Many academics think of citizenship primarily as the fulfillment of committee assignments at the departmental, college, or university level. In many respects, this understanding of citizenship reflects the desire to isolate, define, and measure success or failure. Every member of an academic department (or college or university) must share in that group’s administrative burdens, and committee assignments are generally circulated among department members. In this sense, my citizenship project reflects this natural bias towards formal assignments.

However, as the Spring Seminar has demonstrated, citizenship in an academic community goes beyond formal responsibilities. To thrive in other aspects of their work (scholarship and teaching), most scholars benefit greatly from collaborative efforts, whether within the university structure, among a network of peers, or, perhaps to a lesser extent, in some non-academic contexts. While modest, my goals also include this aspect of citizenship, in the hopes that collaboration will yield fruit in multiple ways.

Assessing Weaknesses

My background and proficiency in administrative tasks is not strong. My vitae does not include participation in student councils, hiring committees, or other common administrative tasks given to graduate students. To become a better citizen in BYU’s academic community, I need more practice in planning meetings, setting organized agendas, and record-keeping.

I could also be better at attending BYU devotions and, in measure, university, college, or department-sponsored lectures.

Addressing Weaknesses

By February 2016, I aim to accomplish the following concrete goals:

1. Currently, my department has assigned me to be the Phi Alpha Theta (History honors society) advisor. In an effort to grow within this relatively lightweight assignment, I have started working on a binder that outlines the responsibilities and traditions associated with BYU’s Beta Iota Chapter. I thus hope to make a tangible contribution by laying down an institutional memory for future advisors and student leaders. At the same time, I hope that the task will give me valuable experience in record-keeping and organization, which will become more important as I am handed more time-consuming committee assignments.

2. My efforts to engage with the scholarly community outside of BYU are already subsumed within the Scholarship portion of my Faculty Development Plan, and I have given (and will continue to give) radio interview for BYU Radio to showcase my work for the community. Therefore, I’d like to focus on engagement with my academic peers within the university. I plan to attend at least SIX university, college, or department lectures during the Fall 2015 semester.
This course development project proposal will identify the weakest aspects of my teaching style and course structure, and plan a variety of realistic enhancements for the Fall 2015 semester. In general terms, these enhancements will include a greater stress on student learning outcomes (rather than on mere instruction), more conscious mechanisms for gauging such outcomes, and a classroom environment conducive to strengthening students’ testimonies.

I have chosen to direct my attentions towards HIST 311, an elective course on the history of film, radio, and television. Should my alterations and improvements prove successful in improving student learning – and student satisfaction – I will extrapolate and re-think my courses in World Civilizations since 1500, The Historian’s Craft, European Revolutions since 1500, Modern Germany, and Nineteenth-Century Europe.

**Assessing Weaknesses**

1. Many students have noted that my classes do not lay enough emphasis on assigned reading materials. This observation is particularly prevalent in my service course – HIST 202 – but the trend extends to my upper-level courses as well. In the past, I gave unannounced in-class reading quizzes. While these quizzes were beneficial in some ways (namely, they forced students to read carefully), there were some substantial drawbacks. For instance, students complained that the more difficult questions referenced relatively obscure passages from the text(s), and did not correspond to any material I covered in my lectures. When I gave easier questions, however, quiz scores skyrocketed and contributed to grade inflation. In the end, I eliminated the quizzes and added other types of assessments. Most students do read before class; I draw on readings to construct lectures and discussions, and this inherently exerts some pressure on participants to keep up. But a demonstrable number of student comments bemoan the fact that the course doesn’t set and enforce a more rigid structure.

2. BYU has a unique mission to facilitate intellectual AND spiritual learning. However, few student comments single out my classes as incubators of spiritual growth. Rating scores corroborate this observation: my courses consistently rate at or slightly below average in the “strengthens testimony” category. It seems clear that students feel comfortable asking about gospel topics if they choose or if they see a connection; I have consistently rated highly in categories such as “responds to students respectfully,” and on an anecdotal level, students seem to understand that I’m happy to reconcile difficult philosophical or historical issues with LDS teachings. But intellectual understanding does not necessarily lead to spiritual insight, and I need to find new, better ways to encourage the latter.

3. Most history courses are writing intensive. They are thus excellent opportunities to teach students how to provide effective peer feedback on written assignments. However, neither my general education nor my upper-level courses contain any significant
provisions for peer evaluation. In my larger classes, teaching assistants provide feedback on first drafts; in smaller classes, I handle all of this work myself.

4. Finally, students have sometimes claimed that my grading procedures are subjective and unfair. While my syllabus does contain a detailed set of instructions for each assessment (including a concrete explanation of how I assign grades), I must acknowledge that I have not yet mastered the art of adhering to a clear, readily accessible rubric.

**Addressing Weaknesses (HIST 311)**

1. Rather than returning to reading quizzes, which hold students accountable but tend to measure effort rather than real student learning, I plan to implement a mandatory study guide for each reading, as outlined by Roni Jo Draper at the 2015 New Faculty Spring Seminar. Study guides will provide a concrete set of reading “tasks,” which I hope will encourage a more active engagement with each text. These tasks will ask students to create an outline of important names and/or places, invite students to critique or even challenge the text, and highlight terms we will examine more closely during the next class session. In short, the guides will explain why I assign specific texts and ask students to consider key questions and concerns before they come to class. During the first part of the semester, students will complete and hand in completed study guides to be assessed. Later in the semester, as we approach the research paper due date, students will no longer be required to submit their guides but will hopefully have developed the habit of completing them.

2. I do not believe that it will be possible to effectively incorporate a “strengthening testimonies” component into the matrix of learning outcomes and course assessments in HIST 311. Rather, improving my ability to reach students at a spiritual level and to convey my own testimony of the atonement and of the restored Church must occur at the “micro” level: I need to look for possible “intersections” or “junctures” in my day-to-day lecture notes. Then, when directed by the Spirit, I will have built-in opportunities to bear testimony or briefly alter the intellectual tenor of the classroom discussion in a spiritual direction. A fusion of planning and spontaneity, I think, is the key to success in improving this aspect of my student ratings.

3. The research paper for HIST 311 will be divided into a two-draft process. After the first draft is submitted, each student will be randomly assigned to critique another student’s draft. In this case, the critique itself will be assessed for its thoroughness and quality. The final draft will be submitted directly to the instructor.

4. To overcome the charge that my assessments are too subjective, I need to be more specific about what I expect in each assignment. One way to do this will be to include a description of what assignments in each grade level should look like. In other words, I will provide a detailed description of characteristics for “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D” assignments, independent of my expectations for individual exams or papers. Like assessment requirements, this list will be included on the syllabus.
Finally, I plan to make this course more memorable by taking advantage of unique university media resources. I will screen certain required films, for example, with an analog projector in the International Cinema theater (SWKT 250). I will also explore using antique radio and/or television sets to present mid-20th-Century broadcasts as listeners and viewers of the age perceived them.
HIST 311: The History of Film, Radio, and Television
Fall 2015

MWF 3-3:50 PM, JKB 3024

Instructor:
Professor Stewart Anderson
Office: 2153 JFSB
Email: stewart_anderson@byu.edu
Phone: 801-422-7494
Office Hours: TBD

Course Description:
This course traces the international development of the major mass mediums of the 20th Century: film, radio, and television. We will explore technical and artistic developments from the dawn of each of these mediums to the present day. We will also look beyond the history of mass media to the understanding of history through these media types. Thus, in this course we will treat popular entertainment films and broadcasts as historical documents.

Learning Outcomes:
By the end of the course, you should:

1. read primary and secondary sources with a critical eye and express these ideas effectively in course assessments.

2. demonstrate a deeper historical understanding of the most important events in film, radio, and television history.

3. analyze media products from an historical, contextual perspective.

4. craft a well-written, coherent research paper drawn from a variety of sources and containing a clear thesis statement.

