



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2011
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

- I. Approval of the minutes, February 16, 2011 meeting
 - II. Approval of the agenda, March 23, 2011 meeting
 - III. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Lewis
 - IV. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Elections Committee, L. Edwards
 - i. Nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals
 - ii. Nominations for the Grievance Committee
 - b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis
 - c. Teaching Evaluation Committee, J. Geringer
 - V. Old Business
 - VI. New Business
 - VII. University Welfare
 - VIII. Announcements by Deans and other Administrative Officers
 - IX. Announcements by Interim Provost Bradley
 - X. Announcements by President Barron
-

FIRST MEETING OF THE NEW FACULTY SENATE YEAR
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 23, 2011
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. **Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, March 23, 2011. Faculty Senate President Eric Walker presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Ahlquist, G. Allen, B. Altman, D. Bernat, J. Bowers, M. Burmester, K. Burnett, J. Carbonell, W. Carlson, T. Chapin, E. Chicken, I. Chiorescu, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, A. Darrow, R. Doel, G. Doran, J. Dorsey, I. Eberstein, C. Edrington, L. Edwards, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, A. Gaiser, J. Geringer, K. Harris, R. Hauber, C. Hofacker, P. Iatarola, R. Ikard, B. Jackson, T. Keller, J. Koslow, D. Latham, B. Lee, S. Leitch, S. Lewis, J. Lickson, T. Lindbloom, W. Logan, L. Lyons, T. Ma, C. Madsen, H. Mattoussi, T. McQuade, W. Mio, D. Moore, N. Piquero, M. Radey, V. Richard Auzenne, J. Saltiel, R. Schwartz, J. Standley, G. Tenenbaum, D. Tsilimingras, R. Van Engelen, D. Von Glahn, E. Walker.

The following members were absent. Alternates are listed in parenthesis:

T. Baker, E. Baumer, P. Born, P. Bowen, A. Chan Hilton, D. Cooper, M. Craig, J. Dawkins, J. Diaz, R. Eger, S. Foo, K. Gallivan, L. Garcia-Roig, D. Gilbert, G. Houlihan, E. Hull, H. Kim, Y. Kim, T. Kolbe, W. Landing (**P. Froelich**), M. Leeser, J. Leiber, T. Matherly, B. Menchetti (**A. Gallard**), M. Mesterton-Gibbons (**A. Agashe**), R. Mizelle, A. Mullis (**C. Readdick**), J. O'Rourke, R. Pekurny, T. Plewa, R. Radach, G. Rogachev, J. Sickinger, L. Spainhour, T. Stallins, F. Tolson, J. Tull (**L. Dudley**), G. Tyson, C. Upchurch (**A. Avina**), O. Vafek, S. Valisa (**E. Alvarez**), I. Zanini-Cordi.

II. **Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the February 16, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. **Approval of the Agenda**

The amended agenda was approved.

IV. Special Order: Provost Search Committee, D. Gibson

Thank you for this time, I'll give you a brief overview. You'll be happy to know that Eric was on the committee and attended the meetings. Eric was at the last meeting where we got quite a bit of business done. Last Friday was our third meeting, our first meeting was more of an organizational meeting, our second meeting we approved the search committee and established a document to be used as a search form. After those two initial meetings there was a long period of time that went by about the process of attracting our candidates and so forth. When we got to our meeting on Friday we had two lists, and in fact these are on the website, and I encourage you all to stay tuned to the website. We've come to the point in the search where things will happen pretty quickly and things can be moving as we move forward. If you just put "provost search" in the fsu web you will find this site and it has the minutes and so forth, and within 24 hours it will have a list of the individuals chosen to go for off-campus interviews. We're probably somewhere between 8 and 10 candidates. But to give you more info there were two lists posted where candidates' names were released. One was "candidates", and one list was "nominees". Candidates actually applied, nominees allowed their credentials to be posted to the website but had not at that point applied. I think it's appropriate that a lot of the action had to do with the nominees. These are the types of people that are going to expose themselves too quickly in a search process like this. In any event, we are just waiting for Witt/Kieffer to confirm with each of the individuals chosen with the committee to ensure that they are interested in proceeding with the understanding that if they choose to do that they will be public at that point.

