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We hire graduate students from all divisions and programs,

to teach students from all divisions and programs.

NB: We hire graduate students who are covered by the terms of their Pedagogical Teaching Plans and those who are not covered by said plans. Please check with your department to see if Writing Program positions are covered by the terms of your Pedagogical Teaching Plan. Some departments have asked students who want to teach outside their Pedagogical Teaching Plans to follow departmental policies for accepting opportunities outside their departments. Please check with your department to see if it has developed such a policy.

**Applications for 2022-23 Academic Year**

## Opportunities Available to Graduate Students - Brief Descriptions

**Application Deadline: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 at 12pm CST**

We offer several teaching positions for graduate students:

1. **Writing Interns in the Humanities Core** are graduate students who assist faculty by providing writing instruction in first-year Humanities Common Core courses. Writing Interns typically work for two quarters of an academic year (Autumn and Winter), depending on scheduling and course demand. These appointments are ordinarily renewable. To work as a Writing Intern, you must complete a training course in Spring 2022 or Summer 2022. The training course is available for credit if you wish (HUMA 50000).

2. **Lectors** are graduate students teaching as Course Assistants in our advanced writing course ENGL 13000/33000: Academic and Professional Writing (a.k.a. Little Red Schoolhouse). Lectors typically work one or two quarters a year, depending on scheduling and course demand. Lectors may also have opportunities to work in summer quarter. To work as a Lector, you must complete a training course in Autumn 2022. This course may be taken for course credit (ENGL 50300). After you have taught as a Lector, you are automatically eligible to teach as a Humanities Writing Intern, or as a Lector in other courses.

3. **Writing** **Tutors** are graduate students who work individually with students in the Common Core sequences. The Writing Tutor appointment is for one quarter and it is ordinarily renewable each quarter, as Writing Tutor appointments are available in Autumn, Winter, and Spring quarters. Writing Tutors will participate in a training course in Spring or Summer 2022. After successfully completing their training, Writing Tutors may also be eligible to work as Humanities Writing Interns. Writing Tutor positions do not count toward students’ Pedagogical Teaching Plans.

**For more information about the Lector, Writing Intern and Writing Tutor positions, see** [**writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs**](http://writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs)

**General Qualifications**

1. To teach as a Lector, Writing Intern, or Writing Tutor you must in most cases be enrolled in a graduate degree program at the University of Chicago. Students in the fifth year of Ph.D. study or beyond may be eligible for tuition grants. You need not be in advanced residency to apply and to work in these positions.   
     
   We ask all graduate students to check with their departments to determine whether Lector or Writing Intern positions will count toward their Pedagogical Teaching Plan, and whether they are eligible to teach with the Writing Program outside of their Pedagogical Teaching Plan (if applicable).
2. Current MAPH, MAPSS, and CIR applicants are an exception to our general qualifications about current enrollment in a degree program by special arrangement. We welcome your application!
3. MAPH applicants who are incoming students must receive permission from their graduate departments prior to applying for 2022-23 Writing Program positions*.*
4. **We welcome applicants from throughout the University.** You do not need prior experience teaching writing; you do not need to be in a literature department; you do not need to have been an undergraduate major in rhetoric, composition, or literary studies. You do not need to be a native English speaker.

## Application Components & Procedure

**The application requires the following six components:**

1. **One Letter of Recommendation**

The letter of recommendation should be from someone familiar with your teaching or your potential as a teacher. It's less important to get a letter from someone who can speak to the quality of your scholarly work than it is to get a letter evaluating the way you interact in a classroom.

If you have no previous teaching experience, we suggest you ask someone who has seen you participate in a class, seminar, or workshop. The letter does not have to be from a member of the University of Chicago faculty, so if you have teaching experience at another institution, a letter from a faculty member there may be best. A second letter of recommendation is permitted, but not at all required.

Please ask your recommendation writer to send the letter by email to[**writing-program@uchicago.edu**](mailto:writing-program@uchicago.edu)by the application deadline. Recommendations may not be accepted after Friday, February 12th.

