

Term Information

Effective Term Spring 2026

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area Civics, Law, and Leadership
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org Chase Center for Civics - D4260
College/Academic Group Office of Academic Affairs
Level/Career Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog 3310
Course Title American Religion(s): Fractures and Foundations
Transcript Abbreviation American Religions
Course Description This course introduces sociological perspectives on what religion is and how it works, especially in the United States; it explores what made the role of religion in the early American Republic distinct from other times and places; it examines the influence of religion in modern American society, with a focus on trends such as politicization and secularization.
Semester Credit Hours/Units Fixed: 3

Offering Information

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

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites
Exclusions
Electronically Enforced Yes

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

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

Requirement/Elective Designation

Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students will articulate how religion works as a social phenomenon, critically analyze how religion in the American context shapes citizenship, and evaluate major perspectives on the role of religion in social conflict.

Content Topic List

- Religion; American Religion; Religious Pluralism; Religion and Political Polarization; Religion and Social Pluralism; Secularization; Religion in the Public Square; Religion and Public Intellectuals

Sought Concurrence

Yes

Attachments

- CIVICLL, American Religion(s) - Syllabus.pdf: Syllabus
(Syllabus. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- CIVICLL, American Religion(s) - GE Worksheet.pdf: GE Worksheet
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Concurrence Exchanges - Education, Law, Glenn, Arts & Sciences.pdf: Concurrence Exchanges
(Concurrence. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Memo Regarding Submission of American Religions.pdf: Memo Regarding Concurrence
(Cover Letter. Owner: Fortier,Jeremy)
- Chase concurrence.pdf: Concurrence - Additional
(Concurrence. Owner: Reed,Kathryn Marie)

Comments

- Sending back per email discussion (by Reed,Kathryn Marie on 08/21/2025 09:50 AM)

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	08/19/2025 06:21 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	08/19/2025 06:21 PM	Unit Approval
Revision Requested	Reed,Kathryn Marie	08/21/2025 09:50 AM	College Approval
Submitted	Fortier,Jeremy	08/21/2025 10:17 AM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Fortier,Jeremy	08/21/2025 10:18 AM	Unit Approval
Approved	Reed,Kathryn Marie	09/02/2025 12:24 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Hilty,Michael Neff,Jennifer Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Steele,Rachel Lea	09/02/2025 12:24 PM	ASCCAO Approval

Memo Regarding Submission of “American Religion(s)”

During the concurrence process this course faced reservations from three units within Arts & Sciences, which have been addressed as follows:

- SOCIOL’s initial objections were discussed in a meeting between representatives of the department and the Chase Center. In response, Chase made two rounds of revisions to the syllabus which received approval from SOCIOL. This was a constructive exchange which we believe has resulted in a more effectively inter-disciplinary course.
- HISTORY’s initial objections were addressed via extensive discussions between Brian Schoen and Scott Levi, which resulted in modifications to our syllabus that incorporated greater disciplinary breadth into the course. HISTORY now concurs.
- COMPSTD initially denied concurrence based on alleged curricular overlap but then modified its position in email correspondence between COMPSTD Department Chair Hugh Urban and Chase Center Associate Director Brian Schoen, where COMPSTD’s objections turned to focusing on the claim that the syllabus deals too narrowly with Christianity. COMPSTD suggested that we change the title to “Christianity in America,” which reflects a concern not over content duplication but the reverse: COMPSTD disapproves of our course’s approach to American Religions – a discussion that may be worth having, but which does not bear on the matter of content duplication for concurrence purposes. COMPSTD may not have formally rescinded its initial non-concurrence regarding this course, but if the department’s main objection is that our course does not do something they think it should do, then it would seem to follow that their complaint is less about course duplication than about the lack of alignment between the aims of our units. Since that exchange, COMPSTD has been non-responsive about this course. The course was submitted for concurrence over six weeks ago, during which time we have worked constructively with other units about this and other courses. COMPSTD has never attempted to concretely demonstrate duplication between our courses.

In sum: while this course initially faced some reservations, they were addressed collaboratively to the satisfaction of two units. Whatever objections COMPSTD may have do not concern content duplication, and the department has declined to engage Chase about the substance of the course for more than six weeks now. It is time for this course to move forward.