So with that, we plan to have one more meeting which will be next week. We have a set of interview questions that have been drafted and amended by a couple of us, going through the committee and trying to work those things out, the finer details, on Tuesday of next week. Wednesday we will all be driving down to Orlando, and Thursday and Friday we will have two complete days of off-campus interviews. Some of these candidates had an opportunity to talk with our President, and I think everyone felt like that was a very good thing, I certainly did. It would never be a good outcome to pursue candidates that would not be a good fit with the President, we need that to work well, obviously, plus the fact that this candidate is going to have to work with all the constituents as well. So I think we are feeling pretty good about the process so far. I think Witt/Kieffer has done a good job for us. I think they did a good job with info about the candidates beyond what was available on the website. I think the committee felt well-informed and in a position to make reasonably good judgments.

Is the website confidential?

Once it's on the website it's not confidential. Once you're a faculty you have contact to the website, so everything is there and there's no reason to go any further than that to send out emails. So inform your colleagues to get info from the website and we will do our best to make sure it's updated as much as possible.

There was a date there, but this is a fluid process. We get to the point of doing off-campus interviews and we get to the point where we get a cohort and we choose from there.

Were there nominees not listed on the website?

There could have been, yes. Those would have been nominated but decided not to pursue.

So none of those who are currently part of the process are not on the website?

There could be one, but I'll be sure by tomorrow. They said they would be done by tonight so when you see the list, that will be the list.

A very last minute entry wouldn't be surprising, so we're all staying tuned.

Would you review with this group the time table?

The big week you need to be alert to is April 11th, because this is when on-campus interviews would occur. You can be sure there will be lots of opportunities to meet at least 5.

In a search like this you can start with 8 people and then be down to 6. The people we are identifying have been in the marketplace, some may look at other opportunities, some may pull out. So the committee made a decision to make this as conclusive as it can be at the airport stage. To make sure we were covering the ground and not leaving anything on the ground. But we will make sure we didn't miss an opportunity.

V. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Lewis

Good afternoon. In the month since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Steering Committee met together three times and had a fourth meeting this morning with President Barron. In addition, we provided input to the Board of Trustees when they met on March 3rd.

At the Board of Trustees meeting, both Dr. Barron and I, on behalf of the Steering Committee, spoke about the potential impact on FSU faculty and staff of additional legislative budget cuts and the possibility of increased contributions for benefits. Dr. Barron emphasized that the number of assistant professors is now near 200, down 32% from 2007. He called that situation a "ticket to mediocrity" that has the potential to haunt the university for decades if not corrected immediately. As your representative, my focus was on comparing faculty salaries at FSU with those at public and private institutions across the country. Only at the assistant professor level are we even close to being competitive. Later in the day, our colleague, Ross Ellington, bragged to the Trustees about many of the research and creative accomplishments that faculty at FSU have received and about the "balanced portfolio" that FSU offers with its diverse faculty. The messages that the members of the Board of Trustees heard were powerful and, we hope that they will share them with legislators and policy makers with whom they talk and do business.

Interim Provost Bradley joined the Steering Committee on February 23rd to discuss issues related to the establishment and management of interdisciplinary programs and their courses. We mentioned many of the issues that have been raised here about course approval, funding, the academic homes of faculty participants, student credit hours, governance, etc. Dr. Bradley agreed that there needs to be policies for these interdisciplinary programs and offered to speak to President Barron about the problem. We spoke this morning with President Barron about this issue and indicated that interdisciplinary programs are key to many of the “Big Ideas” that have been proposed for the fundraising campaign and confirmed that there need to be mechanisms in place to guide these programs. He is going to appoint a small committee to consider what mechanisms might be appropriate. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee is eager to help with this project.

Two points of information may be of interest to you. First, the Steering Committee approved bulletin language recommended by the Graduate Policy Committee to implement the revisions to the policies for dissertation defenses on which we voted at our last Faculty Senate meeting. Second, we learned that the University is beginning to use an online AOR system this spring. Eventually, it is supposed to be tied to FACET, which might reduce some of the discrepancies that occur between effort reporting and assignment.

John Geringer brought to the Steering Committee the proposal you will hear later today from the Teaching Evaluation Committee. It is assumed that the topic of evaluation of teaching will be raised again after the new provost arrives and gets settled.

The Steering Committee reviewed Resolution 11 from the Student Senate regarding the issues of the high costs of textbooks. The Steering Committee shares the concern expressed by the resolution and reaffirms its interest in providing high quality materials at as low a price as feasible.