Texts/Readings:


Films (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

*Le Voyage Dans la Luna*, directed by Georges Méliès, 1902.
*The Birth of a Nation*, directed by D. W. Griffith, 1915.
*The Kid*, directed by Charlie Chaplin, 1921.
*Frankenstein*, directed by James Whale, 1931.
*Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, directed by Frank Capra, 1939.
*Mother India*, directed by Mehboob Khan, 1957.
*Bonnie and Clyde*, directed by Arthur Penn, 1967 (optional).
*Planet of the Apes*, directed by Franklin J. Schaffner, 1968.
*The Sorrow and the Pity*, directed by Marcel Ophüls, 1969.
*Schindler’s List*, directed by Steven Spielberg, 1993 (optional).

Radio Programs (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

“Be Ye Men of Valour,” BBC speech written by Winston Churchill, 1940.
“Sorry, Wrong Number,” *Suspense*, written by Lucille Fletcher, 1943.

Television Programs (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

*Texaco Star Theater*, NBC, 1949.
*Irrlicht und Feuer*, DFF (East Germany), 1966.

**Expectations:**

*Attend:* Attendance is not required, but it is strongly encouraged. Your test grade will almost certainly suffer if you don’t engage with the course lectures and discussions.

*Be Punctual:* I expect you to be to class on time. Also, if you need to leave early, let me know ahead of time. Violators will be subject to my evil eye.
Participate: You should always come to class prepared to ask and field questions. Your contributions do not need to be flawless or perfect. But I do expect each class member to participate in our seminar-style discussions.

Read: This syllabus contains a detailed reading schedule which maps out a set of common readings for each of our sessions. I expect you to read the assigned material for each session BEFORE you come to class and to bring assigned readings to each discussion period. I also expect you to answer all questions and complete all tasks on the reading study guides (see below). Note that required films, radio programs, and television broadcasts are considered readings in their own right.

Assessments:

Reading Study Guides: I will periodically distribute reading study guides. These guides will contain a short list of questions and/or tasks. Some of these tasks should be completed before reading, some during, and some after (each guide will contain detailed, unique instructions). Study guides are designed to help you focus on the key topics or aspects of assigned passages. They detail what I expect you to get out of each reading, and provide a blueprint for our coming discussions. Not every assigned chapter will have a study guide, but I do expect you to write (or type) your answers and be ready to hand them in on the day we discuss the corresponding topic. Incomplete or unrelated responses will not receive full marks.

Primary Source Analysis 1 and 2: The primary source analysis is designed to give you practice in reading, understanding, and explicating media sources. You will, after consultation with the instructor, choose TWO distinct primary sources and then write a 2-page analysis on EACH (please use the same formatting guidelines given below for the research paper, i.e. double-spaced, Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins, etc.) in which you provide the following information:

A) When and where the document was created.
B) What the document says, in your own words.
C) Why this document is significant in the context of the culture and/or society in which it was produced.

Your two analyses must come from different mediums. In other words, if your first analysis is on a film, your second must be on a radio or television program.

Of all the assignments in this course, the primary source analysis may be the one most relevant to your future endeavors. People from all walks of life and in all professions must read and get to the bottom of documents, be they legal briefs or automobile repair summaries. Bear this in mind as you study and explicate your chosen documents: you need to demonstrate, in your own words, an understanding of what it says, giving both context and significance. The first Primary Source Analysis is due on Sep. 25th. The second is due on Oct. 30th.

NOTE: Late primary source analyses will be marked down one half-letter grade per day. Thus, if you submitted an assignment two days after the due date which merited a “B,” your final grade would be a “C+.”
**Research Paper:** Learning to write well is an important part of any history course. Therefore, in addition to the examinations and primary source analyses you will be expected to write a research paper (6-8 pages) on a topic of your choice. You may expand on a theme or question that comes up during our class discussions or you may seek out a different topic, so long as it touches on one of the media forms covered in the course. Research papers will be graded according to four equally weighted criteria:

A) Argument (a coherent thesis statement, clear topic sentences, a strong sense of unity throughout the paper).
B) Organization (well-constructed transitions, an on-topic introduction (and conclusion), fully developed paragraphs).
C) Knowledge of the Material (relevant historical data, an appropriate number of sources, correct (and properly cited!) information).
D) Grammar and Spelling (appropriate word choices, correct spelling throughout, well-constructed sentences).

You are expected to use at least one primary source AND at least three secondary sources as you write your paper. All topics, whether unique or well-trodden, must be approved by the instructor. Please use 12-point Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins, and double spacing throughout. Do not leave an extra space between paragraphs. A title page is not necessary, but please number your pages and include your name, the submission date, and the course title at the top of the first page. Please consult the Chicago Manual of Style (or see me) for other questions on formatting and style. The paper is composed of TWO DRAFTS.

The first draft is peer-reviewed (see below). In this stage, I will be assessing the peer reviewer and his/her comments, not the draft itself. The due date for the first draft is: Nov. 13th

The due date for the peer review is: Nov. 24th

The final draft will be submitted directly to me. The due date is: Dec. 9th

**NOTE:** Late research papers will be marked down one half-letter grade per day.

**NOTE 2:** FHSS Writing Lab: To get help with your paper’s organization, structure, focus, tone, and documentation style, you can go to the FHSS Writing Lab in 1049 JFSB to meet one-on-one with a peer advisor. All advisors are students from our college and are trained in APA, Turabian (Chicago), AMA, and MLA styles.

To prepare for a tutorial, take:

- A copy of the assignment.
- A hard copy of your draft, whatever stage it may be in.
- A list of questions and concerns you have about your paper.

Walk in Monday through Friday 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. or make an appointment online: [http://fhsswriting.byu.edu](http://fhsswriting.byu.edu)

For more information, go to the website at [https://fhsswriting.byu.edu/Pages/Home.aspx](https://fhsswriting.byu.edu/Pages/Home.aspx)

or email [fhss-writinglab@byu.edu](mailto:fhss-writinglab@byu.edu)

**Peer Review of Research Paper Drafts:** Research paper first drafts are due on Nov. 13th. After I’ve received your drafts, I will randomly redistribute one to each class member for peer review.

Your peer review comments must contain the following elements:

A) A critique of the paper’s argument and thesis.
B) A critique of the paper’s organization, including topic sentences and transitions.
C) An engagement with, and correction of, the paper’s citation style (Chicago or Turabian) and source material.
D) A review of the paper’s grammar and spelling.

It is expected that your comments will be thorough, honest, and constructive. A more detailed checklist will be distributed later in the semester.

**Final Examination:** The exam contains two sections.

**Section I: IDs.** In the first section of the exam, you will be required to choose and write on eight identification (ID) terms from a list of twelve. Each response should:

A) Explain When (the term took place).
B) Explain Where (the term occurred).
C) Explain What (the term is).
D) Explain the significance of the term within the context of this course in at least **TWO** distinct ways.

Response lengths may vary, but should be no more than about 3-4 sentences. Please write in complete sentences; do **NOT** use bullet lists or a stream of consciousness. This first (ID) section will be worth 40% of the examination grade.

**Section II: Essay.** In the second section, you will be given three essay questions. You must respond to **ONE** of the three in a coherent, handwritten essay. Your essay will be graded on the following criteria:

A) Argument (a coherent thesis statement, clear topic sentences, a strong sense of unity throughout the paper) - 30% of the essay grade.
B) Knowledge of the Material (relevant historical data, correct information) - 50% of the essay grade.
C) Engagement (evidence of original thought and personal engagement with the course material) - 20% of the essay grade.

In short: demonstrate that you know the course material but also be sure to craft an original argument, complete with an introduction, thesis, supporting points, and a conclusion. The second (essay) section will be worth 60% of the examination grade. There is no time limit for this exam. The exam will take place on Friday, December 18th at 3 PM (in our classroom).

**Policies:**

**Late Policy:** Late primary source analyses, book reviews, and research papers will be marked down one half-letter grade per day. You **CANNOT** make up examinations unless you provide a compelling reason for your absence ahead of time. You cannot make up in-class quizzes under any circumstances.

**Academic Honesty:** Each student is expected to do his or her own work. If you use another person’s words, you **MUST** use quotation marks and give the original author credit. Instances of plagiarism, however small, will not be tolerated. If you get caught, you will fail the assignment or exam in question and I will refer the case to the Honor Code Office. Please consult the University Student Academic Honesty Code for a more detailed description of what constitutes
plagiarism. And if you are still confused, please don’t hesitate to ask me before you hand in the assignment.

