Faculty Development Plan

Self-assessment

- Citizenship: My core strength in terms of citizenship is an awareness that institutional history matters. I’m aware that I still have much to learn, so I seek opportunities to talk with my more seasoned colleagues. In my current assignment as 295 coordinator, I’ve had in-depth conversations with my predecessor, Jamin Rowan, as well as Miranda Wilcox, who has helped me to understand the assessment end of things. My only ambition as a department citizen is to lift where I stand, leaving my colleagues free to attend to their own responsibilities. To this end, I will continue in my efforts to learn the history of the department, college, and university, in order to gain a better understanding of how and why the pieces fit together the way they do.

- Teaching: I’m enthusiastic about what I teach, and I enjoy finding ways to stretch my students’ thinking such that I can learn from them. In this a major challenge is working out how to pitch the course just far enough above students’ current abilities that they learn productively, but not so far that they despair. I’m quite happy to teach a range of courses, because each course gives me opportunities to explore new texts and ideas. I tend, however, to think of learning holistically, so designing assessments tied to specific learning outcomes has not always been my strong suit. I’ve made recent strides in this area, though, by developing better exams for ENGL 291 and working to incorporate writing instruction more effectively into ENGL 382. My aim is to become a capable instructor at all levels of the curriculum.

- Scholarship: My scholarship seems to be progressing nicely. Archival research last summer helped my book project to coalesce, and I’ve made steady progress since then. Conference attendance has yielded fruitful collaborations and publication opportunities: the Liverpool conference last summer launched some very productive ongoing correspondence with a German colleague and might also lead to a published essay. At the recent Milton conference in Murfreesboro, a leading scholar suggested that a co-panelist and I collaborate on editing a special issue of a journal on our topic of early modern political theology, for which we’ve gathered an impressive early slate of abstracts. Our initial venue didn’t work out, so we’ll retool the project over the coming months. I also sent an article based on a book chapter to Studies in Philology, whose editor suggested it would be a better fit for PMLA, so I’m making the necessary changes and plan to send it back out soon. I hope to finish a draft of my book manuscript this calendar year so that I can begin shopping it in early 2017. At present I’m targeting Stanford’s “Cultural Memory in the Present” series.

Professional goals

- Citizenship: I take a conservative approach to citizenship assignments, being more interested in building incrementally on existing institutions than in radically shaking things up. In my assignment as 295 coordinator, therefore, I aim to focus on implementing the vision for the course as refined by Jamin Rowan. In particular, I aim to meet in person with all faculty newly assigned to the course to help them get started off on the right foot, while using end-of-semester norming sessions as an opportunity to learn from seasoned 295 instructors. Additionally, I will work with the DEC on the possibility of establishing a program where undergraduates can serve as TAs for the course, especially with newly-assigned faculty.

- Teaching: My goals are to use the exam results from this latest semester of 291 to fine-tune my classroom teaching, in particular by making sure that each class has a distinct “big picture” that the students know they need to know. With 382, my recent Winter course built on a previous
experiment in having students write papers responding to arguments I’ve presented in short papers by adapting the seminar format used in meetings of the Shakespeare Association of America. I divided the class in half, each student read all of the papers in their group, and then they spent about 10 minutes as a group discussing each paper. This exercise was very successful, and I’ll keep refining it for future use. I’ll be teaching 295 again in the Fall, which will give me an opportunity to implement ideas for improvement from the last time I taught it. I’ve been assigned a graduate course in Spring 2018, so I’ll work to develop that (learning from my recent experience teaching 630). Additionally, to expand my repertoire, I intend to propose a 495 for 2017-18.

- Scholarship
  - Spring/Summer 2016: Participate in James Chandler book manuscript workshop; send article version of chapter 2 to Studies in Philology; submit proposal for edited collection on early modern political theology (with Ben LaBreche, University of Mary Washington); write entry on Baxter for the Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy; finish book chapter 3.
  - Fall 2016: Write book chapter 4
  - Winter 2017: Shop book manuscript; begin work on De Doctrina project (a short, polemical book on how to read Milton’s theological treatise).

