

Teaching Portfolio

Teaching evaluations: This portfolio includes teaching evaluations for one course for which I was the instructor of record, four courses for which I was a teaching assistant, and several workshops for which I was the primary instructor. For courses that took place at Northwestern University, the university's Course and Teacher Evaluations system generates reports from completed student course evaluations. Due to the length of these reports, I have compiled relevant information here and provided links to copies of the original reports online. For two courses on my CV where I served as a teaching assistant, the course evaluations provided to students did not ask about my role, and thus no evaluations are included here for those two courses.

Syllabi: This portfolio includes three syllabi, to illustrate my approach to curricular design and pedagogy described in my teaching statement. The first is the syllabus I created for the *Field Studies in Social Justice* course, where I served as an instructor of record. The second is a sample syllabus for an undergraduate Introduction to American Politics and Government course. The third is a sample syllabus for an undergraduate course on American political development.

Table of Contents

Course and Workshop Evaluations	2
Evaluations: <i>Field Studies in Social Justice</i> , Winter 2020 (Instructor-of-Record)	2
Evaluations: <i>Institutions, Rules, & Models in Social Science</i> , Winter 2019.....	4
Evaluations: <i>Urban Politics</i> , Fall 2018.....	4
Evaluations: <i>Studying Public Opinion</i> , Spring 2018.....	6
Evaluations: <i>Introduction to Comparative Politics</i> , Spring 2016.....	7
Evaluations: <i>R boot camp</i> , Summer 2018	8
Evaluations: Miscellaneous R workshops	9
Evaluations: Pedagogical workshops, September 2019.....	10
Sample Syllabus 1: <i>Field Studies in Social Justice</i>	12
Sample Syllabus 2: <i>Introduction to American Politics and Government</i>	18
Sample Syllabus 3: <i>American Political Development in the 20th Century</i>	24

Course and Workshop Evaluations

EVALUATIONS: *FIELD STUDIES IN SOCIAL JUSTICE*, WINTER 2020 (INSTRUCTOR-OF-RECORD)

The full evaluation report generated by the university's Course and Teacher Evaluations system is available on my website [here](#). I have copied and reformatted the results below. The following page is a copy of a separate course evaluation conducted by the Chicago Field Studies program.

No. of students	8
Responses received	6
Response ratio	75%

Survey questions about the course:

Question (1 = very low; 6 = very high)	Mean	Median
Provide an overall rating of the course.	5.17	5.00
Estimate how much you learned in the course.	5.17	5.50
Rate the effectiveness of the course in challenging you intellectually.	4.83	5.00
Rate the instructional materials (texts, audiovisual materials, etc.) used in this course.	5.17	5.00

Survey questions about the instruction:

Question (1 = very low; 6 = very high)	Mean	Median
Provide an overall rating of the instruction.	5.50	5.50
Rate the effectiveness of the instructor in stimulating your interest in the subject.	5.50	5.50
Rate how well prepared the instructor was for the class.	5.83	6.00
Rate the effectiveness with which the instructor communicated course content and ideas.	5.50	6.00
Rate the instructor's enthusiasm for the class.	5.67	6.00

Did the course help you learn? Why or Why not?

Yes. The small seminar style and class size really allowed for ample discussion and opportunities to really delve into the content with full understanding.

Yes

Please summarize your reaction to this course focusing on the aspects that were most important to you.

Great class. The content is very interesting and relevant to certain social issues facing different communities. It pairs very well with nonprofit or advocacy internships. Kumar was a great professor and cares a lot about the content and student engagement.

Great course with a great instructor

What are the primary strengths of the instructor?

Cares about student input

Very clear instruction

Number of Students Responses

8

Instructor Rating

5.8

Class Rating

5.6

Scale: 1-not satisfied to 6-very satisfied, it couldn't have been better

Instructor & Class

Comments – What did you like about your instructor?

My instructor was prepared for class and had an idea of what topics to discuss.
What I liked best about my CFS course and the instructor was that we talked about the current social justice issue in Chicago and used local media to learn how these complex issues developed and how we can impact in progressing these movements. Never have I taken a class at Northwestern with a more invested instructor who made sure we were learning about the issues we are currently facing.
He was very communicative
I liked how the course was centered around the history of Chicago, and for the students to better understand the area in which they're working in.
I thoroughly enjoyed the readings and topics my professor selected for each class. Kumar facilitated wonderful and insightful discussions for the class, that I truly helped me grow as a thinker and individual
Kumar was extremely accommodating and concerned about his students' well-being. He also made sure to tailor class discussion to topics that students expressed interest in, which made it feel much more personal.
The small seminar class setting
He was very approachable

Comments – What improvements would you suggest?

I like the case studies portion. maybe more of those?
I wouldn't give any improvements to the course or the instructor I wish every instructor at Northwestern was as invested and each course had a more modern lense (where applicable). grade easier on the assignments that aren't discussion posts
At times, I didn't feel comfortable speaking in the class. I think it might have been a me thing, but sometimes I felt that my opinions or thoughts weren't valued as real input.
I do wish that the course was not 3 hours long on weeknights. I really wanted to put my full effort and attention into the class, but it was very difficult to do after long days prior. I feel like a 2 hour course would still be sufficient for the materials and also a more efficient use of time.
N/A
More in class activities
Nothing at this time

EVALUATIONS: *INSTITUTIONS, RULES, & MODELS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE*, WINTER 2019

The full evaluation report generated by the university's Course and Teacher Evaluations system is available on my website [here](#). I have copied and reformatted all TA-focused components below.

No. of students	33
Responses received	30
Response ratio	90.9%

Question (1 = very low; 6 = very high)	Mean	Median
The TA was able to answer the students' questions adequately.	5.07	6.00
The TA was well prepared for each session.	4.93	6.00
The TA communicated ideas in a clear manner.	5.00	6.00
The TA showed strong interest in teaching the course.	4.81	5.00

What are the primary strengths and weaknesses of the teaching assistant?

Kumar knows what he is talking about and in office hours can essentially act like a second teacher.

Kumar is fair with the assignment grading and gets them done quickly, which is always nice. He always has mostly feedback during office hours.

he was extremely condescending

I really didn't interact with him a lot but appreciated that he showed up to lectures and clearly knew what he was talking about

Kumar puts a lot of time in this course, offering many office hour sections and attending class with us.

He's a nice guy, but I feel like he'd be better suited to teaching a political science course, particularly one relating to voting, as that is his area of study.

He was very helpful during office hours, but sometimes our conversations felt rushed because he had other students waiting to talk to him as well

Kumar provides very helpful suggestions to help me with my paper.

Teaches honestly and is available often to help with papers
Strengths: pretty much did everything correctly

Kumar was a REALLY great TA. I definitely appreciated the key insights he had for my papers and how committed he was to make extra office hours when he found that students were having trouble. The optional discussion sections were also helpful at times, which was nice. However, he does grade quite harshly.

Very knowledgeable, gave good feedback on assignments.

I really liked working with Kumar and although he was a very difficult grader, I felt as though he was genuinely trying to help me improve as a writer. His feedback was easy to apply to my next paper and so forth.

Kumar was very helpful in answering all of my questions after class/during office hours! Section, however, always felt like a waste of time (though I don't think that's Kumar's fault)

Kumar is a very approachable person and I think his expertise and welcoming attitude really makes him an ideal TA for MMSS 211–3. Perhaps utilizing more discussion sessions to show the modeling he works with (in addition to Excel, Jamovi, etc.) will be valuable additions for those interested in doing research in the future.

Kumar was great and always available to help. He responds to emails super quickly and I appreciated his extra office hours.

Kumar was very helpful at all times, both inside and outside of class. He helped break down complex concepts into digestible pieces. Only real criticism is that at times his feedback was a bit basic. Overall, one of the best TAs I have ever had.

Very helpful with facilitating my own thinking about things or bringing up different angles to my own thoughts. Clear communication and kept the class up to date on many things. Open to questions and generally a good TA.

He was very good at helping the students

EVALUATIONS: *URBAN POLITICS*, FALL 2018

The full evaluation report generated by the university's Course and Teacher Evaluations system is available on my website [here](#). I have copied and reformatted all TA-focused components below.

No. of students	23
Responses received	11
Response ratio	47.8%

Question (1 = very low; 6 = very high)	Mean	Median
The TA was able to answer the students' questions adequately.	5.64	6.00
The TA was well prepared for each session.	5.64	6.00
The TA communicated ideas in a clear manner.	5.64	6.00
The TA showed strong interest in teaching the course.	5.82	6.00

What are the primary strengths and weaknesses of the teaching assistant?

Kumar is a fantastic TA. He cleared up questions students had from lecture and also helped us organize the course material so that we could prepare for exams. He answered questions clearly and showed interest in his students.

Good facilitator

He was invested in our learning

Knowledge of material. Effective communication. Availability. Willingness to help

Because the class had so much reading, Kumar did a good job breaking them down into categories and related topics in such a way as to make them feel much more manageable and cohesive.

Kumar is by far the best TA I have had at Northwestern. He knows the material very well, he communicates ideas effectively, and he engages well with students not only in the discussion sections but in lectures as well. He is extremely helpful in trying to understand the course material, and provides great constructive feedback on essays. I would be the first person to sign up for any class that he taught

Kumar was an excellent TA. Very knowledgeable and communicated everything in a clear manner

Kumar was a fantastic resource. He responded to emails very quickly, and led great discussion sections

He knows his material and creates a welcome environment for discussion. Grades too much on structure and writing style rather than actual content which I thought wasn't an accurate reflection of how well I was engaging with the subject material.

EVALUATIONS: *STUDYING PUBLIC OPINION*, SPRING 2018

I served in a non-standard teaching assistant role for this course, and as such the formal course evaluation system was not used. The instructor asked students to complete a course evaluation form addressing the teaching assistants and an optional session that I led. The results from this evaluation are copied below.

