

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

AA-005-256

Correction to Cross-Listing Policy 1122

Academic Affairs Committee

Date: February 11th, 2026

Executive Committee

Received and Forwarded

Date: February 11th, 2026

First Reading: February 25th, 2026

Second Reading: March 18th, 2026 (tabled)

Second Reading: April 15th, 2026

Background

1. Name: Laura Massa
2. Email: lmassa@cpp.edu
3. Title of Referral: Correction to Cross Listing Policy 1122
4. Names and Titles of proponents:
 - a. Cheryl Koos, AVP Faculty Affairs
 - b. Terri Gomez, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
5. Keywords: Cross, Listing, 1122
6. Is there a deadline by when this referral needs to be considered by the Academic Senate?
Yes
7. Deadline Date: 3/18/2026
8. Justification for deadline: Registration for fall 2026 starts in April; departments should be able to complete their schedule before registration begins.
9. Background: This referral is to address conflicts that have arisen related to the staffing of cross-listed courses. Staffing courses is the purview of the academic department offering the course (per Article 20, section 20.2b). The correction being requested is to eliminate the line about staffing from line 2.2 of the cross-listing policy.

The current text reads:

“When cross-listing existing courses or proposing new cross-listed courses, both program chairs of the relevant programs shall agree to cross-list the course, jointly decide on the staffing of the course each time it is offered and collaborate on content. Current agreement and future intent are signified by chairs’ approval in the curriculum approval process.”

The correction is to remove "jointly decide on the staffing of the course each time it is offered and collaborate on content," which is shown using track changes in the attached file.

10. Recommended Resources
 - a. Cheryl Koos, AVP Faculty Affairs
 - b. Terri Gomez, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
 - c. Cross listing policy:
https://www.cpp.edu/academic-manual/1100-1199-curricular-policies/policy_1122-cross-listing-policy.pdf
 - d. CFA CBA Article 20: Workload, section 20.2b (note that the appropriate administrator in this section is the dean)
<https://www.calstate.edu/cs-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Documents/unit3-cfa/article20.pdf>
11. Attachments – See Below

Discussion

The Academic Affairs Committee received this referral on November 20th, 2025. During a discussion at our first meeting of the Spring semester, January 28th, the referral's author, Dr. Laura Massa (Academic Affairs committee member and Associate Vice President for Academic Programs) shared that Policy 1122 as it is currently written conflicts with CBA Article 20: Workload, section 20.2b, in which it is noted that "instructional assignments of individual faculty members in the classroom, laboratory, or studio will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department chair (or designee) and/or the individual faculty member." During this discussion, the Academic Affairs Committee unanimously agreed that the change proposed by Dr. Massa to remove the suggested phrase on staffing in line 2.2 of Policy 1122 aligns with current practice and effectively addresses potential conflicts with CBA Article 20, section 20.2b. Consultation emails were sent to Dr. Cheryl Koos (AVP Faculty Affairs) and Dr. S. Terri Gomez (Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs) for further feedback. Provost Gomez responded to express her support for the proposed revised language for the reasons stated above. She also noted that the current policy as written is impractical and, in the case of emergencies in which faculty may need replacement during a semester, the "offering department and dean often have limited options on such short notice where placing a qualified faculty member in the course must be done expeditiously."

During the referral's First Reading on February 25th, 2026, the committee received general feedback and several proposed modifications to the referral text. Much of this feedback focused on the cross-listing of Area 6 courses and the importance of maintaining language in Policy 1122 that emphasizes collaboration and consultation as outlined in the CBA. The proposed modifications include:

- Retaining the phrase "and collaborate on content";
- Incorporating clarifying language from CBA Article 20, section 20.2b concerning the consultation process in instructional assignments, "Instructional assignments of individual faculty members in the classroom, laboratory, or studio will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department chair (or designee) and/or the individual faculty member";
- Adding a statement detailing that instructional assignments can be revisited after an administrative decision.

The following week, the committee met to discuss these suggested changes and begin a period of extensive consultation with the chairs of departments and programs that offer cross-listed courses. The committee requested feedback on the referral's original proposed change to Policy 1122 as well as on the three proposed modifications listed above. Feedback was received from the following 10 departments/programs:

- Apparel Merchandising and Management Department

- English and Modern Languages Department
- Ethnic and Women’s Studies (EWS) Department
- Interdisciplinary General Education Program
- Kinesiology and Health Promotion Department
- Liberal Studies Department
- Nutrition and Food Science Department
- Political Science Department
- Theater and New Dance Department
- Urban and Regional Planning Department

