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Resolution # 08
2009-2010
College Senate

TO: Dr. John R. Halstead, College President
FROM: The College Senate: February 1, 2010
RE: I. Formal Resolution (Act of Determination)
II. Recommendation (Urging the Fitness of)
III. Other, For Your Information (Notice, Request, Report, etc.)

SUBJ: Two-Year Residency Requirement (resolving #22 09-10 RP)

Please fill out the bottom portion and follow the distribution instructions at the end of this page.

TO: Steven B. Lewis, The College Senate President
FROM: John R. Halstead, College President
RE: I. Decision and Action Taken on Formal Resolution (circle choice)
   a. Accepted - Implementation Effective Date: Fall 2011
   b. Deferred for discussion with the Faculty Senate on __/__/__
   c. Unacceptable for the reasons contained in the attached explanation

II, III. Response to Recommendation or Other/FYI
   a. Received and acknowledged __/__/__
   b. Comment: __________________________

Signed: ___________________________________________________________________________
         (Dr. John R. Halstead, President, The College at Brockport)
         Date: 2/17/10

DISTRIBUTION
Upon approval, resolutions are posted to the College Senate Web at http://www.brockport.edu/collegesenate/resolutions
**DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS:** FEBRUARY 28
Incomplete proposals or proposals received after the deadline may not be reviewed until next semester.

**INSTRUCTIONS** – please, no multiple attachments – each proposal must be submitted electronically as one document.

- Submit only complete proposals. Include support letters from department chair and dean.
- Proposals must be prepared individually in Word format using committee guidelines available at brockport.edu/collegesenate/proposal.html.
- Fill out this cover page for each proposal and insert it electronically as the front page of your document. (brockport.edu/collegesenate/proposal.html)
- Email whole proposal with cover page as one document to senate@brockport.edu and facprez@brockport.edu.
- All updates must be resubmitted to the Senate office with the original cover page including routing number.
- Questions? Call the Senate office at 395-2586 or the appropriate committee chairperson.

1. **PROPOSAL TITLE:** Please be somewhat descriptive, i.e. Graduate Probation/Dismissal Proposal rather than Graduate Proposal.
   Recommendation Regarding Two Year Residency Proposal

2. **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**
   Statement of conditional approval for a two year residency proposal.

3. **WILL ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AFFECTING BUDGET ARE NEEDED?** _x__ NO  ___ YES  EXPLAIN YES
   (This is not a proposal for a residency requirement, but a statement of advice on such a proposal)

4. **HOW WILL THIS EFFECT TRANSFER STUDENTS:**
   N/A (see #3)

5. **ANTICIPATED EFFECTIVE DATE:**
   Fall 2011

6. **SUBMISSION & REVISION DATES:** PLEASE PUT A DATE ON ALL UPDATED DOCUMENTS TO AVOID CONFUSION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Submission</th>
<th>Updated on</th>
<th>Updated on</th>
<th>Updated on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/24/09</td>
<td>12/9/09</td>
<td>2/4/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **SUBMITTED BY:** (contact person)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Georger</td>
<td>Delta College Program</td>
<td>5473</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgeorger@brockport.edu">jgeorger@brockport.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **COMMITTEES TO COPY:** (Senate office use only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Forwarded For Approval To</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Enrollment Planning &amp; Policies</td>
<td>Committee for approval</td>
<td>11/25/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Faculty &amp; Professional Staff Policies</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>12/7/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> General Education &amp; Curriculum Policies *</td>
<td>GED to Vice Provost</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Graduate Curriculum &amp; Policies</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>12/14/09, vote 2/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Student Policies</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>Signed 2/17/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Undergraduate Curriculum &amp; Policies</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* follow special Gen Ed procedures for submission of General Education proposals at “How to Submit Proposals” on our Website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **REJECTED -WITHDRAWN**

NOTES: M. Esler will present a powerpoint at the 2/1/10 Senate meeting. MINUTES 2/1/10: A MOTION TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL TO APPLY TO THE INCOMING CLASS OF 2011 AND NOT 2010 WAS MADE BY C. EDWARDS AND SECONDED. THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.
December 9, 2009
TO: College Senate, The College at Brockport, SUNY
FROM: Enrollment Planning and Policies Committee
SUBJECT: Two Year Residency Requirement

The Bylaws of the College Senate specify the purpose of the EPP as follows: “The Committee shall act for the Senate in the continuing study and review of College Policies in the area of recruitment, admissions and retention.” Article Six, Section I. 1

Following this charge, we have studied and discussed the proposal requiring all first time (“direct entry”) college students to reside on campus for two years, and wish to make our recommendation, seeking Senate endorsement of this recommendation.