No. of students assigned to me	6
Responses received	5
Response ratio	83.3%

Question (1 to 5 scale)	Mean
How prepared was your TA?	5 (highly prepared)
How clearly did your TA present material?	4.8 (very clearly)
How much did your TA help you develop critical thinking skills?	4.8 (a lot)
How helpful was your TA's feedback on assignments?	5 (very helpful)
For your level of understanding, were your TA's explanations and instructions too complicated, too simple, or about right?	3 (just about right)
How clearly did your TA answer questions?	5 (very clearly)
How easy did you find it to meet with your TA?	5 (very easy)

How knowledgeable in the course content was your TA?

More than qualified. Very knowledgeable.

I never ran into anything Kumar could not help me with.

Kumar was extremely helpful the entire time and I never doubted that he didn't understand the work and was clearly very knowledgeable.

Very knowledgeable

Did you attend the optional session on regression analysis led by Kumar Ramanathan? If so, please provide some feedback on how helpful the session was.

Yes, I attended this session. While the session was led by Kumar, all 3 TAs were present and helped everyone there. They all worked together well to teach us basic R skills and how to analyze our data. They all stayed past the scheduled time to work with all of us there until we felt comfortable with the program and how to run analyses.

Yes, and this session was also a tremendous help. I had no idea what I was doing beforehand, and walked away with a basic understanding of R.

Very helpful

Yes. It was a good start for what we needed, but it could have been longer and more detailed. There was a steep learning curve to R, and I had to do a lot of the learning of the program on my own.

Yes, it was helpful.

EVALUATIONS: *INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS*, SPRING 2016

I was a freelance teaching assistant for this course at Tufts University. The official online course evaluations conducted by the university for this semester did not include specific questions about the teaching assistant or discussion sections. However, students did refer to these aspects of the course in two of the voluntary open-ended questions available on the course evaluation. Copied below are those relevant excerpts.

No. of students	45
Responses received	67
Response ratio	67%

What aspects of this course worked best to facilitate your learning?

(22 total responses received; below are the 11 responses that addressed the TA or discussion sections.)

Kumar, the TA, was fantastic. His knowledge of the subject was extensive, and he always had answers to my questions! the recitations¹

The lecture and the recitation were the best ways for me to learn. Many of the readings were dense or dry, and only made full sense to me after discussion in class or recitation.

I think that recitations, not the questions, really facilitated learning.

Lectures were the most useful, as well as recitation sections, where we could ask clarifying questions and discuss what we heard in lecture or read.

The class is incredibly well-organized, well-structured in that it provides detailed and clear guidelines for almost everything (each lecture, reading, test and paper assignment is well-explained) and the arrangement of the class is logical and progressive. TA is extremely helpful, enthusiastic and good at engaging discussions.

discussion in recitation, lecture slides

The recitations really helped solidify my knowledge.

The lectures really helped to make sure that the reading was understandable and that the material was manageable. The recitations were also quite helpful to make sure that we understood specific parts of the readings that we didn't have time to review in class.

Lectures were thorough and well organized; Kumar was an excellent TA and really helped to clarify the readings.

The discussions during recitation

Please provide any additional comments regarding the instructor.

(15 responses received; below are 4 responses also addressed the TA.)

Prof. Shevel and Kumar are both great. Kumar is very helpful and understanding of any problems I or my friends have had. He is patient and you can tell he really wants everyone to understand the material.

Both Professor Shevel and Kumar were really great- always really helpful and easy to talk to, and made it so much easier to get through the large amount of material we studied.

Professor Shevel was the best professor ever! Very understanding and helpful. Kumar (TA) was also great!

¹ At Tufts University, discussion sections are called "recitations."

EVALUATIONS: R BOOT CAMP, SUMMER 2018

This was a 3-day (16 hours) boot camp on R for incoming students in the Masters of Science in Analytics program at Northwestern. I was the primary instructor for 8 hours and served as an assistant for the other instructors for the remainder of the time.

No. of students	33
Responses received	30
Response ratio	90.9%

Question	Mean	Median
The R material was well presented.	4.53 (strongly agree)	5
The appropriate material was covered during the R sessions.	4.58 (strongly agree)	5
The R subject matter will be useful during the program.	4.75 (strongly agree)	5
I learned a lot during the R sessions.	4.64 (strongly agree)	5
The R exercises were useful.	4.56 (strongly agree)	5
The pace of the R sessions was...	3.44 (neither)	3
How familiar were you with R prior to these bootcamp sessions?	2.83 (a little familiar)	3

Did anything make some R sessions more effective than others?

Equally useful and effective

dplyr was really useful, had good examples

Not particularly. I thought they did a great job of using the repo and distributing resources so that we could all practice.

Going through exercises together was helpful

Plenty of exercises and real world examples really helped put things in context

It built nicely over the three days which helped

well-designed exercises and in class practice problems... helpful slides

Exercise sections

comprehensive materials

More time. The session on dplyr was helpful and long while the session on data.frame felt a little more rushed because it was shorter.

Not especially. being exposed to all the libraries and doing examples was helpful.

I thought each of the R lectures was effective individually.

Style of presentation

The ggplot session was very effective in showing the multiple ways of answering similar questions. The final culminating exercise was also very helpful

Please give an overall impression of the R sessions.

Great

Very good

Maybe tried to cover too much

Absolutely amazing. If possible, cover dplyr and data.table on separate days

Very helpful!

Thumbs up.

Loved most of the R session (except dplyr and data.table being covered on the same day)

I like it a lot

A little too easy to get lost

R sessions were great! I felt like my skills improved immensely in just a few days.

Overall, I thought the instructors knew what they were talking about, and i learned quite a bit.

Well presented

helpful, although i would spend a little less time on ggplot

There was a lot of good material covered, but I wish more time in class was dedicated to the final exercise.

It was great!

EVALUATIONS: MISCELLANEOUS R WORKSHOPS

I have been an instructor for five workshops on data analysis in R for the Political Science Department at Northwestern. Evaluations are available for two of these workshops, and are shared below.

Introduction to data visualization in R (undergrad- and grad-level), March 2020

Question	Mean
Pace of material (1 = too slow; 5 = too fast)	3.25
Materials (1 = not helpful; 5 = very helpful)	5.00
Content (1 = too simple; 5 = too complex)	3.50
Instruction (1 = not clear; 5 = very clear)	4.75
Value of workshop in improving your understanding of R (1 = not useful; 5 = very useful)	4.875

Intermediate R for social scientists (grad-level), December 2018

Question	Mean
Pace of material (1 = too slow; 5 = too fast)	3.67
Materials (1 = not helpful; 5 = very helpful)	4.22
Content (1 = too simple; 5 = too complex)	3.44
Instruction (1 = not clear; 5 = very clear)	4.22
Value of workshop in improving your understanding of R (1 = not useful; 5 = very useful)	4.89

EVALUATIONS: PEDAGOGICAL WORKSHOPS, SEPTEMBER 2019

In September 2019, I was selected as an instructor for the annual New TA Conference organized by the Searle Center for Teaching & Learning at Northwestern. After undergoing a week-long training in August, I co-designed and co-taught two workshops for graduate students who would be serving as teaching assistants for the first time. The evaluations for the two workshops are shared in full below.

“Establishing the TA-Professor Relationship” (co-taught with Matt Nelsen)

The average rating for this workshop, among 11 attendees, was 5 on 1-5 scale.

What went particularly well or what did you find most useful about this session?

Discussing scenarios and how to avoid ending up in a difficult situation.
Handouts and orientation towards planning ahead are very useful
Working through the various scenarios and planning exactly what to clarify with professor entering the quarter.
The scenarios were very helpful.
I liked the break out groups and working through the questions together.

Scenarios and fixes.
Useful strategies for establishing a good TA-professor relationship as well as strategies for managing difficult students.
The discussion on scenarios
Suggestions on formative assessments; group exercises
The scenarios and handouts were very useful. Both gave me something to think about and tangible skills to apply during my TAship.

What recommendations or suggestions for improvement do you have?

Might have been useful to do some more scenarios very quickly (lightening round) but not positive about that.
Could be interesting to have some insight into subfield specific differences.
None.

It will be useful to include the text of the discussion scenarios on the slides rather than showing blank slides. Its helpful for following along the scenarios.
None.
Maybe fewer long talky stretches

What is one key idea of approach from this workshop you will incorporate into your own teaching?

Establishing communication with the professor is key.
Maintaining consistent professor communication.
Incorporating formative assessments about my teaching and the readings weekly or biweekly.
I will make sure I communicate with the professor. I will make sure I coordinate with other TAs.
Formative assessment using Google survey/simulator
Meet with the professor to set clear expectations and objectives for grading, discussion, and student feedback.

Communication with professor and being proactive re: looking at syllabus and what are potential sources of confusion/friction.
Comprehensive discussions with the prof and establish rules with students.
Discussing grading rubric with professor.
Meet the professor!
I will ask feedback from students.

“Encouraging Student Writing through Constructive Feedback” (co-taught with Janine Chow)

The average rating for this workshop, among 17 attendees, was 4.29 on a 1-5 scale.

What went particularly well or what did you find most useful about this session?

Techniques for feedback
 Examples were good/useful
 Learning different strategies for in-class writing workshops
 Jigsaw activity
 Good learning about specific strategies
 The portion on feedback techniques was really helpful! All of the examples they gave were great!
 Learning different strategies for giving feedback to students
 Well organized. Had example, had handouts.

Knowing different ways to give feedback to students.
 Models of feedback for the Beloved essay. Examples of editing techniques/strategies.
 Interactive discuss and handouts
 The different strategies.
 Groups and discussions
 Really well done. Appreciated in-depth coverage of techniques and examples.
 Everything – and I rarely give this comment.
 Learning different styles of feedback.

What recommendations or suggestions for improvement do you have?

Less group exercises, cover more techniques.
 More specificity about mechanics of writing effective feedback
 Rethink examples for “good” and “bad” feedback
 Tips on time-efficient feedback
 Introducing everyone took a long time. The instructions for the think/pair/share were confusing.
 Explanation for each technique was really vague. Maybe leaders can lecture each technique then do group exercise.

Activities were a little confusing/too complex. I would have preferred doing more practice of the techniques rather than the jigsaw activity.
 More example on how to use these techniques to grade lab reports (if possible?)
 Be sympathy to STEM TA with easier reading excerpts
 The content from the jigsaw exercise was great. The breaking into a group and then another didn't seem beneficial and to watered down info.
 None!

