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\*W EXEC 17-15  
Resolution to Delay Full Implementation of Revised EO 1100 and EO 1110  
**M/S/P 09/27/17**

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH strongly opposes the lack of transparency and shared governance in the process by which both Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110 were developed and presented to the twenty-three California State Universities (CSUs); and be it further,

**RESOLVED**: That the ASCSUDH supports the ASCSU position that, before any implementation, the Chancellor’s Office (CO) engage in data-driven and genuine consultation with the faculty at the twenty-three CSUs , with the goals of refining both EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110 before full implementation;[[1]](#footnote-1) and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that the CO work with the CSUs to develop an analysis of the costs *to each CSU* of wholesale modification of the General Education (GE) and academic preparation portions of the curriculum and share that analysis widely; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that the CO work with the CSUs to identify resource allocation mechanisms needed and any additional funding necessary from the CO to cover the costs *to each CSU* of wholesale modification of the General Education (GE) and academic preparation portions of the curriculum; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that the CO accord campuses as much autonomy and flexibility as possible in the adaptation of individual CSU GE programs to the revisions; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that Provost Spagna work with faculty, staff and administrators in both Academic and Student Affairs to assess: **a)** current pilot courses in English and Math that address developmental learning, **b)** the support needed for faculty-led curriculum development, **c)** the implications of all revisions for non-tenure track faculty, including work available and entitlements, and the extra workload the revisions will result in for all faculty, and **d)** related outreach, advising, and enrollment processes and policy implications; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that Provost Spagna work with faculty, staff and administrators in both Academic and Student Affairs to assess the resources and costs needed to support that plan, including the costs of training faculty, especially non-tenure track faculty to protect work available and entitlements, and to identify resources allocation mechanisms in place and any additional funding necessary from the CO to cover the costs to CSUDH; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH request that Provost Spagna work with faculty, staff and administrators in both Academic and Student Affairs to create an agreed upon plan that addresses the specific needs of CSUDH to best facilitate student success holistically not just in terms of time to graduation; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSUDH invite President Hagan and Provost Spagna to join the Academic Senate in writing a joint letter to Chancellor White requesting the extension of EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor White, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Loren Blanchard, the ASCSU, CSU Senate Chairs, the English and Math Councils, President Hagan, Provost Spagna, CSUDH VP Student Affairs, CSUDH VP Faculty Affairs, and Dean of UG Studies, and the CSUDH ASI.

***RATIONALE:*** CSU faculty and campus constituents have expressed serious concerns about the adequacy of the consultation, the content, and the timeline of revised Executive Order 1100 and newly released Executive Order 1110. The two require vast curricular changes, which bring into question the need for the hasty release of these Executive Orders during the summer break, a time when only a handful of ASCSU faculty representatives were available. The insistence by the Chancellor’s Office that the CSU needed to move forward at such a pace suggeststhat the administration is more attuned to the pressures of outside forces than tothe needs of its students and continuing faculty efforts to meet those needs.

When an Executive Order (EO) is issued, time is needed to understand and interpret the changes and engage in clarifying conversations. The faculty, staff and administration at CSUDH need time to discuss changes and develop appropriate curricular and pedagogic responses. We contend that the revision to EO 1100 and the newly released EO 1110 did not arise from the fulsome shared governance process needed to reflect faculty expertise, and therefore the ASCSUDH and the faculty it represents are compelled to reject changes in curricula that do not originate through such a fulsome process.

Changes to basic curriculum policy need thoughtful consideration informed by a nuanced understanding of the rationale and impacts of proposed changes on the quality of education that CSU campuses provide and that our students deserve. In the case of EO 1100 (revised), those impacts include the consequences of acceptance of all online courses, reciprocity of all upper-division GE courses, and the implications of allowing all GE courses to be double counted (EO 1100 Section 2.2.6.1). Further, CSUDH faculty and administration are working together to avoid any unintended consequences of a rushed and poorly designed implementation at CSUDH. *There are significant unknowns that make it difficult to anticipate the impact of the changes as well as designing workable curricular models:*

