

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA  
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

AA-007-256

University Curriculum Guide–Senate Approval

Academic Affairs Committee

Date: February 11th, 2026

Executive Committee

Received and Forwarded

Date: February 16th, 2026;  
April 6th, 2026

First Reading: April 15th, 2026

Second Reading: May 6th, 2026

## **Background**

1. Name: Gregory Barding
2. Email: [gabarding@cpp.edu](mailto:gabarding@cpp.edu)
3. Title of Referral: University Curriculum Guide – Senate Approval
4. Names and Titles of proponents:
  - a. Mario Guerrero (Chair, GE Committee)
  - b. Peter Hanink (Chair, Academic Senate)
5. Keywords: Curriculum, University, Guide, Scheduling, GE
6. Is there a deadline by when this referral needs to be considered by the Academic Senate?  
No
7. Deadline Date: N/A
8. Justification for deadline: N/A
9. Background: University Curriculum is considered the purview of the faculty (AS-3592-23/FA) and there are senate-approved policies placed in the guide. President Ortiz requested Academic Programs (under the leadership of AVP Pinter-Lucke) conduct a review (AP-002-112) of the University Curriculum Guide in 2010 to determine the parts that include Senate-approved policies, Chancellor's office policies, and those not supported by documentation. The referral was sunset by the Executive Committee without explanation, but since 2010, the University Curriculum Guide has included (to my knowledge) footnotes designating the various sources for the changes. Although the University Curriculum Guide is a document that houses policies and procedures from various sources, arbitrary changes to the document without consultation could lead to significant confusion and disruption in course offerings, scheduling, and/or curriculum development. Since the University Curriculum Guide is a truly collaborative document and has a significant impact on curriculum, I propose that the University Curriculum Guide should be approved annually by the Academic Senate in a similar manner as the Academic Calendar. We understand that some processes and procedures are dictated by the CSU. For those processes, procedures, and policies not under direct faculty jurisdiction, the implementation of such areas should be held in consultation with the faculty and this is best facilitated through the Academic Senate.
10. Recommended Resources
  - a. Department Chairs
  - b. AVP Scheduling
  - c. AVP Academic Programs
  - d. Associate Deans
  - e. College Curriculum Committees
  - f. GE Committee
11. Attachments – See Below

## **Discussion**

The Academic Affairs Committee received this referral on January 22nd, 2026. During the committee's January 28th meeting, Dr. Laura Massa (Associate Vice President for Academic Programs) noted that the Curriculum Guide itself provides procedural guidance to faculty rather than establishing curriculum policy. Requiring the curriculum guide be approved annually by the Academic Senate would create logistical complications by formalizing a process that currently exists outside of normal Senate purview. Currently, each year a handful of procedural updates are made to the guide but these changes do not cover substantial curriculum policy or processes. To balance the referral's focus on shared governance with an interest in minimizing faculty workload, a "compromise solution" was therefore proposed that would be achieved through annual reports to the Academic Senate (as opposed to the requirement of full senate oversight and approval).

Following this initial discussion, the committee engaged in a period of consultation. Dr. Massa met with the author of the referral, Dr. Gregory Barding (Vice Chair, Academic Senate and author of the referral) and Dr. Aaron DeRosa (Faculty Director of Undergraduate Studies and GE) to discuss this and other possible solutions. An agreement was reached that would involve the above "compromise solution" in the form of an annual presentation on the final version of the guide during the Senate's late-summer meeting or the first meeting of the Fall semester.

Following this meeting, the committee received additional emails from Dr. Barding and Dr. Peter Hanink (Chair, Academic Senate and proponent of the referral) who expressed support for the annual presentation alongside an email "preview" that would inform the Senate of the changes and provide time for feedback as appropriate. This would involve an email being sent from the Office of Academic Programs to the Senate with proposed changes (tracked), followed by a presentation in the first Fall meeting with the finalized version and additional changes that were incorporated. The timing for such an email was not specified, although this process would provide enough time for faculty insight on proposed changes document before the presentation and publishing of the finalized version, in recognition that it is a "living document" that is updated continuously.