We learned that 31 individuals, 18 of whom were faculty, accepted the Voluntary Separation offer. We were saddened to hear that among those who couldn't resist the VSP was Dr. Anne Rowe, who has served as Dean of the Faculties since 2003. Her retirement from that position, which will be effective May 31st, was announced yesterday at the Deans' and Chairs' meeting. Dr. Rowe has been a friend of our faculty and will definitely be missed.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Elections Committee, L. Edwards

1. Nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals

There were no additional nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals.

2. Nominations for the Grievance Committee

There were no additional nominations for the Grievance Committee.

b. **Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis**

I have two items to report today. First, the Multicultural Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Policy Committee reviewed the syllabus for *HFT 2062: International Wine and Culture* and approved this course as meeting the criteria for the multicultural designation as a cross-cultural, or X course, effective Spring, 2011.

In addition, the appropriate Undergraduate Policy Committee subcommittee reviewed *ENG 3600: Hollywood Cinema* (see addendum 1) and recommended approval of this course as meeting the criteria for Liberal Studies Area IV (Humanities and Fine Arts). If there are no questions, on behalf of the UPC, I move approval of this course for Liberal Studies Area IV, effective for the Fall, 2011 semester. **The motion passed.**

c. **Teaching Evaluation Committee**

See addendum 2.

The motion passed.

VII. **Old Business**

There were no items of old business.

VIII. **New Business**

There were no items of new business.

IX. **University Welfare**

a. Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito

New Collective Bargaining Agreement (*still* forthcoming).

I regret to report that the message on this from last month still applies: Progress is being made in getting new printed collective bargaining agreements. We should be able to post a complete copy within days and I hope that we can distribute printed copies next month.

NTTF Reclassification

A working document reflecting the considerable efforts of the Joint BOT-UFF Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Reclassification is posted at the

UFF-FSU “Bargaining News” web page as announced yesterday. The Committee has been attempting to find agreeable procedures and language to implement the recommendations of the Faculty Senate’s NTTF report of 2007. There are still some areas where the Joint Committee has not yet found mutually satisfactory wording, but I trust that they will. Hopefully by May, the Committee will offer a final report to the BOT and UFF bargaining teams. As you can see in the working document, much of the Committee’s attention has been focused on how the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) will change. If the bargaining teams reach agreement, ratification by the BOT and faculty is the next step. Then, the Florida Public Employees Relations Commission will be asked to approve changes that involve its previous rulings in defining our General Faculty Bargaining Unit. Yes, it is complicated!

Assuming reasonable progress and eventual success in these matters, some of the key changes will include:

- Continuing Multi-Year Agreements for NTTF after promotion (“rolling contracts”)
- Honorific “professor” titles for NTTF with appropriate tenured faculty members’ approval
- Rationalized position classification titles, and appropriate working titles, both reflecting the mission-specific roles (e.g., teaching, research, research support, or service) of most NTTF
- Mechanisms for reclassification of current NTTF and for possible conversion of NTTF lines to tenure track lines

Although it might have been desirable to let the Committee complete its work before “going public,” working drafts have been shared with deans and rumors were starting to surface about their contents. Consequently, we felt it was necessary to make the latest working draft available to all. Although comments are welcome on the working draft, I give you fair warning that we will solicit comments once again when a final draft is ready.

State Government and the Budget: The Session of Misdirection

The hoax I alluded to last month is still playing out. I can’t begin to recount all the anti-public employee bills in the time you would tolerate. There was a long story in Inside Higher Ed today called “‘Organize or Die’ in Florida” that provides some details. One example of the misdirection campaign stands out to me, however. I have twice heard John Thrasher speak about *taxpayers* being upset about public employees having the right to request payroll dues deduction. *Who knew?* And why aren’t they upset about the other 363 payroll deduction options?

Of more immediate concern to the UFF and the faculty is the requirement of majority *membership* to retain representation rights. In other words, if less than a majority of FSU faculty become dues-paying members of the UFF, there will be no

representation rights. No contract. I thought the lopsided 96% vote of 2003 was a pretty clear indication of what the faculty wants. I also wonder what it would mean to apply the same test to political parties: So the elected representatives will be tossed from office if a majority of potential voters do not become dues-paying members of the Republican Party? Interesting to think about.

Being from Illinois, I cannot help but think of one of my favorite Republicans, Abraham Lincoln. I sure hope he was right about the ultimate failure of attempting to fool people.

