

Department of Cinematic Arts: APR “Action Plan”

points reviewed and extended from our Academic Program Review of Sept. 2008, with review of the External Review Committee Report of Nov. 2008, submitted for review by UNM Executive Review Committee, May 2009.

Introduction

Last fall, in the footsteps of an eighteen-month intensive self-study, and upon completion of a much-debated written report of our Department’s dynamic conversations, Cinematic Arts faculty, staff, and students hosted a very successful Academic Program Review site visit. Three external reviewers—Professors Ruth Salvaggio (University of North Carolina), Deborah Fort (College of Santa Fe), and Caroline Hinkley (Naropa University)—joined UNM American Studies Chair Gabriel Meléndez to assess the Department’s and everyone’s interdependent achievements. We’re extremely grateful for the efforts of this Review Committee as we are appreciative of the eighteen UNM administrators, staff, and faculty who interacted initially with us, subsequently meeting with the Committee, so that the Department can finally be recognized in the pantheon of truly outstanding programs at UNM.

We write now in final summation of our APR, taking as our guide the External Review Committee’s Report. Just as UNM administrators requested that the team examine four major questions, which “centered on collaborations between Cinematic Arts and the Interdisciplinary Film and Digital Media Program, student diversity, areas that should be targeted for growth, and administrative/faculty workloads,” so, too, do we address these issues as we propose plans for the future. Similarly, as Provost Suzanne Trager Ortega suggested a three-part structure for the reviewers’ assessment, so do we follow her counsel, and include here commentary on the extremely positive regard we earned as a Department, the astute observations made by the team, and practical recommendations they set forth.

I. On “Recognition”

Curriculum. As readers of both the External Review Committee’s commentary and our APR written report will be able to see, Cinematic Arts’ “cutting edge curriculum . . . rivals that of any curriculum at the top ranked cinematic and media studies programs in the California system with ten times their faculty and resources.” This statement merits real reflection. The UC system is famous for offering students rigorous critical studies in cinema and practical experience in filmmaking.

And while we entertain no wish to “rival” such august company, we realize, with our state legislators, that New Mexico is fast becoming the new filmmaking capital of the West.

Surely, the very department leading film- and digital image-making at UNM should stand with the university’s “Number One Funding Priority.” Point One of our Action Plan includes asking the University to recognize this and fund us according to our merit.

Faculty. We’re pleased that the reviewers appreciated “all faculty members’ . . . high quality of research and creative productions,” and that the team particularly noted professors’ “engagement with students”: our own overarching concern. That the Committee was “impressed throughout [their] visit with the faculty’s commitment to the *quality* of the educational experience” heartened us completely. It is indeed excellence in teaching, learning, art making, and scholarship—together with the uplifted way we model interacting in the world—that matters to us most.

Students. Both the Review Committee and the eighteen-strong Executive/Faculty Committee cited delight and a fair amount of surprise that Cinematic Arts students and faculty enjoy such “a close mentoring relationship that not only guides students through the program but also sustains ‘networks’ that channel them into employment in the film industry and other related areas of work.” The Executive Committee praised our listing of majors and their post-grad employment, as did the Review Committee members, who commented, “We consider this remarkable for a department with such high student enrollments that have steadily increased over the years, and with all current courses at capacity enrollment.” While CA faculty were delighted with such delight, we, in turn, were a bit surprised: shouldn’t we (all at UNM) be doing more here? Student/alumni/faculty relations ought to constitute the core of any university’s mission. We recommend fewer, and less intensive, academic program reviews for any department eager to maintain their focus on what truly matters.

Our Action Plan Point Two includes privileging student/faculty/alumni relationships above even important analysis of such engagement.

Diversity. Cinematic Arts boasts a history of teaching “diverse diversity” to some fairly diverse students. We do a superb job with regard to economic and gender diversity in both our student and faculty/staff populations, as both stats and our curriculum reflect.¹ With respect to ethnicity, as the review team noted,

¹ As Professor Fort pointed out during the “Exit Interview,” it is remarkable that our small unit has been able to attract two women teaching studio arts: Associate Professor Nina Fonoroff represents a field, Experimental and Avant-Garde Filmmaking, not especially noted to include women; part-time Lecturer Melissa Henry is among the few Native American women in production. Our curriculum also supports coursework in these areas;

forty percent of our majors come from multi-ethnic backgrounds, and the Hyperion Database shows that if we account for pre-majors, this figure would rise to fifty percent. While we agree that our “department’s innovative multicultural curriculum is responsible in large part for this notably strong record of diversity”—and while we’re also proud of our “impressive curricular foundation in Latina/o, Native American, ‘Third World,’ and Diasporic cinema that distinguishes the department”—it is important to note that the percentage of students of color has actually decreased since the years leading up to 2003, the period we were last able to offer a *complete* instantiation of our ethnic studies curriculum.

