

**General Education Course Information Sheet**  
*Please submit this sheet for each proposed course*

*Department & Course Number*      Film and Television 98TB  
*Course Title*                              Working Girls: The History of Women Directors in the United States

1 Check the recommended GE foundation area(s) and subgroups(s) for this course

**Foundations of the Arts and Humanities**

- Literary and Cultural Analysis \_\_\_\_\_
- Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis \_\_\_\_\_
- Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice   X

**Foundations of Society and Culture**

- Historical Analysis \_\_\_\_\_
- Social Analysis \_\_\_\_\_

**Foundations of Scientific Inquiry**

- Physical Science \_\_\_\_\_  
*With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)* \_\_\_\_\_
- Life Science \_\_\_\_\_  
*With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)* \_\_\_\_\_

2. Briefly describe the rationale for assignment to foundation area(s) and subgroup(s) chosen.

This course will be focused on class discussions based around weekly readings and screenings. Guided by the instructor, students will be given ample opportunity to discuss with their classmates assigned material as a way to fully engage with and understand the subject, as well as hone their critical thinking and viewing skills and prepare ideas for their written assignments.

3. List faculty member(s) and teaching fellow who will serve as instructor (give academic rank):  
Steve Mamber, Fellow Maya Montañez Smukler

4. Indicate what quarter you plan to teach this course:

2012-2013      Winter   X                        Spring \_\_\_\_\_

5. GE Course units        5  

6. Please present concise arguments for the GE principles applicable to this course.

General Knowledge      

This course is designed to introduce students to core concepts of historiography, feminist media studies, as well as film and television
--

theory and production studies as a way to approach the historical topic of women film directors in the United States.

□ Integrative Learning This course depends on interdisciplinary approaches by using theoretical models from the fields of history, feminist and gender studies and media studies (including both visual and cultural/industrial analysis).

□ Ethical Implications

□ Cultural Diversity This course focuses on gender and race as a way to study the film industry’s history of discrimination based on these categories. In doing so, students will examine the intersection of gender, race and business/industry (Hollywood) through a historiographic approach.

□ Critical Thinking This course will help students develop skills of critical media analysis, interpretive commentary and argument building through weekly reading, discussion and screening assignments; and develop an understanding of research methodology and archival study in preparation for their final term paper.

□ Rhetorical Effectiveness

□ Problem-solving This course will emphasize a critical approach to material evidence—press clippings, archival papers, historical texts—as a way for students to learn new ways to approach cinema, both through an historical (cultural and industrial) perspective and through visual and narrative analysis.

□ Library & Information Literacy

**(A) STUDENT CONTACT PER WEEK**

1. Seminar:	3	(hours)
<b>(A) TOTAL student contact per week</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>(HOURS)</b>

**(B) OUT-OF-CLASS HOURS PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)**

1. General Review & Preparation:	<u>2</u>	(hours)
2. Reading	<u>3</u>	(hours)
3. Group Projects:	<u>0</u>	(hours)
4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams:	<u>0</u>	(hours)
5. Information Literacy Exercises:	<u>0</u>	(hours)

6. Written Assignments:

3 (hours)

7. Research Activity:

4 (hours)

**(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week**

**12** (HOURS)

**GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal 15 hours/week**

15

**FTV98T: Working Girls: The History of Women Directors in the United States**  
**Instructor: Maya Montañez Smukler**

**Course Description**

In 2008, Kathryn Bigelow became the first woman, and the first American woman, to win an Oscar for Best Director. Why does this historical “first” matter so much to the legacy of women directors and why did such a win take so long? This class will examine the category of “women directors” as a directors’ study situated within an industrial-cultural context of American film history. Formulated around a paradox, this class rejects the false subject category of “women directors,” while at the same time tracing the bio/filmographies of such filmmakers—marked by their gender. To the former, this course will engage students in questions of creative agency vs. essentialism with regards to the politics of historical representation and historiographical categorization: Does grouping women directors together assume their creative output and professional experience is homogeneous? By separating them does their inclusion in American film history become disconnected? To the latter, this class admits the necessity of such categories as a strategy to correct the absences and marginalization experienced by a diverse selection of directors, arguably due to gender, in both their professional work and in historical texts.

