

Assignment 3

Tori White

Group Presentation

Now that we all have some experience working with early modern books in the Special Collections, it's time to tackle a larger, more complex research project! The good news is that you'll work on this project with 2-3 of your classmates so that you can share the labor. The other good news is that you'll work on the project in stages, so that you don't get overwhelmed.

When it comes to conducting the research for the presentation, **you'll have to do both kinds of collaboration**: the kind where you all physically get in one place at one time and work together, and the kind where you divvy up the work that you have to do.

Aside from the 8-10 minute group presentation, the tangible finished products of this collaboration will be a research proposal, an annotated bibliography, and presentation slides.

Part I: The Proposal

First, your group will select a text from UCD's Special Collections. **The text must have been printed between 1500 and 1700, and a substantial portion of the text must be devoted to lyric poetry.** For example, Fulke Greville's *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes* would work because, although it contains many non-lyric works, it contains the entirety of Greville's sonnet sequence *Caelica*. On the other hand, Shakespeare's second Folio would not work because it contains only a few poems dedicated to Shakespeare—not enough lyric poetry, in other words. The amount of lyric matters because your research should link our interests in the forms, moods, tropes, and themes of Renaissance lyric poetry to our interests in material culture and books as cultural artifacts. Please also take into consideration the fact that each of you will later write a paper on (or at least related to) this text, so choose wisely.

As soon as your group has selected a text, **email me the title, author, and call number for my approval.** I will not let more than one group work on the same text, so don't delay. If you can't or don't want to make a decision for yourselves, let me know ASAP and I will select a text for you.

Once I give you the go-ahead, write your proposal.

The proposal should be **300-500 words** long, and it should answer the following questions:

1. What are the basics of your text? Year and location of publication, language(s), author(s), genres, etc? (Include much of what you would write in an Archival Assignment).
2. Why have you selected this text? What makes it interesting or worth our time? Why do further research on this text?

3. What do you hope to find out about this text, both as a literary work and as an object that was produced in a particular place and time? List at least three specific questions that you think you might be able to tackle.

4. What resources do you think you will use in your research? **List at least three resources that you plan to consult.**

The proposal is due Week 5b, submitted in class as a hard copy.

Part II: The Annotated Bibliography

The annotated bibliography will be a group-authored document that lists the following:

- Every source you consulted (whether you actually read it or not)
- Which group member(s) found, skimmed, and/or read it
- How it will or won't be useful to your particular project

Your annotated bibliography should list 15-25 academic or scholarly sources.

A sample entry from your annotated bibliography should look something like this:

De Grazia, Margreta and Peter Stallybrass, "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text,"
Shakespeare Quarterly 44.3, 1993. 255-83.

This article was read by Bobby and Suzy, who learned x, y, and z. Concept p was a little too complicated for our short presentation (though it was totally fascinating), so for our presentation, we chose to focus on concept q.

For an article, book, or chapter that you didn't actually read, you can say things like this:

- Skimmed by Tammy and Timmy. They deemed it unsuitable for our project because of reasons x, y, and z. May be of interest to researchers working on a, b, or c.
- Jack and Jill read the abstract, and although the article sounded interesting for reasons x, y, and z, they ultimately chose not to read it for reasons a, b, and c.

The annotated bibliography is due Week 6b, submitted in class as a hard copy.

Part III: The Group Presentation

The end product of your collaboration will be the presentation.

Your presentation must:

- last 8-10 minutes (at minute 12 I will bang the proverbial gong)
- introduce us to the text with slides that share key quotations and images
- be informative and analytical (but not discussion-focused)
- summarize 1-2 scholarly interpretations of this text from the last 15 years
- involve every member of the group (not just in the preparation stages, but in the presentation stage as well)

- contain a penultimate slide of study questions for the final exam*
- contain a concluding slide with an MLA-formatted works cited page

* **On the study questions:** The information that your group presents will be fair game for the final exam for this course. With that in mind, and as a group, please **prepare a list of 3-5 short answer questions** that you think would be appropriate for the exam.

This exercise will be good for you because it will encourage you to reflect on what you want the class to get out of your presentation. What do you want people to know or be able to describe, identify, or recall about your text? This question should guide you as you prepare your presentation.

It is possible that at least one of the questions that you generate will appear, verbatim, on the final exam.

Epilogue:
Memo to the Instructor from the Student

When all your collaborative work is submitted and you have given your presentation, you must complete an assessment sheet for **each** of your group mates.

Your name:

The name of the group member that you are assessing:

Please rate your group member on a scale of 4 (HIGH) to 1 (LOW) for the following categories:

Planning, Organization, and Communication: 1 2 3 4

Research: 1 2 3 4

Feedback (suggestions, questions, and constructive criticism): 1 2 3 4

Writing: 1 2 3 4

Editing: 1 2 3 4

Presentation Persona: 1 2 3 4

Teamwork: 1 2 3 4

It may be that someone's contribution to the collaborative effort was 100% valid without fitting neatly into one of these categories. Or it may be that someone satisfactorily does everything on this sheet, but is nevertheless difficult to work with. So if you want to rate someone according to "Other," please use descriptive sentences rather than a 1-4 scale.

Other:

Additional Comments?