We are indeed “committed to improving” our overall ethnic diversity, recognizing that “improvement” is therefore not merely teleological. As we argued in our APR, our goals are dependent upon maintaining, as well as improving, diversity. And at this juncture it is remediation that is urgently required. To underscore our argument in anticipation of our Action Plan request, we remind readers that diversity in the Cinematic Arts curriculum is an imperative at risk:

‘Third World’ Cinemas, Native American Filmmaking, and *Cine Latino* studies have long distinguished Cinematic Arts. With the eventual retirement of Dr. Mora, together with the loss of Dr. Alvaray to DePaul University, plus the necessary course reductions occasioned by Dr. Dever’s assumption of Department Chair duties, however, this area of Departmental Distinction is endangered. Key to Cinematic Arts, to the Interdisciplinary Film and Digital Media Program’s founding principles, to the “Arts of the Americas Cluster” proposed by CFA (see Section VI of our APR), and crucial to the “majority-minority” Latino students at UNM, it is essential that we find ways to continue to enhance a Course Series that speaks to the specific heritage of our part of the globe. These popular offerings serve to enliven everyone’s experience at UNM while underscoring the histories and experiences of particular students whose access to higher education has been constrained by the very conditions that many of the works in *Cine Latino* Course Series classes, and other related Series, seek to illuminate.

One first realizes that two of the above-mentioned faculty are themselves representative of the diversity we seek in our curriculum and in our faculty.

Our “commitment to improving diversity” thus redounds to our Action Plan Point Three: That Cinematic Arts be permitted to seek applications from underrepresented candidates and hire a Professor of Latin American/US Latino/and Diasporic Film Studies; and that we be granted permission to likewise search for a full-time Lecturer in Native American film studies and production.

see syllabi from “Images of (Wo)men” (a course about men, women, and everybody else), to “Avant-Garde Filmmaking,” now archived in our electronically available Appendix.

Staff. We appreciate and underwrite the External Reviewers' paean to our staff. Department Administrator Chris Polansky and her team of part-timers deserve special recognition, particularly in light of the fact that increasingly poor ratios of teachers to students mean that staffers have to spend commensurately more time shouldering burdens that faculty used to handle, including walk-in advisement, web design and input, library management, course advertisement, plus equipment assessment, acquisition, maintenance, and check-out.

As we see a continued influx of IFDMers and steady growth in our majors and minors, the position of Technical Coordinator James Roy, now working only a .75 FTE, will have to be increased to full-time and supported by at least another half-time employee in charge of our "Equipment Cage." In addition, our web designer/ print and media library manager/ department advertiser (see, for example, our beautifully wrought Course Catalogues archived in our Appendix) is also functioning as Office Manager in charge of work-study students, while doubling as Media Advisor in direct service of all CA students. In order to fund Jenn Griggs's half-time appointment, we must currently divide the funding sources for her position, given that we receive only the administrative part of her salary from allocated monies. **Here we consequently request complete funding for a full-time position of an Administrative Assistant.**

Point Four of our Action Plan: Seek and secure an additional 1.5 FTE's worth of staff salary for three currently part-time employees.

Space. We're pleased that our reviewers, in lauding the "palpable spirit" that resides in our offices and editing rooms, also warn of the need for expansion of that cheerfully crowded space. As we've discussed in our APR, our current requirements for growth include elements listed in our "Quick-View Plan for Expansion and Enhancement of Facilities." Within the next few years (or "sooner," we wrote) Cinematic Arts students and faculty need to be:

- enjoying dedicated use of a computer classroom in addition to our individual editing suites, where new software applications could be taught, and where students and faculty could share works in progress during "lab time" class sessions;
- expanding our equipment inventory to include a small dolly set-up and a modest-sized crane;
- continually and regularly scheduling replacement and maintenance of digital cameras, computers, and 16mm film cameras;
- revamping the Studio to include a green screen, black drapes, a studio lighting grid, and sound in the projection booth (this would make it a more fully functioning *production* space, suitable for making images and sounds, as well as indispensable for mounting installations and