Course sections will be organized chronologically allowing for students to study the bio/filmographies of numerous female filmmakers working within Hollywood and adjacent independent film communities within an historical perspective to consider the way in which their career trajectories intersected with industry changes and broader cultural shifts. The class will begin with the present day and Bigelow’s Academy Award win to introduce questions of the relationship between history and gender that will configure the core of the quarter to then move through eras such as Early Cinema, the Classic Studio System, the social change of the 1960s and 1970s, completing with the dueling commercial success of the 1980s and 1990s art house and blockbuster directors/films.

**Course Objectives**

Upon successful completion of the course, students should possess the following skills and knowledge:

- Introduction to core concepts of historiography, feminist media studies, as well as film and television theory and production studies through course readings.
- Exposure to broad sampling of women directed, U.S. made, commercial films from early Hollywood through the present.
- Understanding of shifts in cultural attitudes and media industry trends that impacted all filmmakers in general, and women filmmakers in particular.
- Develop skills of critical media analysis, interpretive commentary and argument building through weekly reading, discussion and screening assignments.
- Hone research skills to work with primary source material in paper and on-line archives; develop understanding of research methodology.

**Course Participation**

Weekly class discussions are an essential part of this seminar. Students are expected to come to each class having completed the assigned readings and screening and be ready to engage in detailed discussion of text and film alike.

**Course Readings and Screenings:**

Each week, required readings and screenings will introduce students to events in film history, bio/filmography details about individual directors, as well as historiographical questions regarding gender and film studies. Readings will be available in the form of a course reader and all films, including those screened as clips in class, will be available at the Media Collections and Services in Powell Library (several of these titles are also available through companies such as Netflix, iTunes and Amazon). During Week 1, students will sign-up for one reading **and** one screening presentation. These presentations will be short—5 minutes. Students will identify a text's key arguments/film's main themes and suggest two discussion questions to initially start off our group discussion.

**Press Analysis, Short Paper (3 pages)**

During Week 1, students will choose from an extensive list of women directed films—post-1970—to conduct a study of how that film and its maker was covered in the press. A detailed paper prompt will be distributed at this time. The goal of this assignment is to construct a critical analysis of **three other critic's** interpretation of the film and what kind of attention was paid to its director in the reviews. Some questions to consider: Does the fact that this movie is directed by a woman factor prominently in the review? What relationship, if any, does the reviewer establish between the thematic content, performance style, casting, genre of the movie with the director? Are there certain assumptions made in the review of the movie due to the fact that it was directed by a woman? Does a discussion of gender appear at all in the reviews—perhaps some and not others?

**Final Paper (15-18 pages)**

For the final paper students will choose a subject related to any of the individual directors, cultural and/or industrial topics and narrative themes discussed over the course of the semester. Students may focus on the work of an individual director, a specific era or a group of filmmakers that show some kind of similarities either in the films they make (e.g., visual aesthetics, thematic topics) or a shared historical and industrial context (e.g., directors of the silent era). During class discussions, students will have ample opportunities to work through sample case studies as a way to prepare for their final projects. An 8-10 page rough draft of the final paper will be due on Week 8. These drafts will be returned the following week with comments.

**Final Paper Prospectus with Annotated Bibliography (350 words)**

The outline for the proposed final paper topic must include a 350-word description of the argument-based analysis you will be making that will contain the essay's main argument/thesis statement and a brief, but specific, summary of the main points you plan to address. In addition (not included in the 350 word description), please include a list of

the films you will be writing about and an annotated bibliography of **at least five potential sources** (articles and/or books) you plan to use. During Week 2, instructions for compiling an annotated bibliography will be covered, as well as how to use film and paper archives (at UCLA and the Margaret Herrick Library) and on-line databases such as ProQuest.

### **Final Paper Presentations**

During the first 45 minutes of class during Week 8-10, students will give a brief presentation of their final paper (somewhere between 7-10 minutes depending on enrollment) including its main argument, methodological approach research materials used.