* *We do not know how the “multiple measures” used to determine Early Start eligibility will be implemented, when these measures will be implemented, and how they will affect the number of students required to participate in Early Start.*
* *We do not know if students deemed Early Start eligible will continue to take 3-unit Early Start courses in both English and Math on the Dominguez Hills campus (as opposed to English or Math).*
* *We do not know if two-semester (fall and spring) stretch composition courses are permissible as one possible option for Early Start students (we have received conflicting and possibly contradictory messages from the CO on the role of stretch composition from the CO).*
* *We support replacing EPT and ELM assessments but not with evaluating students' high school coursework and other measures not specified.*
* *We do not know how students not destined for CSUDH but who currently enroll in our 1-unit ESM 11 course will be served. We articulate those with other CSUs by providing an output score equivalent on the ELM*. *If there is no ELM, it is not clear what we would offer, or how to articulate it.*​

*Between EO 1110 and revised EO 1100, two levels of developmental composition (ENG 88 and ENG 99) and two levels of GE composition (ENG 110 and ENG 111) need to be reconfigured. The English Department has constituted a task force made up of seven tenure-track faculty members to design and implement the curricular response to the two executive orders. The task force is currently assessing the Early Start curriculum and DSP program that we piloted in Summer 2017. We are very concerned that implementation of these major curricular structures by Summer 2018 and Fall 2018 may not be feasible. A timeline that allows curricular modifications to be completed by the end of Spring 2018, vetted through the various curriculum committees in fall 2018, and implemented in Summer and Fall 2019 is much more feasible.*

*We have serious* *concerns about the adequacy of the support we can provide students in terms of strengthening their writing skills, especially given the narrow constraints within which some CO and campus administrators are interpreting provisions of the executive orders*.  *We are particularly concerned about the degree to which implementation within such narrow constraints will limit the options and reduce instruction time for those students most in need of writing support.*

*Between EO 1110 and revised EO 1100, two levels of developmental mathematics (MAT 3 and MAT 9 ) and one level of mathematics (MAT 105, 131, 153, 171, 191, 193), including potential new options for quantitative reasoning. The Mathematics Department needs to study the effectiveness of different models and curricula, including “stretch” courses already being piloted and new pilots planned for* *spring and summer 2018. The new math curriculum developed in response to EO 1110 should ultimately have a positive effect for our students, as we will have the freedom to prepare them for courses on their pathway.*

*We do not foresee students with the greatest need saving any time compared to our current model, since students on the longest pathway will continue to take two terms to complete GE math.* *We are going to pilot a program of putting students at the higher not college ready level in a single semester co-requisite, which could shorten their path to completion of GE Quantitative Reasoning. We anticipate that most (formerly developmental) students will end up with more college units as a result of taking credit-bearing courses from the beginning. We also anticipate unintended consequences on student GPAs and therefore financial aid.*

Furthermore, CSUDH needs time and resources to determine how best to proceed without damaging these and other GE courses, the programs that offer them, and the students who benefit from exposure to the diverse perspectives that GE courses provide.

*CSUDH has already born the financial challenge for the creation of a robust Early Start Program without additional funding from the CO. The changes proposed in EO 1110 and the revised EO 1100 will require the CO to provide new funding, including baseline funding for the success of the changes. For the implementation phase, new funding sources are necessary to conduct the assessment of the Summer Bridge 2017 pilot curriculum and for faculty development of spring and summer 2018 pilot English and Math curriculum, including funds to train faculty (mostly non-tenure track) in both departments.*

Therefore, implementation of the two Executive Orders must be put into abeyance until a data-driven, collaborative analysis of the impacts of these Executive Orders is undertaken in concert with ASCSU and campus senates. Such analysis should focus specifically on costs, resource allocation, and the impact on departments and programs.

1. Academic Senate of the California State University, “On the Development and Implementation of Executive Orders 1100 (Revised) and 1110,” AS-3304-17/FGA/AA/APEP September 14-15, 2017 (<https://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2017-2018/Documents/3304.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)