**Relationship between individual goals and department/university needs**

- Citizenship: I believe that having a robust and successful 295 program opens the door for both students and faculty to do amazing things in upper-level courses. I am fully on board with the department’s vision for the course and will do my utmost to implement that vision in practice.
- Teaching: I am aware of the emphasis the department places on having faculty who are able to teach up and down the curriculum. I embrace this emphasis, and I am actively working to expand my teaching repertoire.
- Scholarship: My conversations with the chair have emphasized the importance of publishing in my field. I have an ambitious scholarly agenda, and I am making steady progress on it. Additionally, by collaborating with colleagues at other universities I hope to advance BYU’s reputation as a place that values serious scholarship.

**Resources needed**

- I find that I have all the resources I need. The department has been quite generous in funding international travel for combined research and conference presentations.

**Activities and accomplishments**

- See the Self-assessment section above.

**Assessment measures**

- Citizenship: I aim for meaningful interaction with each 295 instructor.
- Teaching: I will write a self-assessment at the conclusion of each course, including action items for improving future iterations.
- Scholarship: Although I do plan on sending off one piece for publication in 2016, the only peer-reviewed work likely to appear this year is the encyclopedia entry on Baxter. A more meaningful metric would be progress on my book project; per the timeline above, I aim to have completed my book manuscript by the end of the year. The special issue of the Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies will likely appear in 2018.
Citizenship Project

Name

National/International

1. I am currently working with Ben LaBreche (University of Mary Washington) on co-editing a special issue of the *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* on early modern political theologies. We have already assembled an impressive collection of abstracts, and we are currently in the process of writing the proposal (having already discussed the idea with the journal’s editors). By February 2017, the proposal should be in and hopefully accepted.

2. Other professional commitments mean that I will not be traveling to the UK this year or next, so I will use social media (especially Twitter, but also Facebook) to maintain and build my connections with young scholars in my field in the UK (Alison Searle, Tom Charlton, Mark Burden, and others). Twitter is also an excellent means of maintaining relationships with scholars in the U.S. I tend to let work crowd out Twitter participation, but I'll set aside a few minutes each day for social media networking.

3. Recent attendance at the Renaissance Society of America conference enmeshed me in plans (orchestrated by a senior scholar in my field) to assemble a roundtable on early modern political theology. By February 2017 we will have firmed those plans up for the conference in late March or early April.

BYU

1. My primary citizenship goal is to learn the institutional history of my department, my college, and the university. To that end, I’ve cultivated relationships with senior colleagues, and I will continue to talk with them regularly.

2. As the course coordinator for ENGL 295, I am designing a departmental structure for using undergraduate teaching assistants in the course. I’ve discussed the idea at length with the chair, and I will write the proposal in May 2016.

3. With the aim of being a good colleague at the University level, I’ve developed friendships with people from a range of other disciplines. We meet regularly for lunch, and they’ve been the means of my meeting other interesting people at BYU (who have on occasion been of great use to me in my scholarship).

4. I have participated in the Humanities Center’s Medieval and Renaissance Studies research group since my arrival, and I will continue to do so. I also make an effort to attend Humanities Center events whenever practicable.
Scholarship Strategies Project

Name

My major scholarly goal is to complete work on my book manuscript (tentatively titled *Weak Consent: Early Modern Political Theology and the Post-Secular Politics of Love*) by the end of 2016 and begin shopping it to presses by February 2017. This entails completing work on one chapter currently in progress and writing another. In conjunction with this book project, I will send an article version of an already completed chapter to *Studies in Philology*, whose editor invited the submission. Given that journal’s short review period, it is plausible that I could have a publication decision from them before February. I have also been asked to write a brief entry on Richard Baxter for the *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy*, which I will complete this summer.

I have identified most of what I will need to read to complete the book project; the relevant items are organized on my desk, and I’ve already made good progress since Winter semester ended. Going forward, my plan for the summer is to write in the mornings, take a break for lunch (no work allowed!), and read in the afternoons. When I have other demands on my mornings, I will write in the afternoon. I have an ongoing Twitter conversation with Lara Dodds at Mississippi State, using the hashtag #deadlineexchange, as a means of mutual goal-setting and accountability. We report to each other regularly.

Because I hope to have completed work on the current book manuscript by the end of Winter term, by February I hope to have begun early work on my next project, which will be a short book (building on articles I’ve already published) on how to read Milton’s *De Doctrina Christiana*.