CIVICLLL 3xxx
American Religion(s): Foundations and Fractures
Spring 2026

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

Instructor: Jesse Smith
Email:
Office:
Office Hours:

I. Course Description & Student Outcomes

From the colonial era onward, religion has consistently played a key role in American culture and civic life. That role, however, has changed over time and always been contested. In light of this shifting religious landscape, this course has three aims: first, to provide an overview of sociological perspectives on what religion is and how it works, with a focus on theories most relevant to the United States' context; second, to explore the role of religion in the early American Republic, which was distinct from other times and places in ways that remain relevant today; and third, to examine the influence of religion in modern American society, with a focus on trends such as politicization and secularization.

II. Course Objectives

This course focuses on religion as a source of fractures and foundations in American civic life by asking students to discuss and evaluate statements by public intellectuals, designed as contributions to America's never-ending "culture wars," in light of scholarship on religion from a wide range of academic disciplines. As a result, the course serves the programmatic learning outcomes of the Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society, whose students are expected to:

- Use a multi-disciplinary perspective to identify and evaluate historical antecedents of contemporary problems, real-world applications of theoretical claims, and the principled bases for practical courses of action within the pluralistic American polity.
- Draw on multi-disciplinary perspectives to effectively research and present arguments about civic traditions and civic life, using verbal, textual, and visual means in ways that fairly characterize arguments that counter their positions.

In addition, by the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Articulate how religion works as a social phenomenon, including what makes it distinctive and how it influences public life.
- Critically analyze how religion in the American context shapes understandings and activities of citizenship.
- Describe competing perspectives on the idea of the separation of church and state.



- Recognize differences and similarities in the major religious traditions dominant in American society--historically and today.
- Effectively research and present arguments regarding the religious dimension of American traditions and civic life, both verbally and in written form.
- Identify and evaluate historical antecedents of the American religious landscape, from the colonial era through the present day, with recognition of how religion shapes both social solidarity and conflict.
- Describe the ways that different American religious traditions serve to shape, uphold, reform, or challenge existing social structures.
- Identify and evaluate major perspectives on the role of religion in modern social conflict, focusing on major arguments in both academic scholarship and public discourse.
- Understand theories and evidence related to secularization as a major and long-lasting change in American culture.

III. GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes

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

GEN Goals

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

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

This course explores the ways that religious thought and practice distinctively inform views of American citizenship and belonging, both historically and today. Religion and religious diversity are--and have always been--fundamental aspects of American life, whether at the level of community or of government. Religion can serve to inform and motivate good citizenship in some cases, while serving as a source of conflict and exclusion in others. Course lectures, discussions, and activities will help students think critically about the role of religion in the American founding (Week 4), competing understandings of the idea of separation of church and state (Week 5), religious thinking and community as a means to challenge injustice (Week 7), and religion as a source of social solidarity (Week 8).

IV. Course Texts

All readings will be available on Carmen.

It is essential for you to keep up with the reading and to read actively. Active reading means taking notes as you read, crafting ideas in your own words, making a list of questions you have as you read, and reading far enough ahead that you have a chance not only to read but to think about what you have read. Reading in this way may be more time-consuming in the short term but will save you time in the long run as you improve your ability to remember, apply, and integrate the concepts we cover throughout the course.

V. Assignments and Grading

1. Attendance and participation (15%): Discussion will be a major component of this class. Students are expected to show up to class on time, having done the readings listed for that day and prepared to talk about them. Students who do not attend class sessions will be unable to complete in-class assignments which will have a negative impact on their grade in the course. Please note the following policies:

- For each unexcused absence from class, students will be docked 5% of their participation grade. Students who miss 25% or more of the class sessions will receive a 0 for this portion of the course. Missing classes for illness, university-sponsored events, or religious holidays does not count, but for an absence to be considered “excused,” you must contact the instructor within one week. Please reach out to the instructor with any questions about this policy.
- Consistent, high-quality participation—including respectful listening, contributing to discussion, and building on peers’ insights—is expected each week. Occasional informal



writing or group exercises may be used to facilitate discussion and deepen reflection. Students will be docked 1 point of their participation grade (1/100 pts) for every day they do not bring their assigned text *or* do not speak up in class. If you are struggling to participate in discussion, please come to office hours or reach out.

2. Analysis of religious service (15%): You will be required to attend or watch online a religious service from a denomination or tradition other than your own and then write an analysis of several aspects of the service, including sacred/profane elements, use of ritual, and mode of congregational collective engagement. Your analysis should be a minimum of five pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font with no more than one-inch margins.