Due to the complexity of the feedback received, the committee asked to table the referral’s Second Reading (originally scheduled for March 18th) until the following Senate meeting on April 15th. This request was granted by the Senate, and in the weeks following, the committee met to discuss the feedback before agreeing upon a revised recommendation. Strengthening Policy’s 1122 alignment with the CBA alongside the retention of the phrase “collaborate on content” were supported by a significant majority of responses the committee received during this consultation period. Following robust discussions, the committee voted to adopt the following changes to Policy 1122:

- Remove the phrase "jointly decide on the staffing of the course each time it is offered" (part of the referral's originally proposed change, which is intended to strengthen Policy 1122's alignment with CBA Article 20, section 20.2b);
- Retain the phrase "and collaborate on content" (feedback received by department chairs and Senate members);
- Incorporate clarifying language from CBA Article 20, section 20.2b concerning the consultation process in instructional assignments, “Instructional assignments... will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department chair (or designee) and/or the individual faculty member" (feedback from department chairs and Senate members);
- Include a statement that consultations must be documented and scheduled in alignment with the academic calendar (feedback received by department chairs);
- Add a statement detailing that instructional assignments can be revisited after an administrative decision (feedback from department chairs and Senate members).

The document (see below) is a draft of Policy 1122 with the proposed revisions (in red) which are based on the feedback the committee received during this extended period of consultation and deliberation.

Following the drafting of this document, the committee engaged in further consultation with Dr. Jocelyn Pacleb (Chair, EWS), EWS Department Faculty, Dr. Mario Guerrero (Chair, GE

Committee), Dr. Berit Givens (Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee), Dr. Gregory Barding (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), and Dr. Cheryl Koos (AVP of Faculty Affairs) on the draft revision to Policy 1122, which includes the new modifications. The majority of feedback expressed support for the revisions, with the suggestion from Dr. Givens that with the removal of the phrase “jointly decide the staffing” in Section 2.2, it would be helpful to clarify “who is consulting whom” in Section 2.7. Dr. Guerrero also reiterated that the committee consider including a statement recognizing that effective implementation depends on participating departments having sufficient instructional capacity to support these courses (since cross-listed courses require sustained and long-term collaboration between departments):

- 2.10 “Effective implementation of cross-listed courses requires participating departments to have sufficient instructional capacity to sustain scheduling feasibility, pedagogical quality, and the academic needs of both departments and students. Cross-listing arrangements shall therefore be implemented in a manner consistent with maintaining this capacity.”

On the other hand, Dr. Koos recommended going back to the referral's original proposal of cutting the current policy phrase "jointly decide on the staffing of the course each time it is offered and collaborate on content," not adding anything else that might convolute the process in anti-contractual ways (two deans being involved, etc), and eliminating any explanatory footnotes. In a follow-up email, Dr. Koos provided an explanation in support of the referral's original proposal:

“In the current Section 2.2, the policy states that chairs 'collaborate on content.' In practice, this is not a role chairs typically play. Courses are governed by an approved ECO, and the faculty member assigned to teach the course is responsible for delivering content consistent with that ECO, while retaining appropriate academic freedom in how that content is taught. Removing the 'collaborate on content' language brings the policy into alignment with standard practice.

Section 2.7, by contrast, addresses consultation among programs on administrative and operational matters (e.g., scheduling, faculty assignment, evaluation, articulation, course modification, and delivery method). This reflects a process of discussion and coordination, but it does not extend to determining course content, which remains the responsibility of the assigned faculty member within the parameters of the ECO.

For this reason, the proposed change to Section 2.2 is not in conflict with Section 2.7; the two sections address distinct aspects of course management. I continue to recommend proceeding with the original proposal to remove the problematic language without adding

additional provisions that could introduce ambiguity or conflict with established roles or the CBA.”

During this recent period of consultation, those that supported the retention of the phrase “collaborate on content” and the related revisions emphasized their alignment with the CBA and established standards of practice. Specifically, Dr. Givens noted that because department faculty determine course content via the Curriculog process—in which chairs approve course content following department consultation—the inclusion of the phrase is logically consistent with existing workflows. This position is supported by Drs. Guerrero and Barding, who agreed that the revised language does not conflict with the CBA. Dr. Barding highlighted that while ECOs are foundational, departmental "flavor" and instructor interpretation necessitate a focus on content. Dr. Guerrero further clarified that the proposed revisions do not assign instructional authority or override administrative staffing control but rather codify expectations for ongoing curricular coordination which is already consistent with shared governance and with Section 2.7's emphasis on consultation. He added further:

“I think removing ‘collaborate on content’ would unintentionally narrow the meaning of cross-listing. It would shift the policy toward a model where cross-listing is established at the proposal stage but has limited ongoing curricular significance, with content understood solely at the level of the assigned instructor. This seems difficult to reconcile with the purpose of cross-listing as a mechanism for sustained disciplinary engagement. Collaboration on course content does not conflict with the CBA and is a standard aspect of curricular governance.