- performances in our studio practice classes);
- purchasing equipment to initiate a live-video-mixing-performance course (this might be “Videator” software, with a site license whereby we could have a copy on several MAC laptops that would be available for students to check out; also, a video mixing device would give us the capacity to generate live video performance work);
 - constructing two or three animation stations in various editing rooms (the purchase and use of even currently available MAC software that works with low-end computers, which would hook into a camera on a copy stand in order to shoot cell animation, would speak [as does the 16mm film course] to the historic linkage and lineage of cell animation with respect to fundamental qualities of any moving image);
 - providing networking capabilities for students and faculty, since portable digital storage drives are no longer serving our needs;
 - finding funding for “hi-definition decks” to be placed in each editing suite for the support of hi-def work. Blu-Ray DVD burners, and various types of software that are capable of burning these discs, are now fast becoming the industry standard;
 - installing a Blu-Ray disc player and hi-resolution projection equipment in the Studio.

Point Five of our Action Plan, as supported by our External Reviewers:² Seek and secure dedicated use of a computer classroom, construct two or three animation stations in editing rooms (to be returned to us from the ARTS Lab, who “borrowed” space in our building for a limited time), and continue to expand our equipment inventory as noted above.

Administration. Cinematic Arts has a long history of effective self-government, beginning with Professor Ira Jaffe’s thirteen years heading the Department until his retirement in 2003. A number of us, hired during his tenure, are particularly grateful to have been able to develop the programs he envisioned. Faculty and staff generosity, as noted by our reviewers, extended then, as it does now, “well beyond the already long academic workday.”

Action Plan, Point Six: In order to maintain the “generous work paradigm” our current chair has been praised for fostering, we seek a forty-hour workweek as the 1.0 FTE standard.

² As detailed in their review: “Teaching computer-based technologies works best in a group lab where students in a class can work with faculty support and supervision. Cinematic Arts currently does not have such a facility. We recommend that creating such a lab be explored as an interdisciplinary venture where several departments and programs, including Cinematic Arts and IFDM, could benefit from a shared teaching space.”

Collaborations with other Units are to be continued, for the benefit of transdisciplinary studies promoted across the cinematic arts; we appreciate the Review Committee's notice of our curriculum-enhancing strategies.

Action Plan Point Seven: Create real-time interactions with cross-campus colleagues in order to stimulate intellectual and creative collaborations.

Assessment and Written Report. To be "acknowledged and applauded" for our "good assessment [practices] and willing participation in ongoing conversations related to assessment" is an authentic joy. As we'd hoped would be clear in the written report, which "excited students" who actually "quoted from the tome in their positive testimonies," we take assessment seriously. We love what we do and we're eternally eager to reflect upon the effect of our work.

Yet we don't take assessment so seriously that it becomes some apotheosized object of veneration in itself. In this, perhaps, we part company with those who believe that everything can, and should, be evaluated. Having logged a cumulative six decades in the classroom, or at our desks advancing scholarship, or during late nights with the Steenbeck flatbed editing films, our creed compels us to give our attention as directly as possible to those who are in our immediate care. We do this in full regard of future generations, because we realize if we don't engage those at hand, there will, in fact, be no future to worry about.

We wrote in our introduction that we had "as much pleasure engaging an important assignment as we were frustrated by its subtracting our attention from other pressing academic concerns," a sentiment that gained in truth, primarily in the latter part of the equation, as the many months of writing the results of the study began to sequester inordinate time from teaching, research, and creative work. *The assignment to complete a program review fell particularly heavily upon UNM's smallest department, with one of four tenured/tenure track members on leave in Sweden, and another whose sabbatical the administration asked to be postponed in favor of the review.*

These circumstances—and our responses to them—would not have been as dramatic had we not been strapped for faculty. Two associate professors and one Code 1 assistant professor—albeit in discussion with every other instructor and staff member, including our colleague in Sweden—cannot teach and research and create and serve on committees *and* write an assessment review. That the Review Team "was impressed with a written report that participates in complex modes of narrative" testifies to an energy we're proud of; but, truth be told, it's a strength that could have been better employed elsewhere.