3. Religious background interview (15%): For this assignment, you will interview someone outside of your immediate family and from a religious background other than your own. Your goal will be to explore how they arrived at their current religious beliefs, identities, and practices, and to understand how religion shapes their life today. You will then submit a paper highlighting key insights from your interview, linking them to class material. Your analysis should be a minimum of five pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font with no more than one-inch margins.

4. Reading reflections (20%): You will complete eight reading reflections based on questions provided for you regarding the themes, tensions, and modern significance of the topics covered in any given week. Each of these reflections should be between two and four pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font, and with no more than one-inch margins.

5. Culture wars reflection paper (10%): You will write an essay comparing and contrasting at least *two* of the responses to America's religious divide. After assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each, you will make an argument stating which response you find most compelling and why. Discuss perceived barriers to the implementation of this response, and the likely effects of this response if it were to be adopted. This paper should be at least seven pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font, and with no more than one-inch margins.

6. Secularization reflection paper (10%): You will write an essay comparing and contrasting at least *two* perspectives from the readings on the probable trajectory of American religion in the remainder of the 21st Century. After reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of each, you will make an argument stating which outcome you think is the most likely, and why you find it more compelling. Discuss the likely implications for American civic life of the trajectory you selected. This paper should be at least seven pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font, and with no more than one-inch margins.

7. Final exam (15%): The final exam will take the form of a written take-home with a series of essay questions on themes we have covered throughout the class. Responses to these questions should add up to at least eight pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font with no more than one-inch margins.

Course Policies:

No Screens: Outside of class, personal electronics are a necessary tool for learning in the modern educational environment. Inside of class, they are more likely to serve as distractions than learning aids. For this reason, I do not allow use of phones or laptops during class, unless otherwise instructed.

Deadlines: All assignments will be due at 11:59pm on the due date listed in the syllabus. Late assignments will automatically drop 20 points (two letter grades) if submitted within 24 hours after the deadline, and 50 points thereafter. If there are extenuating circumstances that interfere with timely assignment completion, please discuss this with me *before* the assignment is due.

Grading Scale

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

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

Course Schedule

Please note: Topics and assignments may shift; changes will be announced in class and on the course site.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Reading/assignments</u>
<u>Week 1</u>		
Class 1	Introduction/syllabus	Syllabus
Class 2	What is religion?	Christian Smith, <i>Moral, Believing Animals</i> (Ch. 5)
<u>Week 2</u>		
Class 1	Religion as moral system	Selections from Jonathan Haidt, <i>The Righteous Mind</i>



Class 2	Religion as cultural system	Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System"
<u>Week 3</u>		
Class 1	Religion in the early Republic	John Winthrop, "City on a Hill" sermon George Washington's Farewell Address Perry Miller, "Did the Puritans Start It All?" Edmund S. Morgan, "William Penn and the English Origins of American Religious Pluralism"
Class 2	Religious beliefs of the American Founders	John Fea, <i>Was America Founded as a Christian Nation?: A Historical Introduction</i> (Chs. 11-13) Mark David Hall, <i>Did America Have a Christian Founding?</i> (Introduction, Ch. 1) <i>Due:</i> <i>Analysis of religious service</i>
<u>Week 4</u>		
Class 1	The separation of church and state – Then	Patrick Henry, "A Bill Establishing A Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion" James Madison, "Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments" Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to the Danbury Baptists" Ian Bartrum, "Of Historiography and Constitutional Principle: Jefferson's Reply to the Danbury Baptists"
Class 2	The separation of church and state – Now	Selections from Steven D. Smith, <i>The Rise and Decline of American Religious Freedom</i> <i>Due:</i> <i>Reflection paper</i>
<u>Week 5</u>		
Class 1	Cultural contours of American religion	Bellah et al., <i>Habits of the Heart</i> (Ch. 2)

Class 2

Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart* (Ch. 9)

Due: Reflection paper

Week 6

Class 1

The Black Church

Frederick Douglass, Appendix to
Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass

W.E.B. DuBois, "Of the Sorrow Songs"

W.E.B DuBois, "Credo"

Class 2

Christianity, Islam, and
racial justice

Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from
Birmingham Jail"

Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a
Dream"

Malcolm X, "A Message to the
Grassroots"