Background:
1. Brockport has achieved an impressive first year retention rate, suggesting we have expertise in developing programs of engagement that work well to retain students.
2. Initiatives are underway, and resources allocated to enhance the second year experience, such as the hiring of a full time second year coordinator beginning January 2010, and planned measure to give second years students a more preferred standing than in the past, when it comes to choosing (and securing) their desired residency options.
3. A significant volume of study in the field of higher education supports the premise that residency on campus is associated with positive outcomes, one of which is student retention. Other positive results, such as progress toward graduation and higher levels of engagement with peers and faculty are also supported by on-campus residence.
4. There is some Brockport research showing a positive correlation between residency and retention, and academic performance.
5. Other intuitive benefits seem to be associated with on campus living. Some of which are:
   - More proximate access to resources such as computer labs, library, advisors etc.
   - Greater safety related to personal security, fire protection etc.
   - Less ongoing access to alcohol or other illegal substances (The affected population is predominantly under 21 years old).
6. Two year residency is required by a clear majority of our sister SUNY institutions.
7. Brockport has the room for an increased number of second year students, without needing such measures as tripling.
8. In other cases, students seek off campus accommodations for perceived or real advantages over the on- campus residential experience,(eg. the need for “single room privacy”). For such students this avenue of “advantage” would be closed in the second year.

Possible Effects on Enrollment and Retention:
1. A second year residency requirement may increase retention from second to third year, and improve the overall Brockport experience in terms of engagement. Research seems to support this possibility.
2. However less likely, the second year experience may decrease retention from second to third year, owing to the dissatisfaction of students who would have preferred to live off campus.
3. The number of first year applications may be affected in a positive way due to parental perceptions favoring on-campus residence. (see “intuitive benefits” above)
4. The number of first year applications may be affected in a negative way due to students’ perception that Brockport no longer distinguishes itself from “the competition” with greater residential choice and freedom.
5. Retention from first to second year may decline as students who are seeking a solution to financial pressures, or seeking particular living conditions such as a private room, may elect to transfer.
Recommendation:
1. Whereas: Greater retention of second year students and the potential benefits of better academic performance and greater engagement are goals worth pursuing, ones which warrant a calculated risk.
2. Whereas: The risk of a significant negative impact on enrollment or retention seems small.
3. Whereas: Professionals in the field of Student Affairs and Residential Life are trusted to research the benefits of new policies, and monitor the effectiveness of changes in reaching desired outcomes.
4. Whereas: The College has demonstrated a commitment to enhancing the First Year Experience, as well as the Transfer and Second Year Experience.

The Enrollment Planning and Policies Committee supports the Two Year Residency Requirement on the following conditions:

Conditions:
1) Enriched programming should be delivered to second year students, with metrics established to measure the defined outcomes.
2) Specific research of the Brockport population should be conducted to better understand the motivation for living off campus. This might include “exit” interviews conducted by Res Life staff of all students opting to move off campus, with special focus on the 2009 cohort (who will move off campus in 2010-11) and the 2010 cohort, (who will move off campus in 2011-12). This may also include researching sister SUNY colleges for retention results attributed to residency.
3) Clear retention baseline data should be documented for past years, and compared to subsequent years. “Pre” and “Post” measurements should be conducted to establish causation between residency and retention.
4) The academic quality of incoming first year students should be monitored for possible negative acceptance of the residency requirement.
5) This policy should be reviewed by the Enrollment Management Task force in Fall of 2012 to determine the effect on first to second year retention and in Fall of 2013 to determine the effect on second to third year retention.
Evidence Related to
Second Year Residency Requirement

M. Esler

Second Year GPA

Two-year Retention
Initial cohort = students retained after 1 year

Second Year Students
n = 868

SUNY Comparison

From the Research

“Housing arrangements, placement in sets of classes with the same students, and special academic, athletic, and interest groups can aid in developing a social attachment to the school” (Bean, 229).
From the Research

“Students living on campus were 1.73 times more likely to return the second year and 1.38 times more likely to persist to the third year” (Nora, Barlow and Crisp, 136)

From the Research

“With a few noteworthy exceptions (Asada et al., 2003; Knox et al., 1993; K. Smith, 1993), the studies we reviewed generally point to the positive net effects of living in a residence hall (versus off campus) on shifts toward more positive and inclusive racial-ethnic attitudes and openness to diversity broadly defined” (Pascarella and Terenzini, 309)

From the Research

“In our current review, we found nothing to change our conclusion on this point. With few exceptions (for example, Grayson, 1998b), researchers have found that living in an on-campus residence hall increases the likelihood of persistence and degree completion whether students’ precollege characteristics are controlled or not (Astin, 1993c; Astin et al., 1996; Ballard, 1993; Canabal, 1995; Christie & Dinham, 1991; Hollings, 1992; King, 2002; Ryland et al., 1994; Thompson, Sarnirattanu, & Rafter, 1995; Tsui, Murdoch, & Mayer, 1997; Wolfe, 1993).” (Pascarella and Terenzini, 421)
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