At the committee's February 11th meeting, Dr. Massa noted that the Curriculum Guide typically gets published during the summer period and involving the Senate in a "preview" of revisions would significantly push up the timeline and potentially present complications. However, it would be possible for a document covering the contents of the presentation to be shared with the Academic Senate for publishing on the website, as is usually done for Senate presentations and committee reports. It was reiterated that a summer meeting or first meeting of the Fall would be an ideal time for the Office of Academic Programs to deliver the presentation. In light of this information, the committee unanimously recommended the "compromise solution" that would require an annual presentation of the changes made on the University Curriculum Guide by the

Office of Academic Programs, alongside the publishing of a document covering the contents of the presentation (as is typical for Senate presentations, referral reports, and other matters). The committee agreed to this approach with the understanding that an annual presentation on changes made to the document would provide time and space for faculty insight on a living document that “can be edited or revised at any time,” even though the process of providing feedback on such revisions would not be defined, at least in part, by formal Senate approval process.

Following this meeting, the committee received feedback from Dr. Mario Guerrero (Chair, GE Committee) who emphasized the importance of shared governance and faculty authority on matters related to curriculum, particularly on those sections of the Curriculum Guide that directly impact curriculum and academic policy. In lieu of a wholesale presentation without a defined mechanism for objection, he proposed that the Senate establish a formal approval process on sections of the Curriculum Guide that impact curriculum policy and academic standards, and a defined “notice and objection process” for updates that govern administrative procedure. This would require the work of identifying these specific sections of the Curriculum Guide, similar to the 2010 review (AP-002-112) requested by President Ortiz to determine the parts of the Curriculum Guide that include Senate-approved policies, Chancellor’s office policies, and those not supported by documentation. Identifying and separating the sections that require a formal approval process “would balance efficiency with shared governance, [although] the language here would need to be intentional to maintain consistency over time.”

As Dr. Guerrero explained, there are parts of the Curriculum Guide that appear to not have Senate-derived policy establishing its structure. They are not policy-derived, but establish standards of practice to which departments are expected to adhere. Examples of these sections include:

- ***Curricular Exception Memo*** (pp. 59-60 and appendix D). Interpretation: As written, it creates an administrative pathway for modifying how degree requirements are applied to students, including substitutions, unit discrepancies, grade requirement revisions, and teach-out determinations. These are not minor clerical adjustments. These memos directly affect how a faculty-approved curriculum is interpreted and enforced in practice;
- ***Appendix A: ECO Guide*** (the very last ECO field on p. 68). Interpretation: This section includes the statement: “This data will be updated and provided to departments again during the GE Program Review and the next recertification cycle, at which point departments will be asked to show their efforts to improve student learning and success.” That sentence appears minor, but it introduces a potentially major, seemingly mandatory expectation tied to a “GE Program Review” process that has not been formally agreed upon, defined or approved in Senate policy. While the idea of deeper review has been discussed very briefly within the GE Committee, there has been no formal articulation of

what “GE Program Review” entails or what standards govern it. Yet the language in the guide reads as a directive;

- **Miscellaneous: Course requisites have numerous implications for a department** (*last line on p. 17*). Interpretation: This section includes a statement that “Hidden prerequisites are not allowed.” This is not derived from Senate-approved policy but establishes a standard of practice;
- **Major Electives: Elective lists should be carefully maintained to reduce petitions and exceptions** (*middle of p. 16*). Interpretation: This section includes a statement that “Elective buckets must have a limited list of courses to satisfy the requirement.” This is not derived from Senate-approved policy but establishes a standard of practice.

The clarification of these sections would also entail identifying which areas of the Curriculum Guide would fall under a “notice and objection process.” Defining this lane clearly would reduce the logistical burden by reserving full Senate review only for substantive changes while allowing routine operational updates to move efficiently. With respect to the Chancellor’s Office, CSU, accreditation, or government mandates, Academic Programs would retain the ability to implement required compliance language to meet external deadlines, while those mandated changes that affect curriculum policy or academic standards would be brought forward for prompt Senate review or ratification. An accelerated objection window would also be used when timelines are tight, coordinated with the Chair and Vice-Chair, as needed. Examples of administrative or editorial updates with a defined “notice and objection” period are:

- Annual calendars and deadlines (we already do this in a referral);
- Workflow steps related to Curriculog or PeopleSoft;
- Contact lists, templates, examples, and formatting guidance;
- Clarifying edits that do not add, remove, or modify requirements or approval authority.

The committee discussed this detailed feedback, and Dr. Massa provided points of clarification on several of the bulleted areas above. With regard to the Curricular Exception Memo (pp. 59-60 and appendix D), for instance, Dr. Massa explained that this process is based on long-standing practice. On the point regarding Major Electives (‘elective lists should be carefully maintained to reduce petitions and exceptions’; middle of p. 16), it was explained that the units published in the catalog have legal implications and financial aid implications. She reiterated that policy is not being invented but policy and practices are being made transparent in compliance with state and federal policy.

