ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, March 26, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   - Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
   - April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   March 12, 2019 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         1. Continuous Enrollment Report (handout)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. BPC (B. Street)
         1. Academic Calendar: Faculty input into timing of spring break
      iv. FAC (M. Rush)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
      i. AVP EM
      ii. AVP Academic Programs
      iii. Director of Academic Operations
   d. GE Task Force Final Report (see previous handout 1-16 pages) (Pages 17-23 contains lists of members and references.)
   e. BC/CSUB Partnership
   f. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   g. University Week
      i. Faculty Meeting

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. ITAC Report
7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING APRIL 4, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   **Announcements**
   - President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   
   **Consent Agenda**
   - New Business
   - Old Business

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, March 12, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), J. Millar, J. Tarjan, M. Rush, E. Correa, B. Street, M. Danforth, V. Harper

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION**
   - President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   - Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
   - April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny
   - University Hour – the Cabinet is not opposed. There may be a way to overcome utilization.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   E. Correa moved to have the minutes of March 5, 2019 approved electronically.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   The agenda was approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. **AS Log (handout)** A sub-committee chair said there was a lack of engagement by certain administrators in meetings. V. Harper asked for feedback on the participation of those members. Next fall, the EC will take-up whether the assignment of positions needs to be changed.
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) Functionally, it works to have L. Zuzarte in AAC for the remainder of the semester. V. Harper switched assignments to sub-committees due to work on the Annual Catalog. He made immediate reinstatement of D.
Jackson on AAC where her expertise is valuable. A. Hegde said that going forward, it should be position based. D. Boschini said the appointments will be cleared with Interim Provost V. Harper.

ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) The committee concluded work on Referral #10, Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal. The committee’s recommendation has been sent back to C. Catoda and J. Watkins. The attendance and participation of administrators has improved since the appointment of D. Jackson and K. Knutzen as members of AS&SS. They have the institutional knowledge that is valuable. D. Jackson was especially helpful to the discussion of the Referral #11, Textbook Ordering Process.

iii. BPC (B. Street) 2018-2019 Referral # 9 University Hour No resolution is forthcoming or action by the Senate required.

iv. FAC (M. Rush) REF 2018-2019 # 19 name changed to “Faculty Workload”. M. Rush will pass along work done on REF 2018-2019 #6 DLC to AAC for consideration.

b. Interim Provost Update – V. Harper is still considering an Academic Affairs consultant. He is working with AASCU, and a former President of several same-size institutions. The reason is that the renewal of CSUB Strategic Plan and the trend toward becoming a metro university is important and different than what has been done before. AA will be producing an organizational structure to chart the university’s future. The questions include, do we need a Dean of Research, split undergraduate and graduate studies, should we have colleges, should we break-out one of the schools to be a college? The consultant will be on campus for a couple days of meetings to arrive at a view of the campus at a macro organization level. The report will not be ready in time for Strategic Planning process to be completed. There are parts of the report that can be used to plan future years. J. Millar asked that the answers address the projected number of MPP, Dean(s) and any other new positions. Will the TT faculty deficit be filled? V. Harper said he sees improvement on TT hires in this cycle. D. Boschini said that the change in organizational structure, dividing schools, etc. needs to be transparent and inclusive. The consultant may have a fresh eye and be right, yet we still want to take the correct approach. A. Hegde’ perception is that the university re-organization of college and schools is the administration’s purview. V. Harper responded that there is a
governance aspect. He added that the consultant’s report is to be informative and not deterministic. The Deans and Interim Provost will meet today. T. Davis has produced three scenarios of different levels of increase budget for the university. They will lead to an estimate for budgets for the entire CSUB. A sub-set of that scenario will be tenure-track faculty. There will be a number of TT for each scenario, plus 1 for the sustainability position. V. Harper is an advocate for increasing those numbers. The Deans have taken their chairs requests for TT and then ranked them. Those numbers will go into a decision matrix and roll up to the school level data. V. Harper’s negotiation with the deans will be the allocation of the pool of lines across the schools and Antelope Valley. The conversation opens today, and will continue over several meetings. The data will be given to deans to have discussion with their chairs so that those conversations between Vice Provost and Council are transparent, and unfold to faculty. A. Hegde appreciates V. Harper’s process and said that he was asked by junior faculty to explicitly pass along their appreciation too. V. Harper replied that the campus is late into the process, and that there is restricted data. As the campus grows into the process and can weight factors over a couple cycles, it will become right. T. Davis is doing scenarios for all divisions across the entire university. V. Harper is interested in AA. BAS is about two weeks from having the numbers ready. A. Hegde asked about the new AVP in BAS and how the decision was made in light of the statement that no MPPs would be added. V. Harper said that the decision was made very early into his current position. T. Davis brought it to Cabinet and the President approved it. D. Boschini asked if V. Harper have the ability to make arguments for year-round faculty hiring. She asked that he keep an open mind when faculty come with ways that are different than what the university has done before. J. Miller asked for V. Harper to offer T. Wallace a TT line to help the counseling center faculty’s workload assigned to Student Affairs. V. Harper acknowledged Senator Millar’s help with a student yesterday.