### **Plagiarism**

UCLA enforces a strict policy on academic honesty. Students are required to properly cite, with footnotes and/or quotation marks, all materials used in any class assignments. Plagiarism is a serious offense and will result in the failure of this course. For additional questions on how to avoid plagiarism, please ask your instructor and visit <http://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/StudentGuide.pdf>

### **Requirements**

- Class Participation and Weekly Preparedness (includes reading/screening presentations): 25%
- Short Paper: 10%
- Final Paper Prospectus with Annotated Bibliography: 15%
- Final Paper Rough Draft: 10%
- Final Paper Presentation: 5%
- Final Paper: 35%

### **Assignments**

**Due Week 4**--Short Paper (3 pages)

**Due Week 5**--Final Paper Prospectus with Annotated Bibliography

**Due Week 8**—Draft of Final Paper (8-10 pages)

**Due Week 10**--Final Paper Presentation

**Due Final's Week**--Final Paper (15-18 pages)

### **SEMINAR SCHEDULE**

#### **WEEK 1—The Politics of Authorship: History, Myth-Making and the Film Director**

**In Class:** Introductions and syllabus review. Sign-up sheet for weekly screening and reading presentations. Instructions for short paper and sign-up sheet.

**Discussion Prompts:** How does Scott define gender as an historical category? What “problems” does she identify with women as historical subjects? In the press articles,

how is gender within film history presented and/or situated? How is Bigelow placed within film history as a woman and as a director? In her case, is she identified as one or the other or both?

**Read:**

- Dargis, Manohla. “How Oscar Found Ms. Right.” New York Times, 10 Mar.2010.
- Nochimson, Martha P. “Kathryn Bigelow: Feminist Pioneer or Tough Guy in Drag?” Salon.com 24 Feb. 2010.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. Gender and the Politics of History, p. 1-50.
- Turan, Kenneth. “As Oscar Ceremony Approaches, the Picture is Unclear.” Los Angeles Times. 7 Mar. 2010.

**Screen:** *Hurt Locker* (2008)

**In Class Clips:**

Selections from the Academy Awards and Golden Globes

**WEEK 2—Film Pioneers—Early Cinema**

**In Class:** Instructions on how to compile an annotated bibliography and how to conduct primary research using on-line, paper and film archives.

**Discussion Prompts:** How would you describe the methodological approach of Armatage, McMahan and Slide? According to those three authors, what are the challenges of writing about women directors from the silent era? Are there reoccurring obstacles in creating the history of women directors in early Hollywood? How would you compare the careers of these three filmmakers?

**Read:**

- Armatage, Kay. The Girl From God’s Country: Nell Shipman and the Silent Screen. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2003, p. 32-54
- McMahan, Alison. Alice Guy Blaché: Lost Visionary of the Cinema. New York: Continuum, 2002, p. xxii-42.
- Slide, Anthony. Lois Weber: The Director Who Lost Her Way in History. Westport (CT): Greenwood Press, 1996, p. 1-19.

**Screen:** *Something New* (1920, Nell Shipman) & *Where Are My Children* (1916, Lois Weber)

**In Class Clips:**

*Making of An American Citizen* (1912, Alice Guy Blache)  
*Mabel’s Busy Day* (1914, Mabel Normand)

**Optional Reading:**

Mast, Gerald. A Short History of the Movies, p. 9-26

### **WEEK 3—Classic Hollywood Anomaly: Dorothy Arzner**

**Discussion Prompts:** How does Johnston define “counter-cinema” and where does she place filmmakers Arzner and Lupino within it? How was Arzner portrayed in the popular press during the prime of her career? How was her butch persona framed in the context of the masculine oriented role of director? How is her femininity as a woman director framed within the era’s “New Woman”?

**Read:**

- Johnston, Claire. “Women’s Cinema as Counter-Cinema.” Sexual Stratagems: The World of Women in Films, p. 133-143.
- Kay, Karyn and Peary, Gerald, ed. Interview with Dorothy Arzner. Women and the Cinema: A Critical Anthology, p. 153-168.
- Mayne Judith. Directed by Dorthoy Arzner, p. 112-130; 151-181.

**Screen:** *Christopher Strong* (1933)

**In Class Clips:** *Working Girls* (1931) & *Stage Door* (1937)

### **WEEK 4—Hollywood Insider Working Outside the System: Ida Lupino**

**DUE at Start of Class:** Short Paper—press analysis of film and director.

**Discussion Prompts:** Identify the complexities within the debate about how Lupino, the real director, was locked in by the press to various expectations of “female” and “male” characteristics. Using the TV and film examples we watched of her work, how would you identify those assigned qualities? In interviews, how does Lupino perceive herself in this debate?

