: What Did the War Mean?: Loyalty and Treason in the Civil War's Aftermath

Reading: William Blair, *With Malice Toward Some*, chapter 8

Kettner, TBD

Primary Source: Lincoln's Second Inaugural Message

-Primary Source Analysis Essay 2 Due by Midnight on the day of Class 20-

Self-Reflection Memo #2 Due

Week 11: Reconstruction, Part I

This week, students will examine African Americans' continued efforts to secure the rights of citizens. The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 as a precursor to the 14th Amendment created strong pushback from white Southerners and former Confederate states, resulting in intense and racially motivated violence against Blacks and their Republican allies. Students will be asked to evaluate the progress made since the 13th Amendment's passage, the new challenges and obstacles facing African Americans during early Reconstruction, questions surrounding former Confederates and their placement within the Union, the rise of political and racial violence, among other topics. How did Black Americans' push for citizenship and the right to vote impact the course of Reconstruction? In what ways were civil rights fusing with political rights? How did the passage of the 15th Amendment cause a split between women's rights groups, and what implications did it have for women to gain the right to vote?

Class 21: The Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment

Reading: Eric Foner, *The Second Founding*, chapter 2

Primary Source: 14th Amendment

Listen: Backstory Podcast: "How Reconstruction Transformed the Constitution"*

Class 22: The Fight for the 15th Amendment

Reading: Eric Foner, *The Second Founding*, chapter 3

Primary Source: 15th Amendment*

Listen: Backstory Podcast: "A More Perfect Union?"*

Carmen Discussion Post Due

Example Discussion Post Questions:

-In what ways do the Civil War amendments (13, 14, 15) protect and expand claims to citizenship? Is Reconstruction America's "second founding"?

-Do these amendments create a more just society?

-What methods and strategies did historical actors use to restrict African American rights? Were they effective and why?

Week 12: Reconstruction, Part II

This week, students will read and engage with two intersecting and recurring themes throughout Reconstruction: political violence and race, and political violence and gender. In the Civil War's aftermath, political violence in many ways fused with racial animosity and racialized views of gender, resulting in countless episodes of extralegal violence on small and large scales. This political violence also had a class element, too, with poorer white Americans concerned about African Americans "stealing" their jobs. The outbursts of violence during Reconstruction were ways to combat the continued expansion of 'American citizen' to include Black men and women and responses to the expansion of the franchise to include Black men. Students will continue asking how and why violence—in this case non-sanctioned vigilante violence—remained so intertwined with American citizenship. How did Americans at the time respond to and attempt to curb these injustices? Were they effective in creating a more just society? Students will also complete the third of three self-reflection and self-evaluation assessments geared toward helping them identify areas of excellence as well as areas of growth/improvement in their classroom

participation, their written work, and the development of their thinking on citizenship-related issues.

Class 23: Race, Violence, and Citizenship

Reading: Kidada Williams, *I Saw Death Coming*, TBD

Primary Source: Excerpts from the *KKK Trials*, Bedford Series

Class 24: Race, Gender, and Citizenship

Reading: Hannah Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, TBD*

Primary Source: Excerpts from the *KKK Trials*, Bedford Series

Week 13: Women and the Continued Fight for Suffrage

In this penultimate week, students will address how women—white and Black—continued pressing for the full rights of citizens well into the twentieth century. After the women’s rights movement faced internal disagreement after the 15th Amendment’s passage, it would take another half century for women’s right to vote to be codified in the U.S. Constitution. Why such a long delay? What implications did that have for American citizenship? With the passage of the 19th Amendment, has the question of citizenship in America been resolved? Students will grapple with the long fight for women’s rights, drawing on the course’s early weeks in the Revolution’s aftermath, to interrogate this long arc in search of a just society. Did the 19th Amendment create a more just society, one where all people could lay claim to citizenship?

Class 25: “Remember the Ladies”: Women during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era

Reading: Ellen Carol DuBois, *Suffrage: Women’s Long Battle for the Vote*, TBD*

Class 26: Women and Woodrow Wilson

Reading: Ellen Carol DuBois, *Suffrage: Women’s Long Battle for the Vote*, TBD*

Primary Source: 19th Amendment*

Carmen Discussion Post Due

Example Discussion Post Questions:

-How did debates around the 19th Amendment and women’s suffrage draw on progress made after the Revolution?

-Describe how notions of citizenship and justice have evolved since the Civil War’s end. Who now is included a ‘citizen’?

Week 14: Who defines citizenship?

Class 27: Who is a citizen, and who defines it?