c. Searches
   i. AVP EM – The position was released yesterday.
   ii. AVP Academic Programs - The position was released yesterday.
   iii. Director of Academic Operations – The posting of the position closed yesterday.
iv. Associate Dean of Grad and Undergraduate – The job description has been completed and will be posted next week. It is internal. Hiring will complete this semester.

v. The Interim Dean SSE will start mid-August. The election of a Search Committee for the permanent SSE Dean national search is needed by the end of the year.

vi. There is a committee forming for the AVP Facilities committee.

d. GE Task Force Final Report (see previous handout 1-16 pages) (Pages 17-23 contains lists of members and references.)

i. GE Task Force Resolution (handout) J. Millar said that Dr. Blanchard released the report before the Statewide Senate had even accepted or reviewed it in the ASCSU committees. No one in ASCSU had reviewed it. The Senate has wisdom and moves in its own way. The Task Force Report may not be accepted by CSU and it shadows what that CO may do. ASCSU will start discussions tomorrow and it will come out in the Plenary. It could come out as an EO but not because the Senate passed it. There is a huge conversation on how the CO reviews and chooses data and the reports from which they make their reports. M. Danforth said the GE Task Force Report was discussed in AAC’s February 14, 2019 open forum. They noted that the report recommended no double counting. That topic is not in M. Martinez’ draft CSUB resolution. D. Boschini said that the Senate resolution needs to be broadened to represent more issues and offer solutions. J. Millar gave an example of how CSUB would be outraged if Senate had a Distributed Learning Task Force and their report was distributed by our President before the Senate had a chance to look at it. Several people are upset that they haven’t been able to look at the effect of double counting on the students. She encouraged the group to submit comments and information to D. Boschini or our Statewide Senators. E. Correa asked how the GE Task Force Report is linked to the GI 2025. SSE is concerned that the quality of education and the level of rigor expected needs to be intact while changes are being made. We want students to graduate and be successful, but we don’t want to dilute education. There is push back on scholastic expectations in order to push students through by offering summer classes and other things. There needs to be a distinction that, while this is coming forward as a particular initiative for
specific reasons, it’s not really attached in a way that it’s going to have an impact on what’s going forward for graduation. Otherwise faculty will be pushing back because they are being told what to do to implement changes so there is less demand on students so we can just push them through so our graduation rate increases. That’s a problem. There needs to be a conversation about the direction of each initiative and the impact on overall success of student graduation. The initiatives are not just being done with the intent of getting them through quickly. J. Millar sees the connections. She is impressed how many times other campus senators bring up what CSUB has been discussing, and how some campuses miss what we see. B. Street asked in what haste he should be concerned. Is this going to be worked through at stateside senate or what is the expectation of CSUB? D. Boschini said it depends how much has been invested. The GE Task Force was formed by the CSU Senate, the CO got their hands on it and then distributed it before it was to go through the process. J. Millar will know by next week if CO will be doing an end-run on the CSU Senate. M. Danforth said that AAC felt that the GE Task Force Report is a detriment to the Graduation Initiative for the accredited programs. It will so greatly constrain the students. It is a step toward tumbling down the cliff. AAC is also concerned that if there isn’t double counting, such that students will have a lot more named classes and a lot less free classes, how will that affect our ability to have enough sections? It get back to the tenure density issue. It would be a graduation impediment if they can’t get into those classes. A. Hegde said that it’s not just the accredited classes. The Economics department has a program that is very tight - 120 units - and it works due to double counting. If double counting isn’t allowed, it puts students in jeopardy. Nursing, and many other programs on campus would be affected if no double counting went into effect.