Malcolm X, "God's Judgment of White
America"

Malcolm X, "Not Just an American
Problem, but a World Problem"

Due: Religious background paper

Week 7

Class 1

The 20th century
consensus I

Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*
(Chs. 1-3, 5)

Class 2

The 20th century
consensus II

Robert Bellah, "Civil Religion in
America"

John Courtney Murray, *We Hold These
Truths* (Ch. 1)

Due: Reflection paper

Week 8

Class 1

The rise of the Christian
Right

Selections from Daniel K. Williams,
God's Own Party

Class 2

The consensus
contested

Selections from Richard John Neuhaus,
The Naked Public Square

Due: Reflection paper

Week 9

Class 1	Religion, politics, and populism	Selections from Tobias Cremer, <i>The Godless Crusade</i>
Class 2	The “Christian nationalism” debate	Selections from Tobias Cremer, <i>The Godless Crusade</i> Kenneth Woodward, “The Myth of White Christian Nationalism” <i>Due: Reflection paper</i>
<u>Week 10</u>		
Class 1	Responses: Religious retreat	Selections from Rod Dreher, <i>The Benedict Option</i>
Class 2	Responses: Religious resurgence	Selections from R.R. Reno, <i>Return of the Strong Gods</i> <i>Due: Reflection paper</i>
<u>Week 11</u>		
Class 1	Responses: Pluralism	Selections from John Inazu, <i>Confident Pluralism</i>
Class 2	Responses: A renewed social contract	Selections from Jonathan Rauch, <i>Cross Purposes: Christianity’s Broken Bargain with Democracy</i>
<u>Week 12</u>		
Class 1	Secularization	Peter Berger, <i>The Sacred Canopy</i> (Chs. 1–2)
Class 2		Selections from James K.A. Smith, <i>How (Not) to be Secular: Reading Charles Taylor</i> <i>Due: Reflection paper</i>
<u>Week 13</u>		
Class 1	The rise of the “none’s”	Selections from Stephen Bullivant, <i>Nonverts: The Making of Ex-Christian America</i>
Class 2	Spiritual practices	Tara Isabella Burton, <i>Strange Rites</i> (Introduction, Chs. 1, 4) <i>Due: Culture wars reflection</i>
<u>Week 14</u>		

Class 1	Is religion in the modern world obsolete?	Christian Smith, <i>Why Religion Went Obsolete</i>
---------	---	--

Class 2		Christian Smith, <i>Why Religion Went Obsolete</i> (continued) Due: Reflection paper
---------	--	--

Week 15

Class 1	Do we still need religion?	Selections from Ross Douthat, <i>Believe</i>
---------	----------------------------	--

Class 2	Concluding thoughts	Jason Blakely, "An Atheist's Return to the Catholic Church: A Story of Death, Love, and Meaning" Ayaan Hirsi Ali, "Why I Am Now a Christian" Due: Secularization reflection
<u>Finals week</u>		Due: Final exam

VI. 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<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>
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>	<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>

“American Religion(s): Foundations and Fractures” Worksheet Responses

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

This course understands citizenship as an evolving cultural phenomenon that is shaped by the beliefs and values of diverse individuals within a community. “American Religion(s): Foundations and Fractures” will help students explore the varied and competing ways in which religion, specifically, has shaped (and continues to shape) understandings of Americanism and American citizenship. Through a combination of primary source analysis and secondary source readings, students will grow to appreciate how religion and religious diversity have been fundamental aspects of American life, whether at the level of community or of government. They will also explore how religion can serve to inform and motivate good citizenship in some cases, while serving as a source of conflict and exclusion in others.

ELO 1.1

This course challenges students to critically explore the ways that religious thought and practice distinctively inform views of American citizenship and belonging, both historically and today. It will do this through several activities:

-Readings: Course texts have been intentionally chosen to introduce students to diverse theoretical approaches to the study of religion (e.g. Clifford Geertz’s anthropological approach versus Jonathan Haidt’s moral foundations theory) and diverse experiences of religion in America (e.g. Black Church, Catholicism, Islam, Christian nationalism, spiritual practices).

-Reading Reflections: Students’ eight reading reflections will require them to analyze 1) how authors conceptualize religion, justice, and citizenship (and the relationship between them), and 2) the modern significance of the topics covered (e.g. are there parallels between John Winthrop’s “City on a Hill” Sermon and contemporary religious and political rhetoric about the American nation?)