**Read:**

- Bart, Peter. “Lupino, The Dynamo.” New York Times, 7 Mar. 1965.
- Dixon, Wheeler Winston. Lost in the Fifties: Recovering Phantom Hollywood, p. 134-158.
- Kuhn, Annette Ed. Queen of the ‘B’s: Ida Lupino Behind the Camera--
  - Rabinovitz, Lauren. “The Hitch-Hiker,” p. 90-102.
  - Kearney, Mary Celeste and James M. Moran. “Ida Lupino as Director of Television,” p. 137-150.
- Weiner, Debra. Interview with Ida Lupino, Women and the Cinema: A Critical Anthology, p. 169-178.

**In Class Clip:** *Mr. Adams and Eve*, “The Other Mrs. Adams” (1957)

**Screen:** *The Hitch-Hiker* (1953) & *Four Star Playhouse*, “House for Sale” (1953)



**WEEK 5—Hollywood’s Alternative: 1960s New York Independent Film**

**DUE at Start of Class:** Final Paper Prospectus with Annotated Bibliography.

**Discussion Prompts:** How does James position independent filmmaking in the U.S. during the 1960s in relationship to Hollywood during the same era? What does Rabinovitz identify as the “woman’s artist dilemma” and how did Clarke find herself faced with it? What was the distribution and exhibition mechanism for independent film in 1960s New York? Using Bem’s discussion of biological essentialism how do you interpret De Hirsch and Clarke’s insights on being a woman filmmaker?

**Read:**

- Bem, Sandra Lipsitz. The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993, p. 6-38.
- James, David. E. Allegories of Cinema: American Film in the Sixties, p. 3-28
- Kay, Karyn and Peary, Gerald, ed. “A Conversation, Storm De Hirsch and Shirley Clarke.” Women and the Cinema: A Critical Anthology, p. 231-242.
- Rabinovitz, Lauren. Points of Resistance: Women, Power & Politics in the New York Avant-garde Cinema, 1943-71, p. 1-36; 92-149.

**Screen:** *The Cool World* (1963, Shirley Clarke) and *The Plastic Dome of Norma Jean* (1965, Juleen Compton)

**In Class Clips:**

*Bridges Go Round and Round* (1958) & UCLA TV Roundtable with Shirley Clarke and University students (circa mid-1980s)

**WEEK 6—Hollywood Margins: 1970s Low Budget Exploitation Film**

**In Class:** Return Final Paper Outline/Bibliography with comments. Sign-up for final paper presentations during WEEK 8-10.

**Discussion Prompts:** What criteria does Sarris use to identify a film director as an *auteur* and entry into the canon of American Cinema? What argument does Kael present in response to Sarris’ categorization? How do low budget exploitation films fit within the *auteur* catalog? How does Modleski place the work of Wishman within the paradox of prefeminism and misogyny? What was the business model for low budget, exploitation films and how did they function parallel to Hollywood? What makes Rothman and her films a “feminist”?

**Read:**

- Kael, Pauline. “Circles And Squares,” Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings, p. 666-679.

- Lowry, Ed. “Dimension Pictures: Portrait of a 1970s Independent.” Chris Holmlund and Justin Wyatt, eds. Contemporary American Independent Films: From the Margins to the Mainstream, p. 35-44.
- Modleski, Tania. “Women’s Cinema as Counterphobic Cinema: Doris Wishman as the Last Auteur.” Jeffery Sconce, ed. Sleaze Artists: Cinema at the Margins of Taste, Style, and Politics, p. 47-70.
- Sarris, Andrew. The American Cinema, p. 15-37.
- Williams, Tony. “Feminism, Fantasy and Violence: An Interview with Stephanie Rothman,” Journal of Popular Film and Television, Summer 1981.