You will submit all your other materials (below) to us on the Writing Program website by the application deadline. Prepare the five materials below **before** you start submitting them on our website, as they must be submitted at the same time.

1. **Personal Statement and Cover Sheet**

In 1-2 pages (single-spaced), please let us know about your writing and revision experiences, your approach to writing, and/or anything else you think relevant. The cover sheet is included in this packet.

1. **Resumé or Curriculum Vitae (CV)**

A resumé or CV detailing your education and teaching experience.

1. **Writing Sample and Cover Sheet.**

7-10 pages (double-spaced). You are welcome to submit a *portion* of a longer paper.

Do NOT put your name on this. The cover sheet is included in this packet.

1. **Sample Student Paper Comment**

The paper itself is included in this packet. Do NOT put your name on this. If Microsoft Word automatically inserts your name anywhere in the file, rest assured that we will take care to anonymize it before distributing the application for review.

You may take up to an hour to comment on the paper, using any combination of end comments and marginal comments that you think appropriate. We ask you to pretend you're writing to the *author* of the paper, *not* to us. We're interested in how you engage with the writer, and the way you use the paper comment as an opportunity to teach the writer something about writing.

When you have all of these items assembled and you are ready to fill out the application form, you may do so here:[**https://writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs/apply**](https://writing-program.uchicago.edu/content/writing-program-application-submission)

## FORMS FOR APPLICATION MATERIALS BELOW

### Cover Sheet One: Personal Statement Cover Sheet

Please create a copy of this cover sheet as a separate Word file and submit it with your other application materials.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Your first name:** | **Your last name:** | **Your email:** |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommender's name and email**: |
|  |

**Personal Statement**

In 1-2 pages (single-spaced), let us know about your writing and revision experiences, your approach to writing, and/or anything else you think relevant. You may paste your statement below or include it in a separate document.

### Cover Sheet Two: Cover Sheet for Writing Sample

Office Use Only: Application number\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please paste this cover sheet to the beginning of your writing sample. To allow us to judge this portion of your application anonymously, **please do not include your name on this cover sheet or the writing sample itself.**

1. Is your submission (part of) a:

\_\_dissertation chapter \_\_journal article \_\_conference paper

\_\_ paper for coursework

\_\_other:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Please provide a brief synopsis of the piece you have submitted: what is your overall argument, and/or

what are the main points that you’re trying to communicate to your readers?

3. Is this an excerpt of a larger project? If so, how does it fit into the larger project?

4. Who are your intended readers? What disciplines are you writing for, and what might your imagined audiences care about? [For example: perhaps you’re writing for a Sociology audience, but also for a more interdisciplinary audience of scholars interested in urban studies.]

5. What about the piece are you most happy with?

6. Few writers believe their writing is perfect. You may feel that a central concept eluded description, or that a key paragraph escaped all bounds of rational structure, or that a sensitive issue might not have been framed in the best possible way. In a paragraph or less, please tell us what about this piece gave you the most difficulty as a writer.

**Sample Student Paper for Commenting**

For this portion of the application, we ask you to spend **no more than 80 minutes** to read the sample student paper below and perform two kinds of tasks, detailed below.

**Context for this paper**: Your student, Jamie, has sent the following draft to you and would like feedback. Don’t feel that you need to demonstrate to us everything you know about writing; likewise, this is not a copyediting test. We are more interested in what you would do to support this student’s growth as a writer.

**Task 1: Diagnosing the Paper for Us.**

After reading the sample paper, use the template below to list *for us* two writing skills that you believe the student has already mastered fairly well and two to three writing issues that you believe should be priorities for this student over the course of the quarter. Use the template provided below and limit yourself to about 50 words per item. Please spend no more than 20 minutes on Task 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Writing Skills the Student Displayed | Writing Issues the Student Should Work On |
| 1. | 1. |
| 2. | 2. |
|  | 3. |

**Task 2: Write a Paper Comment to the Student.** Write a fairly long, detailed comment (about 3/4s of a page, single-spaced) meant for the student writer, Jamie. You’re welcome to include bubble comments as part of your feedback to the student. For this comment, use the paper as an occasion to teach the student one or at most two writing skills you believe will help the student address a writing issue you identified in Task 1. (Don't forget, the student won't have access to what you've written for us in Task 1. Anything you want the student to understand about their writing will have to be explained in the paper comment.)