What is one key idea of approach from this workshop you will incorporate into your own teaching?

“sandwich principle” / Different voices in feedback writing
 Toddler/teen and demonstrating by example together so it's useful to be more purposeful about that.
 I hadn't thought much about how in text comments and overall comments should work
 Different ways to give feedback
 The toddler/teen strategy
 Jigsaw examples of working with students
 Using the sandwich principle

The feedback techniques!
 Definitely think about giving feedback.
 Possibly nothing, but it was interesting.
 Jigsaw type
 Be constructive in feedback
 Written common styles and when they are more useful.
 Allow for one on one feedback.
 The color-coded grouping and regrouping.

Sample Syllabus 1: Field Studies in Social Justice

Below is a syllabus I developed for the course *Field Studies in Social Justice*, where I was the instructor of record. The course was part of the Chicago Field Studies program at Northwestern University, where students undertake an internship in Chicago alongside the course. Students have the option to take the course for between 1 to 4 credits, which is reflected in the design of assessments in the syllabus.

Chicago Field Studies

CFS 391 Field Studies in Social Justice
 Winter 2020, Wednesdays 6:00pm-9:00pm
 Scott Hall 107 (Burdick Room)

Instructor:

Kumar Ramanathan
kumar.ramanathan@u.northwestern.edu
 Scott Hall 215

Course description

Social justice is generally defined as the pursuit of just and equal access to resources, privileges, and social status. Conversely, social justice is the process of enacting change to address persistent social inequalities. In this course, we will examine a number of contemporary issues through a social justice lens, and investigate how different modes of action can be employed to address social inequalities. The first half of the course considers several contemporary social justice issues in the Chicago area. We will likely consider the issues of segregation, gentrification and urban development, police violence, and public school funding (these are subject to change depending on student interest and scheduling concerns). For each issue, we will discuss recent policies, conflicts, or controversies and place them in historical context. In doing so, we will practice assessing the power relations and social inequalities embedded in each issue. During the second half of the course, we will learn about different forms of collective action that seek to enact structural social change. Specifically, we will consider the capacities of non-profit and advocacy organizations, community organizing, movement politics, and electoral politics to address social inequalities, and the relationships and trade-offs between these approaches. Together, the course readings, discussions, and assignments are designed to help students develop the capacity to analyze social inequalities and critically consider approaches to taking action to address them.

This course will count one credit toward Weinberg Distribution Requirement for Area III: Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Learning objectives

1. Recognize and describe some key features of social inequality in the Chicago area
2. Analyze power relations and forms of inequality embedded within particular social issues
3. Identify different modes of action for social change, and consider the differences and interrelations between these modes
4. Practice conducting research to develop a deeper understanding of one social justice issue and possible strategies for action, given the student's personal or career goals

Assessments

	1 credit	2 credits	3 credits	4 credits
Attendance and participation	30%	25%	20%	20%
Reading and discussion posts	35%	25%	25%	25%
Internship reflection (due week 4)	--	20%	10%	10%
Presentation (due weeks 6-9)	--	--	20%	20%
Final project (due during finals)	35%	30%	25%	25%

Attendance and participation (everyone)

- **Come to class every week, and get to class on time.** Given that this is a small, seminar-style course, attendance is crucial and forms a large part of your grade. If you need to miss class or expect to arrive late, you need to make a request and let me know the reason ahead of time.
- Attend mandatory **one-on-one meetings** during week 2 and week 5. The former meeting will be a chance for me to learn about you, and the latter is a check-in on your progress and your plan for the final project. You are, of course, welcome to meet with me more frequently if you wish.
- **Participate during class.** Your participation grade will not depend on how frequently you speak, but rather on the extent of your engagement with your classmates.
- **Bring readings and/or reading notes to class.** I encourage you to bring printed copies, but laptops or tablets are fine, as long as you're not distracting yourself or others. *Reading from a phone in class is not allowed.*
- I will grade your participation periodically using a rubric available on Canvas. The grades are cumulative, meaning you can improve your grade over time.

Readings and discussion posts (everyone)

- Complete the **course readings**, which will all be posted on Canvas. Each week's readings will come with a set of guidelines that you should review before you begin reading. I recommend that you take brief notes on each reading summarizing its main points and your main reflections on it, as this will enable you to engage more thoroughly during class discussion.
- Respond to **discussion post prompts** on Canvas by 9am on Wednesday (except week 1). These prompts will ask you to reflect on the readings and raise questions or themes for our discussion.
- I will grade your posts for evidence of critical thinking, active reflection, creative questioning, engagement with course material and others' comments, clear writing, and, generally, the ability to follow directions. Your lowest grade will be dropped.

Internship reflection (2-4 credits only)

- Write a reflection on your internship experience so far, 2 to 4 pages in length (double-spaced). Discuss (1) what you expected from this internship and how your experience has matched or varied from those expectations; (2) what kinds of social inequalities or issues you have observed or encountered in your work; and (3) what you hope to learn during the rest of your internship.
- A prompt and a rubric for this assignment will be posted on Canvas.

Presentation project (3-4 credits only)

- Prepare a presentation, 10 to 15 minutes in length, about a recent or ongoing social justice effort in the Chicago area. Explain the issue being addressed, who is addressing it, and what modes of action they are using. Be prepared to answer questions from your classmates.
- Examples: the 2019 Chicago teachers' strike and its "social equity" goals; the 2016 #ByeAnita campaign to remove Cook County State's Attorney Anita Alvarez from office; local neighborhood efforts to create more affordable housing.
- You may choose to focus on a particular campaign, or profile an organization/movement more broadly. If you wish to present about something not Chicago-focused, clear it with me first.
- A prompt and a rubric for this assignment will be posted on Canvas.

Final project (everyone)

- You have **three options** for this final project:
 1. *Model research and action that you envision doing in a workplace.* This could be a design for a campaign, research about an issue as part of a community organizing strategy, a piece of journalistic reporting about social justice work, etc. It could be based on your current workplace, or a kind of workplace where you would like to be in the future. This option could take the form of a paper, but it could also take other forms (e.g. a report, a memo, etc.)

2. *Critical reflection of how you might pursue collective action to address a social justice issue.* What issue would you address, and in what context? What mode of collective action would you pursue, and how? This option should take the form of a 10 to 12-page paper.
 3. *Create your own project.* If you have alternative ideas to the above two, feel free to discuss them with me and we can design a different project format. You can be creative: this could be a podcast, a zine, a Wikipedia article, etc. The core requirement is that the final must address some social issue(s) and engage with some mode(s) of action. I am happy to help you create a final project option that is related to some work that you are doing at your internship, but it will have to include sufficient components that involve critical reflection about the work and engagement with the course materials.
- I will explain the final project options in more detail and offer some examples during class in week 4. You will need to choose one of these options during our week 5 one-on-one meeting. By week 7, you need to submit a **final project plan** which (1) describes the topic and structure of the project; (2) describes the kind of research you think you will have to do; and (3) provides a list of attributes you think the project needs to receive an A.
 - Since the structure of the final project will look different for each student, there is no single rubric. Along with the feedback on your plan, I will provide some guidance on what you should include, tailored to the form that your final project will take. Plan to spend about **15-20 hours** in total on this project (from when you select your topic through completion).

Course policies

General policies

- I am deeply committed to the effort to create spaces where all members of our community feel comfortable sharing their thoughts, as well as challenged to consider other perspectives and experiences. I ask each of you to participate actively and respectfully in this effort. In class we will create conduct guidelines for our little **academic community** this quarter.
- Any student requesting accommodations related to a disability or other condition is required to register with **AccessibleNU** (accessiblenu@northwestern.edu; 847-467-5530) and provide professors with an accommodation notification from AccessibleNU, preferably within the first two weeks of class. All information will remain confidential.

Assessment policies

- A few notes on **plagiarism and academic integrity**: 1) While your assignments can be inspired by work that you have done for other classes, you must submit original work for this class. 2) Northwestern defines plagiarism as “submitting material that in part or whole is not entirely one’s own work without attributing those same portions to their correct source” (“Principles of Academic Integrity”). See the Weinberg handbook for more information. Cite information in any presentations you create, as well as in papers.
- **Late assignments** will lose points at my discretion—typically a letter grade a day if I have not heard from you and made arrangements about a late submission in advance (A to A-...).
- A note on **pre-submission feedback on assignments**: For written work, I do not review full drafts, but welcome you to send me outlines and/or troublesome sections of your writing, which we can discuss in an in-person or remote meeting. I find that this is often a more helpful stage for feedback and encourages students to check in about assignments earlier. If you feel that you need more general help with writing, I recommend making an appointment at the Writing Place.

CFS policies

- An **internship is required for enrollment in any CFS course**. Therefore, in addition to the academic components listed above, your grade is dependent on completion of your internship. Quitting, getting fired, or failing to complete the internship hours appropriate to your credit enrollment could affect your final grade.
- Toward the end of the quarter, please keep an eye out for an **Evaluation Survey** from CFS, and be sure to complete it on time. *These surveys do not go to your internship. Instructors see only the course section and only after final grades have been submitted in Caesar.* The course section of the survey is designed to complement but not replace CTECs.

Course schedule

Readings for the first few weeks are included below. The remainder of the readings will be assigned during the course, adapted to student interest. The homepage of the Canvas site shows you modules for each week. In addition to the readings, each module includes a set of **guidelines** that go over what is assigned and some key things to which you should pay attention. I will post an updated syllabus with all the readings, if you would like one for your records, at the end of the course.

Week 1: Introduction

- Bell, Lee Anne. "Theoretical Foundations for Social Justice." In *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Maurianne Adams et al., 4th edition. Routledge, 2018.