Meanwhile, the UFF is in the midst of trying to reach majority membership at FSU. Should we fail in that, we may ultimately have the law tossed out for being at odds with Florida's constitution, but we don't think losing our contract for a few years in the interim is an attractive prospect, and last year's arbitration ruling speaks clearly to that prospect.

b. Golden Pride Lecture Series, D Moore

World-class humanitarian and writer Nicholas Kristof -- whose NYTimes column this morning, "Hugs From Libyans," is datelined Cairo -- is speaking Monday night, March 28, in Ruby Diamond Auditorium. His talk's at 7:00 and the doors open at 6:30. Sponsor is FSU's Golden Tribe Lecture Series, and it's a pleasure to be one of the two faculty representatives on that committee, along with Harrison Prosper from Physics.

X. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Karen Laughlin, announced that the Undergraduate Research Symposium is Tuesday, March 29, 2011 10:00 am - 2:00 pm in Strozier Library.

XI. Announcements by Interim Provost Bradley

The legislative session, a lot of the staff down at the legislature has parted since the last session, so the amount of expertise down there isn't as great as it has been in a whole lot of areas. Any number of things have popped up this session. We have consolidation of activities at the NW Regional data center, we had a (?) issue for a while, the FL center for Library Automation is under a major potential change that has some ramifications for resources. They were taking up some sabbaticals for a while but that seems to be falling away. They made a brief discussion about tenure, that's fallen away. They now seem to be deciding whether you can use head-hunting with the government to get sunshine that way. The Dean's salary, some of the Deans have high salaries, and some of them have over 200 thousand, so it will be limited to 200 thousand, so that is some weird recruiting styles. Of course some retirements is being affected in several different ways. The health benefits are yet to come. And even things like the chart council which isn't significant to most of you,

but there's a lot of mischief to be done with changing the charter council. So there's a lot of things brewing down in the legislature, many more than most. Especially an ill-informed, I think.

Yesterday I talked to the Deans and the Chairs, and the signal was I think we are in the nature area of about a 10 percent cut. The house billing came out today and cut about 16%. That's a very bad cut, in 30 million dollars. But things seem to be changing almost by the day down there. So normally things would be happening and you would stick with it, you would get info with the noise. But it seems to be less info in the signal than usual. So I guess one of the morals is don't get too upset by what's happening now, wait for a couple weeks to get really upset. Although if you're lobbying things then keep lobbying.

Joe is our SACS liaison, and he is in the business of trying to get info from you about the Quality Enhancement plan that's part of SACS, and he really needs, and the university really needs the participation of the senate. And that may not seem that important but in a couple of years we have to actually put these documents in front of people and it makes a big difference if we have more than 10 people to respond to a survey. It really is important.

Dr. Walker:

All of us need to do this: on your BB site, click organizations and scroll down to Quality Enhancement plan. Click, it will take you to the site. We are looking for ideas. Quantity matters here, so does quality, but its important when we go to SACS with an end product, and we will have an end product. SACS wants to chart a review that X number of ideas were presented, X number approved, and they want to be able to back up the process with those kinds of numbers. So please log in under your organizations "Quality Enhancement plan" and take a look at some of the samples from SACS. (lists examples)

The only person that is happy about the retirements of Anne Rowe, my colleague in the department of English and Joe McElrath, is the chairman of the department of English who is remembering President Barron's promise that the voluntary separation would lead to new lines coming back to the department, so we will hold it to that, although we cannot replace Joe and Anne.

The second thing is the salary plan for professors review committee, the SPPRC, which you are selected, is having an organizational meeting with the Dean of Faculties, to sit down and make sense of the next stage of the process. A reminder is its due at the end of the next week, so we are going to sit down and work on that on your behalf.

The third thing I want to mention is that those of you who are members of the new senate which begins in April, would have already received from Melissa who is the coordinator of the Senate, the nomination ballot for the Steering Committee. Remember in April you'll do two things: you'll elect the president and second you'll elect the members for the 2011-2012 steering committee. The seven members elected to the cycle, there's always 3 or 4, this year we're on the 4th cycle, and because of a couple of departures Melissa and I looked, I think


we're going to be selecting 5 positions on the Steering Committee. Now there are a number of returning members who are nominated and will be ready to serve, but there will also be some empty seats on the steering committee, so if you would look at that nomination ballot which Melissa has circulated electronically, and you could get back to her so she can put together the election ballot for that election of the Steering Committee that will occur in April.