Honor Code Dress and Grooming Standards: All students are expected to comply with the University’s dress and grooming standards.

Preventing Sexual Discrimination and Harassment: Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education and pertains to admissions, academic and athletic programs, and university-sponsored activities. Title IX also prohibits sexual harassment of students by university employees, other students, and visitors to campus. If you encounter sexual harassment or gender-based discrimination, please talk to your professor; contact the Equal Employment Office at 801-422-5895 or 1-888-238-1062 (24-hours), or http://www.ethicspoint.com; or contact the Honor Code Office at 801-422-2847.

Students with Disabilities: Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the Services for Students with Disabilities Office (422-2767). Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified, documented disabilities. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the SSD Office. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures by contacting the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895, D-285 ASB.

Grading:

I use the following percentages when calculating letter grades:
A = 93 – 100
A- = 90 – 92
B+ = 87 – 90
B = 83 – 86
B- = 80 – 82
C+ = 77 – 80
C = 73 – 76
C- = 70 – 72
D+ = 67 – 70
D = 63 – 66
D- = 60 – 63
F (E) = below 60

In general, written assignments fall into one of the following grade levels:
A: Superior. The paper contains a thought-provoking argument, seamless transitions, clear topic sentences, and near-perfect grammar. It is both well-researched and well-written.
A-: Excellent. The paper contains a cogent argument and clear topic sentences. Its transitions may be confusing or incomplete. It contains plenty of citations and references, but provides only
tenuous evidence that the author has seriously engaged with the material. Mechanical errors (grammar, spelling, and syntax) are present, but minimal. It contains no serious deficiencies but does not warrant the highest mark.

B+: Very Good. The paper contains a cogent argument and serviceable topic sentences. In general, it suffers from a clear deficiency in grammar, syntax, or organization (but not all three). A paper containing outstanding research but serious grammatical errors might fall into this category, as would a well-written paper that lacks citations and/or familiarity with historical material. Papers in this category are still above-average.

B: Good: The paper contains a clear argument, but the thesis statement may be poorly worded. It contains transitions, citations, and topic sentences, but some paragraphs may be demonstrably inferior. It effectively conveys its main argument, but without nuance, energy, or precision. In general, the paper contains multiple conventional errors (grammar, spelling, etc.), but also contains multiple redeeming qualities.

B-: Satisfactory: The paper contains an argument, citations, and rudimentary transitions. However, it also exhibits some poor grammar and lacks a sufficient number of sources. The argument goes missing for long stretches, and the paper tends to summarize background information more often than advance the thesis statement. Commonly, the writer is genuinely interested in the class material but is unable (or unwilling) to expend the energy required to produce a quality paper.

C+: Below Average: The paper forwards an argument in the introduction, but forgets to augment or support it. Most of the paper is a summary of the textbook, with secondary source citations thrown in to try to cover up the lack of effort. It was hastily written, with some glaring grammar mistakes. The paper contains some redeeming features (an interesting sub-argument or a well-presented secondary source) but lacks unity or cohesion.

C: Deficient: The paper forwards an argument, but does not provide enough evidence to support it. It contains the trappings of a university-level history paper (citations, paragraphs, and a thesis statement) but fails to demonstrate critical thinking or serious engagement. It summarizes material, but does not return to the argument except in the conclusion. The paper contains some major conventional mistakes. It has not been proofread.

C-: “Passing”: The paper resembles a “C” paper, but its mistakes are even more glaring. It flirts with a non-passing grade because it contains so many obvious deficiencies.

D: Poor: The paper understands its task but completely fails to deliver. “D” papers are usually characterized by incomplete or missing sections. The paper may also completely lack an argument and/or citations. It is distinguished from an “F” paper by at least containing some pertinent (though unsubstantiated) remarks.

F (E): Failing: The paper is off-topic, unsound, and completely deficient. It is unoriginal and hastily constructed.

Please see the “Assessments” section (above) for specific instructions regarding each assignment, paper, or exam.

Grade Distribution:

Reading Study Guides – 5%
Primary Source Analysis 1 – 15%
Primary Source Analysis 2 – 15%
Research Paper Peer Review – 10%
Research Paper – 30%
Final Examination – 25%

Other Notes about Grading:

If you feel that you have received an unfair grade on any assignment, you have the right to formally request a reassessment. To initiate this, you **MUST** first submit an official complaint in writing, together with the original copy of the assignment in question. Please keep your tone civil and professional, and do not try to send complaints via email. I do not treat grade complaints as a personal insult. They are a perfectly legitimate way for you to seek redress, and I will always treat your point of view with respect (even if I disagree).

Course Schedule

Week 1: An Introduction to Media History; The Origins of Cinematic and Broadcasting Technologies
Aug 31: Syllabus, Course Intro
Sep 2: Mass Media from an Historian’s Perspective
Sep 4: The Invention of Film (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 1)

Week 2: The Origins of Cinematic and Broadcasting Technologies, cont.
Sep 7: NO CLASS (Labor Day)
Sep 9: The Invention of Radio
Sep 11: The Invention of Television (Smith, Chapter 1)

Week 3: Film in the Silent Era
Sep 14: Peddling the Spectacle: Early Films and Film-like Productions (*An Impossible Voyage*, 1904)
Sep 16: Cinema during WWI (*The Birth of a Nation*, 1915)
Sep 18: Film Becomes an Art: World Cinema in the Silent Era (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 3)

Week 4: Early Radio
Sep 21: From Crystals to Vacuum Tubes: Radio Spreads During the 1920s (“Seven Keys to Boldpate,” on *Jack Benny*, vol. 6, Lux Radio Theater)
Sep 23: Radio and Morality (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 7)
Sep 25: Radio and the Formation of Consumer Culture (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 8; “Sorry, Wrong Number,” on *The Best of Suspense*) – **Primary Source Analysis 1 Due**

Week 5: The Early Hollywood System
Sep 28: Thomas Edison and the Origins of a Commercial Industry
Sep 30: Hollywood as Entertainment (*The Kid*, 1921; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 2)

Week 6: Radio and Film during the Great Depression
Oct 5: Shortwave Subversion (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 2)
Oct 7: Hollywood as Escapism (*Frankenstein*, 1931; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 4)
Oct 9: Hollywood as Social Commentary (*Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, 1939)

Week 7: Radio and Film During WWII
Oct 12: Radio and Film Propaganda: Liberal Democracy (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 5)
Oct 14: Radio and Film Propaganda: Fascism and Communism
Oct 16: The Impact of the War Elsewhere (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 14)

Week 8: The Postwar Media Landscape
Oct 19: Early Television in the United States and Europe (*Texaco Star Theater*; Smith, Chapters 2 and 3)
Oct 21: Radio and Nationalism (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 12)
Oct 23: Film Documentaries Enter a New Era (*The Sorrow and the Pity*, 1969; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 6)

Week 9: The Golden Age of Television
Oct 26: Television Explodes (*The Goldbergs*, “David’s Cousin”)
Oct 28: Documentaries and News Magazines: Education in Democracy (Smith, Chapter 5)
Oct 30: Television Fiction and Morality (Smith, Chapter 9) - **Primary Source Analysis 2 Due**

Week 10: Upheavals during the 1960s
Nov 2: Film and the Representation of Generational Conflicts (*Bonnie and Clyde*, 1967 OR *Planet of the Apes*, 1968; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 7)
Nov 4: (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 8)
Nov 6: Broadcast Media and the 1968 Student Uprisings (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 18)

Week 11: Cinema: A Global Affair
Nov 9: Hollywood Reborn (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 9)
Nov 11: Trends in European Cinema

Week 12: The Cable and Satellite Revolutions
Nov 16: Cable Television in the United States (Smith, Chapter 11)
Nov 18: The Significance of Satellite Television (Smith, Chapters 14 and 15)
Nov 20: Current Affairs in the 1970s and 1980s