Part I: Understanding and analyzing issues

Week 2: Segregation

- University of Virginia Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, "The Racial Dot Map." <https://demographics.virginia.edu/DotMap/>.
- Trounstein, Jessica. "Prologue" and "Introduction" (pp 1-13). In *Segregation by Design: Local Politics and Inequality in American Cities*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Choose one:
 - Coates, Ta-Nehisi. Sections I, II, VI, and VI "[The Case for Reparations.](#)" *The Atlantic*, June 2014.
 - Lopez, Mark. [Segregated By Design \(based on Richard Rothstein's The Color of Law\)](#). Short film, 2019.
- Nagasawa, Katherine. "[What Happened to Chicago's Japanese Neighborhood?](#)" *WBEZ*, August 13, 2017.
- Barr, Mary. "Segregation without Segregationists: How a White Community Avoided Integration." In *The Strange Careers of the Jim Crow North: Segregation and Struggle Outside of the South*, edited by Brian Purnell and Jeanne Theoharis. New York: NYU Press, 2019.
- Krysan, Maria. "[How to Address Segregation in Chicago.](#)" Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, October 26, 2018.

Week 3: Urban development and gentrification

- "Beverly," "Pilsen," and "Uptown." In *The Chicago Neighborhood Guidebook*, edited by Martha Bayne. Belt Publishing, 2019.
- Howard, Tanner. "[A Template for Displacement Narratives: On Daniel Kay Hertz's 'The Battle of Lincoln Park.'](#)" *Cleveland Review of Books*, October 16, 2018.
- Schneider, Benjamin. "[CityLab University: Zoning Codes.](#)" *CityLab*, August 6, 2019.
- Read this blog post and **pick 1-2 of the linked articles to read**: Institute for Housing Studies at DePaul University. "[Mapping Stories of Neighborhood Change.](#)" September 19, 2019.
- **Optional**: Chase, Johnny, and Danny Ecker. "[How City Power Players Diverted Millions in Blight-Fighting TIF Cash to Navy Pier.](#)" *Crain's Chicago Business*, July 21, 2017.

Week 4: Racial violence and policing

- Pupovac, Jessica. "[Chicago's Red Summer.](#)" *WBEZ*, July 21, 2019.
- Lind, Dara. "[The Ugly History of Racist Policing in America \(interview with Heather Ann Thompson\).](#)" *Vox*, August 19, 2014.
- Bittle, Jake, Olivia Stovicek, and Kylie Zane. "[In the Report.](#)" *South Side Weekly*, January 17, 2017.
- Moore, Natalie Y. "[How Chicago's Survivors of Police Torture Won Reparations.](#)" *The Marshall Project*, October 30, 2018.

- MacArthur Foundation. [“‘Radical Inclusion’ to Combat Racial Injustice \(profile of BYP 100\).”](#) *Grantee Stories* (blog), July 18, 2019.
- Bellware, Kim. [“Are Changing Ward Lines a Source of Chicago’s Violence?”](#) [summarizing research by Robert Vargas]. *Chicago Magazine*, April 12, 2018.

Week 5: Public education

- Basic glossary of Chicago Public Schools terms (available on Canvas).
- Ewing, Eve. [“What Led Chicago to Shutter Dozens of Majority-Black Schools?”](#) *The Guardian*, December 6, 2018.
- Taylor, Jeanette. [“Why I’m Hunger Striking for Dyett High School.”](#) *The Chicago Reporter*, August 24, 2015.
- Campbell, Alexia Fernández. [“The 11-Day Teachers Strike in Chicago Paid Off.”](#) *Vox*, November 1, 2019.
- Center for Illinois Politics. [“Illinois School Funding, a Prime Time Primer.”](#) *Center for Illinois Politics* (blog). November 3, 2019.
- Perez Jr, Juan. [“90% of U.S. School Boards Are Picked by Voters, but Not in Chicago. Here’s Why That Could Change.”](#) *The Chicago Tribune*, April 19, 2019.

Part II: Exploring modes of action

Week 6: Advocacy organizations and the dynamics of nonprofits

- Make sure to review the definitions of key terms included in the guidelines.
- Strolovitch, Dara Z., and M. David Forrest. [“Social and Economic Justice Movements and Organizations.”](#) In *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups*, edited by L. Sandy Maisel, Jeffrey M. Berry, and George C. Edwards III, 2010.
- Strolovitch, Dara Z. [“Can Advocacy Groups Speak for the Most Disadvantaged?”](#) Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, May 1, 2012.
- Skocpol, Theda. [“Associations Without Members.”](#) *The American Prospect*, December 19, 2001.
- Han, Hahrie. [“How Do Effective Associations Spur Citizen Engagement?”](#) Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, January 1, 2013.
- Lynn, Elizabeth, and Susan Wisely. “Four Traditions of Philanthropy.” In *The Civically Engaged Reader: A Diverse Collection of Short Provocative Readings on Civic Activity*, edited by Adam Davis and Elizabeth Lynn, 210–217, 2006.

Week 7: Community organizing and community development

- Ganz, Marshall. “What Is Organizing.” *Social Policy*, Fall 2002.
- Hamington, Maurice. “Community Organizing: Alinsky and Addams.” In *Feminist Interpretations of Jane Addams*, edited by Maurice Hamington, 255–74, 2010.
- MacArthur Foundation. [“Fighting Foreclosures and Building Community \(profile of Southwest Organizing Project\).”](#) *Grantee Stories* (blog), October 19, 2016.
- Loomis, Erik. “The Eight-Hour Day Strikes (Chicago, 1886).” In *A History of America in Ten Strikes*. New York: The New Press, 2018.
- Haines, Anna. “Asset-Based Community Development.” In *An Introduction to Community Development*, edited by Rhonda Phillips and Robert Pittman, 38:48, 2014.
- MacArthur Foundation. [“There Grows the Neighborhood \(profile of Sweet Water Foundation\).”](#) *Grantee Stories* (blog), October 9, 2018.

Week 8: Electoral politics

- Dukmasova, Maya. [“Chicago Inside Out.”](#) *Places Journal*, October 2018.
- Daniels, Matt. [“The Kim Foxx Effect: How Prosecutions Have Changed in Cook County.”](#) *The Marshall Project*, October 24, 2019.

- Patel, Amisha, and Emma Tai. [“Progressives Have a Game Plan for Replacing the Chicago Machine.”](#) *In These Times*, April 4, 2018.
- Tanzman, Will. [“How a Group of Unapologetic Progressives Scored Big Wins in Chicago’s Elections.”](#) *The Nation*, April 5, 2019.
- Post, Margaret A. [“Why Some Politically Active 501\(c\)\(4\) Organizations Are More Effective Than Others.”](#) Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, 2019.
- Andrews, Kenneth T., Hahrie Han, Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, Lara Putnam, Daniel Schlozman, Theda Skocpol, Vanessa Williamson, Sarah James, Caroline Tervo, and Michael Zoorob. [“How to Revitalize America’s Local Political Parties.”](#) Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, 2019.

Week 9: Social movements and coalitions

- Doussard, Marc, and Jacob Lesniewski. 2017. [“Fortune Favors the Organized: How Chicago Activists Won Equity Goals under Austerity.”](#) *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39 (5): 618–34.
 - Han, Hahrie. [“When Does Activism Become Powerful?”](#) *New York Times*, December 16, 2019.
 - Ganz, Marshall, and Liz McKenna. [“The Practice of Social Movement Leadership.”](#) *Mobilizing Ideas* (blog), June 2017.
 - Choose two:
 - Esparza, Julia. [“Illinois Is Officially a ‘Sanctuary State’ for Immigrants.”](#) *Chicago Tribune*, August 28, 2017.
 - Lane, April. [“Know Your Movements: The #EraseTheDatabase Campaign.”](#) *South Side Weekly*, October 16, 2018.
 - Lazare, Sarah. 2018. [“Mariame Kaba: Social Movements Brought Down Rahm—Now They Can Transform Chicago.”](#) *In These Times*, September 10, 2018.
 - Moore, Natalie. [“From Mayor To Movements: Black Women In Chicago Are In Command.”](#) *WBEZ*, March 26, 2019.
-

Sample Syllabus 2: Introduction to American Politics and Government

Below is a sample syllabus for an undergraduate course on introduction to American Politics and Government. This course is designed both to introduce students to key concepts and theories, and to act as a gateway to the study of American politics and political science more broadly.

Introduction to American Politics and Government

Instructor: Kumar Ramanathan

Course description

This course serves as an introduction to key theories, concepts, and arguments in the study of politics and government in the United States. We will begin the course with a focus on political institutions. While many of the examples we will consider concern the federal government, we will also examine the relationship between federal, state, and local levels of government. Then, we will shift to considering how individuals and groups participate in politics. In the final part of the course, we will combine what we have learned and discuss how politics and policy change over time. The theme that cuts through the course is *political power*—who has it, how is it used, and to what ends?

The course is also a gateway to the field of political science. Each week, a set of short introductory readings will introduce you to key concepts and arguments that will motivate our discussion. These will be accompanied by one or two longer in-depth readings that offer an example of how political scientists conduct research on specific questions. The lecture material each week will introduce theories and debates concerning each topic, and connect the material to current events.

Assignments

Attendance and class participation (15%): Your weekly discussion sections are an opportunity for discussion about the course material in a smaller setting. Before your section meets, post on the discussion board (see below). During your section, make sure to follow your TA's instructions. I encourage you to ask questions and engage in discussion during lectures as well, but this portion of your grade will be based on discussion sections.

Discussion board posts (15%): Starting in week 2, you will be required to post on a discussion board for your section each week. Posts are due the day before your section meets. Your post should either *pose a question* about the readings/lectures or *reflect on key concepts and arguments* covered in the readings/lectures. Your TA will provide some examples during the first section meeting.

Current events analysis (20%): This assignment asks you to discuss how political science research on political institutions (covered during weeks 2-6) helps shed light on an ongoing political controversy. You should offer this analysis in a manner that is accessible to a general audience without a background in political science. You can either submit this analysis as a 4-to-6 page paper or an 8-to-10 minute video (both formats should include references). You will be provided with guidelines and a list of prompts based on ongoing events. You can also propose your own topic (this must be approved by the instructor before you proceed). This analysis is due at the end of Week 6.