If our teaching and committee work didn't suffer, our research and creativity did. Such retardation puts off career advancement in undersized departments like ours,

and subsequently leaves such small units without senior faculty for longer periods than necessary. Is this the price the university wants to exact in exchange for a few people producing a nonetheless excellent assessment of an outstanding department? Long before the next assessment rolls round, before another sabbatical is summarily postponed, or before another faculty member on leave is interrupted by e-missives about the position she's not paid to maintain, this Department will require a critical mass of faculty—or at least a reasonable quorum.

Action Plan Item Eight, direct from the APR: “Initiate a complex conversation with our Executive Committee about what matters *most* at the University.”

As we affirmed in the introduction of our APR,

Though our worlds are increasingly fraught with greater challenges and fewer resources, we're collectively smarter and richer than any of us might imagine. Submitting this report indicates our acceptance of the University's invitation to contemplate where we are, what we've done, and where we're headed at an institution that could lead the nation—why not?—in redefining the very idea of artistic and intellectual wealth.

This is to say that the “poverty mentality” we all sometimes hold in our admittedly straightened and beloved New Mexico actually does not have to metamorphose into strategies designed to explicate our realities in grandiose corporate style. Even the likes of a 333-page APR, which yes, serves as a “mediation informing both the discipline and its interdisciplinary extensions” is somehow out of line. However much we welcomed administrative urging to “write our review in our own way,” we still felt compelled to respond to an exhaustive set of questions and follow an exacting protocol, if only to prove our “small gem” of a Department's intrinsic value.

We hope readers will understand that our commentary here, as “raw and respectful” as any in our report, isn't about casting blame, but rather about university zeitgeist. Just as the faculty and administration bravely gathered this spring to launch discussions regarding our university life, the kinds of questions and conversations we are raising here saw resonance in those useful debates. Does the university actually want to transform the experience of education into a business paradigm? How do we all use our time to the best effect? Do prestigious universities feel the need to shore up their identities with exigent assessment tasks, or have they less cumbersome ways of evaluating themselves? What kinds of introspective practices in larger or smaller institutions—or in varyingly sized departments—foster creativity? What modes of measurement impede workaday accomplishment?

With these questions in mind throughout the writing of our report, we alternated between dogged progression and dauntless passion. How much better to have entertained a complex conversation with *other Departments* about what matters *most* at the University—including the way we assess ourselves—and then to have brought this discussion into play *with the Administration* before any of us embarked on review?

Action Plan Strategy Nine: Encourage, and participate in, campus-wide conversations about the parameters, legibility, timing, and true use value of large-scale assessment.

II. Regarding “Cautious Observations”

We hardly need reiterate our External Reviewers’ opening observation: “Faculty, Staff, and Equipment are spread too thin. Everyone is overworked. The department is functioning at and beyond capacity requirements.”

Moreover, since the completion of our written report in early fall 2008, Cinematic Arts has seen a *twelve percent increase in majors*. Again, only four tenured/tenure line faculty members, with one .75 lecturer, have been principally responsible for these ninety-four majors.

This load is accompanied by our teaching and mentoring a large and active group of Interdisciplinary Film and Digital Media students who have been mandated to take a minimum of 18 credits and a maximum of 27 credits, plus electives, in Cinematic Arts. (All film courses offered in IFDM are, in fact, provided by our Department. This means that IFDMers, majoring in Critical Studies, are required to take up to eighty percent of their classes in Cinematic Arts.)

In addition to these two sets of majors, we instruct numerous, and deeply invested, students earning a minor in Media Arts—and this, in the company of legions of general education students interested in the juncture between moving image arts and their myriad disciplines.

Our long-serving adjunct faculty members, noted professionals in their fields, have been essential in enriching our students’ careers nearly at the cost of their own. These scholar/artists raise SCH in directly inverse proportion with the “volunteer” rate of pay we’ve been able to offer them. Together with the sketchy term-to-term contracts we can only pinch out, these conditions have all but turned away key

faculty, charged with offering required courses in Studio Production for majors in Cinematic Arts and IFDM.³

Core faculty in Cinematic Arts instruct a 3-3 load while serving on numerous graduate committees for other UNM Departments. With an eye to keeping and increasing SCH this year, the department chair instructed four courses, instead of a program head's usual two, all enrolled at capacity. As ever, we are still managing the Department with one TA/GA line that typically must be broken up into smaller salaries to pay for part-time faculty. Each of our large lecture courses (averaging between eighty to over one hundred students) is served by a solitary assistant to the instructor. Still, university-wide advisors implore us to offer more and more courses. Indeed, we could easily fill three or four more Intro to Film cohorts, as well as more studio production classes across all levels. Yet then we could not manage the subsequent growth in upper-division classes when new students, like their current peers, fall in love with moving image art and the inspiring professors who teach precisely what it is today's students most want to learn.