XII. Announcements by President Barron

President Barron was unable to attend the meeting.

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:42p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

HOLLYWOOD CINEMA

COURSE INFORMATION



Course ID:	ENG 3600
Instructor:	Pete Kunze
Semester:	Fall 2010
Classroom:	TBA
Time:	TBA
Office:	Williams 313
Office Hours:	TBA
Contact:	pkunze@fsu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Perhaps no art form is as influential in the 20th century as the film, and no country dominated this art like the United States, where “Hollywood” and “movies” became synonymous. And yet courses on twentieth century American literature continue to gloss over the contribution Hollywood made to the American narrative tradition. In this course we will examine how Hollywood cinema developed from photography to silent films to blockbusters. The study of Hollywood cinema is interdisciplinary, so our focus will be on films as texts, the interaction of image and sound. We will discuss the development of the Hollywood cinema, both as an art and a business, as well as closely analyzing films of artistic and social importance. As we will see, cinema allows us to pursue the same issues as written texts, and we will discuss topics like authorship, narrative, audience reception, and how these films, as texts created for mass appeal, both distill and instill ideology. Studying cinema as literature reveals the complicated nature of both, expanding our understanding of how texts are composed of signs that give meaning to our world and our selves.

COURSE PREMISES

- Literature is artistic.
- Literature is philosophical.
- Literature is political.
- Literature is experimental.
- Literature is communal.

COURSE OUTCOMES

- Students will be able to identify major movements in the history of American cinema from inception to the present, including key film and directors appropriate to each time period and movement.
- Students will be able to generate an interpretation of a film.

- Students will be able to write a critical response to a film without the aid of outside sources. Feedback designed to foster students' writing proficiency will be provided.
- Students will develop essential skills, including close reading, critical analysis, and interpretative writing.

COURSE TEXTS

There are no assigned textbooks. All readings will be critical articles posted to Blackboard. The films will be viewed during a designated weekly screening period. Watching a film is the equivalent of reading a novel, so I expect you to either attend the screening or purchase your own copy. When possible, I will leave a copy on reserve in the library. Do not depend on Blockbuster, Netflix or Video 21 to carry these films; there are 42 of you and usually only one copy of the films.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

- Complete two papers, due in weeks 5 and 12, respectively.
- Complete two exams, to be given in weeks 8 and 16, respectively.
- Participate actively and relevantly in class discussion.
- Read all materials and view all films.

GRADING DISTRIBUTION

- 25% Quizzes
- 20% Paper One (Week Five)
- 20% Paper Two (Week Twelve)
- 15% Midterm Examination (Week Eight)
- 20% Final Examination (Week Sixteen)

Nota bene: All work in this course must be original.

LIBERAL STUDIES

The Liberal Studies Program at Florida State University has been designed to provide a perspective on the qualities, accomplishments, and aspirations of human beings, the past and present civilizations we have created, and the natural and technological world we inhabit. This course has been approved as meeting the requirements for Liberal Studies Area IV, Humanities and Fine Arts, and in combination with your other Liberal Studies courses, provides an important foundation for your lifelong quest for knowledge.

ATTENDANCE

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize

students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness. In this course, more than 4 unexcused absences may result in failure.

ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to ". . . be honest and truthful and . . . [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://dof.fsu.edu/honorpolicy.htm>.)

ADA STATEMENT

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class. This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the: Student Disability Resource Center 874 Traditions Way 108 Student Services Building Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167 (850) 644-9566 (voice) (850) 644-8504 (TDD) sdrc@admin.fsu.edu <http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu/>

SYLLABUS CHANGES

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

EXAMINATIONS

There will be two examinations in this class, testing both comprehension of the texts and command of the critical concepts we'll be developing throughout the semester. Each exam will comprise of 50 short-answer questions, varying from biographical information to applying a critical concept. Students will be permitted to use their notes, but they will not be allowed to bring texts or electronic devices (including laptops, audio recorders, Blackberries, iPads, etc). The final exam will not ask you about texts from the midterm, but critical concepts from earlier in the semester are fair game. Any issues with exam dates should be addressed prior to the exam. Students who miss an exam will be assigned an essay for partial credit.

READING WRITING CENTER

The RWC offers one-on-one help for students with their writing, whether they need help with a writing problem, understanding what their teacher wants, or just want to do better on their writing

assignments. The Center is staffed by teaching assistants who are trained in writing and teaching. Make an appointment by calling ahead (644-6495) or stopping in – room 222C of the Williams Building.