Research summaries (10% x 2): This assignment asks you to read one of the articles or chapters in the "suggested" readings sections and summarize its theory, argument, and findings. You have to write two summaries over the course of the semester; each should be 3-to-5 pages. You may submit the summaries at any point until Week 13, but at least one must be submitted by Week 10. I encourage you to pick readings from weeks whose topics you find most interesting, and to write the summaries immediately after the week where we cover related material. If you agree, your summaries will be shared with the whole class, as these can be a helpful way of figuring out future classes you would like to take.

Final assessment (30%): You have two options for your final assessment, which will be due by the end of finals week. Option 1 is a set of short essay questions based on the course material (similar to a take-home exam). For this option, questions will be provided on the last day of class. Option 2 is an 8-to-10 page paper that will ask you to identify and summarize social science research on one of the topics covered in the course. If you choose this option, you must notify your TA in Week 11 and attend a session on library resources during Week 12 (where prompts will also be provided).

Improvement bonus: For the current events analysis and research summaries, you will have the option to submit an updated version based on the feedback that you receive. You can receive up to a 5-point increase for the current events analysis and up to a 2-point increase for each research summary. You must submit the updated version within 10 days of receiving feedback.

Course policies

Reading: The best way to absorb the course materials and use them in your assignments is to take notes on the main points of each reading. The required readings are labeled “introductory” and “in-depth”. I will presume during lectures that you have read the “introductory” readings thoroughly. The “in-depth” articles may be challenging. You should post any questions you have about these readings on the discussion board, and I will provide additional explanation and context during lectures.

Writing: This course requires at least three written assignments. I recommend seeking out the Writing Center’s services if you would like additional support with writing, especially if you choose the research paper for the final option.

Sections and participation: During sections, your TA will facilitate discussion about the lectures and readings, and will be available to answer questions about the material. Your participation grade is based on these sections. This does not mean you need to talk a lot, but rather it is an encouragement to contribute to the discussion in some way over the course of the semester. Raising questions and offering comments are equally valuable contributions.

Accommodations: Accommodations for health or other reasons could include missing an occasional class, getting a short extension on an assignment, etc. If you think you may need something like this, contact me as soon as possible. If you need testing accommodations, interpreter services, etc., please follow the standard procedure through the University Accessibility Office.

Course schedule

Week 1: Introduction—what do we mean by “politics” and “government”?

Required	Fitzgerald, Jennifer. “What Does ‘Political’ Mean to You?” <i>Political Behavior</i> 35, no. 3 (September 1, 2013): 453–79. doi: 10.1007/s11109-012-9212-2 . (22pg) Mettler, Suzanne. “Our Hidden Government Benefits.” <i>New York Times</i> , September 19, 2011. (2 pg)
----------	---

Part I: Political Institutions

Week 2: The State

Introductory (required)	Interview with Prof. Aziz Rana, WBUR’s <i>Radio Open Source</i> , segment of episode dated December 3, 2015, 0:00 to 11:43. https://radioopensource.org/the-new-nativism/ . (12 min)
In-depth (required)	Prowse, Gwen, Vesla M. Weaver, and Tracey L. Meares. “The State from Below: Distorted Responsiveness in Policed Communities.” <i>Urban Affairs Review</i> 56, no. 5 (2020): 1423–71. doi: 10.1177/1078087419844831 . (39 pg)
Suggested	Soss, Joe, and Vesla Weaver. “Police Are Our Government: Politics, Political Science, and the Policing of Race-Class Subjugated Communities.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 20 (2017): 565-591. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-060415-093825 . Levi, Margaret. “The State of the Study of the State.” In <i>Political Science: The State of the Discipline</i> , ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. American Political Science Association, 2002, 33-55. Sheingate, Adam. “Why Can’t Americans See the State?” <i>The Forum</i> 7, no. 4 (2010). doi: 10.2202/1540-8884.1336 .

Week 3: Federalism

Introductory (required)	Robertson, David Brian. “Federalism and the Dynamism of American Politics.” SSN Basic Fact. Scholars Strategy Network, May 1, 2012 . (3 pg) Rudalevige, Andrew. “Federalism.” <i>Founding Principles: American Governance in Theory and Action</i> , Bowdoin College, 2017, Chapter 2 . (12 min) Rocco, Philip. “The Political Roots of Uncooperative Federalism.” SSN Basic Facts. Scholars Strategy Network, February 19, 2014 . (2 pg)
-------------------------	--

	Law, Anna O. “The myth of ‘open borders.’” <i>The Washington Post</i> , September 9, 2021. (2 pg)
In-depth (required)	Grumbach, Jacob M. “From Backwaters to Major Policymakers: Policy Polarization in the States, 1970–2014.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 16, no. 2 (2018): 416–35. doi: 10.1017/S153759271700425X . (20 pg)
Suggested	Farris, Emily M., and Mirya R. Holman. “All politics is local? County sheriffs and localized policies of immigration enforcement.” <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 70, no. 1 (2017): 142-154. doi: 10.1177/1065912916680035 . SoRelle, Mallory E. and Alexis N. Walker. “How Congressional Lawmakers from both Parties Preempt State Power to Achieve Partisan Policy Goals.” SSN Key Findings. Scholars Strategy Network, August 24, 2017 . (3 pg)

Week 4: Legislative Institutions

Introductory (required)	Schickler, Eric and Frances Lee. “Introduction,” in <i>The Oxford Handbook of the American Congress</i> , ed. George C. Edwards III, Frances E. Lee, and Eric Schickler. Oxford University Press, 2011. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199559947.003.0001 . (6 pg) Volden, Craig and Alan E. Wiseman. “Who are the Most Effective Lawmakers in Congress?” SSN Key Findings. Scholars Strategy Network, October 31, 2014 . (2 pg)
In-depth (required)	Rubin, Ruth Bloch. "Organizing for Insurgency: Intraparty Organization and the Development of the House Insurgency, 1908–1910." <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> 27, no. 2 (2013): 86-110. doi: 10.1017/S0898588X13000096 . (25 pg)
Suggested	Krehbiel, Keith. <i>Information and Legislative Organization</i> . University of Michigan Press, 1991, pp. 30-31, 42-45, 48-60. Fenno, Richard F. <i>Home Style: House Members in Their Districts</i> . Longman, 1978, Chapter 5. “Legislating in the Dark” (featuring James Curry). <i>No Jargon</i> , Scholars Strategy Network, episode dated August 9, 2016 .

Week 5: Executive Institutions

Introductory (required)	Galvin, Daniel. “U.S. Presidents and the Challenge of Party-Building.” SSN Key Findings. Scholars Strategy Network, April 1, 2012 . (2 pg) Kernell, Samuel. “Introduction” in <i>Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership</i> , 4 th edition. CQ Press, 2006, 1–8. (8 pg) “How Bureaucrats Make Good Policy” (featuring Rachel Augustine Potter and Maraam Dwidar). <i>The Science of Politics</i> , episode dated October 9, 2019 . (43 min)
In-depth (required)	Druckman, James N. and Lawrence R. Jacobs. <i>Going Public: Presidents, Public Opinion, and Manipulation</i> . University of Chicago Press, 2015, Chapter 2: “The Political Strategy of Tracking the Public.” (21 pg)
Suggested	Moynihan, Daniel, Pamela Herd, and Hope Harvey. “Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions.” <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 25, no. 1 (2015), 43–69, doi: 10.1093/jopart/muu009 . Moe, Terry M. “Delegation, Control, and the Study of Public Bureaucracy.” <i>The Forum</i> 10, no. 2 (2012). doi: 10.1515/1540-8884.1508 .

Week 6: Judicial Institutions

Introductory (required)	Fletcher, Kimberley L. “How the Courts Transformed Executive Authority in Foreign Affairs.” Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, January 16, 2020 . (2 pg) Powell, Cedric Merlin. “How Race-Neutral Rulings by the Supreme Court Perpetuate Inequalities.” Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, August 8, 2019 . (2 pg) “How the Federalist Society Changed the Supreme Court Vetting Process” (featuring Amanda Hollis-Brusky and Paul Collins, Jr). <i>The Science of Politics</i> , episode dated August 1, 2018. (20 min)
In-depth (required)	Barnes, Jeb. “Bringing The Courts Back In: Interbranch Perspectives on the Role of Courts in American Politics and Policy Making.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 10 (2007): 25-43. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.080505.101210 . (14 pg)
Suggested	Bonica, Adam, Adam S. Chilton, and Maya Sen. “The Political Ideologies of American Lawyers.” <i>Journal of Legal Analysis</i> 8, no. 2 (Winter 2016): 277–335. doi: 10.1093/jla/lav011 .

Part II: Individuals, Groups, and Political Participation

Week 7: Social Identities and Social Groups

Introductory (required)	Hajnal, Zoltan. Immigration & the Origins of White Backlash. <i>Daedalus</i> 150, no. 2 (Spring 2021): 23–39. doi: 10.1162/daed_a_01844 . (14 pg)
In-depth (required)	Bos, Angela L., Jill S. Greenlee, Mirya R. Holman, Zoe M. Oxley, and J. Celeste Lay. “This One’s for the Boys: How Gendered Political Socialization Limits Girls’ Political Ambition and Interest.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> , FirstView (2021): 1–18. doi: 10.1017/S0003055421001027 . (15 pg) Lee, Taeku. “From Shared Demographics to Common Political Destinies: Immigration and the Link from Racial Identity to Group Politics.” <i>Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race</i> 4, no. 2 (October 2007): 433–56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X07070245 . (18 pg)
Suggested	Harris, Fredrick C., and Viviana Rivera-Burgos. “The Continuing Dilemma of Race and Class in the Study of American Political Behavior.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 24 (2021): 175-191. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-050317-071219 . Junn, Jane, and Natalie Masuoka. “The Gender Gap is a Race Gap: Women Voters in US Presidential Elections.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 18, no. 4 (2020): 1135-1145. doi: 10.1017/S1537592719003876 .