While your comment should keep in mind that this is a draft that can be revised, your comment should, at the same time, teach the student something about writing that they can use in future papers. Please spend no more than 60 minutes on Task 2.

**Submit Comment 1 and 2 as one Word document.**

*-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Personal Identity in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*

As much as *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is a suspense story, it is also a philosophical look into identity and accountability. Any reading of it will inevitably raise the question of the degree to which Jekyll and Hyde are the same person. Is Hyde a separate entity from Jekyll, or simply an excuse to himself and the world for Jekyll to act out his dark wishes. There is no clear answer to this question, but due to Jekyll and Hyde’s shared consciousness and the uncertain nature of Jekyll’s rejection of Hyde’s actions, it is more likely that they are the same person than not. So, while arguments that Jekyll and Hyde are the same or different person both can appeal to Locke’s definition of personal identity, due to the the strong evidence of their shared conscience and Jekyll’s accountability for Hyde’s actions, as well as Locke’s allowance for a person to share two bodies, it is more plausible that they are the same.

There are several indications in the final chapter of Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, in which Jekyll provides a narration of his experiment, that suggest that Jekyll feels he and Hyde are the same person, implying that, according to Locke’s theory, they are in fact the same person. One early indication is that for much of his narration, he describes both Jekyll’s and Hyde’s experiences in the first person. This indicates that at the very least, Jekyll feels that he shares an identity with Hyde. In addition, the fact that Jekyll leaves all of his belongings to Hyde in his will is strong evidence that he feels he will be able to continue to enjoy these belongings in the body of Hyde, suggesting that he feels he continues to be himself even when he appears as Hyde. According to Locke’s definition of person, the fact that Jekyll feels as though he and Hyde are the same person is evidence that they are the same person. Locke describes the concept of person as “a thinking intelligent Being, that… can consider it self as it self, the same thinking thing in different times and places…” To Locke, a person is a thinking substance that can consider it self the same self at different points in time. The fact that Jekyll consistently treats Hyde as himself indicates that he considers himself to be the same person as Hyde, which, according to Locke, indicates they are the same person.

Admittedly, Jekyll does after a point describe the actions of Hyde in the third person, which may, to Locke’s theory of self, suggest that they cease to be the same at this point. However, throughout the entire chapter he still demonstrates that he is conscious of all of Hyde’s actions. Because Jekyll cannot be present at any of the events he describes regarding Hyde, Jekyll’s consciousness of these events must come from Hyde’s consciousness of the events, so they must be the same consciousness. This shared consciousness of events, according to Locke, is still indicative of a connection of personal identity. Locke writes, “Whatever has the consciousness of present and past actions is the same Person to whom they both belong.” Jekyll is conscious of his present action of writing his narrative and has consciousness of the past actions of Hyde. So, because of this connection of consciousness, Jekyll and Hyde are the same person.

Even so, there is a key piece of evidence in Jekyll’s narration that supports the notion that he and Hyde are in fact not the same person. Jekyll goes to great lengths to separate himself from the actions of Hyde. He claims, on Hyde’s misdeeds, that “It was Hyde, after all, and Hyde alone, that was guilty. Jekyll was no worse; he woke again to his good qualities seemingly unimpaired; he would even make haste, where it was possible, to undo the evil done by Hyde.” Jekyll here clearly demonstrates that he does not hold himself accountable for the actions of Hyde. According to Locke’s concept of personal identity, this is evidence that Jekyll and Hyde are in fact not the same person. He argues that “whatever past Actions [a person] cannot reconcile or appropriate to that present self by consciousness, it can be no more concerned in, then if they had never been done…”. The fact that Jekyll does not attribute Hyde’s actions to his own present consciousness indicates that those actions are not a reflection of that present consciousness, though they are a reflection of Hyde, suggesting that Jekyll and Hyde are the same person. Despite their shared consciousness, this difference in accountability suggests that they are two different persons.