Week 13: Film since the 1980s
Nov 24: (Friday Instruction) Film as Culture-Reflector (*Good Bye Lenin*, 2003) – **Peer Review Due**
Nov 25: NO CLASS (Thanksgiving)
Nov 27: NO CLASS (Thanksgiving)

Week 14: Television and Radio since 1989
Nov 30: Television as Collective Memory: The Moon Landing, The Berlin Wall, and the OJ Simpson Trial (Smith, Chapter 7)
Dec 2: Television as Collective Memory, cont.
Dec 4: The Future of Radio (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 24)

Week 15: Conclusions
Dec 7: The Future of Film and Television
Dec 9: Conclusions - Research Paper Final Draft Due

**Final Examination:** Friday, Dec. 18, 3 PM – 6 PM, JKB 3024
I. Scholarship

A. Scholarship Strengths

1. My primary research, which focuses on German television history in the 1950s and 1960s, makes an important contribution to the historiography of the post-WWII era. Television has often been cited as a political tool in the Cold War battle for the hearts and minds of the German public and as a mouthpiece for the affluence of the mid-1950s West German Economic Miracle. But few historians have looked carefully at the medium’s fundamental role in rebuilding Germany in the wake of the Nazi catastrophe. My work situates television—the most successful mass medium of the mid-20th Century—within a broader cultural context, explaining how it challenged and reformulated a wide variety of social and moral issues. This reinterpretation has the potential to dramatically alter the way historians look at reconstruction in postwar Germany.

2. My research agenda has expanded to include other topics. For example, I used the Winter 2015 Faculty Scholarship Workshop to develop an article on collective memory and the celebration of Martin Luther’s 500th birthday in 1983, currently under review at History and Memory. I’m also revising a theoretical piece about how historians should rethink the history of morality. I hope to submit this to History and Theory within the next few weeks. Most recently, I’ve been spending the Spring 2015 semester in Germany and Switzerland, visiting church media archives. While cognizant of the fact that taking on too many projects can be counterproductive, my willingness and ability to tackle new challenges is one of the strengths of my scholarship.

B. Scholarship Weaknesses

1. I tend to obsess over rejected articles. While some types of feedback will trigger a necessarily lengthy process of revision, in general it would be better to give myself a short deadline for turning my articles over to another venue.

2. I could also spend more time networking, particularly with established television historians. External reviews constitute a significant component of the 6th/7th year review process, and extending my circle of professional acquaintances—particularly among prominent historians in my field—can only be beneficial.

C. 2015 Scholarship Goals
1. I recently submitted a comparative study of collective memory strategies during East and West Germany’s celebration of Martin Luther’s 500th birthday in 1983 to *History and Memory*. My goal is to have this article accepted for publication by the end of the year.

2. My first important task during the Summer 2015 semester will be to submit an article, “Revisiting the History of Morality,” to either *History and Theory* or *Rethinking History*. This contribution, which argues that historians ought to be more explicit in their attention to past moral codes and ethical systems, has the potential to leave a much more durable impression on the discipline than anything else I’m working on at the moment. The piece has been germinating for a long time, and I think I’m nearly ready to test the peer-review waters.

3. At this stage in my career, I aim to attend two academic conferences per year. This goal has already been accomplished for 2015. I recently participated in a UK-based examination of TV criminal thrillers at the University of London-Royal Holloway and in the American Society for Church History’s Spring Meeting (both in April). My primary objective at these venues was to network with television and church history scholars. I am pleased to report, however, that my success was not limited to networking: my London conference paper will be published in a special issue of the *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television*.

4. My most urgent goal for 2015 – finding a new publisher to send my book manuscript out for reviews – has already been accomplished. It is currently under review at the University of Toronto Press. If the reviews come back negative, I’ll of course need to re-prioritize my immediate goals to make sure the monograph project doesn’t stall.

5. Finally, the time has come to conduct fresh archival research. I am currently visiting the Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Köln to look at the way the Catholic Church shaped and controlled early German television and radio. Next week, I’m also going to visit the state archive in Lausanne, Switzerland to examine documents on the NGO Moral-Rearmament. I hope to parry both of these research trips into journal articles and/or book chapters. My target is to publish two articles by the summer of 2016.

### D. Long-Term Scholarship Goals

1. My most important long-term goal is, and will remain, securing publication of my first monograph. All other considerations must revolve around that, as the Department of History considers it the most important benchmark in the CFS review process.

2. I intend to use my current research trips as a first step in collecting material for my second book project. As I currently envision it, this book will examine the way Catholic and Protestant authorities influenced postwar German media, including film, radio, television, stage drama, and possibly print media.

3. Finally, I plan to produce – on average – two peer-reviewed articles and/or chapters per year until the completion of my 6th/7th year review. My goal should be to establish my scholarly reputation in four areas: television history, postwar German history, memory studies, and historiography/theory.

### E. Strategies for Success in Scholarship
1. I will not achieve my ambitious research and scholarship goals without a concrete weekly schedule. The first, and most important, aspect of this schedule will involve writing on a daily basis. During the Summer 2015 semester, I will set aside the hours between 8 and 10 AM (of every weekday) for academic writing. Similarly, I plan to reserve one hour per weekday to research and reading directly related to my scholarly projects. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, I expect to at least double these writing and research hours. My weekly schedule will also include one hour for developing and conceptualizing future projects (such as my 2nd monograph) and one hour for identifying, researching, and writing external grant proposals.

2. As a second strategy for meeting my scholarship goals, I plan to avoid the “backburner” phenomenon. I find that my most productive stretches of scholarly writing involve multiple projects. When I leave a writing project standing for more than about a week, the amount of time I spend conceptualizing and envisioning the shape of my work almost doubles. I believe that if I can spend some time each week on about 3 distinct pieces of scholarship, my production will increase substantially.

3. I need to continue to take advantage of BYU’s substantial internal funding resources. I am currently using both FHSS and Kennedy Center Faculty Research Grants to undertake research in Europe. The Kennedy Center also offers funding for faculty to bring well-known scholars to campus for lectures and presentations. I plan to use this mechanism in the coming years to invite and build professional relationships with important scholars in postwar German and television history.

4. Finally, to fully realize my ambitious research agenda, I need to harness external funding sources. I have elected to teach two courses during the Summer 2015 Semester so that I will be free to conduct research during both the Spring and Summer 2016 Semesters. I plan to apply for funding from the German Historical Institute, the German Academic Exchange Program, and the American Philosophical Society, as well as many other institutions.

II. Teaching

A. Teaching Strengths

1. With the exception of my first semester as a Visiting Assistant Professor in 2011, my student evaluation scores at BYU have consistently ranged between average and above-average when compared with other courses in the Department of History. In particular, I have scored very high in Instructor categories such as, “Interest in student learning,” “Opportunities to get help,” “Responded to students respectfully,” and “Explained concepts effectively.” These scores demonstrate my ability to establish a classroom atmosphere of trust and inquisitiveness.

2. Peer evaluations have generally been positive, the most recent commenting on the clarity of my syllabus and course design, students’ attentiveness during lectures, and my responsiveness to student questions. While there is certainly room for improvement (see below), I feel that I have somewhat exceeded expectations as an early-career teacher.

B. Teaching Weaknesses
1. Students have sometimes claimed that my grading procedures are subjective and unfair. While my syllabus does contain a detailed set of instructions for each assessment (including a concrete explanation of how I assign grades), I must acknowledge that I have not yet mastered the art of adhering to a clear, readily accessible rubric.

2. Many students have noted that my classes do not lay enough emphasis on assigned reading materials. This observation is particularly prevalent in my service course – HIST 202 – but the trend extends to my upper-level courses as well. In the past, I gave unannounced in-class reading quizzes. While these quizzes were beneficial in some ways (namely, they forced students to read carefully), there were some substantial drawbacks. For instance, students complained that the more difficult questions referenced relatively obscure passages from the text(s), and did not correspond to any material I covered in my lectures. When I gave easier questions, however, quiz scores skyrocketed and contributed to grade inflation. In the end, I eliminated the quizzes and added other types of assessments. But a demonstrable number of student comments bemoan the fact that the course doesn’t set and enforce a more rigid reading structure.