Class 28: Review for Exam

Final Reflective Essay Due

Final Exam during Exam Period

VIII. University Policy Statements

Academic Misconduct

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

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

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

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

Disability Services (with Accommodations for Illness)

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

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

Grievances and Solving Problems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Religious Accommodations

Ohio State has had a longstanding practice of making reasonable academic accommodations for students' religious beliefs and practices in accordance with applicable law. In 2023, Ohio State

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

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

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

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

Policy: **Religious Holidays, Holy Days and Observances**

Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

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

All students have important obligations under the Code of Student Conduct to complete all academic and scholarly activities with fairness and honesty. Our professional students also have the responsibility to uphold the professional and ethical standards found in their respective academic honor codes. Specifically, students are not to use unauthorized assistance in the laboratory, on field work, in scholarship, or on a course assignment unless such assistance has been authorized specifically by the course instructor. In addition, students are not to submit their work without acknowledging any word-for-word use and/or paraphrasing of writing, ideas or other work that is not your own. These requirements apply to all students undergraduate, graduate, and professional. To maintain a culture of integrity and respect, these generative AI tools should not be used in the completion of course assignments unless an instructor for a given course specifically authorizes their use. Some instructors may approve of using generative AI tools in the academic setting for specific

goals. However, these tools should be used only with the explicit and clear permission of each individual instructor, and then only in the ways allowed by the instructor.

Intellectual Diversity

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix – The Evolution of Citizenship 1775-1920 Worksheet Responses

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

This course understands citizenship as a legal status that entails rights and responsibilities, and as an evolving and contested cultural concept. This course specifically examines the evolution of citizenship in the United States from the Revolutionary era through the early 20th century when women gained the right to vote. During these approximately 150 years, Americans engaged in debates over who could claim the mantle of citizen, resulting in political and social movements and even armed conflict. Through close readings of primary and secondary sources, students will gain insight into how various individuals and groups have pushed to expand or restrict who could be a citizen and who or what had the authority to decide who was a citizen.

ELO 1.1 (Engage in critical and logical thinking)

Students will analyze concepts of citizenship, specifically American citizenship, at an advanced and in-depth level than in a Foundations course. They will assess well-known and foundational documents such as drafts of the Declaration of Independence and letters written by Abigail Adams as well as lesser-known primary sources such as pamphlets, addresses, court cases, and political writings, alongside modern historical scholarship (1.1). These materials allow students to assess how definitions of citizenship were constructed, enforced, and challenged over time, and how lived experiences of **inclusion** and **exclusion** shaped broader civic debates. Students will learn how to read this array of material closely and with a critical eye, interpreting the lives of a diverse group of actors (both well-known and unknown) to best contextualize their experiences and to analyze their roles in shaping the new and growing United States (1.1). Alongside modern historical scholarship, students will assess how citizenship operated as both an **inclusive** ideal and an **exclusionary** practice. They will evaluate how legal regimes, political institutions, war, labor systems, and state power shaped definitions of **citizenship**, and how lived experiences of **inclusion** and **exclusion** informed broader civic debates.

ELO 1.2 (Engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly explanation of the topic or ideas within this theme)

Students will then write in-depth interpretations of these sources in either formal writing assignments or through discussion boards and present their conclusions to their fellow classmates (1.2). Additionally, through that written work, students will engage with and assess the scholarly interpretations of Americans lived experiences from 1775 to 1920 through a variety of new and cutting-edge scholarship mixed with a small number of scholarship older than 15 years. This aims to help students actively see how historical interpretations evolve and change over time as well as situate their own intellectual inquiry, development, and conceptualizations of citizenship and belonging in this wider tradition of analysis (1.2).

ELO 2.1 (Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences)

Students will identify, describe, and synthesize a wide range of historical experiences of citizenship and exclusion across the long nineteenth century by examining how **race, gender, class, immigration status, and indigeneity** shaped lived experiences of civic membership and political participation (2.1). Through comparative analysis, students will evaluate how different communities encountered the same laws, institutions, and political developments in **unequal** ways, and how structural **inequalities** produced divergent citizenship outcomes across regions and historical moments (2.1). Assignments will require students to integrate perspectives from multiple social groups and time periods into coherent analytical arguments, deepening their understanding of citizenship as a contested and uneven social practice rather than a uniform legal status (2.1). Students will also make detailed connections about how **race, class, and gender** shaped the experiences and identities of these social groups and actors (2.1).

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 demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through structured reflection, self-assessment, and analytical writing that prompts them to evaluate how their understanding of **citizenship, justice, and belonging** evolves over the course of the semester (2.2). By building on prior academic knowledge and personal experiences while engaging with new historical evidence and challenging perspectives, students will develop metacognitive awareness of their growth in historical thinking and analytical skills (2.2). Through sustained reflection on how exposure to **diverse** historical experiences reshapes their assumptions about civic membership and inequality, students will cultivate greater intellectual autonomy, confidence, and self-directed engagement as learners (2.2). Students will complete a series of low-stakes reflective response memos that will prompt them to connect course readings to their prior knowledge, track moments of intellectual challenge, and assess how new historical evidence reshapes their assumptions (2.2). In addition, a midterm self-assessment and a final reflective essay will require students to identify growth in their analytical skills and historical reasoning as well as their capacity for self-learning and self-reflection, articulate areas of continued difficulty, and set goals for future learning and confidence as learners (2.2)

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)

Students will describe and analyze a broad range of perspectives on citizenship by examining how different historical actors and communities articulated competing definitions of rights, membership, and belonging in the United States across political, cultural, national, global, and historical communities. (3.1). The course foregrounds the experiences and viewpoints of enslaved and free Black Americans, Indigenous peoples, women, immigrants, workers, and political elites, allowing students to assess how historical context shaped political identities and civic claims across social, regional, and temporal boundaries (3.1). Through discussion, comparative analysis, and writing, students will evaluate how citizenship functioned differently for various groups and how these differences reveal the complexity and contested nature of civic life (3.1).