However, Jekyll’s protestations can be viewed in a different light, suggesting he may not be telling the truth. It is clear throughout Jekyll’s narration that he is concerned with demonstrating his innocence. Not only does he try to establish that he is not accountable for Hyde’s actions, he also attempts to portray himself as a victim, claiming “no one has ever suffered such torments” as he has. Because of Jekyll’s motive to show his innocence, and his history of lying in hiding the truth about Hyde, it is likely that he would be willing to lie about his accountability for Hyde’s actions in order to support his goal. So, any claim by Jekyll that he does not feel accountable for Hyde’s actions should not be wholly trusted. In fact, there is self admitted evidence that he has felt accountable for the things Hyde has done. He recounts that when transforming back to Jekyll after Hyde had killed Carew, “The pangs of transformation had not done tearing him, before Henry Jekyll, streaming tears of gratitude and remorse, had fallen upon his knees and lifted his clasped hands to God.” This admission of remorse is evidence that Jekyll feels to accountable to some degree for the murder.

The nature of Hyde’s existence is also evidence that Jekyll in fact does own the actions taken by Hyde. Jekyll begins his narration by describing his struggle with reconciling the upright and less upright parts of his mind, coming to the conclusion that “man is not truly one, but truly two.” This struggle is what inspires his experiment. He writes, “If each [part of the mind],… could but be housed in separate identities, life would be relieved of all that was unbearable; the unjust might go his way, delivered from the aspirations and remorse of his more upright twin; and the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path.” So, in this light, Hyde is born entirely out of Jekyll’s malicious thoughts and tendencies, meaning that all of Hyde’s tendencies and actions to some degree come from Jekyll. However, despite his success in generating Hyde, Jekyll notes that he himself remains his initial blend of good and bad, and not a likewise wholly good person, writing the he “was still the old Henry Jekyll, that incongruous compound of whose reformation and improvement I had already learned to despair”. Jekyll still maintains all of the aspects of Hyde he had tried to separate. So, all of Hyde’s thoughts and inclinations still come from suppressed thoughts and inclinations of Jekyll’s, meaning any actions taken by Hyde must to some degree emerge from a desire on the part of Jekyll. Jekyll’s desire to remove these tendencies indicate that he owned these tendencies at the time, and the fact that the experiment does not change him suggests he continues to own them. So, although Jekyll may not admit it, it is likely that he feels accountable for Hyde’s actions, as they are inspired by his own malicious tendencies. So, as Jekyll and Hyde clearly share a consciousness, and likely share accountability for their actions, it is most likely that they are the same person, according to Locke’s concept of self.

Locke’s theory also allows reconciliation between the concept of Jekyll and Hyde being the same person but having two different figures. It is widely agreed by all who meet Hyde that his appearance is different from that of Jekyll; he said to be a short man with a distinctively evil countenance. One could argue that according to Locke, Jekyll and Hyde are different “men” due to their difference in figure. He writes, “Identity of the same *Man* consists in nothing but a participation of the same continued Life, by constantly fleeting Particles of Matter, in succession vitally united to the same organized body.” Because the particles that make up Hyde are organized into a different form than Jekyll, it could be argued that the two do not fit Locke’s idea of the same man. Nonetheless, even this potential contradiction is not a problem in questioning if they are the same person. In fact, Locke devotes a section to the thought experiment of the same consciousness existing in two different bodies. He writes, “should the soul of a Prince, carrying with it the consciousness of the Prince’s past Life, enter and inform the Body of a Cobler,… he would be the same person as the prince.” According to Locke, if the same consciousness is transferred from one physical body to another, the person inhabiting the two bodies would be the same. So, although Jekyll and Hyde have drastically different figures, (which according to Locke makes them different “men”), they are still the the same person.