-Lectures and discussions: course lectures and discussions will help students think critically about the role of religion in the American Founding (Week 4), competing understandings of the idea of separation of church and state (Week 5), religious thinking and community as a means to challenge injustice (Week 7), and religion as a source of social solidarity (Week 8).

-Reflection papers: Students will develop logical reasoning skills as they prepare the following written reflections: 1) a **Culture wars reflection paper**, comparing and contrasting at least *two* of the responses to America’s religious divide. After assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each, students will make an argument stating which response they find most compelling and why. They will also discuss perceived barriers to the implementation of this response, and the likely effects of this response if it were to be adopted. 2) a **Secularization reflection paper**, comparing and contrasting at least *two* perspectives from the readings on the probable trajectory

of American religion in the remainder of the 21st Century. After reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of each, students will make an argument stating which outcome you think is the most likely, and why they find it more compelling. They will also discuss the likely implications for American civic life of the trajectory they selected.

-Final exam: Students' final exam will consist of essay questions on themes we have covered throughout the class (e.g. secularization theories, the religious beliefs of the American Founders, the relationship between religion and populism, and the rise of the Christian Right).

ELO 1.2.

The course demands rigorous scholarly engagement through close analysis of both primary sources (e.g. George Washington's Farewell Address, Patrick Henry's "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," and W.E.B. DuBois's "Credo") and major works by leading historians and theorists of religion (e.g. Clifford Geertz, Jonathan Haidt, Christian Smith, and Peter Berger). Lectures and readings will provide students with an overview of sociological perspectives on what religion is and how it works, with a focus on theories most relevant to the United States' context (Weeks 1 and 2); it will challenge students to explore the role of religion in the early American Republic, which was distinct from other times and places in ways that remain relevant today (Weeks 4-5); and it will give students the opportunity to examine the influence of religion in modern American society, with a focus on trends such as politicization and secularization (Weeks 10-15). Throughout the semester, students will explore the role of religion in both the early (Weeks 4-5) and current (especially Weeks 10-11) American republic, synthesizing their knowledge in eight reading reflections and two critical book reviews. Students will also develop their understanding of the role of religion in public life through out-of-classroom projects. The combination of the "Religious background interview" and "Analysis of religious service" assignment will help students investigate how religious belief and practice affects the experiences of individuals today—and can legitimately promote and inform public and political activity.

ELO. 2.1:

Students will identify, describe, and synthesize approaches to and experiences of American religion and citizenship through:

Active class participation: Attendance and active participation in class makes up 15% of students' grade. Discussions will challenge them to engage in analytical thinking, comparing conceptions of the separation of church and state during the American Founding and today (Week 4), dissecting what Robert Bellah means by "civil religion" (Week 7), and debating Kenneth Woodward's argument in "White Christian Nationalism" (Week 9).

Written assignments: students will complete two experiential assignments that will help them identify and describe the way religion functions in public life. First, in their "**Analysis of religious service**" assignment, students will be required to attend or watch online a religious

service from a denomination or tradition other than their own and then write an analysis of several aspects of the service, including sacred/profane elements, use of ritual, and mode of congregational collective engagement. Students' "religious background interviews" will also be worth 15% of their grade. For this assignment, students will interview someone outside of your immediate family and from a religious background other than your own. Their goal will be to explore how they arrived at their current religious beliefs, identities, and practices, and to understand how religion shapes their life today. They will then submit a paper highlighting key insights from their interview, linking them to class material. These assignments will enable students to draw connections between course readings and contemporary American life, synthesizing and broadening their understanding of the diverse ways religion shapes the lives of diverse individuals and communities.

ELO 2.2:

This course will empower students to develop a sense of self as learners through:

Reading Reflections: Throughout the course, reading reflections will help students build skills and comfort in summarizing and analyzing sometimes-difficult texts, with my feedback providing them further guidance.

Out of class activities: Through their interviews (see "Religious background interview") and religious attendance visits (see "analysis of religious service"), students will have a chance to practice effective observation and exercise creativity in terms of what they ask, observe, and interpret in their assignments.

Exam: Students' final exam will provide students the chance to build on their own experiences as Americans and reflect on how our course material connects to modern American life. For example, the exam will ask them to describe two prominent theories of secularization and use them to develop a reasoned, evidence-based response to the following question: Is America a more or less secular nation that it was at the time of the American Founding?