**Screen:** *Terminal Island* (1973, Stephanie Rothman)

**In Class Clips:** *Bad Girls Go To Hell* (1965, Doris Wishman) & *Bury Me An Angel* (1972, Barbara Peeters)

### **WEEK 7—New Hollywood: 1970s Studio Filmmaking**

**Discussion Prompts:** How would you summarize the historical perspective of these authors to 1960s/70s Hollywood? How would you differentiate each of their perspectives? Are there words/phrases used and/or stand out attitudes conveyed in each article? Are there any that seem repeated in all three? How does Quart differentiate between “feminist mainstream filmmakers” and Elaine May? How does Tobias situate May within Hollywood? How does she perceive herself within the film industry?

#### **Read:**

- Biskind, Peter. Easy Riders, Raging Bulls, p. 13-22.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, ed. The Last Great American Picture Show, p. 37-69.
- Lemon, Dick. “How to Succeed in Interviewing Elaine May (Try, Really Try),” New York Times 4 Jan. 1970.
- Phillips, Julia. You’ll Never Eat Lunch in this Town Again, p. vii-xxiv.
- Quart, Barbara Koeing. Women Directors: The Emergence of a New Cinema, p. 37-59.
- Tobias, Andres. “For Elaine May, a New Film-But Not a New Leaf.” New West. 6 Dec. 1976, p. 57-66.
- Excerpts from Elaine May interview, Harvard Film Archives, November 2010.

**Screen:** *A New Leaf* (1971, Elaine May)

**In Class Clips:** *Ishtar* (1987, Elaine May) & Elaine May & Mike Nichols’ comedy skits

### **WEEK 8—1980s Watershed: Art House Goes Commercial and Commercial Goes Big**

**DUE in Class:** Draft of Final Paper (8-10 pages). First 45 minutes of class spent on final paper presentations.

**Discussion Prompts:** What changed in the 1980s—economically, culturally, film industry-wise—that ushered in a new generation of women directors? How did this generation differ from their predecessors in the 1970s? What is the relationship between women directors and popular film genres? Are there specific genres associated with women directors? Ones that women directors get hired more often for? If so, what are the implications creatively and economically?

**Read (less reading due to allow students extra time to work on Final Paper Drafts):**

- Cole, Janis, and Dale, Holly. Interview with Susan Seidelman. Calling the Shots: Profiles of Women Filmmakers.
- Davis, Sally Ogle. “The Struggle of Women Directors,” *New York Times*, 11 Jan. 1981.
- Peirson, John. Spike Mike Slackers & Dykes: A Guided Tour Across a Decade of American Independent Cinema, p. 6-20; 24-30; 83-103

**Screen:** *Desperately Seeking Susan* (1985, Susan Seidelman)

**In Class Clips:** *Fast Times at Ridgemont High* (1982, Amy Hecklering), *Suburbia* (1984, Penelope Spheeris), *Desert Hearts* (1985, Donna Deitch), *Children of a Lesser God* (1986, Randa Haines), *Big* (1988, Penny Marshall)

### **WEEK 9—1990s Sundance Generation**

**DUE in Class:** First 45 minutes of class spent on final paper presentations. Draft of Final Paper returned. \*Possible guest speaker: Allison Anders or Kasi Lemmons.

**Discussion Prompts:** What purpose does it serve for “complete histories” of a film movement (this week, contemporary American Independent film) to contain women directors in a separate chapter? In this regard, how do Newman and Levy justify their categorization methods? What are the market and aesthetic characteristics of “indie” film and how are women directors framed within those qualities?

- Holmlund, Chris and Justin Wyatt, eds. Contemporary American Independent Films: From the Margins to the Mainstream—
  - Insdorf, Annette. “Ordinary People, European-style: Or How to Spot an Independent Feature,” p. 23-29
  - Eberwein, Robert. “The IFC and Sundance: Channeling Independence,” p. 231-247
- Levy, Emanuel. Cinema of Outsiders: The Rise of American Independent Film.
- Newman, Michael Z. Indie: An American Film Culture, p. 87-140

**Screen:** *Eve’s Bayou* (1997, Kasi Lemmons) & *Things Behind the Sun* (2001, Allison Anders)

### **WEEK 10—Final Cut: The Politics of Cinema vs. Blockbuster**

**DUE in Class:** First 45 minutes of class spent on final paper presentations.

**Discussion Prompts:** Should women be held to a higher standard and not “sell out” to commercial success? How are “chick flicks” or “women’s films” defined and in what way are women directors positioned within assumptions about these kinds of films? With regards to “chick flicks,” what is the assumed relationship between women directors and female audiences?