PAPERS

You will write two papers this semester, each focusing on a different aspect of Hollywood cinema. This class is designed to improve not only how you “read” films, but how you process what you read. Therefore, both papers emphasize close reading and a reader’s engagement with the text. All papers should be single-spaced, in Times New Roman (12) or Palatino Linotype (11). Feel free to meet with me if you have concerns over the paper. Schedule an appointment and I will help you flesh it out. Do so several days *before* the paper is due. I will not review and comment on papers emailed to me. You must meet with me in person. Papers will be graded according to the following rubric:

GRADING RUBRIC

CRITERIA
<p>THESIS and CONTENT (Development) The essay has a thesis—a single, central point that is interesting, original, striking and substantial. The central idea is developed in the essay through well-chosen, appropriate, concrete details that show originality and freshness. Author shows rather than merely tells. Generalizations and assertions are defended. Arguments are logical.</p>
<p>ORGANIZATION The essay is organized and well structured (there is a beginning, a body, and a conclusion). The essay exhibits a clear strategy for persuasion and development. The organization works with the thesis so that the thesis and the organization serve the purpose of the essay. Essay does not digress from central point. Transitions help the paper flow smoothly. Introductory paragraph(s) is (are) interesting and appropriate. Concluding paragraph is clear and convincing.</p>
<p>PARAGRAPHS Paragraphs are organized, unified and coherent. Each supporting paragraph has a controlling idea. In supporting paragraphs, topic idea helps further the thesis.</p>
<p>STYLE Sentences are well constructed. Writer avoids modifier problems. Sentences show variety of pattern and are rhetorically effective. The essay is written in a style and tone appropriate to the audience, topic and purpose. Words are appropriate and well chosen. Writer avoids jargon and sexist language.</p>
<p>GRAMMAR, SPELLING, MECHANICS Writer avoids errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.</p>

PAPER ONE: DEFINING STYLE

Choose ONE of the following options:

- In 1999 the American Film Institute surveyed industry professionals to determine the top 50 stars in film history. Select one actor or actress from the list here posted on Blackboard. Watch three films **starring** your selection. Then, write a paper that discusses the appeal of that actor or actress. Did he or she work in various genres (James Stewart) or was his or her appeal associated with a specific genre (John Wayne and the western)? How would you describe the types of characters he or she played? How did he or she play them? Discuss each film in detail, outlining the public persona of your star.
- Auteur theory explores the way directors made their distinctive imprint on films, even though they worked within the stringent studio system. Select a director who we could call an auteur: their films have a distinctive quality. Watch three films and then discuss each film in detail, outlining the representative style of the director. What qualities unite the films? Are they within the same genre? Do they use the same actors? Are they plot-driven or character-driven?

Your paper should be 1,500 words long. No research is necessary, but it certainly is not discouraged. Be sure to cite when applicable, providing an MLA-formatted Works Consulted page. Papers are due in Week Five.

PAPER TWO: FILM AS CULTURAL ICON

Choose ONE of the following options:

- Since 1989 the National Film Registry has been working to preserve iconic American films. The list of films that have been selected thus far is available on Blackboard. Select one of the films (it cannot be a film we'll be watching in class) and discuss in a detailed essay why this film is iconic. Why is it emblematic of Hollywood cinema at its finest? What is the cultural relevance of the film? Consider the form, content, director, stars, reception, and the time in which the film was released. How is the film distinctly American?
- Choose one film released since 2000 that you feel is worthy of preservation. Present an argument why the film is either fine cinema or an American cultural icon. Consider the form, content, director, stars, reception and the time in which the film was released.

Your paper should be 1,500 words long. Cite three sources, including critical articles, film history, interviews, or film reviews. Be sure to cite when applicable, providing an MLA-formatted Works Consulted page. Papers are due in Week Twelve.

QUIZZES

A quiz covering the film and readings will be administered every week. I will not allow make-ups.

HOW TO AVOID BEING A TACKY COLLEGE STUDENT

- Class starts at as noted. Arriving late is disrespectful to your classmates and me.
- Take responsibility when you fail to do something. It's not your printer's fault.
- All papers should be in black ink AND on clean, white paper AND stapled.