This is especially important in the context of Area 6. State law (Education Code 89032) and CSU GE policy require that courses in Area 6 either carry an EWS prefix or be formally cross-listed with one. Cross-listing is therefore a necessary condition for compliance and serves as the primary mechanism through which Ethnic Studies disciplinary expertise is incorporated into a course.

Given that structure, retaining language that reflects ongoing curricular collaboration is essential to remain in compliance with state law and CSU GE policy. Retaining the structure and footnotes help ensure that cross-listing remains substantively meaningful and aligned with legislative intent and systemwide policy. To the extent there are perceived tensions between the CBA and state law or CSU GE policy, those would seem to require clarification at the systemwide level or the legislature, rather than being resolved through narrowing the scope of CPP's cross-listing policy.

Given that cross-listing functions as a necessary condition for Area 6 compliance under state law and CSU GE policy, I think it is important that this connection be explicitly

considered as part of the policy revision. For these reasons, I would strongly recommend retaining ‘collaborate on content’ and keeping the footnotes. The committee’s revised draft strikes a thoughtful balance. I think moving away from it would undercut the progress that has been made.”

In a meeting with the EWS Department on Wednesday, April 8th, additional feedback underscored the importance of further consultation and included:

- Emphasizing what makes Area 6 distinct from other areas, particularly since Area 6 is shaped by State law (Education Code 89032) and CSU GE policy. Area 6 (then Area F) is also what precipitated the creation of Policy 1122 - Cross Listing (see [AA-004-201](#));
- Revising Section 2.8 or creating a new section in this policy should mention and clarify “disciplinary deference” for Ethnic Studies in Area 6 cross listed courses;
- Revisiting Section 2.6 and how FTES is received;
- Support for the proposed Section 2.10 that emphasizes instructional capacity: “Effective implementation of cross-listed courses requires participating departments to have sufficient instructional capacity to sustain scheduling feasibility, pedagogical quality, and the academic needs of both departments and students. Cross-listing arrangements shall therefore be implemented in a manner consistent with maintaining this capacity”;
- Consulting CFA leadership on the university and system-wide level to clarify the revisions and their alignment with the CBA.

The Academic Affairs Committee met to review feedback regarding the proposed revisions to Policy 1122 (see below). Due to the complexity of the responses received, the committee did not reach a final decision prior to my briefing with the Executive Committee. Despite the unresolved status, the Executive Committee recommended advancing the referral for a Second Reading on Wednesday, April 15th. Consequently, this remains an information-only report without a formal recommendation.

Recommendation

At this time, the Academic Affairs Committee does not have a recommendation as the feedback remains unresolved.

Policy 1122 - Cross Listing
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
POLICY NO: 1122
CROSS LISTING POLICY

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for cross-listing of all University GE and non-GE courses.

2. CROSS LISTING

2.1. Any new course may be cross listed in multiple program areas.

2.2. When cross-listing existing courses or proposing new cross-listed courses, both program chairs of the relevant programs shall agree to cross-list the course, ~~jointly decide on the staffing of the course each time it is offered~~ and collaborate on content.¹ Current agreement and future intent are signified by chairs' approval in the curriculum approval process.

Footnote 1: For instructional assignments, refer to CBA Article 20 Section 20.2b. Consultations in instructional assignments involve both program areas (see Policy 1122, Section 2.7). Instructional assignments can be revisited as needed in alignment with the CBA.

2.3. Cross-listed courses shall be listed under both program areas in the catalog and class schedules.

2.4. Students can only receive credit once for any cross-listed course.

2.5. Course numbering, units, prerequisites, description, and General Education categories shall be identical for cross-listed courses.

2.6. The program area(s) funding the course receives the FTEs for the course.

2.7. Program areas cross listing the course must consult **regularly and as needed** regarding scheduling, faculty assignment, faculty evaluation, course articulation, course modification, and

¹ *For instructional assignments, refer to CBA Article 20 Section 20.2b. Consultations in instructional assignments involve both program areas (see Policy 1122, Section 2.7). Instructional assignments can be revisited as needed in alignment with the CBA.*

course delivery method.²

Footnote 2: Consultations must be documented (e.g. emails, MOU) and scheduled in alignment with the academic calendar (i.e. at least one semester before courses are offered).

2.8. Removal of a course's cross-listing status may be done at the request of a chair of either program cross-listing the course.

2.9. Compliance with this policy shall be evaluated as a part of the regular program review process. Part of each program review shall involve justifying all the cross listings of a program's courses and may result in the reduction of cross-listings for a course. Evaluation of compliance will be undertaken by the Program Review Committee during each program's review.

² *Consultations must be documented (e.g. emails, MOU) and scheduled in alignment with the academic calendar (i.e. at least one semester before courses are offered).*