3. BYU has a unique mission to facilitate intellectual AND spiritual learning. However, few student comments single out my classes as incubators of spiritual growth. Rating scores corroborate this observation: my courses consistently rate at or slightly below average in the “strengthens testimony” category. It seems clear that students feel comfortable asking about gospel topics if they choose or if they see a connection; I have consistently rated highly in categories such as “responds to students respectfully,” and on an anecdotal level, students seem to understand that I’m happy to reconcile difficult philosophical or historical issues with LDS teachings. But intellectual understanding does not necessarily lead to spiritual insight, and I need to find new, better ways to encourage the latter.

4. Most history courses are writing intensive. They are thus excellent opportunities to teach students how to provide effective peer feedback on written assignments. However, neither my general education nor my upper-level courses contain any significant provisions for peer evaluation. In my larger classes, teaching assistants provide feedback on first drafts; in smaller classes, I handle all of this work myself.

C. 2015 Teaching Goals

1. Starting with the Summer 2015 semester, I will introduce a more comprehensive rubric for essays and research papers. The rubric, which will be distributed as a blank form before each assignment, will include more detailed information about the nature and attributes of each grade level (A, A-, B+, etc.), as well as a thorough explanation of the expectations for the assignment in question.

2. Rather than returning to reading quizzes, which hold students accountable but tend to measure effort rather than real student learning, I plan to implement a mandatory study guide for some readings, as outlined by Roni Jo Draper at the 2015 New Faculty Spring Seminar. Study guides will provide a concrete set of reading “tasks,” which I hope will encourage a more active engagement with each text. These tasks will ask students to create an outline of important names and/or places, invite students to critique or even challenge the text, and highlight terms we will examine more closely during the next class session. In short, the guides will explain why I assign specific texts and ask students to consider key questions and concerns before they come to class. This goal is an integral
part of my Fall 2015 course development project, which is directed at HIST 311: The History of Film, Radio, and Television.

3. My ability to reach students at a spiritual level and to convey my own testimony of the atonement and of the restored Church must occur at the “micro” level: I need to look for possible “intersections” or “junctures” in my day-to-day lecture notes. Then, when directed by the Spirit, I will have built-in opportunities to bear testimony or briefly alter the intellectual tenor of the classroom discussion in a spiritual direction. A fusion of planning and spontaneity, I think, is the key to success in improving this aspect of my student ratings.

4. I have often felt that my teaching style – open, engaging, and relatable – is best-suited to an intimate atmosphere. While my Instructor student evaluation scores have in general been above-average, beginning with the Fall 2014 Semester I have tried to learn all my students’ names. This is no easy task in HIST 202, but I feel that the idiosyncrasies of my personality make this a desirable and potentially very rewarding goal. I will continue to prioritize this goal during the Summer 2015 and Fall 2015 Semesters.

D. Long-Term Teaching Goals

1. Achieve, and maintain, a 7.0 mean overall student evaluation of teaching score in all my upper-level courses.
2. Minimize negative student comments in all my courses.
3. Build a classroom atmosphere in which students’ testimonies can be strengthened.

E. Strategies for Teaching Success

1. To continually identify the strengths and weaknesses of my courses (which will, in turn, help make me a better teacher), I need to systematically track trends in student comments.
2. I plan to regularly attend teaching and faculty development workshops over the next several years. These workshops will help me formulate concrete improvements in my courses.
3. I will constantly look for ways to revise and improve the rubric I use for assessing students’ work. This rubric, which may differ from course to course, must align with my stated learning outcomes.
4. Where it seems appropriate, I will take advantage of some Faculty Center programs, such as SCOT.

III. Citizenship

A. Citizenship Strengths

1. My experience with departmental, college, or university assignments has been quite limited. In my new role as a Phi Alpha Theta advisor, however, I have tried to be actively engaged. For example, I have agreed to chair a panel at the PAT spring conference at Weber State University. I have also started working on a binder that outlines the responsibilities and traditions associated with BYU’s Beta Iota Chapter. I thus hope to
make a tangible contribution by laying down an institutional memory for future advisors and student leaders.

2. In addition, I’ve been an active participant in BYU’s scholarly community. In 2012, I supervised an intern in media history and gave the Beckham Lecture in Communications. More recently, I’ve appeared on KBYU’s Thinking Aloud, given two lectures for International Cinema, and spoken to the Women’s Studies Colloquium. I also participated in the college’s Fall 2014 Civic Engagement Workshop.

B. Long-Term Citizenship Goals

1. My formula for citizenship success will be relatively simple: diligently fulfill all department assignments, support my colleagues in their citizenship responsibilities, and attend at least 4-5 department, college, or university lectures per semester. I expect that my assignments will increase in the coming years, so it is important to develop good citizenship habits now.

IV. Evaluating the Plan’s Success

A. 2015

The success of this faculty development plan during 2015 will be based on the following criteria:

1. Two journal articles are in print or have been accepted for publication by the end of the 2015 calendar year
2. Two additional journal articles and/or book chapters have been completed (though not necessarily submitted)
3. Two academic conferences have been attended
4. The monograph proposal and/or manuscript has been continuously under consideration during the 2015 calendar year
5. Self-reported charts demonstrate that the target amounts of time spent writing and researching have been met
6. Student evaluations of teaching fall within acceptable departmental target ranges

B. Evaluating the Plan’s Success (3rd-Year Review)

The success of this faculty development plan at the time of my 3rd-Year review will be based on the following criteria:

1. The monograph is (at least) under contract with a university press
2. At least 5 solid journal articles and/or book chapters have been published since August 2014
3. Student evaluations of teaching fall within acceptable departmental target ranges
4. Students begin to note that the course is both engaging and faith-promoting

C. Evaluating the Plan’s Success (Final Review)

The success of this faculty development plan at the time of my Final Review will be based on the following criteria:
The ultimate success of this faculty development plan will be based on the following criteria:

1. The monograph is published and has been well-received
2. At least 10 solid journal articles and/or book chapters have been published since 2014
3. At least one article has appeared in each of the following groups of journals:
   a. Central European History/German History/German Studies Review
   b. Memory Studies/History and Memory
   d. History and Theory/Rethinking History
4. Significant progress towards a second monograph has been demonstrated
5. Student evaluations of teaching regularly fall within acceptable departmental target ranges
6. Students have noted that the course is both engaging and faith-promoting
7. All department assignments have been fulfilled with diligence and vigor
This course development project proposal will identify the weakest aspects of my teaching style and course structure, and plan a variety of realistic enhancements for the Fall 2015 semester. In general terms, these enhancements will include a greater stress on student learning outcomes (rather than on mere instruction), more conscious mechanisms for gauging such outcomes, and a classroom environment conducive to strengthening students’ testimonies.

I have chosen to direct my attentions towards HIST 311, an elective course on the history of film, radio, and television. Should my alterations and improvements prove successful in improving student learning – and student satisfaction – I will extrapolate and re-think my courses in World Civilizations since 1500, The Historian’s Craft, European Revolutions since 1500, Modern Germany, and Nineteenth-Century Europe.

Assessing Weaknesses

1. As noted above in the Faculty Development Plan, many students have noted that my classes do not lay enough emphasis on assigned reading materials.

2. As noted above in the Faculty Development Plan, few student comments single out my classes as incubators of spiritual growth.

3. As noted above in the Faculty Development Plan, neither my GE nor my upper-level courses contain any significant provisions for peer evaluation.

4. As noted above in the Faculty Development Plan, students have sometimes claimed that my grading procedures are subjective and unfair.