ELO 3.2 (Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen)

Students will identify, reflect on, and apply knowledge and skills associated with **intercultural competence** by analyzing how cultural difference and social hierarchy shaped access to citizenship and participation (3.2). By examining how **race, gender** norms, **class** structures, religion, and national origin influenced civic inclusion and exclusion, students will analyze how historical actors understood themselves and others within diverse and unequal civic communities (3.2). Assignments will require students to reflect on how difference was constructed and managed through law, custom, and political practice, deepening their understanding of pluralism and inequality and supporting informed, historically grounded civic awareness (3.2).

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

Students will examine, critique, and evaluate expressions of **diversity, equity, and inclusion** by analyzing how historically constructed ideas of **race, gender, and class** shaped citizenship outcomes and produced unequal access to rights and protections (4.1). By centering lived experiences of **inclusion and exclusion** through petitions, testimony, and claims-making by marginalized groups, students will assess the justice implications of citizenship regimes across different historical moments and connect abstract ideals of equality to concrete historical experiences of injustice (4.1).

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)

Students will analyze and critique the intersection of **justice, difference, and citizenship** by examining how these concepts operated within structures of power and movements for social change (4.2). Through sustained analysis of abolitionism, Reconstruction politics, women's rights activism, labor reform, and immigration debates, students will evaluate how cultural traditions, legal frameworks, and political authority shaped competing efforts to redefine civic membership (4.2). Assignments will require students to compare the effectiveness and limitations of advocacy for social change and to evaluate competing justice claims advanced by state actors and marginalized communities, deepening their understanding of citizenship as a dynamic and contested site of power (4.2).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Monday, August 18, 2025 at 3:01:46 PM Eastern Daylight Time

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

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

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

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

Hi Tasha,

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

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

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Tasha,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society

The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Monday, August 18, 2025 at 3:03:01 PM Eastern Daylight Time

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 at 11:07:58 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Ralph, Anne
To: Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Schoen, Brian
Attachments: image001.png, image003.png

Jeremy and Brian,

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

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

Thanks,
Anne



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

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

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

Anne E. Ralph

Morgan E. Shipman Professor in Law
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Strategic Initiatives

Michael E. Moritz College of Law

55 West 12th Avenue | Columbus, OH 43210

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

Pronouns: she/her/hers

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

Hi Anne,

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

Hi Anne,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society

The Ohio State University

Latest Article: ["Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist"](#)

Monday, August 18, 2025 at 3:04:13 PM Eastern Daylight Time

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

Hi Jeremy,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

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

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

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

Pronouns: he/him/his

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

Hi Rob,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society
The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Monday, August 18, 2025 at 3:05:15 PM Eastern Daylight Time

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

Thank you Bernadette.



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

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

Hello all,

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

Thanks,
Bernadette

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

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

**Andrew W. Martin**

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

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

Hi Andrew and all,

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

Many thanks,
Bernadette

**Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



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

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

Hi Andrew –

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

Let me know if I can add anything further.

All best,

Jeremy

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy

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

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

Best

Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

From: Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 2:47 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Cc: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

This was ASC’s understanding too

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

Also understood that Theatre had concerns regarding overlap with THEATRE 5771.10

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

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

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

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

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

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

This was ASC’s understanding too

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

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

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

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

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

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

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

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

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

Hi Jeremy and Brian

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

Thanks
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hi Jeremy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy and Brian

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

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

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

Best,
Bernadette



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

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

Thanks, Bernadette.

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

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

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

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

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Jeremy

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

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

My best,
Bernadette



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

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

Dear Jeremy,

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

My best,
Bernadette



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

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

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy



Jeremy Fortier

Assistant Director, Salmon P. Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society
The Ohio State University

Latest Article: "[Why to be a Civic Constitutionalist](#)"

Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 9:53:20 AM Eastern Daylight Time

Subject: Concurrence
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 at 4:24:21 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Martin, Andrew
To: Schoen, Brian, Fortier, Jeremy
CC: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Attachments: image001.png

Hi Brian and Jeremy

I spoke with Scott Levi and he is granting concurrence from History on the courses they had previously raised concerns about. I believe those were:

Presidential Crises in War and Peace
The Evolution of Citizenship in America
The Pursuit of Happiness

He will provide a response shortly for the courses in the most recent round of concurrence.

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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