This year we were finally successful in adding .25 FTE to our lecturer line. As of next fall, then, CA will enjoy two associate professors, two pre-Code 3 assistant professors, and one full-time lecturer.⁴

We're proud of our "widow's mite" that enabled what constitutes a total instructional growth of five percent—funds saved, dollar by dollar, year by year since 2003, on the fringes of our late colleague Gus Blaisdell's lecture line. But this is the way to finance a visionary department that constitutes thirty-eight year's worth of excellence in teaching film and digital media studies at UNM?

This deplorable situation notwithstanding, we're still operating with trademark good will and sustained good humor, buoyed by yet another off-the-charts year of successes:

- Assistant Professor Eva Hayward publishes several more articles as book chapters and juried journal pieces while working on two monograph contracts (Universities of Minnesota and Chicago)—this during her leave from UNM, where she is working as a Researcher at the University of Uppsala, Sweden, coordinating that nation's first-ever international conference on animality and visual culture;

³ As is evidenced in our APR tome, required courses at every level are democratically instructed: associate professors teach gateway courses as well as upper-division classes; adjuncts provide the same broad expertise across the curriculum.

⁴ By catalogue count, CA is not only the smallest Department at UNM; for the last six years, since the retirement of our former Chair, Ira Jaffe, we've served without a full professor in our ranks.

- Lecturer Bryan Konefsky takes home UNM Lecturer of the Year, bringing our department total of UNM major teaching prizes to three, not counting additional nominations—this while organizing, with some two dozen students, Albuquerque/UNM’s fourth international “Experiments in Film” festival;
- Assistant Professor and Department Advisor James Stone creates an enormously well-received new course for IFDM and CA, “The History of Animation,” while serving on no fewer than six committees, with their attendant subcommittees, within the College of Fine Arts and the University;
- Associate Professor Nina Fonoroff’s growing body of works on paper—a series of sixty-five collage books eloquently wrought in mixed media—transforms into a tremendously popular new course, “The Art of Collage,” imagined during an extended period of service on CFA’s crucial Personnel Committee;
- Associate Professor and Chair Susan Dever conducts year-long, post-APR site visit discussions with faculty and students about where we’re headed next; teaches seventy five students in four seminars, and then hires, after an exhaustive national search, a one-year replacement for Dr. Hayward, in the person of:
- Visiting Associate Professor Caroline Hinkley, an internationally recognized photographer and film scholar, who, in the capacity as one of the External Reviewers of our APR, remarked that “Cinematic Arts is such a cutting edge Department that [she’d] give anything to work here.” Whereupon this former Dean of Naropa University actually found herself engaged in art making and scholarship at UNM, as the Department unanimously urged. Hinkley replaced Hayward to teach our most demanding gateway and senior capstone courses to great acclaim, while in addition offering, with Dever, a third New Media course on Saturdays especially designed for IFDM and CA students.

Detailing other such successes in this section of their review, our assessment team also noted the “ongoing administrative duties that have precluded any sabbatical for the Chair ever since her hire as a beginning Assistant Professor”—adding that important, quotidian duties also “*continue to complicate leaves for other faculty.*” While we have put into place a partial sabbatical for the chair and a partial parental leave for Professor Stone during the upcoming fall term, this was only possible, strangely enough, given the extraordinary generosity of one Visiting Associate Professor, hired to replace a much more junior professor at that employee’s junior rate of pay. Professor Hinkley has also agreed to serve as Acting Department Chair during her last term as a Visiting Associate, focusing on the day-to-day operation of the Department (minus budgetary and hiring matters). Although we’re proud of all this generosity and flexibility, everyone’s coming yet again to the fore so that we all have a bit of respite is nonetheless stretching us

dangerously. As our reviewers expressed, “Under such stress, how can the department sustain long-term stability? How does success not lead to burnout?”