Week 8: Interest Groups and Social Movements

Introductory (required)	Karpf, David. “The left is pushing Biden to spend more. It’s a sound strategy.” <i>The Washington Post</i> , Monkey Cage, July 15, 2021. (2 pg) Hayward, Clarissa Rile. “Disruption: What Is It Good For?” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 82, no. 2 (April 1, 2020): 448–59. doi: 10.1086/706766 . (12 pg) “Get Organized” (featuring Ziad Munson). <i>No Jargon</i> , Scholars Strategy Network, episode dated June 6, 2018 . (22 min)
In-depth (required)	Strolovitch, Dara Z. “Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, And Gender.” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 68, no. 4 (2006): 894-910. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00478.x . (15 pg)
Suggested	“Black Lives Matter, Police, and America’s Democracy” (featuring Vesla Weaver). <i>No Jargon</i> , Scholars Strategy Network, episode dated June 24, 2020 .

	“Feminism, a Century Later” (featuring Kristin Goss). <i>No Jargon</i> , Scholars Strategy Network, episode dated January 26, 2016 .
--	--

Week 9: Public Opinion and Media

Introductory (required)	DeSante, Christopher D., and Candis Watts Smith. 2020. “Less Is More: A Cross-Generational Analysis of the Nature and Role of Racial Attitudes in the Twenty-First Century.” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 82 (3): 967–80. doi: 10.1086/707490 . (13 pg) Leopre, Jill. “Long Division.” <i>The New Yorker</i> , November 24, 2013. (10 pg)
In-depth (required)	Mutz, Diana. “How the Mass Media Divide Us.” In <i>Red and Blue Nation? Characteristics and Causes of America’s Polarized Politics</i> , ed. Pietro S. Nivola and David W. Brady. Brookings Institution Press, 2006, 223–48. (26 pg)
Suggested	Crowder-Meyer, Melody. “How Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Their Intersections Shape Americans’ Issue Priorities.” <i>Journal of Women, Politics & Policy</i> Online First (September 5, 2021): 1–15. doi: 10.1080/1554477X.2021.1971506 . Masuoka, Natalie and Jane Junn. <i>The Politics of Belonging: Race, Public Opinion, and Immigration</i> . University of Chicago Press, 2013, Chapter 6: “Framing Immigration: ‘Illegality’ and the Role of Political Communication,” 156–84. Kalmoe, Nathan and Donald Kinder. <i>Neither Liberal nor Conservative</i> . University of Chicago Press, 2017, Chapter 1: “Introduction—Innocent of Ideology?”

Week 10: Political Parties and Elections

Introductory (required)	Andrews, Kenneth T., Hahrie Han, Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, Lara Putnam, Daniel Schlozman, Theda Skocpol, Vanessa Williamson, Sarah James, Caroline Tervo, and Michael Zoorob. “How to Revitalize America’s Local Political Parties.” Policy Brief. Scholars Strategy Network, January 30, 2019 . (4 pg) Drutman, Lee. “How Much Longer Can the Two-Party System Hold?” Vox, September 17, 2018 . (5 pg) Azari, Julia. “Weak Parties and Strong Partisanship are a Bad Combination.” Vox, November 3, 2016 . (4 pg) Schickler, Eric. “Debunking the Myth that Identity Politics is Bad for the Democratic Party.” Vox, April 16, 2018 . (6 pg) Santucci, Jack. “The Fight Over Ranked-Choice Voting in New York City.” 3Streams, June 18, 2021 . (2 pg)
In-depth (required)	Anzia, Sarah F. “Election Timing and the Electoral Influence of Interest Groups.” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 73, no. 2 (2011): 412-427. doi: 10.1017/S0022381611000028 . (14 pg) Grumbach, Jacob M., and Charlotte Hill. “Rock the Registration: Same Day Registration Increases Turnout of Young Voters.” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> Published Online (2020): 1–21. (20 pg)
Suggested	Grant, Keneshia N. “Great Migration Politics: The Impact of the Great Migration on Democratic Presidential Election Campaigns from 1948–1960.” <i>Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race</i> 16, no. 1 (2019): 37-61. doi: 10.1017/S1742058X19000109 . Fraga, Bernard L., and Julie Lee Merseth. “Examining the Causal Impact of the Voting Rights Act Language Minority Provisions.” <i>Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics</i> 1, no. 1 (2016): 31-59. doi: 10.1017/rep.2015.1 .

Week 11: Political Participation and Representation

Introductory (required)	Nelsen, Matthew D. “Serious historians are criticizing Trump’s 1776 report. It’s how most U.S. history is already taught.” <i>The Washington Post</i> , January 28, 2021 . (2 pg) “Who Votes and Why” (featuring Jan Leighley). <i>No Jargon</i> , Scholars Strategy Network, episode dated November 1, 2016 . (29 min) “Does Diversity in Congress Translate into Representation?” (featuring James Curry and Kenneth Lowande). <i>The Science of Politics</i> , episode dated January 30, 2019 . (35 min)
In-depth (required)	Junn, Jane. “Participation in Liberal Democracy: The Political Assimilation of Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the United States.” <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i> 42, no. 9 (1999): 1417–38. doi: 10.1177/00027649921954976 (18 pg) Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. “Confronting Asymmetric Polarization.” In <i>Solutions to Political Polarization in America</i> , ed. Nathaniel Persily. Cambridge University Press, 2015, 59–70. (10 pg)
Suggested	Ngai, Mae N. <i>Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America</i> . Princeton University Press, 2014, Chapter 5: “The Internment of Japanese Americans and the Citizenship Renunciation Cases.” Carnes, Nicholas. “Does the Numerical Underrepresentation of the Working Class in Congress Matter?” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 37, no. 1 (2012): 5-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-9162.2011.00033.x .

Part III: Governance

Week 12: Policy Feedback and Inequality

Introductory (required)	Mettler, Suzanne and John Sides. “We Are the 96 Percent.” <i>The New York Times</i> , Opinion, September 24, 2012. https://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/24/we-are-the-96-percent/ . (2 pg)
In-depth (required)	Thurston, Chloe N. “Policy Feedback in the Public–Private Welfare State: Advocacy Groups and Access to Government Homeownership Programs, 1934–1954.” <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> 29, no. 2 (2015): 250–67. doi: 10.1017/S0898588X15000097 . (18 pg)
Suggested	Hacker, Jacob. “Enacting Lasting Policies in an Era of Gridlock.” Niskanen Center (blog), April 28, 2021 . Galvin, Daniel J., and Chloe N. Thurston. “The Democrats’ Misplaced Faith in Policy Feedback.” In <i>The Forum</i> , 15, no. 2 (2017): 333-343. doi: 10.1515/for-2017-0020 . Michener, Jamila. “Policy Feedback in a Racialized Polity.” <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 47, no. 2 (2019): 423-450. doi: 10.1111/psj.12328 .

Week 13: Political Change

Introductory (required)	Taylor, Kirstine. “American political development and black lives matter in the age of incarceration.” <i>Politics, Groups, and Identities</i> 6, no. 1 (2018): 153-161. doi: 10.1080/21565503.2017.1419434 . (7 pg) Thurston, Chloe N. “Black Lives Matter, American political development, and the politics of visibility.” <i>Politics, Groups, and Identities</i> 6, no. 1 (2018): 162-170. doi: 10.1080/21565503.2017.1420547 . (7 pg)
In-depth (required)	Frymer, Paul. <i>Building an American Empire</i> . Princeton University Press, 2017, excerpt from Introduction, pp 1-24. (24 pg)
Suggested	Sheingate, Adam D. “Political Entrepreneurship, Institutional Change, and American Political Development.” <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> 17, no. 2 (2003): 185–203. doi: 10.1017/S0898588X03000129 .

Sample Syllabus 3: American Political Development in the 20th Century

Below is a sample syllabus for an undergraduate course on American political development. This syllabus illustrates my pedagogical approach to assessments, my commitment to connecting course material to students' lives and experiences, and my teaching interests in the areas of law, public policy, and inequality.

American Political Development in the 20th Century

Instructor: Kumar Ramanathan

Course description

This course offers a broad overview of political development in the 20th century United States. The goal of “American political development” scholarship is to identify and explain durable shifts in patterns of governance. In this vein, we will examine major turning points in 20th century political history *and* ask why certain features of American politics maintain continuity over time. Along the way, we will read the work of political scientists, sociologists, and historians. By the end of the course, I hope you will be able to begin answering these questions: What were the major transformations in domestic politics in the United States in the 20th century? How do these developments help explain our politics today?

To answer these questions in 12 weeks would be impossible. To make things manageable, we will focus on three themes: the expansion of the federal government; the role of race in policy and politics; and the role of social movements in political change. Along the way, we will ask questions about political power, institutional change, and racial, gender, and class inequalities. This inevitably means that we will leave out many important developments in 20th century American politics, including changes in subnational governance, patterns of political behavior, the lives and politics of indigenous peoples, the relationship between domestic and global politics, and more. Some of these topics will arise in the background of our readings, but we will not have time to do justice to them. This course is instead designed to help you build knowledge and skills with which to pursue further reading and studies, whether in the classroom or elsewhere.

We will meet twice a week for 75-minute sessions, which will be roughly divided into 50 minutes of lecture and 25 minutes for questions and discussions. You will also meet for 50-minute discussion sections with your TAs each week, which will provide additional time for discussion and to seek assistance on your assignments.

Qualifications/Requirements

This is an introductory course and does not require any specific prerequisites. However, the reading load for this course is substantial (about 4 articles or chapters per week) and consists almost entirely of academic writing. It is recommended to have taken an introductory course in political science or a related field before taking this course in order to build reading skills. If you have not done so, please plan to spend a little extra time each week on reading for this course.

Assignments

Short papers (15% each): You will have to write two critical review papers that are 4-5 pages in length. Each of these papers should focus on the *readings* for a given week of the course between Week 3 and Week 11 and go beyond what we have discussed in class. In each paper, briefly summarize how the readings relate to each other and assess their relative merits. What have you learned by reading all of these texts together? In what ways do the authors agree or disagree with each other? When they disagree, whose position do you find more compelling (if any)? You may offer critiques of your own and incorporate the suggested readings if you wish. Each paper should be submitted on the Tuesday following the week whose topic you have selected. An example short paper and grading rubric will be provided in Week 2.