e. BC/CSUB Partnership – people on campus learned about the initiative from other sources. We need an open space for faculty to talk about this instead of holding an event for greater input. V. Harper has a roster of people working on the committee. There will be five faculty taken from a pool of twelve. There should be a couple meetings by the end of the semester. BC and the developer are moving forward. CSUB
had no role in the logistics and placement of trailers on the property. D. Boschini recommended that a clear message be sent to faculty. P. Jacobs is a consultant. The building owner(s) will build parking for their tenants. None of the students have been matriculated to CSUB. J. Millar said it’s not realistic to expect that BC students will pay a fee to access CSUB counseling, medical or events. D. Boschini reminded the group that the President announced an Open Forum Monday March 18, 0:900 for students, faculty, and staff.

f. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street has received information on when the President and T. Davis are available. The decision will be made soon and the announcement made well in advance.

g. Hiring Procedures – D. Boschini hears about the same two concerns every year.

1) The onboarding of new faculty is fractured between by HR, Faculty Affairs and IT. The on-boarding process of dealing with different departments is not satisfactory. She recommendation that Faculty Affairs talk with new faculty that started in the last two years to learn about the issues and then work to fix it.

2) When the campus decides to hire a TT line, the process of training people who can be on the search committee has created conflict. There is difference in what Handbook says and what departments are hearing from Faculty Affairs. There are exceptions made in some departments whereby Lecturers can be on search committee and then others who use only TT faculty. There are departments with plenty of TT yet vocal lecturers are getting on the search committee. It’s beyond the necessity of convenience. The Handbook says TT serve on the search committee. Lecturers are being led by Faculty Affairs to believe that they have a right. It is EC preference to follow the Handbook. If the Handbook needs to change, then go through the process. It’s not a referral. This is not a referral. Instead, the Handbook needs to be followed.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Faculty Marshals – There used to be three awardees and a Senate Chair. The four were divided evenly to one Undergraduate ceremony and one Gradate ceremony. Now, we have five awards and a Senate Chair for two mace-carrying opportunities. A. Hegde affirmed that faculty are an important part of commencement. Awardees should be part of the platform party. Associate VPs don’t need to be there since they aren’t
directly related to the students. D. Boschini said that one ceremony would be the Senate Chair, the Excellence in Teaching Awardee, Scholarship and Creativity, and Faculty Leadership and Service Award; the chair and 3 major awards. The recommendation to the Commencement Committee is to have the two new awards, Outstanding Lecturer, and Promising New Faculty Award and add an individual to the Undergraduate Commencement so that there are three faculty members for Undergraduate and three faculty members for Graduate Commencement. The Interim Provost V. Harper will take the recommendation to the Commencement Committee.

b. University Week - planning conversations have begun. Agenda

i. Faculty Meeting - D. Boschini would like to have people walk away energized from motivation to solve problems. The idea is to provide an informational session that is highly valuable. Do something meaningful, such as a GI 2025 faculty panel to discuss solutions and an action plan. Highlight the faculty initiatives. E. Correa said that the new faculty have issues around Faculty Day. It is the first day they have to get syllabus, ID, and other things ready for their first day teaching. They are frustrated to sit during Faculty Day while they have looming deadlines to be ready for class. D. Boschini asked for an early schedule of school meetings. M. Danforth recalled that IT used to schedule new faculty for two hours in computer lab as part of the new faculty orientation. The new administrators were there too. It should be added back into new faculty orientation. D. Boschini’s idea is that one person (faculty case manager) could be assigned to make sure things get done so new faculty can be ready for their first day of class. University wide coordination.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING MARCH 21, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   Announcements
   
   UA Public Affairs and Communication – Jennifer Self (Time Certain 10:05-10:10)
   
   Consent Agenda
   
   New Business
   
   Old Business
   
   RES 181911 Annual Catalog Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
* Changes to the University Handbook
Meeting adjourned at 11:45.
**Academic Affairs Committee: Melissa Danforth/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 328 Research Room**

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 02 Change of Membership on AAC and Change in Bylaws</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC Memo to Senate – AAC discussed and decided that since AVP of AP represents AA, the Director of AP need not be an ex-officio on AAC. No update to By-Laws needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC’s feedback was incorporated into the proposal document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The faculty stakeholder’s proposal was withdrawn 2/27/19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 08 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration</td>
<td>In Action Report</td>
<td>Viewing process flows of the annual vs. every two years, workload and implications RES 181911 Annual Catalog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 17 Distributed Learning Committee Policies</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>AAC look at new issue of course approval process that came from FAC’s discussion of Referral 06.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 20 Continuous Enrollment Course</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 22 Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification_AAC+AS&amp;SS</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>AAC and AS&amp;SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00am in BPA 134

