

LRAP Recommendations Regarding Wor-Wic/SU Pilot Program to be Discussed with  
Administrators and other Senate Committees  
October 15, 2010

The LRAP committee recommends that the following agreement be signed by the relevant parties:

Assurances and/or rules for this new program:

1. The Pilot will last 2 years before any decision to expand, to allow all pertinent data to be collected and analyzed. The program may be eliminated more rapidly, however, if it is clearly not successful.
2. No SU incoming freshman will be denied housing on campus if they apply by the deadline.
  - a.) This assumes that the Wor-Wic students will only be placed in freshmen residence halls, or in the public-private partnership facilities. If they are allowed to be placed in upper-class residence halls, then we would expand this to say:
    - i. No SU incoming freshmen or returning upperclassmen will be denied housing on campus if they apply by the deadline.
3. For the courses offered to Wor-Wic students on the SU campus, there will never be more than two sections per year (section size defined as the same size as an equivalent SU course) from any one department on campus
4. English 101/102 will continue to be “off the table,” and not an option for the Wor-Wic students
5. Any new courses added to the WW program will be cleared by the faculty senate and/or SU departments (as an aside: how were existing courses selected? Did faculty have any input?)
6. If a pilot student wants to continue with WW classes in the spring semester and continue to live on the SU campus, this will not be allowed. In the spring, students will either enroll at SU, or move off campus and out of this program.
7. Students selected for involvement in the WW program will have the same approximate diversity indices as those in the regular SU freshman class.
8. If the program eventually expands, classrooms and other facilities will not be denied SU faculty and students. Expansion will never displace existing SU faculty and courses from their physical space and time slots.

Benchmark Data that we would like for SU to collect:

1. Academic Success for WW students:
  - a. Data on WW GPA and Spring SU GPA, and end of sophomore year
  - b. retention/persistence
  - c. course completion at end of WW experience and at end of SU spring semester, and end of sophomore year
2. Comparative Analysis: Choose a random sample of equal size among other freshman cohort spring admits. For this random sample, compare them to the WW/SU students with regards to:
  - a. January Qualifications:
    - i. Prior GPA and number of credits from the fall (if any)

- ii. High school GPA and SAT (as well as other data that would show approximate qualifications as admitted students)
  - b. Performance at SU:
    - i. Spring semester GPA at SU, and sophomore year GPA
    - ii. Retention/persistence
    - iii. Course completion at end of SU spring semester, and at end of sophomore year
- 3. Community Impact: Survey WW/SU students, as well as SU freshman cohort as a whole. We imagine requiring the NSSE, but also a more specific instrument designed to gauge:
  - a. whether this program has any adverse (or positive) impact upon student satisfaction with their freshman year, including both:
    - i. **academics** (ie, is it disruptive to live with someone who gets the same requirement filled, but with a far easier and cheaper course? Or, do WW/SU students in the spring feel that they were adequately prepared for SU courses?)
    - ii. **social life** (ie, are WW/SU students fully integrated? Is there a stigma associated with the program? Etc.)
- 4. Program Cost: What is the SU expenditure per student for the WW/SU students, and for the normal SU freshman cohort?
  - a. We are interested here not in the total program cost, nor where the money comes from. What we want is a per-student dollar figure – what are the resources being spent on these WW/SU students, per person? This figure should include:
    - i. The cost of faculty mentoring and advising
    - ii. The GA for the CSA
    - iii. Any additional support staff costs that are accrued specifically by this program.
  - b. We then would like for this per student cost to be generated for the SU freshman cohort as a whole – comparing apples to apples, focus only upon measurable comparable costs (ie, if the average WW/SU student is responsible for 1/50 of a GA at the CSA, how much support at the CSA would an average SU Freshman receive?)

Showstoppers that would result in the immediate cessation of the pilot program:

1. If there is a statistical decrease in student satisfaction as a result of the program among SU freshmen (as measured by NSSE, and any additional instruments designed)
2. If the per-student funds expended on pilot program students was measurably higher than the per-student funds expended on regular SU freshmen (as measured in benchmark no. 4, above). The decision of what amount of variance is allowed should be discussed and agreed upon in advance – 15%? 10%? None?
3. If this pilot group of students is not performing any better than the regular group of spring admits (or the comparative sample described in benchmark no. 2 above), in terms of GPA, retention, and course completion at the end of their sophomore year