Following this meeting, the committee engaged in further consultation with Dr. Aaron DeRosa (Faculty Director of Undergraduate Studies and GE), who agreed to attend the committee’s next meeting on Wed., March 25th to provide further context on the revision process for the Curriculum Guide, the history of its development, the feasibility of conducting a thorough

review, and the possibility of delivering annual presentations with a defined notice and objection process. Dr. DeRosa noted that the Curriculum Guide originally came from policy and was designed with the intention of making policy more accessible by bridging the gap between policy and faculty through the adding of content. He further explained that while feedback is regularly embraced, a review of the Curriculum Guide alongside a series of annual presentations at the beginning of the Fall semester would be possible, provided that the Academic Senate website be fixed before this review begins.

Following the referral's first reading on Wed., April 15th, the committee received general feedback requesting clarification about the initial recommendation to fix the Academic Senate website. The committee reached out to Dr. DeRosa, who explained that in his work to update the Curriculum Guide, significant systemic failures emerged in how university policy is archived, searched, and managed. He identified three interrelated issues:

1. Technical & Search Infrastructure Failures
  - a. Broken Links: Multiple website redesigns have resulted in dead links throughout existing guides.
  - b. Search Limitations: The official Senate search function often returns no results, even with specific keywords or report numbers. It also lacks full-text search.
  - c. Archive Design: The Senate server was built to manage *processes* (agendas/minutes), not to serve as a searchable *policy archive*. It lacks consistent folder organization.
2. Document Inconsistency & Fragmentation
  - a. Missing Records: There is no uniform "package" for policies; some records have presidential approval but no text, while others have text but no record of approval.
  - b. Overlapping Policies: Complex topics (like Bachelor degree requirements) are governed by multiple overlapping referrals rather than a single, reconciled document.
3. Structural & Jurisdictional Hurdles
  - a. No Central Repository: There is no single designated home for a set of updated policies. Policies are scattered across different departments (Catalog, Enrollment, Graduate Studies, Academic Manual), leading to piecemeal and inconsistently updated information that are owned by different silos of the university.
  - b. Scope Creep: Many necessary policies fall outside the curriculum-based purview of the current revision role, making them difficult to officially address.

Dr. DeRosa also emphasized a necessary shift in strategy toward policy management as opposed to simply the passing of referrals. This involves reconciling decades of old data and ensuring new decisions do not create future conflicts with the archive. This echoes concerns raised by Dr. Berit Givens (Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee), who reported that in her experience, there is no

way of tracking the history of policies in the academic manual or seeing how policies which pass the Senate are implemented.

Along these lines, Dr. DeRosa expressed the importance of exercising care in conducting a review of the Curriculum Guide itself, sharing that the work cannot be treated as a quick “delete” job without first building the new policy infrastructure to replace it through the Senate referral process. The removal of guidance before a new policy is officially ratified could create operational disarray and significantly increase the workload for faculty, staff, and the Registrar’s Office. Doing the work of improving the Curriculum Guide would most likely require a multi-year effort alongside consistent consultation and IT collaboration.

### **Recommendation**

Following a discussion and vote, it is the revised recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee that the Senate appoint a “working group” to conduct a one-time review of the Curriculum Guide that will engage with the entire 83+ -page document to determine the parts that may include Senate-approved policies, Chancellor’s office policies, and other areas that are not referred to by policy or supported by documentation (as originally proposed by President Ortiz in 2010). The “working group” would work over the course of an academic year in consultation with the Office of Academic Programs and the appropriate Senate committee(s) with the purpose of making specific recommendations to the Senate and the Office of Academic Programs (e.g. for ongoing review). In order for this work to take place, the Academic Senate website will need to be fixed as Dr. DeRosa suggested (for an example, see <https://calstate.policystat.com/>).

It is also the recommendation of the committee that an annual report and presentation of edits/revisions made to the curriculum guide be delivered by the Office of Academic Programs to the Senate during the first Fall meeting of the academic year. This follows the Academic Affairs Committee originally proposed “compromise solution” that would require an annual presentation alongside the publishing of a document covering the contents of the presentation (as is typical for Senate presentations, referral reports, and other matters). The committee agrees to this approach with the understanding that an annual presentation on changes made to the document would provide time and space for necessary faculty insight on a living document that “can be edited or revised at any time,” even though the process of providing feedback on such revisions would not be defined—at least initially—by a more formal “notice and objection process” during the period in which the working group is conducting its review of the Curriculum Guide. (This is something that the working group may consider recommending at a later time.)