Addressing Weaknesses (HIST 311)

1. Rather than returning to reading quizzes, which hold students accountable but tend to measure effort rather than real student learning, I plan to implement a mandatory study guide for each reading, as outlined by Roni Jo Draper at the 2015 New Faculty Spring Seminar. Study guides will provide a concrete set of reading “tasks,” which I hope will encourage a more active engagement with each text. These tasks will ask students to create an outline of important names and/or places, invite students to critique or even challenge the text, and highlight terms we will examine more closely during the next class session. In short, the guides will explain why I assign specific texts and ask students to consider key questions and concerns before they come to class. During the first part of the semester, students will complete and hand in completed study guides to be assessed. Later in the semester, as we approach the research paper due date, students will no longer be required to submit their guides but will hopefully have developed the habit of completing them.
2. I do not believe that it will be possible to effectively incorporate a “strengthening testimonies” component into the matrix of learning outcomes and course assessments in HIST 311. Rather, improving my ability to reach students at a spiritual level and to convey my own testimony of the atonement and of the restored Church must occur at the “micro” level: I need to look for possible “intersections” or “junctures” in my day-to-day lecture notes. Then, when directed by the Spirit, I will have built-in opportunities to bear testimony or briefly alter the intellectual tenor of the classroom discussion in a spiritual direction. A fusion of planning and spontaneity, I think, is the key to success in improving this aspect of my student ratings.

3. The research paper for HIST 311 will be divided into a two-draft process. After the first draft is submitted, each student will be randomly assigned to critique another student’s draft. In this case, the critique itself will be assessed for its thoroughness and quality. The final draft will be submitted directly to the instructor.

4. To overcome the charge that my assessments are too subjective, I need to be more specific about what I expect in each assignment. One way to do this will be to include a description of what assignments in each grade level should look like. In other words, I will provide a detailed description of characteristics for “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D” assignments, independent of my expectations for individual exams or papers. Like assessment requirements, this list will be included on the syllabus.

Finally, I plan to make this course more memorable by taking advantage of unique university media resources. I will screen certain required films, for example, with an analog projector in the International Cinema theater (SWKT 250). I will also explore using antique radio and/or television sets to present mid-20th-Century broadcasts as listeners and viewers of the age perceived them.
HIST 311: The History of Film, Radio, and Television  
Fall 2015  

MWF 3-3:50 PM, JKB 3024  

Instructor:  
Professor Stewart Anderson  
Office: 2153 JFSB  
Email: stewart_anderson@byu.edu  
Phone: 801-422-7494  
Office Hours: TBD  

Course Description:  
This course traces the international development of the major mass mediums of the 20th Century: film, radio, and television. We will explore technical and artistic developments from the dawn of each of these mediums to the present day. We will also look beyond the history of mass media to the understanding of history through these media types. Thus, in this course we will treat popular entertainment films and broadcasts as historical documents.  

Learning Outcomes:  
By the end of the course, you should:  

1. read primary and secondary sources with a critical eye and express these ideas effectively in course assessments.  
2. demonstrate a deeper historical understanding of the most important events in film, radio, and television history.  
3. analyze media products from an historical, contextual perspective.  
4. craft a well-written, coherent research paper drawn from a variety of sources and containing a clear thesis statement.  

Texts/Readings:  


Films (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

*Le Voyage Dans la Luna*, directed by Georges Méliès, 1902  
*The Birth of a Nation*, directed by D. W. Griffith, 1915.  
*The Kid*, directed by Charlie Chaplin, 1921.  
*Frankenstein*, directed by James Whale, 1931.  
*Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, directed by Frank Capra, 1939.  
*Mother India*, directed by Mehboob Khan, 1957.  
*Bonnie and Clyde*, directed by Arthur Penn, 1967 (optional).  
*Planet of the Apes*, directed by Franklin J. Schaffner, 1968.  
*The Sorrow and the Pity*, directed by Marcel Ophüls, 1969.  
*Schindler’s List*, directed by Steven Spielberg, 1993 (optional).  

Radio Programs (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

“Be Ye Men of Valour,” BBC speech written by Winston Churchill, 1940.  
“Sorry, Wrong Number,” *Suspense*, written by Lucille Fletcher, 1943.

Television Programs (Available through the HBLL Media Center):

*Texaco Star Theater*, NBC, 1949.  
*Irrlicht und Feuer*, DFF (East Germany), 1966.  

**Expectations:**

*Attend:* Attendance is not required, but it is strongly encouraged. Your test grade will almost certainly suffer if you don’t engage with the course lectures and discussions.

*Be Punctual:* I expect you to be on time. Also, if you need to leave early, let me know ahead of time. Violators will be subject to my evil eye.
**Participate:** You should always come to class prepared to ask and field questions. Your contributions do not need to be flawless or perfect. But I do expect each class member to participate in our seminar-style discussions.

**Read:** This syllabus contains a detailed reading schedule which maps out a set of common readings for each of our sessions. I expect you to read the assigned material for each session **BEFORE** you come to class and to bring assigned readings to each discussion period. I also expect you to answer all questions and complete all tasks on the reading study guides (see below). Note that required films, radio programs, and television broadcasts are considered readings in their own right.

**Assessments:**

**Reading Study Guides:** I will periodically distribute reading study guides. These guides will contain a short list of questions and/or tasks. Some of these tasks should be completed before reading, some during, and some after (each guide will contain detailed, unique instructions). Study guides are designed to help you focus on the key topics or aspects of assigned passages. They detail what I expect you to get out of each reading, and provide a blueprint for our coming discussions. Not every assigned chapter will have a study guide, but I do expect you to write (or type) your answers and be ready to hand them in on the day we discuss the corresponding topic. Incomplete or unrelated responses will not receive full marks.

**Primary Source Analysis 1 and 2:** The primary source analysis is designed to give you practice in reading, understanding, and explicating media sources. You will, after consultation with the instructor, choose **TWO** distinct primary sources and then write a 2-page analysis on **EACH** (please use the same formatting guidelines given below for the research paper, i.e. double-spaced, Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins, etc.) in which you provide the following information:

A) When and where the document was created.
B) What the document says, **in your own words.**
C) Why this document is significant in the context of the culture and/or society in which it was produced.

Your two analyses must come from different mediums. In other words, if your first analysis is on a film, your second must be on a radio or television program.

Of all the assignments in this course, the primary source analysis may be the one most relevant to your future endeavors. People from all walks of life and in all professions must read and get to the bottom of documents, be they legal briefs or automobile repair summaries. Bear this in mind as you study and explicate your chosen documents: you need to demonstrate, in your own words, an understanding of what it says, giving both context and significance. The first Primary Source Analysis is due on Sep. 25th. The second is due on Oct. 30th.

**NOTE:** Late primary source analyses will be marked down one half-letter grade per day. Thus, if you submitted an assignment two days after the due date which merited a “B,” your final grade would be a “C+.”
Research Paper: Learning to write well is an important part of any history course. Therefore, in addition to the examinations and primary source analyses you will be expected to write a research paper (6-8 pages) on a topic of your choice. You may expand on a theme or question that comes up during our class discussions or you may seek out a different topic, so long as it touches on one of the media forms covered in the course. Research papers will be graded according to four equally weighted criteria:

A) Argument (a coherent thesis statement, clear topic sentences, a strong sense of unity throughout the paper).
B) Organization (well-constructed transitions, an on-topic introduction (and conclusion), fully developed paragraphs).
C) Knowledge of the Material (relevant historical data, an appropriate number of sources, correct (and properly cited!) information).
D) Grammar and Spelling (appropriate word choices, correct spelling throughout, well-constructed sentences).

You are expected to use at least one primary source AND at least three secondary sources as you write your paper. All topics, whether unique or well-trodden, must be approved by the instructor. Please use 12-point Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins, and double spacing throughout. Do not leave an extra space between paragraphs. A title page is not necessary, but please number your pages and include your name, the submission date, and the course title at the top of the first page. Please consult the Chicago Manual of Style (or see me) for other questions on formatting and style. The paper is composed of TWO DRAFTS.

The first draft is peer-reviewed (see below). In this stage, I will be assessing the peer reviewer and his/her comments, not the draft itself. The due date for the first draft is: Nov. 13th

The due date for the peer review is: Nov. 24th

The final draft will be submitted directly to me. The due date is: Dec. 9th

NOTE: Late research papers will be marked down one half-letter grade per day.

NOTE 2: FHSS Writing Lab: To get help with your paper’s organization, structure, focus, tone, and documentation style, you can go to the FHSS Writing Lab in 1049 JFSB to meet one-on-one with a peer advisor. All advisors are students from our college and are trained in APA, Turabian (Chicago), AMA, and MLA styles.