ELO 3.1:

Through course readings, discussions, reflection papers, book reviews, and exam questions, students will analyze diverse theoretical perspectives on the relationship between religion and U.S. citizenship and also practice describing and analyzing how religion has affected evolving definitions of citizenship. Course texts have been intentionally chosen to introduce students to diverse theoretical approaches to the study of religion (e.g. Clifford Geertz's anthropological approach versus Jonathan Haidt's moral foundations theory) and diverse experiences of religion in America (e.g. Black Church, Catholicism, Islam, Christian nationalism, spiritual practices). In their reading responses students will be asked to analyze authors' diverse conceptions of religion and citizenship. For example, in weeks 4-5, students will assess competing views of how key Founding Era figures believed religion could inform public morality, and to what extent the state should support this influence. In Week 7, students will explore how religion among African-

Americans has served as a way to challenge social structures in the pursuit of justice. In Week 8, students will examine how expansive religious identities promote solidarity among citizens. And in Weeks 10-11, they will explore more exclusionary understandings of citizenship based on religion.

ELO 3.2:

Through comparative readings (e.g. reading Jonathan Haidt's presentation of religion as a moral system in *The Righteous Mind* alongside Clifford Geertz's "Religion as a Cultural System) and class discussions about authors' and historical figures' diverse approaches to religion, students will develop and apply intercultural competency, civil discourse skills, and other necessary tools for responsible, informed global citizenship. For one, this course will expose them to the historic and present-day religious pluralism in the United States, giving them the chance to reflect on how American religious traditions can be means of inclusivity and exclusivity, harmony and discord. In Week 8, for example, students will consider how American religions overlap in ways to promote a shared sense of citizenship across groups, while in Weeks 7, 10, and 11, they will consider how religions also diverge in ways that produce tensions. Through readings, discussions, and experiential assignments, students will develop a stronger understanding of these overlaps and tensions, with implications for their knowledge of religion's role in societies around the globe.

ELO 4.1:

Throughout the course, students will explore the lived experiences of individuals across lines of gender, race, class, age, and cultural identity through a combination of written texts (e.g. Frederick Douglass's *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, John Winthrop's "City on a Hill," Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail," and Malcolm X's "A Message to the Grassroots"). and out-of-classroom experiences (e.g. the Religious background interview assignment and the analysis of religious service assignment). In their Week 7 readings, reflections, and discussion, for example, students will examine how African American religion has served as a means for pursuing racial diversity, equity, and inclusion in American society. In Week 8, students will evaluate how a more expansive religious identity as well as tradition of civil religion can promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across religious and ethnic barriers (though with limitations). And in contrast, Weeks 10-11 will offer students the chance to critique how religious identity and symbolism can undermine diversity, equity, and inclusion.

ELO 4.2:

Weeks 4-6 and 8 will help students analyze and critique how religion has informed and interacted with larger American civic traditions of egalitarianism and individualism. Students will critique how these notions of citizenship can be tolerant and motivating, on the one hand, and atomizing, on the other. In Weeks 7 and 10-11, students will also explore how religious beliefs and symbols can be leveraged as tools of difference and identity—and as tools to challenge and uphold

existing social structures. Throughout the semester, students will critically interrogate how religious institutions, practices, and thought have and have not been viable means of social advocacy and justice through their reading reflections. Moreover, they will develop their own evidence-based perspective on how religion can legitimately promote and inform public and political activity through class discussion, final exam questions, and their culture wars reflection paper (in which they will compare and contrast at least *two* of the responses to America's religious divide, and assess the strengths and weaknesses of each.

From: [Martin, Andrew](#)
To: [Schoen, Brian](#); [Fortier, Jeremy](#)
Cc: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#); [Reed, Katie](#)
Subject: Chase concurrence
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:33:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Brian and Jeremy

Just a quick update on the Chase courses at Comp Studies. American Religion is not a concurrence issue for the department. They did note that the title may be misleading as it focuses almost entirely on Christianity.

As you know, they continue to have concerns about overlap between the proposed American Witch-Hunts course and Magic in the Modern World. I've asked them to clearly identify points of overlap. I suspect this may result in a meeting that includes Randy Smith, though I'll leave it up to Katie regarding next steps.

By my reckoning that is the last course that has any sort of concurrence issue.