**Read:**

- Glitre, Kathrina. “Nancy Meyers and ‘Popular Feminism’.” Women on Screen: Feminism and Femininity in Visual Culture. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011 p. 17-30.
- Merkin, Daphne, “Can Anybody Make a Movie for Women?” New York Times Magazine.
- Rander, Hilary, Neo-Feminism, p. 6-25.
- Wiggers, Darryl, “Enough Already The Wonderful, Horrible Reception of Nancy Meyer,” CineAction.

**Screen:** *Something’s Gotta Give* (2003, Nancy Meyers)

**In Class Clips:** *Sex and the City* (2008, Michael Patrick King) *Twilight* (2008, Catherine Hardwicke), *Bridesmaids* (2011, Paul Feig)

### Course Bibliography

- Biskind, Peter. Easy Riders, Raging Bulls. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998.
- Dixon, Wheeler Winston. Lost in the Fifties: Recovering Phantom Hollywood. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 2005.
- Cole, Janis, and Dale, Holly. Calling the Shots: Profiles of Women Filmmakers. Ontario: Quarry Press, 1993.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, ed. The Last Great American Picture Show. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004.
- Glitre, Kathrina. "Nancy Meyers and 'Popular Feminism'." Women on Screen: Feminism and Femininity in Visual Culture. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Holmlund, Chris and Justin Wyatt, eds. Contemporary American Independent Films: From the Margins to the Mainstream. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- James, David. E. Allegories of Cinema: American Film in the Sixties. Princeton: Princeton Paperbacks, 1989.
- Johnston, Claire. "Women's Cinema as Counter-Cinema." Sexual Stratagems: The World of Women in Films, Ed. Patricia Erens. New York: Horizon Press, 1979.
- Kael, Pauline. "Circles And Squares," in Gerald Mast & Marshall Cohen, eds. Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings, 2nd Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1979.
- Kay, Karyn, and Peary, Gerald, eds. Women and the Cinema: A Critical Anthology. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1977.
- Kuhn, Annette Ed. Queen of the 'B's: Ida Lupino Behind the Camera. Westport (CT): Praeger Publishers, 1995
- Levy, Emanuel. Cinema of Outsiders: The Rise of American Independent Film. New York: New York Univ. Press, 1999.
- Mast, Gerald. A Short History of the Movies. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986.
- Mayne Judith. Directed by Dorthoy Arzner. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

- Modleski, Tania. "Women's Cinema as Counterphobic Cinema: Doris Wishman as the Last Auteur." Jeffery Sconce, ed. Sleaze Artists: Cinema at the Margins of Taste, Style, and Politics. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2007.
- Newman, Michael Z. Indie: An American Film Culture. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2011.
- Peirson, John. Spike Mike Slackers & Dykes: A Guided Tour Across a Decade of American Independent Cinema. New York: Hyperion, 1995.
- Phillips, Julia. You'll Never Eat Lunch in this Town Again. New York: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Quart, Barbara Koeing. Women Directors: The Emergence of a New Cinema. New York: Praeger, 1988.
- Rabinovitz, Lauren. Points of Resistance: Women, Power & Politics in the New York Avant-garde Cinema, 1943-71. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Radner, Hillary. Neo-Feminist Cinema: Girly Films, Chick Flicks, and Consumer Culture. Routledge, 2010.
- Sarris, Andrew. The American Cinema: Directors and Directions 1929-1968. New York: De Capo Press, 1968.
- Tasker, Yvonne, "Vision and Visibility: Women Filmmakers, Contemporary Authorship, and Feminist Film Studies," Reclaiming the Archive: Feminism and Film History. Detroit: Wayne State University Press: 2010.