To prepare for a tutorial, take:

- A copy of the assignment.
- A hard copy of your draft, whatever stage it may be in.
- A list of questions and concerns you have about your paper.

Walk in Monday through Friday 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. or make an appointment online: http://fhsswriting.byu.edu

For more information, go to the website at https://fhsswriting.byu.edu/Pages/Home.aspx

or email fhss-writinglab@byu.edu

Peer Review of Research Paper Drafts: Research paper first drafts are due on Nov. 13th. After I’ve received your drafts, I will randomly redistribute one to each class member for peer review. Your peer review comments must contain the following elements:

A) A critique of the paper’s argument and thesis.
B) A critique of the paper’s organization, including topic sentences and transitions.
C) An engagement with, and correction of, the paper’s citation style (Chicago or Turabian) and source material.

D) A review of the paper’s grammar and spelling.

It is expected that your comments will be thorough, honest, and constructive. A more detailed checklist will be distributed later in the semester.

**Final Examination:** The exam contains two sections.

**Section I: IDs.** In the first section of the exam, you will be required to choose and write on eight identification (ID) terms from a list of twelve. Each response should:

A) Explain When (the term took place).
B) Explain Where (the term occurred).
C) Explain What (the term is).
D) Explain the significance of the term within the context of this course in at least **TWO** distinct ways.

Response lengths may vary, but should be no more than about 3-4 sentences. Please write in complete sentences; do **NOT** use bullet lists or a stream of consciousness. This first (ID) section will be worth **40%** of the examination grade.

**Section II: Essay.** In the second section, you will be given three essay questions. You must respond to **ONE** of the three in a coherent, handwritten essay. Your essay will be graded on the following criteria:

A) Argument (a coherent thesis statement, clear topic sentences, a strong sense of unity throughout the paper) - **30%** of the essay grade.
B) Knowledge of the Material (relevant historical data, correct information) - **50%** of the essay grade.
C) Engagement (evidence of original thought and personal engagement with the course material) - **20%** of the essay grade.

In short: demonstrate that you know the course material but also be sure to craft an original argument, complete with an introduction, thesis, supporting points, and a conclusion. The second (essay) section will be worth **60%** of the examination grade. There is no time limit for this exam. The exam will take place on Friday, December 18th at 3 PM (in our classroom).

**Policies:**

*Late Policy:* Late primary source analyses, book reviews, and research papers will be marked down one half-letter grade per day. You **CANNOT** make up examinations unless you provide a compelling reason for your absence ahead of time. You cannot make up in-class quizzes under any circumstances.

*Academic Honesty:* Each student is expected to do his or her own work. If you use another person’s words, you **MUST** use quotation marks and give the original author credit. Instances of plagiarism, however small, will not be tolerated. If you get caught, you will fail the assignment or exam in question and I will refer the case to the Honor Code Office. Please consult the University Student Academic Honesty Code for a more detailed description of what constitutes plagiarism. And if you are still confused, please don’t hesitate to ask me before you hand in the assignment.
Honor Code Dress and Grooming Standards: All students are expected to comply with the University’s dress and grooming standards.

Preventing Sexual Discrimination and Harassment: Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education and pertains to admissions, academic and athletic programs, and university-sponsored activities. Title IX also prohibits sexual harassment of students by university employees, other students, and visitors to campus. If you encounter sexual harassment or gender-based discrimination, please talk to your professor; contact the Equal Employment Office at 801-422-5895 or 1-888-238-1062 (24-hours), or http://www.ethicspoint.com; or contact the Honor Code Office at 801-422-2847.

Students with Disabilities: Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the Services for Students with Disabilities Office (422-2767). Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified, documented disabilities. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the SSD Office. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures by contacting the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895, D-285 ASB.

Grading:

I use the following percentages when calculating letter grades:

A = 93 – 100
A- = 90 – 92
B+ = 87 – 90
B = 83 – 86
B- = 80 – 82
C+ = 77 – 80
C = 73 – 76
C- = 70 – 72
D+ = 67 – 70
D = 63 – 66
D- = 60 – 63
F (E) = below 60

In general, written assignments fall into one of the following grade levels:
A: Superior. The paper contains a thought-provoking argument, seamless transitions, clear topic sentences, and near-perfect grammar. It is both well-researched and well-written.
A-: Excellent. The paper contains a cogent argument and clear topic sentences. Its transitions may be confusing or incomplete. It contains plenty of citations and references, but provides only tenuous evidence that the author has seriously engaged with the material. Mechanical errors
(grammar, spelling, and syntax) are present, but minimal. It contains no serious deficiencies but does not warrant the highest mark.

B+: Very Good. The paper contains a cogent argument and serviceable topic sentences. In general, it suffers from a clear deficiency in grammar, syntax, or organization (but not all three). A paper containing outstanding research but serious grammatical errors might fall into this category, as would a well-written paper that lacks citations and/or familiarity with historical material. Papers in this category are still above-average.

B: Good: The paper contains a clear argument, but the thesis statement may be poorly worded. It contains transitions, citations, and topic sentences, but some paragraphs may be demonstrably inferior. It effectively conveys its main argument, but without nuance, energy, or precision. In general, the paper contains multiple conventional errors (grammar, spelling, etc.), but also contains multiple redeeming qualities.

B-: Satisfactory: The paper contains an argument, citations, and rudimentary transitions. However, it also exhibits some poor grammar and lacks a sufficient number of sources. The argument goes missing for long stretches, and the paper tends to summarize background information more often than advance the thesis statement. Commonly, the writer is genuinely interested in the class material but is unable (or unwilling) to expend the energy required to produce a quality paper.

C+: Below Average: The paper forwards an argument in the introduction, but forgets to augment or support it. Most of the paper is a summary of the textbook, with secondary source citations thrown in to try to cover up the lack of effort. It was hastily written, with some glaring grammar mistakes. The paper contains some redeeming features (an interesting sub-argument or a well-presented secondary source) but lacks unity or cohesion.

C: Deficient: The paper forwards an argument, but does not provide enough evidence to support it. It contains the trappings of a university-level history paper (citations, paragraphs, and a thesis statement) but fails to demonstrate critical thinking or serious engagement. It summarizes material, but does not return to the argument except in the conclusion. The paper contains some major conventional mistakes. It has not been proofread.

C-: “Passing”: The paper resembles a “C” paper, but its mistakes are even more glaring. It flirts with a non-passing grade because it contains so many obvious deficiencies.

D: Poor: The paper understands its task but completely fails to deliver. “D” papers are usually characterized by incomplete or missing sections. The paper may also completely lack an argument and/or citations. It is distinguished from an “F” paper by at least containing some pertinent (though unsubstantiated) remarks.

F (E): Failing: The paper is off-topic, unsound, and completely deficient. It is unoriginal and hastily constructed.

Please see the “Assessments” section (above) for specific instructions regarding each assignment, paper, or exam.

Grade Distribution:

Reading Study Guides – 5%
Primary Source Analysis 1 – 15%
Primary Source Analysis 2 – 15%
Research Paper Peer Review – 10%
Research Paper – 30%
Final Examination – 25%

Other Notes about Grading:

If you feel that you have received an unfair grade on any assignment, you have the right to formally request a reassessment. To initiate this, you MUST first submit an official complaint in writing, together with the original copy of the assignment in question. Please keep your tone civil and professional, and do not try to send complaints via email. I do not treat grade complaints as a personal insult. They are a perfectly legitimate way for you to seek redress, and I will always treat your point of view with respect (even if I disagree).