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Recommendations made. Response received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>No further action from AS&amp;SS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process</td>
<td>Pending discussion</td>
<td>Pending discussion of the financial viability before the committee can make recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 16 Faculty Participation in Information Technology Matters</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 22 Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification_AAC+AS&amp;SS</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC and AS&amp;SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am in Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The faculty stakeholder’s proposal was withdrawn 2/27/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BPC No resolution is forthcoming or action by the Senate required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty Affairs Committee: Maureen Rush/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 235 Math Library**  
**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/28/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 01 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18</td>
<td>10/11/18</td>
<td>10/19/18</td>
<td>10/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>03/04/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>03/04/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Moved to AAC</td>
<td>Referral moved from AS&amp;SS to FAC on 10/30/18. Referral moved from FAC to AAC on 03/05/19.</td>
<td>03/07/19</td>
<td>03/15/19</td>
<td>03/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 15_University Council Membership Addition-Library Representative – Handbook Change (105.3)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>3/04/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 18 Graduate Director Term Limits and Feedback Review - Handbook Change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>3/04/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 19 Faculty Workload</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>3/04/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 21 Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee Structure and Process Improvement</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>3/04/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Enrollment for Graduate Students
Prepared by Debra Jackson
Interim Associate Dean, Graduate and Undergraduate Studies

Across the CSU, graduate students who have been advanced to candidacy but have not completed the culminating experience are expected to maintain their status by enrolling in a “continuous enrollment” course. However, the cost, unit-load, and administration of continuous enrollment courses vary greatly. Here is a small sampling of the variety of models across the CSU.

- At CSU Bakersfield, graduate students pay $75 for a 0-unit course, which is administratively run through CSUB’s Extended University. The course code depends on the discipline (e.g. BIOL 7000, GEOL 7000, HIST 700, etc), and the instructor of record is the student’s graduate committee chair.
- At CSU Dominguez Hills, graduate students pay $145 for a course, which is administratively run through Extended Education or stateside, depending on where the program is housed.
- At CSU Chico, graduate students pay $180 for a 0-unit course, GRST 899, which is administratively run through Regional and Continuing Education. Students who have fallen out of status and need to be brought back into active status to finish their program must submit a petition and pay for past semesters, including late fees.
- At CSU Monterey Bay, graduate students pay $200 for a 0-unit course, GRAD 699.
- At CSU Northridge, graduate students pay $250 for a 0-unit course, A/R 601, which is administratively run state-side. The course has no instructor, and the student earns no grade.
- At CSU San Bernardino, graduate students pay $260 for a 0-unit course.
- At CSU Sacramento, Master’s students pay $281 and Doctoral students pay $438 for a 0-unit course, which is administratively run by the College of Continuing Education.
- At CSU San Marcos, graduate students pay ~$300 for a 0-unit course, E699, which is administratively run through Extended Learning.
- At CSU San Luis Obispo, graduate students pay $349 for a 1-unit, credit/no credit course, GS 597.
- At CSULA, graduate students pay $350 for a 0-unit course, UNIV 9000.
- At CSU Fresno, graduate students pay for a 0-unit course, 298C or 299C, through regular enrollment.

Although CSU Bakersfield’s low-cost continuous enrollment fee is a benefit for those graduate students with limited resources, it is out of alignment with other CSU campuses. If the fee were raised, the additional funds could be deployed for services that support graduate student success such as the GSC technology lab, the GSC workshop series, the GSC student-faculty mentor collaborative initiatives, to support recruitment for graduate programs, and/or to support costs associated with thesis/dissertation submission and storage.

Below is a table representing the number of students who have registered for a continuous enrollment course, and the disciplinary programs they are from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>BIOL, EDCA, GEOL, HIST, INST, PPA, BIOL</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
<td>GEOL, PPA, ENGL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before moving forward, the following questions ought to be considered:

- How much should be charged for continuous enrollment?
- Should the course be run through Extended University or stateside?
- Should the course be 0-unit or 1-unit?
- Should the course use a single course code (e.g. CSUB, GRAD) or a disciplinary course code (e.g. BIOL, GEOL, HIST)?
- Should the course have an instructor of record? If so, who?
- Should the course be required or optional for graduate students who have advanced to candidacy but have not completed the culminating experience?
- If continuous enrollment is required for all students, how should this be enforced?
- Which campus bodies need to be consulted to approve any changes?
- How should the continuous enrollment fee revenue be deployed?