- All papers must be handed in as hard copies. I will not accept e-mailed papers.
- Papers are due whether or not you can make it to class.
- All papers should be in MLA format. If not, you lose points.
- All papers should be thoroughly proofread. You will lose two points for every spelling, grammatical and mechanical error. This is college: edit your work.
- Do not ask for an extension. The work is due as noted; plan accordingly.
- This class is no less important than any other class you're taking. I will not excuse you to meet with other professors or to attend review sessions.
- Late work loses a grade a day. Example: after 2 days, the highest grade you can get is a B+.
- Do not ask me if you missed "something important." Contact a buddy if you miss a class.
- You are responsible for maintain back-up copies of all assignments you submit for grading.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week	Lecture	Reading	Viewing
1	Course Introduction		
2	The Rise of Cinema and the Silent Film	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Sklar, "Introduction" to <i>Movie Made America</i> • James Agee, "Comedy's Greatest Era" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Modern Times</i> (Chaplin, 1936, 87 min)
3	The Studio System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Sarris, "Some Notes on Auteur Theory, 1962" • Thomas Schatz, "Introduction" to <i>The Genius of the System</i> • Irving Thalberg, <i>Directions to Readers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Casablanca</i> (Curtiz, 1942, 102 min)
4	The Great Suppression: Hollywood in the 1930s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Motion Picture Production Code of 1930" • Stanley Cavell, "Leopards in Connecticut" from <i>The Pursuits of Happiness</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bringing Up Baby</i> (Hawks, 1938, 102 min)
5	The Great American Film	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andre Bazin, "The Technique of <i>Citizen Kane</i>" • Robert L. Carringer, "Citizen Kane, <i>The Great Gatsby</i>, and Some Conventions of American Narrative" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Citizen Kane</i> (Welles, 1941, 119 min)

6	The Golden Age of MGM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas Schatz, from <i>Hollywood Genres</i> • Sarah Berry, "Genre" • Peter N. Chumo II, "Dance, Flexibility, and the Renewal of Genre in <i>Singin' in the Rain</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Singin' in the Rain</i> (Kelly, Donen, 103 min, 1952)
7	Hollywood as Sanctuary, Hollywood as Hell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph Horowitz, "In Hollywood We Speak German" from <i>Artists in Exile</i> • Ronald Reagan, "House Un-American Activities Committee Testimony" • Daniel Lieberfeld, "Keeping the Characters Straight: Comedy and Identity in <i>Some Like It Hot</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some Like It Hot</i> (Wilder, 1959, 120 min)
8	Alfred Hitchcock and the Fall of the Studio System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Film Quarterly</i> roundtable discussion, "Personal Creation in Hollywood: Can It Be Done?" • Tania Modleski, "Hitchcock, Feminism, and the Patriarchal Unconscious" • Christopher D. Morris, "The Direction of <i>North by Northwest</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>North by Northwest</i> (Hitchcock, 1959, 136 min)
9	The New American Cinema	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pauline Kael, "Review of <i>Bonnie and Clyde</i>" • Christopher Bernstein, "Perfecting the New Gangster: Writing <i>Bonnie and Clyde</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bonnie and Clyde</i> (Penn, 1967, 111 min)
10	The Film School Generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timothy Corrigan, "Auteurs and the New Hollywood" • Christopher J. Knight, "Woody Allen's <i>Annie Hall</i>: Galatea's Triumph over Pygmalion" • Roger Ebert, "Great Movies: <i>Annie Hall</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annie Hall</i> (Allen, 1977, 93 min)

11	High-Concept Filmmaking and the Age of the Blockbuster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justin Wyatt, "A Critical Redefinition" • Warren Buckland, "Serials, Chase Scenes, and Off-Screen Presences: <i>Raiders of the Lost Ark</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Raiders of the Lost Ark</i> (Spielberg, 1981, 115 min)
12	Film in the Reagan Era	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Nadel, "Movies and Reaganism" • W.J.T. Mitchell, "Seeing <i>Do the Right Thing</i>" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do the Right Thing</i> (Lee, 1989, 120 min)
13	Sundance, Miramax and the Rise of Independent Films	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alisa Perren, "Sex, Lies, and Marketing: Miramax and the Development of the Quality Indie Blockbuster" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pulp Fiction</i> (Tarantino, 1994, 154 min)
14	Recent Auteur Cinema	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander Payne, "A Declaration of Independents" • Devon Ogeron, "La Camera-Crayola: Authorship Comes of Age in the Cinema of Wes Anderson" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Royal Tenenbaums</i> (Anderson, 2001, 109 min)
15	Global Hollywood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott R. Olson, "The Globalization of Hollywood" • Christina Klein, "<i>Kung Fu Hustle</i>: Transnational Production and Global Chinese-Language Film" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kung Fu Hustle</i> (Chow, 2004, 95 min)