As far as assessment goes, the proof will be in the pudding: have I sent out the article, written the encyclopedia entry, finished the first manuscript, and started work on the second?
ENGL 295: Writing Literary Criticism
Fall 2016 — TTH 8:00-9:15 — 3082 JFSB

This course serves as an essential part of your introduction to the English Major by teaching you how to write in the professional genre of our field: literary criticism. Learning this genre requires that you develop a core set of skills, the most important of which is using the concrete details of literary texts to advance more abstract conceptual claims—claims that you then support through a logically structured argument built on textual analysis. Several other crucial skills orbit this central one. Both conceptual claims and textual analysis become more persuasive when understood as part of a conversation with other critics, so you’ll have to learn how to find and how to read and make sense of what others have written, whether about the text in question or about the conceptual topic of interest to you. The processes of learning to read and learning to write criticism run in a circle: as you read, you’ll learn basic conventions, rhetoric, and procedures that professional literary critics employ, and you’ll strive to implement these in your own writing; as you write, you’ll become more attuned to the kinds of questions that literary critics ask, and you’ll begin to read with a sharper eye.

Because literary criticism at present almost invariably engages with theoretical concerns, we will also be reading some theory in this class. Even though you will find some of these readings difficult, I believe that they will help you considerably in the crucial task of formulating conceptual claims about literary texts. Be assured, too, that we’ll work together in class to understand these readings.

Equipped with these tools, you’ll be in a position to undertake challenging—and intellectually thrilling—work in your 300 and 400 level classes. Concerted effort here can pay large dividends down the line, meaning that your diligence in this class can be multiplied many times later, enriching your experience in the major.

The Blueprint
For ease of future reference, here’s a very basic model of what a successful paper in this course looks like. The course rubric, available on Learning Suite, usefully breaks this down into technical categories.

- **Introduction:** This has two parts: the introduction and the thesis area. The introduction lays out, as concisely as possible, the textual and conceptual elements required to make your thesis intelligible, by using the critical conversation to establish a conceptual tension or question of some kind. The thesis area then concisely presents your response to this tension or question. This section should occupy no more than 20% of your page allotment.

- **Body:** The body develops the argument distilled in the thesis, moving in a logical sequence (marked out in strong topic sentences) from one idea to the next until you’ve made good on your claim. In the body you will mostly engage with the critical conversation tactically, as you carefully analyze key (and therefore contested) passages of the text at hand.

- **Conclusion:** Rather than merely restating the thesis, the conclusion takes the occasion of having argued your claim thoroughly to step back and put what you’ve accomplished into a larger perspective. My colleague Kristin Matthews compares making an argument to climbing a mountain and writing a conclusion to telling your readers what you see from the summit. This perspective can have to do with the larger text itself or with the conceptual issues you’ve been considering. A good conclusion leaves readers with something new to think about.
Course Materials

- Other materials will be made available through the library’s course reserve system (CR) or on Learning Suite (LS).

Learning Outcomes

During this writing-intensive course, you should achieve the following learning objectives:

- **Writing**: Students will construct a conference length (8-10 page) paper employing purposeful rhetorical moves to develop a coherent and logical argument that makes a significant literary claim.
- **Research**: Students will learn to find and interpret credible sources, integrate them purposefully in support of their own literary analysis, and document these sources correctly using MLA format.
- **Professionalization**: Students will effectively employ the appropriate conventions of style, form, and tone in literary scholarship in written and oral communications.
- **Process**: Students will mature as writers as they devise productive and flexible individual and collaborative processes of writing, including methods for gathering evidence, organizing their argument, prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, proofreading, and peer reviewing.

Course Schedule

**Unit 1: Learning the new form through a close-reading paper**

T 30 Aug. Introductions: moving beyond the five-paragraph essay, and beginning to think about sovereignty and sacredness

TH 1 Sept. Read all of *Richard II*.


TH 8 Sept. Read my “The Sacred Barons in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*” (LS), paying particular attention to the first two paragraphs; Zinsser, ch. 5-8.

T 13 Sept. Read pp. 61-101 in the MLA Handbook and Zinsser chapters 9 and 23; write and post to Digital Dialog (DD, #1) an introduction to the first essay.