Best

Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Professor of Sociology

114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall

Columbus, OH 43210

614-247-6641 Office

martin.1026@osu.edu

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

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

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

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

Hi Tasha,

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy,

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

Sincerely,
Tasha



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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Tasha,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

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

The Ohio State University

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

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

Jeremy and Brian,

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

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

Thanks,
Anne



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

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

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

Anne E. Ralph

Morgan E. Shipman Professor in Law

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Strategic Initiatives

Michael E. Moritz College of Law

55 West 12th Avenue | Columbus, OH 43210

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

Pronouns: she/her/hers

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

Hi Anne,

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

Hi Anne,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

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

The Ohio State University

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

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

Hi Jeremy,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Rob



Robert T. Greenbaum

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of Academic Affairs

Professor, Associate Dean for Curriculum

John Glenn College of Public Affairs

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

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

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

Pronouns: he/him/his

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

Hi Rob,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHASE CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE,
AND SOCIETY

Jeremy Fortier

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

The Ohio State University

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

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

Thank you Bernadette.



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

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

Hello all,

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

Thanks,
Bernadette

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

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



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

Hi Andrew and all,

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

Many thanks,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



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

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

Hi Andrew –

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

Let me know if I can add anything further.

All best,

Jeremy

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy

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

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

Best

Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Professor of Sociology

114 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall

Columbus, OH 43210

614-247-6641 Office

martin.1026@osu.edu

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

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

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

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

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

This was ASC’s understanding too

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

Also understood that Theatre had concerns regarding overlap with THEATRE 5771.10

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

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

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

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

Agreed, seems ok to move forward

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

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

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

This was ASC’s understanding too

- “The Pursuits of Happiness.” We addressed initial concerns from CLASSICS, PSYCH has dropped its initial non-concurrence, and HISTORY does not concur.

Can you send us Psychology’s concurrence (last we saw was non-concurrence from them)

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 12:47 PM

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

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

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

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

The Ohio State University

Andrew W. Martin

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Professor of Sociology

614-247-6641 Office

martin.1026@osu.edu

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

Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:14:01 PM

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

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

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

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

Hi Jeremy and Brian

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

Thanks
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hi Jeremy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Re: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Chase Center Concurrence Request

Hi Jeremy and Brian

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

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

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

Best
Andrew



Andrew W. Martin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

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

Dear Jeremy,

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

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

Best,
Bernadette



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

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

Thanks, Bernadette.

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

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

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

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

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Jeremy

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

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

My best,
Bernadette



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

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

Dear Jeremy,

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

My best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

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

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

Hi Andrew and Bernadette,

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

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

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

All best,

Jeremy

--



Jeremy Fortier

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

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

Subject: RE: Concurrence
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 at 9:14:36 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Martin, Andrew
To: Fortier, Jeremy, Schoen, Brian
CC: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Attachments: image001.png

Thanks Jeremy, History grants concurrence on the American Religion and Evolution of Citizenship courses. Can we Rule Ourselves has concurrence from Political Science (I believe all the courses in that batch that we sent to them are ok), as well as Philosophy. Just waiting for History.

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: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:50 PM
To: Martin, Andrew <martin.1026@osu.edu>; Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>
Cc: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Concurrence

Thanks, Andrew.

I'm obliged to note that HISTORY had also withheld concurrence on "American Religion(s)", because I included our response to their objections when I uploaded that course plus "The Evolution of Citizenship" to curriculum.osu.edu last night (we did this with two courses where objections had dwindled to one or two – hopefully SOCIOL confirmed with you it that it found our changes to American Religion(s) satisfactory).

I can send Katie Reed this update, or resubmit those courses for the record if you and she both prefer (might depend on how they've been processed). I'll make sure the update is included when we submit the other courses on your list.

For courses from our second group of six, "Can We Rule Ourselves?" is highest priority. Better to confront non-concurrence by Tuesday the 26th if necessary (which I believe will be the two-week landmark) because we're obligated to press ahead with that one (we consulted about with several departments about the course ahead of time, but didn't get a verdict from

HISTORY).

Thanks for your work over an admittedly extraordinary summer, Andrew.

All best – Jeremy

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

Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 at 4:24 PM

To: Schoen, Brian <schoen.110@osu.edu>, Fortier, Jeremy <fortier.28@osu.edu>

Cc: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Concurrence

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