Verbal exam (15%): During Week 12, each student will be assigned to a 10-minute slot for a verbal exam. One hour prior to your exam, you will be provided with three video clips from news or popular media containing commentary that includes common misconceptions about topics that we have covered during Weeks 3 through 10. During the exam, pick one clip, and imagine that a friend or relative showed it to you. Having taken this course, how would you respond to them? In other words, this exam tests your ability to synthesize themes from the course in casual conversation. During the one-hour preparation time before the verbal exam, you may refer to your notes and readings.

If you would prefer *not* to take a verbal exam, you can write up your response to the video and submit it by email within 1.5 hours of receiving the videos. If you would like to do this, please notify me before Week 11.

Final assessment (30%): For your final assessment, you have four options:

1. **Research paper:** An 8-10 page paper in response to a prompt based on lectures and readings. For example, questions for this assignment might be: “What was the relationship between the women’s movement and the African American civil rights movement?” or “Why did the expansion of the welfare state decline after

WWII?” The paper should review existing academic literature on the topic and offer a coherent argument in response to the question. You must identify at least 4 secondary sources beyond the course readings. Paper prompts (including some guiding tips) and a rubric will be provided during Week 8. I strongly encourage you to consult your TA *after* you have identified potential additional sources but *before* you have read them.

2. **Wikipedia article:** We will cover many themes, events, and historical figures during this course that are often forgotten in the public memory. This option involves writing a Wikipedia article about such a theme, event, or person, based on the course readings and additional research of the secondary literature (at least 4 additional sources). The article should include detailed citations and links to other relevant Wikipedia pages. If you are often frustrated by writing research papers that only a handful of people read, this is a good option for you. A list of possible articles, as well as guidelines on how to edit Wikipedia pages and track your changes, will be provided during Week 7. You can choose your own article topic if you clear it with me first. You must decide if you are choosing this option by Week 9, so we can ensure that no two students are working on the same article.
3. **Two book reviews:** Often during this course, we will be reading selected chapters from a book. This final paper option involves reading and reviewing two books from any portion of the syllabus. The reviews should be 4-5 pages, summarize the book’s main arguments and contributions, and offer some critiques (you can draw on other readings and lectures if helpful). Ask yourself: What did this book say? What did I learn from it? How could it have been improved? An example and grading rubric will be provided during Week 7.
4. **Two additional short papers:** You may write two additional short papers, following the same requirements as those laid out above. The due dates for these short papers are the same as for the standard short papers. The advantage of this option is that you will have one less final during finals period; conversely, you will have to be write twice as much during the course period.

Course policies

Reading: You are expected to have read all the required readings before each class session. The best way to absorb the course materials and use them in your assignments is to take notes on the main points of each reading—but this can be difficult given the heavy reading load of this course. I recommend that you create small reading groups with your classmates where you can share notes with each other. You should still do all the readings, but working in groups can help you focus on one reading very closely each week while still having notes on all the others for reference afterwards.

Participation: A part of your grade (10%) will be based on your participation. This does not mean you need to talk a lot, but rather it is an encouragement to contribute to the discussion in some way over the course of the semester. Raising questions and offering comments are equally valuable contributions.

Writing: This course requires at least three written assignments. I recommend seeking out the Writing Center’s services if you would like additional support with writing, especially if you choose the research paper for the final option.

Accommodations: Accommodations for health or other reasons could include missing an occasional class, a deadline extension, etc. If you think you may need an accommodation, contact me via email. For testing accommodations, interpreter services, etc., please follow the standard procedure through the University Accessibility Office.

Grading

Grading breakdown:

Attendance	15%
Participation	10%
Short papers	30%
Verbal exam	15%
Final assessment	30%

Improvement bonus for writing assignments: If your grade on the final assessment (x) is higher than your total grade on the short papers (y) then I will add a bonus to your total grade to reflect improvement. The bonus will be calculated using the formula $\frac{2}{3} \times (x - y)$. For example, if you receive 22 points cumulatively on your short papers and 28 points on your final paper, you would receive a 4-point boost in your final grade. There is no penalty if you receive a lower grade on your final paper than on your short papers.

Course schedule

Part I: Introduction

Week 1: Introduction and general themes

The lecture this week will introduce the course generally, and some key concepts that we will be dealing with throughout the semester: the state, governance, inequality, citizenship, rights, and social movements. The required reading highlights key insights that can be gained from a historically-oriented analysis of American politics. Pay close attention to the concept of the “state” (two suggested readings delve further into this concept). The lecture will also discuss how scholars generally *periodize* the 20th century; that is, how they divide the century into distinct eras demarcated by turning points.

Thursday: Required	Mettler, Suzanne and Richard Valelly. “Introduction: The Distinctiveness and Necessity of American Political Development.” In <i>The Oxford Handbook of American Political Development</i> , edited by Richard Valelly, Suzanne Mettler, and Robert Lieberman, Oxford University Press (2016): 1-24.
Suggestions for further reading	Novak, William J. “The Myth of the “Weak” American State.” <i>The American Historical Review</i> 113, no. 3 (2008): pp. 752-72. Kersh, Rogan. “Rethinking periodization? APD and the macro-history of the United States.” <i>Polity</i> vol. 37, no. 4 (2005): pp. 513-22. Morgan, Kimberly, and Ann Shola Orloff. “The Many Hands of the State.” In <i>The Many Hands of the State: Theorizing Political Authority and Social Control</i> , edited by Kimberly Morgan and Ann Shola Orloff, Cambridge University Press (2017): 1-32.

Week 2: Setting the stage

Foner’s (1984) essay will introduce you to some important concepts about class struggle and the welfare state. Warren et al. (2012) argue that American political development cannot be understood without a close analysis of racial hierarchies and cleavages. Goss (2017) reviews and challenges the standard periodization of feminism in the U.S., and introduces readers to women’s movement activism in the mid-century.

Tuesday: Required	Foner, Eric. “Why is there no socialism in the United States?” In <i>History Workshop</i> , pp. 57-80. Editorial Collective, History Workshop, Ruskin College, 1984.
Thursday: Required	Warren, Dorian T., Julie Novkov, and Joseph Lowndes. “Race and American Political Development.” In <i>Race and American Political Development</i> , eds. Dorian T. Warren, Julie Novkov, and Joseph Lowndes (2012): pp. 12-41. Goss, Kristin A. “The Swells between the “Waves”: American Women’s Activism, 1920–1965” <i>The Oxford Handbook of US Women’s Social Movement Activism</i> , eds. Holly J. McCammon, Verta Taylor, Jo Reger, and Rachel L. Einwohner (2017).

Part II: Expansion of the federal government

Week 3: The New Deal

The lecture and readings for the first session provide an overview of the context and content of the new policies and programs created by the federal government during the New Deal. The second session will turn to some of the impacts of these policies, particularly focusing on the inequalities embedded therein.

Tuesday: Required	Morris, Andrew. “The Great Depression and World War II.” In <i>Oxford Handbook of US Social Policy</i> , ed. Daniel Béland, Kimberly J. Morgan, and Christopher Howard. Oxford University Press, 2015.
Thursday: Required	Mettler, Suzanne. <i>Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy</i> . Cornell University Press, 1998. Chapters 1–2. Katznelson, Ira. <i>When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America</i> . WW Norton & Company, 2005. Chapter 2.

Suggestions for further reading	<p>Amenta, Edwin. <i>Bold Relief: Institutional Politics and the Origins of Modern American Social Policy</i>. Princeton University Press, 2000. Introduction and Chapter 6.</p> <p>Fox, Cybelle. <i>Three Worlds of Relief: Race, Immigration, and the American Welfare State from the Progressive Era to the New Deal</i>. Princeton University Press, 2012.</p> <p>Katznelson, Ira. "Making Affirmative Action White Again." <i>The New York Times</i>, 20 Jan. 2018.</p>
---------------------------------	--

Week 4: The Great Society

The first session will examine the decline of the New Deal, specifically the decline of labor organizing and the strength of liberalism in electoral politics, and the state of social policymaking between the New Deal and the Great Society. The second session's lecture will focus on the connections between the social programs of the Great Society and other domains, such as criminal justice policy, drawing from Hinton (2015).

Tuesday: Required	<p>Lichtenstein, Nelson. "From Corporatism to Collective Bargaining: Organized Labor and the Eclipse of Social Democracy in the Postwar Era." In <i>The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980</i>, edited by Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, Princeton University Press, 1989.</p> <p>Klein, Jennifer. "From the Fair Deal to the Great Society." In <i>Oxford Handbook of US Social Policy</i>, ed. Daniel Béland, Kimberly J. Morgan, and Christopher Howard. Oxford University Press, 2015.</p>
Thursday: Required	<p>Hinton, Elizabeth. "'A War within Our Own Boundaries': Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and the Rise of the Carceral State." <i>The Journal of American History</i> vol. 102, no. 1 (2015): 100-112.</p>
Suggestions for further reading	<p>Katznelson, Ira. "Was the Great Society a Lost Opportunity?" In <i>The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980</i>, edited by Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, Princeton University Press, 1989.</p> <p>Sugrue, Thomas J. <i>The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit</i>. Princeton University Press, 2014.</p>

Part III: Race and realignment in national politics

Week 5: Race and realignment, 1930s–60s

This week, we turn to the rising salience of race on the agenda of federal government during the New Deal and WWII period. Drawing on Schickler, Pearson, & Feinstein (2008), we will discuss how contestation over civil rights began to reshape the party alignment. The lecture will also cover different kinds of racialized issues that remained *off* the agenda, such as regulation of immigrants as covered in Ngai (2014). The second session and lecture will use the case of criminal justice policy to analyze how political elites defined and regulated the "problem of race."