TH 15 Sept. Read Zinsser ch. 10; come to class having mapped out the argumentative moves in my essay; post to DD (#2) an outline of the moves your own essay will make.
T 20 Sept. Post to DD (#3) your first body paragraph; read Berger’s essay on Richard’s soliloquy in Act 5 (LS).

TH 22 Sept. Post to DD (#4) an additional body paragraph (you should have the whole body substantially written by this point). Come to class prepared to discuss the last two paragraphs of my essay.

T 27 Sept. Post to DD (#5) your conclusion. Read quotes about revision (LS). Submit a completed draft of your essay to LS before midnight.

TH 29 Sept. Class canceled for one-on-one writing conferences; revised paper due on LS on Friday before midnight.

T 4 Oct. Roundtable 1; grading conferences.

Unit 2: Entering the critical conversation

TH 6 Oct. Schmitt, Political Theology; post to DD (#6) a preliminary attempt at bringing together Schmitt’s ideas with a specific aspect of Richard II

T 11 Oct. Read pp. 3-19 in the MLA Handbook; Kantorowicz, Introduction and chapters 1-2 from The King’s Two Bodies (CR); post to DD (#7) one paragraph that concisely captures the gist of Kantorowicz’s argument.


T 18 Oct. Read pp. 102-16 in the MLA Handbook; Hutson, “Imagining Justice: Kantorowicz and Shakespeare”; post to DD (#9) an analysis of how Hutson engages with critics in the course of advancing her own argument, paying attention both to the substance of the engagement and to its mechanics (i.e., how does Hutson incorporate other critics into the structure of her own paragraphs and sentences?).

TH 20 Oct. Read Zinsser ch. 22 and pp. 116-29 in the MLA Handbook; post to DD (#10) the introduction for a new essay, this time drawing together Schmitt with the critical conversation initiated by Kantorowicz

T 25 Oct. Post to DD (#11) a map of the logical moves required to make good on your thesis, along with the first body paragraph; be sure to include tactical engagement with at least one critic.

TH 27 Oct. Post to DD (#12) an additional body paragraph; by this time you should be well on your way to a completed draft of your essay.

T 1 Nov. Submit a completed draft of your essay to Learning Suite; post the conclusion to DD (#13).
TH 3 Nov. Class canceled for one-on-one writing conferences; submit the revised paper to Learning Suite on Friday by midnight.

T 8 Nov. Roundtable 2; grading conferences.

**Unit 3: Developing Authority**

TH 10 Nov. David Foster Wallace, “Tense Present” (LS); post to DD (#14) one paragraph distilling what this essay taught you about establishing your own authority as a writer.

T 15 Nov. Read Zinsser ch. 20; post to DD (#15) your new introduction.

TH 17 Nov. Work on the body of your essay; post to DD (#16) a comment about what’s giving you the most difficulty in your writing.

T 29 Nov. In-class workshop groups

TH 1 Dec. In-class workshop groups

T 6 Dec. Class canceled for one-on-one writing conferences.

TH 8 Dec. Final paper due by 5pm.

**W 14 Dec. 8am Roundtable 3.**

**Class Procedures**

This is a writing class, so most of our time will be spent analyzing writing. Sometimes, we'll be looking at published literary criticism and breaking down how it works. Much more of the time, we'll be looking at your own writing to assess what works well, what still needs improvement, and how you might make that improvement happen. These discussions aim to help you develop critical insight into how writing works. Accordingly, these class sessions will be discussion-based: I'll invite your insights (and I’ll work to include all class members in these discussions), and then I'll respond by developing the implications of what you’ve said and allowing other class members to do the same. Come prepared, then, by having read (or written) the day’s work with this kind of discussion in mind: have specific insights or questions written down for when I call on you.