There are quality arguments to make on both sides of the question, and even this conclusion is not a certain one; it is only that one argument is better than the other. It is clear from Jekyll’s clear memory of Hyde’s experiences that they share a consciousness, and although Jekyll does not admit it, there is evidence that he does own accountability for Hyde’s actions. Therefore, although there is some evidence to the contrary, it is certainly more likely that Jeykll and Hyde are the same person than not.

## 

## Deadlines and Further Information

The Winter 2022 application **deadline** is **Wednesday, February 2, 2022 at 12pm CST.**

Once we receive your application, it will be assigned a number, and will be identified to the application readers only by that number. The writing sample and paper comment will be rated without any knowledge of who you are. Each application will be read by two people within the Writing Program.

**For more information about our open positions** and the **application** **process**, see writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs

or **contact us at** [**writing-program@uchicago.edu**](mailto:writing-program@uchicago.edu)**.**

## We will be holding two information sessions in Winter Quarter regarding teaching opportunities with the Writing Program:

## Wednesday, January 12th from 12pm-1pm CST

## Wednesday, January 26th from 4:30pm-5:30pm CST

## We will post more information about these sessions [on our website](https://writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs/)

## and in GRADGuide Weekly in early January.

## Detailed Descriptions of Writing Program Opportunities

### Lector: Academic & Professional Writing

(a.k.a. The Little Red Schoolhouse or "LRS")

**Position Description**.

The Little Red Schoolhouse is a course in advanced writing for upper-level undergraduates and graduate students. At the undergraduate level, it addresses the needs of third and fourth-year students who are preparing for advanced writing challenges, including writing a B.A. thesis, applying to graduate school, and applying to professional school. The course meets twice weekly (T/Th, 2:00-3:20pm). Each week students attend one lecture given by the LRS faculty, and one Lector-run writing seminar with no more than **7 students**. The seminar discussions focus on students’ weekly writing assignments. Lector responsibilities include preparing for and leading the seminar discussions, reading and commenting on all weekly papers, and recommending both paper and course grades. Lectors may also hold occasional office hours and meet with students to discuss individual problems.

Commitment:

1. Attending one lecture each week

2. Preparing for and leading one writing seminar each week

3. Submitting written comments for 7 papers each week

**Training**. Lectors are required to attend a quarter-long training course in **Autumn quarter.** In the past, this course has met on Monday afternoons from 3-5:50 PM. This course may be taken for credit (ENGL 50300). In addition, during their first quarters of work, Lectors are required to attend the weekly lectures with their students.

**Compensation** In 2021-22, Lectors earned a base salary of $3,000 per quarter. Some advanced graduate students may be eligible for a higher salary as determined by their Dean of Students. Lectors in the fifth year of Ph.D. study and beyond may be eligible for tuition remission in the quarters they work (check with your Division). We ask all graduate students to check with their departments to determine whether Lector positions will count toward their Pedagogical Teaching Plan, and whether they are eligible to teach with the Writing Program outside of their Pedagogical Teaching Plan (if applicable).

**Further Opportunities.** Once you have worked as a Lector and received satisfactory evaluations from the Writing Program and from your students, you may continue working as a Lector at either the undergraduate or graduate level. You may also work as a Writing Intern in the Humanities Common Core. You will not need to reapply to the Writing Program to obtain these positions.

**Special Qualifications.** The least important qualification is prior experience or an extensive background in teaching English. We have found that the most important qualifications are an analytical mind and the ability to work with undergraduates in a friendly and courteous way. About two-thirds of the Lectors selected regularly come from outside the Humanities Division.

**Term of Appointment**: Winter and/or Spring 2023; possible positions for Summer 2023. Lectors are appointed quarterly, and reappointment is contingent on satisfactory performance.