Cinematic Arts and IFDM. We have a suggestion about how we might avoid such inevitable burnout. In light of our reviewers’ “assessment that Cinematic Arts faculty members are open to, and indeed already significantly involved in, IFDM planning and in the early operation of this program,” and in view of the Review Committee’s emphatic recommendation that “*further resources must be committed to Cinematic Arts*” vis-à-vis IFDM responsibilities, we offer:

Action Plan Ten: Investigate ways to share in the state funding that CA helped to acquire, through our proposal writing and our subsequent “making good” on the proposal’s promises to teach a significant portion of the IFDM curriculum. If funds have not been earmarked for instruction, investigate where else they might come from, and appeal, in slightly less than 300 pages, for their swift and logical transfer to faculty lines in a Department where professors, and even temporary, part-time lecturers, are mandated to offer required courses.

We agree that “Cinematic Arts faculty members occupy a crucial position vis-à-vis the planning and operation of IFDM, and should be key players in *shaping* a productive collaboration between their curriculum and that of IFDM.” We’re already “defining the terms of collaboration,” as we continue to meet with our invigorated (and invigorating) new Head of IFDM, Professor Andrea Polli, during regular committee work, and at functions such as the stimulating Los Poblanos Summit.

Action Plan Agenda Item Eleven: Sustain discussions, launched in these venues, regarding ways we might look across the campus for resources and faculty that would function in yet more shared ways. We’ve already begun productive conversations about constructing a Documentary Film and Digital Media “pathway” through IFDM; Cinematic Arts consequently requests a line for a documentarian (a moving-image maker and critical studies professor) who would constitute a key hire for the entire university.

III. On “Practical Recommendations”:

Readers of the External Review will have noted the Committee’s first observation: that Cinematic Arts, given “high enrollments, increasing majors, and full participation in the Evening and Weekend Program, needs additional resources to *sustain* its own operations.” The absence of such basic support does not even allow us to dream of the future, as the team recognizes, and so they underscore the Department’s “persistent need” for “more lines *across the faculty ranks.*”

This has been our contention throughout our APR, and we've tried to indicate above how the lack of a viable number of professors has significantly slowed the artistic and scholarly careers of the two associate professors we do employ. And while one of our young assistant professors *has* managed to produce massive amounts of scholarship, she has done so thanks only to "sleepless nights after the third IFDM committee meeting in as many days." Our newest assistant professor, having similarly spent his first year in service on numerous IFDM committees, reports needing a post-doc like the one with which his colleague is now advancing. In the event, he's chosen to begin a family, and yet the Department can only afford to grant him a *partial* parental leave. One might rightly respond that these are all individual circumstances and advise us to look to the greater good. But a foreshortened range of scholars and artists at different points in their careers would threaten any department's overall health, leaving it without the crucial mix of energies and wisdoms, together with new and old knowledges, necessary in promoting "the work of productive academic collaboration" that we and our Review Committee urge the university to support.

We echo, then, the External Review Committee's recommendation as our Twelfth Action Plan Item: "Cinematic Arts should not be expected to serve a major interdisciplinary program with its already stretched resources. Therefore, should such collaboration proceed, we recommend additional FTE and Tenure-line positions appropriate to sustain the work of productive academic collaboration and shared student enrollments, including appropriate investments in staff support and equipment."

On "Specific Recommendations about Potential Hires." All academic departments at UNM are unique, but the university's smallest and one of its best also happens to be the one with the largest historical stake in the New Mexico burgeoning film economy. The Executive Review Committee's question to the External Reviewers—"If Cinematic Arts were to be awarded *one* tenure-line position, what would it be?"—troubles us: the question seems to presuppose that we have already reached the same roughly workable size as other departments, and that a single hire would suffice for us.

The Thirteenth Item on our Action Plan constitutes our most significant request for practical help from the University: To encourage the Administration to truly see Cinematic Arts, and, though their understanding, to make an exceptional effort on the behalf of an exceptional Department. We urgently require our Administration to support enough new faculty lines, TA/GA positions, and staff positions to bring us up to par with even the next largest Department in the College of Fine Arts. (That unit, Theatre and Dance, enjoys ninety-eight majors served by fifteen tenured/tenure track faculty.)

Where the External Reviewers responded to the administrative question by saying that they “recommended *at least one tenure-line position at the Assistant or Associate level, with expertise in production and in critical studies,*” they also advocated, as we do, “additional FTE for Cinematic Arts that would, at the least, move two of its contingent faculty to full-time Lecturer positions.”