Tuesday: Required	<p>Schickler, Eric, Kathryn Pearson, and Brian D. Feinstein. "Congressional parties and civil rights politics from 1933 to 1972." <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 72, no. 3 (2010): 672-689.</p> <p>Ngai, Mae M. <i>Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America</i>. Princeton University Press, 2014. Chapter 2, "Braceros, 'Wetbacks,' and the National Boundaries of Class."</p>
Thursday: Required	<p>Murakawa, Naomi. <i>The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America</i>. Oxford University Press, 2014. Chapters 2–3, "Freedom from Fear" and "Policing the Great Society."</p>
Suggestions for further reading	<p>Schickler, Eric. <i>Racial Realignment: The Transformation of American Liberalism, 1932–1965</i>. Princeton University Press, 2016.</p> <p>Grant, Keneshia N. <i>The Great Migration and the Democratic Party: Black Voters and the Realignment of American Politics in the 20th Century</i>. Temple University Press, 2020.</p> <p>Jenkins, Jeffery A., Justin Peck, and Vesla M. Weaver. "Between Reconstructions: Congressional Action on Civil Rights, 1891–1940." <i>Studies in American Political Development</i>, vol. 24, no. 1 (2010): 57-89.</p>

	Chen, Anthony S. “The Hitlerian Rule of Quotas’: Racial conservatism and the politics of fair employment legislation in New York State, 1941–1945.” <i>The Journal of American History</i> , vol. 92, no. 4 (2006): 1238-1264.
--	--

Week 6: Race and realignment, 1970s–90s

The first session for this week focuses on the relationship between race and electoral politics after the civil rights movement. The second session turns to two racialized public policy domains which underwent important transformations in this period: criminal justice and welfare.

Tuesday: Required	Frymer, Paul. “Race, parties, and democratic inclusion.” In <i>The Politics of Democratic Inclusion</i> , edited by Christina Wolbrecht and Rodney E. Hero (2005): 122-142.
Thursday: Required	Murakawa, Naomi. <i>The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America</i> . Oxford University Press, 2014. Chapter 4, “The Era of Big Punishment.” Soss, Joe, Richard C. Fording, and Sanford F. Schram. <i>Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race</i> . Chicago Studies in American Politics edition, University of Chicago Press, 2011. Chapters 2–3, “The Rise of Neoliberal Paternalism” and “The Color of Neoliberal Paternalism.”
Suggestions for further reading	Mayeri, Serena. <i>Reasoning from Race: Feminism, Law, and the Civil Rights Revolution</i> . Harvard University Press, 2011. Wolbrecht, Christina. <i>The Politics of Women's Rights: Parties, Positions, and Change</i> . Princeton University Press, 2010.

Part III: Social movements and transformations in law and public policy

Week 7: Social movements for exclusion and inclusion in the early 20th century

This week, we will focus on the role of social movements in early 20th century politics. Our first session will discuss anti-immigrant restrictionist movements (Zolberg 2009) and labor feminism (Cobble 2014). In the second session, drawing on Dowd (2005) and our course materials from Weeks 5-6, we will complicate the standard history of the civil rights movement, considering its earlier origins and contextualizing it in the social and political conditions of the time.

Tuesday: Required	Zolberg, Aristide R. <i>A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America</i> . Harvard University Press, 2009. Chapter 8, “A Nation Like the Others.” Cobble, Dorothy Sue. “More Than Sex Equality: Feminism After Suffrage.” In <i>Feminism Unfinished: A Short, Surprising History of American Women’s Movements</i> (2014): 1-68.
Thursday: Required	Hall, Jacquelyn Dowd. “The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past.” <i>The Journal of American History</i> , vol. 91, no. 4 (2005): 1233–63.
Suggestions for further reading	Nackenoff, Carol. “The Private Roots of American Political Development: The Immigrants’ Protective League’s ‘Friendly and Sympathetic Touch,’ 1908–1924.” <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> , vol. 28, no. 2 (2014): pp. 129–60. Thurston, Chloe N. “Policy Feedback in the Public–Private Welfare State: Advocacy Groups and Access to Government Homeownership Programs, 1934–1954.” <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> , vol. 29, no. 2 (2015): pp. 250–267. Francis, Megan Ming. <i>Civil rights and the Making of the Modern American State</i> . Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Week 8: The “rights revolution”

Keeping with the theme of last week, we will now turn to the “rights revolution” of the 1950s-70s. Grant (2019) shows us how Black activism transformed party politics, with a focus on presidential campaigns. We then turn to two policy

developments during the late 1960s and early 1970s—the end of racial quotas in immigration and the regulation of sex discrimination—and the role of social movements therein.

Tuesday: Required	Grant, Keneshia N. “Great Migration Politics: The Impact of The Great Migration on Democratic Presidential Election campaigns from 1948–1960.” <i>Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race</i> 16, no. 1 (2019): 37-61.
Thursday: Required	Parker, Kunal M. <i>Making Foreigners</i> . Cambridge University Press, 2015. Chapter 7, “A Rights Revolution?” MacLean, Nancy. <i>Freedom Is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace</i> . Harvard University Press, 2008. Chapter 4, “Women Challenge ‘Jane Crow.’”
Suggestions for further reading	Nadasen, Premilla. “Expanding the Boundaries of the Women’s Movement: Black Feminism and the Struggle for Welfare Rights.” <i>Feminist Studies</i> vol. 28, no. 2 (2002), 271–301. Kessler-Harris, Alice. <i>In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th Century America</i> . Oxford University Press, USA, 2003. Valelly, Richard M. <i>The Two Reconstructions: The Struggle for Black Enfranchisement</i> . University of Chicago Press, 2009. Biondi, Martha. <i>To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City</i> . Harvard University Press, 2009.

Week 9: Retrenchment and counter-movements

Our focus shifts in two ways this week: we turn chronologically to the 1980s-90s, and we focus on the rise of “conservative” or “counter” movements. First, we will consider developments in conservatism in response to movements for racial and gender justice. Then, we will discuss the consequences of white “backlash” to civil rights gains and immigration. Since Abrajano and Hajnal (2015) and Gilens (1996) are writing about more recent events, this will also give us an opportunity to talk about how historical analysis can help us understand the present.

Tuesday: Required	Foner, Eric. <i>The Story of American Freedom</i> . WW Norton & Company, 1999. Chapter 13, “Conservative Freedom.” Kretschmer, Kelsy, and Jane Mansbridge. “The Equal Rights Amendment Campaign and Its Opponents.” In <i>The Oxford Handbook of US Women’s Social Movement Activism</i> , edited by Holly J. McCammon, Verta Taylor, Jo Reger, and Rachel L. Einwohner (2017).
Thursday: Required	Abrajano, Marisa, and Zoltan L. Hajnal. <i>White Backlash: Immigration, Race, and American Politics</i> . Princeton University Press, 2015. Introduction. Gilens, Martin. “‘Race Coding’ and White Opposition to Welfare.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 90, no. 3 (1996): 593–604.
Suggestions for further reading	Michener, Jamila. “Race, Politics, and the Affordable Care Act.” <i>Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law</i> 45, no. 4 (2020): 547-566. Stephens-Dougan, LaFleur. “The Persistence of Racial Cues and Appeals in American Elections.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 24 (2021): 301-320. Galvin, Daniel, and Jacob S. Hacker. “The political effects of policy drift: Policy stalemate and American political development.” <i>Studies in American Political Development</i> 34, no. 2 (2020): 216-238.

Part IV: ‘Liberalism’ and ‘conservatism’

Week 10: Liberalism

What is the role of “liberalism” and “conservatism” in American politics? We will begin with Noel’s (2014) overview of the rise of liberalism and conservatism as ideological projects pursued by intellectual elites. Then, zooming in on

liberalism, we will consider the role liberalism has played in the historical developments we have studied so far, with some reminders and assistance from Lee (2002) and Frymer & Grumbach (2021).

Tuesday: Required	Noel, Hans. <i>Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America</i> . Cambridge University Press, 2014. Chapter 4, “The Independent Development of Ideology.”
Thursday: Required	Lee, Taeku. <i>Mobilizing public opinion: Black insurgency and racial attitudes in the civil rights era</i> . University of Chicago Press, 2002. Chapter 2: Black insurgency and the dynamics of mass opinion. Frymer, Paul, and Jacob M. Grumbach. “Labor unions and White racial politics.” <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 65, no. 1 (2021): 225-240.
Suggestions for further reading	Smith, Candis Watts, and Sarah Mayorga-Gallo. “The new principle-policy gap: How diversity ideology subverts diversity initiatives.” <i>Sociological Perspectives</i> 60, no. 5 (2017): 889-911. Feldman, Stanley, and Christopher Johnston. “Understanding the determinants of political ideology: Implications of structural complexity.” <i>Political Psychology</i> 35, no. 3 (2014): 337-358.

Week 11: Conservatism

The first session will focus on the meaning of conservatism and its appearance in our course materials so far, drawing on Zelizer’s (2010) review of this topic. Then, we consider how ideological projects have shaped modern political parties.

Tuesday: Required	Zelizer, Julian E. “Reflections: Rethinking the History of American Conservatism.” <i>Reviews in American History</i> vol. 38, no. 2 (2010): 367-392.
Thursday: Required	Noel, Hans. <i>Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America</i> . Cambridge University Press, 2014. Chapter 5, “Ideologies Remakes the Parties.”
Suggestions for further reading	Phillips-Fein, Kim. <i>Invisible Hands: The Making of the Conservative Movement from the New Deal to Reagan</i> . WW Norton & Company, 2009. HoSang, Daniel Martinez. <i>Racial Propositions: Ballot Initiatives and the Making of Postwar California</i> . Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010. McGirr, Lisa. <i>Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right</i> . Princeton University Press, 2015.

Part V: Conclusion

Week 12: This week’s sessions will be used for verbal exam slots and as possible make-up periods if needed.

Week 13: Conclusion

In what ways does learning about political history change how we think about contemporary politics? We will close the course by considering how substantive historical knowledge and the skills and methods of historical analysis inform our understanding about politics in the present.

Tuesday: Required	Skocpol, Theda. “Analyzing American Political Development as It Happens.” In <i>Oxford Handbook of American Political Development</i> , edited by Richard M. Valelly, Suzanne Mettler, and Robert C. Lieberman. Oxford University Press, 2014. Thurston, Chloe N. “Black Lives Matter, American political development, and the politics of visibility.” <i>Politics, Groups, and Identities</i> vol. 6, no. 1 (2018): 162-170.
Suggestion for further reading	Valelly, Richard M., Suzanne Mettler, and Robert C. Lieberman, eds. <i>The Oxford Handbook of American Political Development</i> . Oxford University Press, 2016.