Some days, we'll need to have more theoretical or technical conversations, e.g., about things like punctuation or the fine points of MLA Style. On these days, the most important thing to do is ask the questions that you have. Don’t be like the grown-ups in “The Emperor’s New Clothes”—be like the kid. If you feel dumb for having a particular question, odds are that one or more of your classmates also feels dumb about it, so they’ll thank you for having the courage to ask it. And you won’t be dumb, because you’ll be taking initiative in your own education, which is as smart as it gets.
Assignments

Paper 1

Due: Friday 30 September by midnight

In this paper, your task is (deceptively) simple: stake a claim about when exactly in Act 3 Bolingbroke decisively gains power over Richard. Your introduction setting up this claim should explain briefly why identifying this moment in the play is difficult and clarify what criteria, to your mind, constitute decisively gaining power. The body paragraphs will mount a defense (using the play) of your criteria for determining the decisive moment against other possibilities; you'll have to figure out how to arrange the logical components of your defense in such a way as to make it most readily intelligible to readers. For the conclusion, step back and venture some thoughts concerning what Shakespeare seems to be saying about the politics of kingship by writing the transition of power in the way that he did. This paper should be five pages long.

Paper 2

Due: Friday 4 November by midnight

This paper asks you to situate yourself in the critical conversation that developed out of Kantorowicz (and thus also the theoretical conversation rooted in Schmitt). Your paper should begin by showing how the conversation as you’ve encountered it either leaves an idea underdeveloped (or unexplored) or seems to produce a contradiction or tension of some kind. Your thesis then shows how you will respond to this idea and how your response will further the conversation. The body paragraphs develop your claim in a logical progression, and the conclusion returns to show how your argument reinflects the big picture. This paper should be seven or eight pages long.

Paper 3

Due: Thursday 8 December by 5pm

You have three options with this paper. 1) You can revise the first paper by situating it in the Schmitt/Kantorowicz critical conversation and incorporating additional critical perspectives to help you see how your first argument might fit in the conversation. 2) You can revise the second paper by using additional critical perspectives to develop your argument further. 3) You can undertake a reading of Richard II that addresses a new conversation and set of questions, BUT, if you want to go this route, you MUST clear it with me in person no later than 15 Nov (and in order to clear it, you'll need to have identified and read at least three pertinent critical essays enough to hash out a workable introduction in time for that day's assignment).

Digital Dialog

The frequent Digital Dialog posts throughout the semester will form the backbone of our work together in the class. Broadly speaking, they take two forms: responses to readings and drafts of your
writing. These will be due by **3pm** the day before class, so that I have time to read them before we meet. Plan your reading and writing accordingly!

Unfortunately, our limited class time means that discussing each response in class will not be possible. I will respond to all online drafts—if not before class, then shortly afterward. For our class meetings, I will select those posts that I believe will most effectively help us to achieve the goals for the day.

**Oral Presentation**
In connection with a Digital Dialog writing assignment, each student will make a brief (no more than five minutes) oral presentation as a way of introducing a ten-minute class workshop session. Successful presentations will address the process resulting in the piece of writing you’ve shared, an aspect of the piece that you think works well, and something you’re still trying to figure out. You’ll then read aloud what you’ve written, after which your classmates will offer feedback.

**Roundtables**
Having a public (beyond the professor) for your writing helps you to develop the authoritative voice you need as a writer, so we’ll culminate each unit with a roundtable exercise. I’ll divide the class into groups, and you’ll come having read all of the papers in your group (with at least two printed-out questions per paper to prove it). The group will discuss each paper in turn for 10 minutes or so. At the end of the exercise, you’ll write a brief reflection on the back of your printed-out questions and hand them in to me.

**Grade Breakdown**
- Paper 1: 15%
- Paper 2: 20%
- Paper 3: 25%
- Digital Dialog: 25%
- Oral Presentation: 5%
- Roundtables: 5%
- Skip day: 5%

**Course Policies**

**Attendance**
In my experience, students who miss meetings of this class generally have a hard time doing well. Although I don’t have a formal attendance policy, I will still take roll every day, and the frequency of Digital Dialog posts will penalize you if you start falling behind. Missing a single class because of a brief illness or other conflict isn’t a big deal, but a pattern of missed class risks damaging your long-term prospects in the major (and I wish this were hyperbole). Be here.

At the same time, I get that college is hard and that burnout happens, so I’m requiring you to skip my class one time and do something entirely unrelated to school (get breakfast with friends, watch a movie—anything but homework or work or stuff like that). Sleeping in is okay, provided you plan to do it the night before with the intent of missing class. Email me a brief report of what you did while skipping class, and I’ll give you credit.
University Policies
You are responsible for adhering to a range of University policies, including the Honor Code, and especially its provisions about plagiarism. Please review these policies on Learning Suite.