Resolved:

ASI BOARD OF DIRECTORS STANCE AGAINST MANDATORY SECOND YEAR HOUSING

WHEREAS: Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) Board of Directors is the official voice of Cal Poly students, and

WHEREAS: Current on campus housing is not appealing for many students because of the following reasons, including but not limited to:
- The cost of on campus living is much higher than off-campus housing options in the surrounding areas.
- Many amenities are not readily accessible on campus, such as affordable grocery stores, retail stores, and restaurants.
- The atmosphere of Poly Canyon Village is undesirable to many students due to the lack of a community environment, an inability to decorate the bland interior, and an environment of rules and supervision that many students feel is too intrusive.
- The sizeable walking distance through campus or on surface streets from Poly Canyon Village and Cerro Vista to the outlying neighborhoods surrounding Cal Poly is currently unsafe for students walking home late at night, specifically on weekends, due to minimal lighting, security patrol, and security cameras. The safety of our fellow peers is among our top priorities.

WHEREAS: The ASI Board of Directors was presented Cal Poly Administration’s support of mandatory second year housing at the meeting on April 1, 2015, and

WHEREAS: The University President Representative’s presentation argued in favor of mandatory second year housing on the grounds that it would improve retention and graduation rates. The presentation included graphs which showed the differences in retention and graduation rates between students that lived on campus both their first and second year, and students that only lived on campus their first year, and

WHEREAS: The ASI Board of Directors is in opposition to the argument presented by the University, due to the following:
- The data came from a biased sample. Those likely to live on campus a second year cannot be directly compared to those that choose to live off-campus. Additional factors such as GPA, major, and socioeconomic status cannot be ignored in an appropriate statistical study.
- The presentation concluded that the differences in retention and graduation rates were due to living on campus for the second year. This correlation does not
imply causation, and therefore should not be the core of the argument presented.

- The differences in retention and graduation rates between the two groups are not necessarily statistically significant. Naturally, there will be a difference between groups, but this cannot be verified as a meaningful difference without a statistical test.

**WHEREAS:** The ASI Board of Directors believes that the presentation and discussions surrounding this topic are misleading for the following reasons:

- The presentation never explicitly identified the University’s interest in mandatory second year housing, and instead framed it as a report about the retention and graduation rates of Cal Poly students.
- The presentation slides showed graphs with axes that changed between 60% or 70% to 100%, and showed graphs that ranged from 0% to 100%. Manipulation of the axes creates an inaccurate impression of data trends and magnifies the differences in the groups.
- The presentation compares Cal Poly to other universities that have mandatory second year housing requirements; however, several of these universities are private schools and not in California.

**WHEREAS:** The presentation was intended to be brought to various groups around campus to get feedback, however the presentation contradicts other discussions with Administration, and

**WHEREAS:** A Mustang News article released a few days before the presentation quoted Preston Allen, the executive director of University Housing, saying, “Students will not be forced to live on campus...even housing for first-years is not mandatory, there are always exceptions.” This is a misleading way of presenting the topic to the campus. First year on campus housing is mandatory, as would it be for second years given the proposal, and

**WHEREAS:** With mandatory second year housing, there will be a significant increase in on campus residents without plans to increase resident parking.

**THEREFORE**

**BE IT**

**RESOLVED:** That as the official voice of students, the ASI Board of Directors strongly believes on campus housing situations must be improved before mandatory second year housing is considered. The University should create a housing plan that incentivizes students to live on campus rather than requiring that they live on campus.

---

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED: That as the official voice of students, the ASI Board of Directors does not support mandatory second year housing and the argument presented by the University. We urge the University to collect more relevant data to form a valid argument in support of mandatory second year housing. Accurate student opinions cannot be collected with inconsistent information and a misleading presentation.

FURTHERMORE
BE IT
RESOLVED: This resolution will be sent to President Armstrong, Vice President Keith Humphrey, and Executive Director of University Housing Preston Allen.

Certified as the true and correct copy, in witness thereof, I have set my hand and Seal of the San Luis Obispo Cal Poly Associated Students, Inc. this ___ day of ____, 2015.

Attest:
ASI Secretary

ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Board of Directors at San Luis Obispo Cal Poly Associated Students, Inc. this ___ day of ________2015.

Signed:
ASI Chair of the Board

Signed:
ASI President
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