Teaching Evaluation Committee Proposal

We propose that: All student perception of teaching surveys will use SPOT II. This would include the traditional in-class administration, online administration, and distance learning courses. In other words, the 8 SUSAI questions would continue, we would encourage student written comments, and units could add questions if they choose.

Background: We agreed that we would like to move to a common set of questions, few in number, that all faculty would use. We feel this would help encourage students to write comments that would be more helpful to faculty in making improvements in instruction. We acknowledged that with a new Provost coming in the near future, it may be prudent to delay major changes in forms and methods. Because there is a history regarding the SUSAI questions, some units making use of only item 8 ("Overall assessment of instructor"), and other units using all 8 SUSAI questions in annual evaluations of faculty, we decided that for now, we should keep these questions. This preserves some continuity with previous assessments. This would constitute the "common form" that all faculty would use. If units wanted to use additional questions, they certainly could. This is essentially SPOT II.

Florida State University Student Perception of Teaching



Form with fields for Instructor Name, Course Number & Section, Course Title, and Date.

Form design by Assessment Services, 5/23/2005/jme

Student Information

- 1. What is your year in school? (1st year, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Grad/Other)
2. What is your cumulative GPA? (1.99 or less, 2.0 - 2.49, 2.5 - 2.99, 3.0 - 3.49, 3.5 - 4.0)
3. What grade do you expect to receive in this course? (A, B, C, D, F)
4. Is this a required course for you? (yes, no)

State University System Student Assessment of Instruction (SUSSAI)

Table with 8 rows of assessment questions and 5 columns of response options: EXCELLENT, VERY GOOD, GOOD, FAIR, POOR.

Department or Unit Questions

- 30 numbered multiple-choice questions (1-30) for department or unit assessment.

Instructor Questions

- 30 numbered multiple-choice questions (1-30) for instructor assessment.

Please turn over for free response questions.

Free Response Questions

The following items are designed to allow you to express your opinions about this course and communicate **directly to the instructor** your particular feelings and suggestions concerning the course.

NOTE: The instructor will receive this form, as is, after the semester is over and final grades have been recorded. If you are concerned that the instructor might recognize your handwriting, you may wish to communicate your comments in a typed format separately at a later time rather than completing this section.


1. What did you most like about this course? What could be improved? Give examples.

2. What did you most like about this instructor? What could be improved? Give examples.

3. Additional question your instructor may add.

4. Additional comments and suggestions you may wish to add.

Florida State University Student Perception of Teaching



Form with fields for Instructor Name, Course Number & Section, Course Title, and Date.

Form design by Assessment Services, 5/23/2005/jme

Student Information

- 1. What is your year in school? (1st year, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Grad/Other)
2. What is your cumulative GPA? (1.99 or less, 2.0 - 2.49, 2.5 - 2.99, 3.0 - 3.49, 3.5 - 4.0)
3. What grade do you expect to receive in this course? (A, B, C, D, F)
4. Is this a required course for you? (yes, no)

State University System Student Assessment of Instruction (SUSSAI)

Table with 8 rows of assessment questions and 5 columns of response options: EXCELLENT, VERY GOOD, GOOD, FAIR, POOR.

Department or Unit Questions

- 30 numbered multiple-choice questions (1-30) with options A, B, C, D, E.

Instructor Questions

- 30 numbered multiple-choice questions (1-30) with options A, B, C, D, E.

Please turn over for free response questions.

Free Response Questions

The following items are designed to allow you to express your opinions about this course and communicate **directly to the instructor** your particular feelings and suggestions concerning the course.

NOTE: The instructor will receive this form, as is, after the semester is over and final grades have been recorded. If you are concerned that the instructor might recognize your handwriting, you may wish to communicate your comments in a typed format separately at a later time rather than completing this section.

1. What did you most like about this course? What could be improved? Give examples.

2. What did you most like about this instructor? What could be improved? Give examples.

3. Additional question your instructor may add.

4. Additional comments and suggestions you may wish to add.