### Writing Intern: Humanities Core

**Position Description.** The chief responsibility of the Humanities Writing Intern is to provide a writing component in a Humanities Common Core section of approximately **17-19 students**. Graduate students from all divisions and programs are eligible to apply. The Writing Intern assists the University faculty member who teaches the section. The duties of Writing Interns will vary, but generally they read the course texts and attend class, read and comment on student papers, and teach writing in small seminar groups. Writing Interns will often have the opportunity to lead one or two discussions of texts in the main class.

Writing Interns divide their class into seminar groups of no more than 7 students, and meet with each of these seminar groups three times. Each seminar meeting lasts an 80 minutes.

Commitment:

1. Attending and reading for two class discussions per week

2. Preparing for and leading 9 small group seminars over the quarter

3. Writing paper comments on half of the student papers (split with instructor).

**Training**. Writing Interns must complete a quarter-long training seminar in **Spring or Summer quarter of 2022.** The seminar will require approximately 3 hours per week of class time and 2 hours per week of preparation. The training may be taken for course credit (HUMA 50000).

**Compensation.** In AY 2021-22, Writing Interns received a base salary of $3,000 per section per quarter. Some advanced graduate students may be eligible for a higher salary as determined by their Dean of Students. Writing Interns in the fifth year of Ph.D. study and beyond may be eligible for tuition remission in the quarters they work. We ask all graduate students to check with their departments to determine whether Writing Intern positions will count toward their Pedagogical Teaching Plan, and whether they are eligible to teach with the Writing Program outside of their Pedagogical Teaching Plan (if applicable).

**Further Opportunities.** Once you have worked as a Writing Intern and received satisfactory evaluations from the Writing Program and from your students, you are eligible for re-appointment as a Writing Intern in future quarters. You need not reapply to the Writing Program to be re-appointed as a Writing Intern, and you may take quarters off and return as your availability dictates.

**Special Qualifications.** You do not necessarily need specialized knowledge of the scholarly work done on the texts in a particular Humanities Core Course. Such knowledge helps, of course, but we have found that the most important qualifications are an analytical mind, the ability to read challenging texts carefully, and the ability to work with undergraduates in a friendly and courteous way.

**Term of Appointment**. Autumn and/or Winter quarter. Writing Interns are appointed quarterly, and reappointment is contingent on satisfactory performance.

### College Core Writing Tutors

**Position Description.** Writing Tutors provide writing support on a one-on-one basis to writers in the Common Core sequences. They’re not copyeditors or proofreaders; instead, Writing Tutors work with writers on individual papers in order to help improve writers' overall skills in academic argumentation and structure.

Writing Tutors can:

* Help writers brainstorm on how to get started on a paper or how to best approach a paper assignment or prompt, particularly in terms of how to construct an argument.
* Read a full or partial draft of a paper and comment on its overall argumentation (use of textual evidence, logical flow of argument, persuasive placement of points, etc.).
* Read a full or partial draft of a paper and comment on its organization, both globally and at the paragraph level.
* Make suggestions for how to revise a paper for greater coherence, clarity, and persuasiveness of argument.

Writing Tutors can work one to three 4-hour shifts per week in the Arley D. Cathey North Reading Room. Shifts are offered in the afternoons and evenings, Sundays through Fridays from Week 2 through Week 11 (Finals). Tutoring may also occur over Zoom If circumstances require us to do so.

Commitment:

1. Teach writing on a one-on-one basis to College Core students during a 4-hour shift each week for 10 weeks.

**Training.**  In Spring or Summer 2022, Writing Tutors attend the training course provided for Writing Interns (HUMA 50000). Writing Tutors also attend brief staff meetings 1-2 times each quarter.

**Compensation.** The beginning salary for Writing Tutors is $17.00 per hour. Writing Tutors receive a $0.50 per hour raise for each quarter they continue to work, up to $23.00 per hour. The Writing Tutor position is not eligible for tuition remission, and does not count toward students’ Pedagogical Teaching Plans.

**Term of Appointment**. Autumn and/or Winter quarter, with more limited availability in Spring. Writing Tutors are appointed quarterly, and reappointment is contingent on satisfactory performance.