Course Schedule

Week 1: An Introduction to Media History; The Origins of Cinematic and Broadcasting Technologies
Aug 31: Syllabus, Course Intro
Sep 2: Mass Media from an Historian’s Perspective
Sep 4: The Invention of Film (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 1)

Week 2: The Origins of Cinematic and Broadcasting Technologies, cont.
Sep 7: NO CLASS (Labor Day)
Sep 9: The Invention of Radio
Sep 11: The Invention of Television (Smith, Chapter 1)

Week 3: Film in the Silent Era
Sep 14: Peddling the Spectacle: Early Films and Film-like Productions (An Impossible Voyage, 1904)
Sep 16: Cinema during WWI (The Birth of a Nation, 1915)
Sep 18: Film Becomes an Art: World Cinema in the Silent Era (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 3)

Week 4: Early Radio
Sep 21: From Crystals to Vacuum Tubes: Radio Spreads During the 1920s (“Seven Keys to Boldpate,” on Jack Benny, vol. 6, Lux Radio Theater)
Sep 23: Radio and Morality (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 7)
Sep 25: Radio and the Formation of Consumer Culture (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 8; “Sorry, Wrong Number,” on The Best of Suspense) – Primary Source Analysis 1 Due

Week 5: The Early Hollywood System
Sep 28: Thomas Edison and the Origins of a Commercial Industry
Sep 30: Hollywood as Entertainment (The Kid, 1921; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 2)

Week 6: Radio and Film during the Great Depression
Oct 5: Shortwave Subversion (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 2)
Oct 7: Hollywood as Escapism (*Frankenstein*, 1931; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 4)
Oct 9: Hollywood as Social Commentary (*Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, 1939)

Week 7: Radio and Film During WWII
Oct 12: Radio and Film Propaganda: Liberal Democracy (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 5)
Oct 14: Radio and Film Propaganda: Fascism and Communism
Oct 16: The Impact of the War Elsewhere (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 14)

Week 8: The Postwar Media Landscape
Oct 19: Early Television in the United States and Europe (*Texaco Star Theater*; Smith, Chapters 2 and 3)
Oct 21: Radio and Nationalism (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 12)
Oct 23: Film Documentaries Enter a New Era (*The Sorrow and the Pity*, 1969; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 6)

Week 9: The Golden Age of Television
Oct 26: Television Explodes (*The Goldbergs*, “David’s Cousin”)
Oct 28: Documentaries and News Magazines: Education in Democracy (Smith, Chapter 5)
Oct 30: Television Fiction and Morality (Smith, Chapter 9) - **Primary Source Analysis 2 Due**

Week 10: Upheavals during the 1960s
Nov 2: Film and the Representation of Generational Conflicts (*Bonnie and Clyde*, 1967 OR *Planet of the Apes*, 1968; Dixon and Foster, Chapter 7)
Nov 4: (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 8)
Nov 6: Broadcast Media and the 1968 Student Uprisings (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 18)

Week 11: Cinema: A Global Affair
Nov 9: Hollywood Reborn (Dixon and Foster, Chapter 9)
Nov 11: Trends in European Cinema

Week 12: The Cable and Satellite Revolutions
Nov 16: Cable Television in the United States (Smith, Chapter 11)
Nov 18: The Significance of Satellite Television (Smith, Chapters 14 and 15)
Nov 20: Current Affairs in the 1970s and 1980s

Week 13: Film since the 1980s
Nov 24: (Friday Instruction) Film as Culture-Reflector (*Good Bye Lenin*, 2003) – **Peer Review Due**
Nov 25: NO CLASS (Thanksgiving)
Nov 27: NO CLASS (Thanksgiving)

Week 14: Television and Radio since 1989
Simpson Trial (Smith, Chapter 7)
Dec 2: Television as Collective Memory, cont.
Dec 4: The Future of Radio (Hilmes and Loviglio, Chapter 24)

Week 15: Conclusions
Dec 7: The Future of Film and Television
Dec 9: Conclusions - Research Paper Final Draft Due

**Final Examination:** Friday, Dec. 18, 3 PM – 6 PM, JKB 3024
My primary research, which focuses on German television history in the 1950s and 1960s, makes an important contribution to the historiography of the post-WWII era. Television has often been cited as a political tool in the Cold War battle for the hearts and minds of the German public and as a mouthpiece for the affluence of the mid-1950s West German Economic Miracle. But few historians have looked carefully at the medium’s fundamental role in rebuilding Germany in the wake of the Nazi catastrophe. My work situates television – the most successful mass medium of the mid-20th Century – within a broader cultural context, explaining how it challenged and reformulated a wide variety of social and moral issues. This reinterpretation has the potential to dramatically alter the way historians look at reconstruction in postwar Germany.

My research agenda has expanded to include other topics. For example, I used the Winter 2015 Faculty Scholarship Workshop to develop an article on collective memory and the celebration of Martin Luther’s 500th birthday in 1983, currently under review at History and Memory. I’m also revising a theoretical piece about how historians should rethink the history of morality. I hope to submit this to History and Theory within the next few weeks. Most recently, I’ve been spending the Spring 2015 semester in Germany and Switzerland, visiting church media archives. While cognizant of the fact that taking on too many projects can be counterproductive, my willingness and ability to tackle new challenges is one of the strengths of my scholarship.

Scholarship Goals – by February 2016

1. I recently submitted a comparative study of collective memory strategies during East and West Germany’s celebration of Martin Luther’s 500th birthday in 1983 to History and Memory. My goal is to have this article accepted for publication by the end of the year.

2. My first important task during the Summer 2015 semester will be to submit an article, “Revisiting the History of Morality,” to either History and Theory or Rethinking History. This contribution, which argues that historians ought to be more explicit in their attention to past moral codes and ethical systems, has the potential to leave a much more durable impression on the discipline than anything else I’m working on at the moment. The piece has been germinating for a long time, and I think I’m nearly ready to test the peer-review waters.

3. At this stage in my career, I aim to attend two academic conferences per year. This goal has already been accomplished for 2015. I recently participated in a UK-based examination of TV criminal thrillers at the University of London-Royal Holloway and in the American Society for Church History’s Spring Meeting (both in April). My primary objective at these venues was to network with television and church history scholars. I am pleased to report, however, that my success was not limited to networking: my London conference paper will be published in a special issue of the Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television.

4. My most urgent goal for 2015 – finding a new publisher to send my book manuscript out for reviews – has already been accomplished. It is currently under review at the University of Toronto Press. If the reviews come back negative, I’ll of course need to reprioritize my immediate goals to make sure the monograph project doesn’t stall.
5. Finally, the time has come to conduct fresh archival research. I am currently visiting the Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Köln to look at the way the Catholic Church shaped and controlled early German television and radio. Next week, I’m also going to visit the state archive in Lausanne, Switzerland to examine documents on the NGO Moral-Rearmament. I hope to parry both of these research trips into journal articles and/or book chapters. My target is to have both these articles finished by February 2016.

Strategies for Success in Scholarship

1. I will not achieve my ambitious research and scholarship goals without a concrete weekly schedule. The first, and most important, aspect of this schedule will involve writing on a daily basis. During the Summer 2015 semester, I will set aside the hours between 8 and 10 AM (of every weekday) for academic writing. Similarly, I plan to reserve one hour per weekday to research and reading directly related to my scholarly projects. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, I expect to at least double these writing and research hours. My weekly schedule will also include one hour for developing and conceptualizing future projects (such as my 2nd monograph) and one hour for identifying, researching, and writing external grant proposals.

2. As a second strategy for meeting my scholarship goals, I plan to avoid the “backburner” phenomenon. I find that my most productive stretches of scholarly writing involve multiple projects. When I leave a writing project standing for more than about a week, the amount of time I spend conceptualizing and envisioning the shape of my work almost doubles. I believe that if I can spend some time each week on about 3 distinct pieces of scholarship, my production will increase substantially.

3. Finally, to fully realize my ambitious research agenda, I need to harness external funding sources. I have elected to teach two courses during the Summer 2015 Semester so that I will be free to conduct research during both the Spring and Summer 2016 Semesters. I plan to apply for funding from the German Historical Institute, the German Academic Exchange Program, and the American Philosophical Society, as well as many other institutions. These applications will be submitted by February 2016.

Evaluating Success

1. Two journal articles are in print or have been accepted for publication by the end of the 2015 calendar year
2. Two additional journal articles and/or book chapters have been completed (though not necessarily submitted)
3. Two academic conferences have been attended (already accomplished)
4. The monograph proposal and/or manuscript has been continuously under consideration during the 2015 calendar year
5. Self-reported charts demonstrate that the target amounts of time spent writing and researching have been met