To Recap Potential Faculty and Staff Hires: As we’ve argued in this review, Cinematic Arts—serving a “pivotal role” in IFDM, and functioning as a key Department in our own right—needs to hire one senior and one junior professor, attracting a Latin Americanist with the ability to offer courses in Post-Colonial Cinemas, plus a multimedia/new media moving-image maker who would be additionally capable of advancing scholarship in an interdisciplinary program in Documentary.

For IFDM, Theatre, and Cinematic Arts even to maintain required courses in areas where special expertise is necessary, we also must move *at least two* of our contingency faculty to full-time lectureships. In addition to the faculty member previously mentioned (Native American filmmaker and scholar, Melissa Henry), we would very specifically like to see Lecturer Matt McDuffie on board full-time. McDuffie is an award-winning, working, professional screenwriter and author of numerous scripts for a variety of production companies including Columbia Television, United Artists, Twentieth-Century Fox, Warner Brothers, and HBO. A graduate of UNM’s Department of Theatre, McDuffie serves a wide audience, from UNM students to (pre)professional screenwriters, novelists, and playwrights from Albuquerque to Los Angeles. We’ve been utterly fortunate to have him with us, even though he has moved from full- to part-time time given funding cuts, but if we don’t act to stabilize his position, he’ll soon return to full-time screenwriting in LA.

Finally, we seek at least three half-time TA/GA lines in Cinematic Arts. If we’re to offer large enrollment gateway courses opening to serious upper-division work, our professors must be sufficiently supported in the classroom.

Overarching Implications. We conclude here in what’s really taken form as an addendum to our original Action Plan, the well-hammered Strategic Plan already in the APR, which quite precisely wraps our desiderata and tactics around the aims of our College and University as enumerated in their Strategic Plans.⁵ CA’s Departmental Plan is still very much a part of current considerations, and we recommend it to readers interested in an in-depth accounting of all our forward-looking activities.

⁵ See “Strategic Planning,” in Section VI our APR, where we originally requested three new tenure/tenure track lines (one in studio; a second in history/criticism; and a third artist/theorist in both areas) before we arrived at the difficult conclusion that we could function with only two of these types of hires, plus two new lecture lines.

Completing Cinematic Arts' first-ever evaluation, we hope our Executive Review Committee will properly appreciate what our External Reviewers affirmed: that our expressions of gratitude for *everyone's* over-the-top energy, though seemingly in contrast with our critiques of University demands for us to have completed an almost unwieldy study, are not incommensurate stances. Knowing the depths of Cinematic Arts' acute sacrifices, as well as appreciating the focused quality of attention Administrators have extended to us throughout this process, we want to thank *and* entreat our leadership in the same breath.

Asked to produce SCH, prepare students, advance scholarship, mentor studio and critical studies alums, make significant art, and attend to the complexities of running today's Bannerized departments . . . all while strategically planning just like everybody else, we four tenured/tenure track faculty and our lecturer—together with a handful of contingent faculty, our too-few staff members, our ninety-four majors, hundreds of minors, and other cross-pollinating students—still entertain the serious aspirations and joyful work ethic of infinitely better-endowed units. "Maybe," are now beginning to hope, "this Academic Program Review will reflect our hard-won achievements and ultimately have been worth every ounce of our extended dedication."

If the Department of Music and Music Ed (which boasts twenty-eight tenured/tenure track faculty teaching 109 majors), and the Department of Theatre and Dance (with fifteen tenured/tenure line faculty instructing ninety-eight majors) can enjoy robust teacher-student ratios, perhaps our ninety-four majors will finally begin to see their fair share of faculty faces.

Adding one senior and one junior professor, two full-time lecturers, one and one-half FTEs to our staff, and three TAGAs to Cinematic Arts, we shall still constitute one of the most cost-effective and dynamic units in the entire University.

This reality, perhaps visible solely because of our well-conceived and meticulously completed APR, will surely transform the painful instantiation of a program review into sustainable educational experiences for generations of creative and industrious Cinematic Arts students earning their degrees at UNM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Dever, Associate Professor and Chair, 2003 - present

Nina Fonoroff, Associate Professor, 2005 - present

Eva Hayward, Assistant Professor, Code Two, on leave June 2008 - August 2010

James Stone, Assistant Professor, Code One, August 2008 - present

Bryan Konefsky, Part-Time Lecturer III, 2006 - present