## New Course Proposal

	Film and Television 98TB Working Girls: History of Women Directors in U.S.				
<a href="#">Course Number</a>	Film and Television 98TB				
<a href="#">Title</a>	Working Girls: History of Women Directors in U.S.				
<a href="#">Short Title</a>	WOMEN DIRECTORS-US				
<a href="#">Units</a>	Fixed: 5				
<a href="#">Grading Basis</a>	Letter grade only				
<a href="#">Instructional Format</a>	Seminar - 5 hours per week				
<a href="#">TIE Code</a>	SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]				
<a href="#">GE Requirement</a>	Yes				
<a href="#">Major or Minor Requirement</a>	No				
<a href="#">Requisites</a>	Satisfaction of entry-level writing requirement. Freshmen and sophomores preferred.				
<a href="#">Course Description</a>	Seminar, five hours. Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred. Study of women filmmakers in Hollywood from early cinema to present day, within industrial-cultural context of film history and American society. Letter grading.				
<a href="#">Justification</a>	Part of the series of seminars offered through the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows.				
<a href="#">Syllabus</a>	File <a href="#">Film TV 98TB Syllabus M. Smukler.pdf</a> was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.				
<a href="#">Supplemental Information</a>	Professor Steve Mamber is the faculty mentor for this seminar.				
<a href="#">Grading Structure</a>	Class Participation and Weekly Preparedness (includes reading/screening presentations): 25% Short Paper: 10% Final Paper Prospectus with Annotated Bibliography: 15% Final Paper Rough Draft: 10% Final Paper Presentation: 5% Final Paper: 35%				
<a href="#">Effective Date</a>	Winter 2013				
<a href="#">Discontinue Date</a>	Summer 1 2013				
<a href="#">Instructor</a>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>Title</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Maya Montanez Smukler</td> <td>Teaching Fellow</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Title	Maya Montanez Smukler	Teaching Fellow
Name	Title				
Maya Montanez Smukler	Teaching Fellow				
<a href="#">Quarters Taught</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input type="checkbox"/> Winter <input type="checkbox"/> Spring <input type="checkbox"/> Summer				
<a href="#">Department</a>	Film, Television, & Digital Media				
<a href="#">Contact</a>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>E-mail</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CATHERINE GENTILE</td> <td>cgentile@oid.ucla.edu</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	E-mail	CATHERINE GENTILE	cgentile@oid.ucla.edu
Name	E-mail				
CATHERINE GENTILE	cgentile@oid.ucla.edu				

[Routing Help](#)

## ROUTING STATUS

Role: Registrar's Office

Status: Processing Completed

Role: Registrar's Publications Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (lhennig@registrar.ucla.edu) - 56704

Status: Added to SRS on 8/2/2012 2:33:00 PM

Changes: Title, Description

Comments: Edited course description into official version.

Role: Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (dthomson@registrar.ucla.edu) - 51441

Status: Added to SRS on 7/25/2012 9:38:11 AM

Changes: Short Title

Comments: No Comments

Role: FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (mcastillo@college.ucla.edu) - 45040

Status: Returned for Additional Info on 7/25/2012 9:27:26 AM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office. Is it problematic that FTV 98TA is in 13S while FTV 98TB is in 13W? If so, can you adjust the course numbering?

Role: FEC Chair or Designee - Meranze, Michael (meranze@history.ucla.edu) - 52671

Status: Approved on 7/20/2012 4:48:13 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: No Comments

Role: L&amp;S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (mcastillo@college.ucla.edu) - 45040

Status: Returned for Additional Info on 7/13/2012 3:43:43 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: Routing to Michael Meranze for FEC approval

Role: CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (cgentile@oid.ucla.edu) - 68998

Status: Approved on 7/13/2012 3:41:30 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: on behalf of Professor Kathleen Komar, chair, CUTF Program

Role: L&amp;S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (mcastillo@college.ucla.edu) - 45040

Status: Returned for Additional Info on 7/13/2012 3:37:00 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: Routing back to Cathie Gentile, per request.

Role: Initiator/Submitter - Gentile, Catherine (cgentile@oid.ucla.edu) - 68998



Status: Submitted on 7/12/2012 2:51:41 PM

Comments: Initiated a New Course Proposal

[Back to Course List](#)

---

[Main Menu](#) [Inventory](#) [Reports](#) [Help](#) [Exit](#)  
[Registrar's Office](#) [MyUCLA](#) [SRWeb](#)

Comments or questions? Contact the Registrar's Office at  
[cims@registrar.ucla.edu](mailto:cims@registrar.ucla.edu) or (310) 206-7045