

CAMPUS LIFE ADVISORY BOARD

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS

REPORT

**Brown University
August 2006**

Contact Information:
Campus Life & Student Services
Brown University
Box 1896
Providence RI 02912
401.863.1800



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Brown University Campus Life Subcommittee on Alcohol and Other Drugs was charged with an alcohol policy review that was intended to examine as broadly as possible the use of alcohol and other drugs by students. We evaluated the institution's policies, related resources and services, educational initiatives, judicial system, programming, staffing, academic regulations, and enforcement. We also included within the scope of our review factors related to the neighborhoods adjacent to our campus, how behavior and policy are handled on- and off-campus, and community establishments that contribute to the availability of alcohol in the area. In the spring of 2005, the Subcommittee decided that the main focus of this review would be alcohol use, given the fact that the vast majority of problems and concerns on campus were alcohol-related.

It is important to make clear at the beginning of this report that our work was not in response to any particular campus event, but was intended to be a periodic review to keep our policies and approach up-to-date and timely, and to include the most recent research on alcohol use among college students. The work of the Ad Hoc Social Event Review Committee, in contrast, was occasioned by two campus events in November 2005. These events contributed to the importance of our review, and the recommendations and research by that committee have contributed to our efforts, but our charge has always been more comprehensive and has been motivated by an interest in harm reduction and the need to incorporate the best practices into our approach at Brown.

Approach to this Review

This Subcommittee affirms that our primary interest is in promoting the health and safety of our community. Like many colleges and universities, we find ourselves in the position of knowing there is alcohol and drug use on our campus, and we need to operate within the context of the laws governing that use. At the same time, we must work to protect students' safety, given the behavior that occurs. The behaviors that concern us threaten the well-being or violate the rights of individuals to perform optimally as students. Within the Brown culture of student choice, therefore, our aim is to strike a balance between increased monitoring of behavior on the one hand and individual responsibility on the other. We intend to emphasize the preservation of community standards and promote the academic mission of the university. We paid careful attention to behavioral norms on our campus, and consequently present some recommendations aimed at decreasing heavy binge drinking and at increasing the comfort and visibility of non-drinkers and light drinkers. We also focused on the need to clarify the information we provide to students about our policies and to promote consistent responses to infractions.

Summary Recommendations

1. **Adopt the Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Social Event Review Committee Pertaining to Alcohol Use and Service**

These recommendations include targeting pre-partying or pre-gaming (the practice of consuming alcohol before attending social functions), regulations about the availability of non-alcoholic beverages and food at social events serving alcohol, limiting the hours of social functions, and additional training for bartenders and event managers.

2. Address Alcohol Use in the Residence Halls

Along with the Ad Hoc Social Event Review Committee, this Subcommittee endorses increasing residence hall staffing, particularly looking at models to bring older students into Residential Peer Leader roles. The Subcommittee also endorses increasing expectations for intervening in problematic drinking behavior.

3. Enhance Prevention and Harm Reduction

The Subcommittee endorses additional programming and services for first-year students because they are at particular risk for acute incidents. This would include expanding current prevention programming and revising freshman orientation. The Subcommittee would also like to see more support for non-alcohol events on campus. In recognition of the link between alcohol use and sexual assault, the Subcommittee further recommends requiring sexual assault training for student groups that serve alcohol.

4. Alcohol Service

In this review, the Subcommittee focused on recommendations to decrease under-age drinking, to slow down consumption when alcohol is served, and to utilize methods for keeping track of consumption.

5. Publicize and Educate on Disciplinary Responses to Alcohol Use

The Subcommittee found that information about the non-academic judicial system's response to drinking behavior was not visible enough on campus, creating the perception that disciplinary action was not regularly or consistently taken. Recommendations include establishing student-run regional judicial boards for greater accountability within residence halls, publicizing policies and actions taken when there are violations, and promoting community standards within residential areas.

6. Address Off-campus Behavior and Work with Community Vendors

The applicability of campus policy to off-campus residents is not understood by many students and has resulted in some problems in neighborhoods adjacent to our campus. We recommend working closely with students and neighbors to improve community relations. The Subcommittee would also like to create a partnership with the Liquor Licensing Board in Providence to decrease local sales of alcohol to minors.

THE COMMITTEE AND ITS PROCESS

Committee Charge

The on-going charge of the Subcommittee is to be concerned with the use and misuse of alcohol and drugs on campus by students and their guests, as well the relationship between substance abuse and students' academic lives. It provides advice to the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services and addresses issues related to alcohol and drug use and misuse by students, including patterns of consumption and problems related to use. The subcommittee reports to, consults with, and advises the Campus Life Advisory Board on topics related to alcohol and drug research, policies, trends, sanctions, education, treatment, and recovery from substances. Given that substance use issues involve other campus entities that may not be represented among the subcommittee membership, additional representatives of the Brown community (residential life, dining services, athletics, etc.) are invited to participate on occasion.

Committee Membership

Nancy Barnett, Assistant Professor of Psychiatry/Human Behavior, Chair
Margaret Klawunn, Associate Vice President/ Dean for Student Life, Co-Chair
Frances Mantak, Director of Health Education, Vice Chair
Terry Addison, Associate Dean for Judicial Affairs
Brian Becker, UCS Representative
Benjamin Boas, UCS Representative
Elizabeth Boyd, Graduate Student Representative
Melissa Clark, Associate Professor of Community Health
Meghan Gill, Chair of the Greek Council
Ricky Gresh, Director of Student Activities
Belinda Johnson, Director of Psychological Services
David Lewis, Professor of Medicine and Community Health
Emily Martineau, Coordinator of Community & Government Relations
Ana Mascarenas, Undergraduate representative of Health Education
Kathleen McSharry, Associate Dean and Dean of Chemical Dependency
Kevin O'Connor (replaced Emil Fioravanti), Department of Public Safety
Amelia Rosenman (replaced Trevor Stutz), Students for Sensible Drug Policy representative

Process of this Review

The Subcommittee met approximately every two weeks throughout the 2005-2006 academic year. In addition to the committee members who attended, we asked guest speakers to consult with us and invited some additional students to participate in order to broaden the range of student perspectives that were regularly included in our discussions. Guest members represented students living in substance-free residence halls, Health Education peer educators, Residential Peer Leaders, Emergency Medical Technicians, and members of an introductory level Community Health course. In addition to the student perspectives that informed our meeting discussions, student members of the Subcommittee hosted a meeting with student leaders to solicit their input on our work. We have incorporated their perspectives into our final recommendations.

Our invited guests included faculty from the Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies, the Senior Associate Dean /Director of Residential Life, the supervisor of Emergency Medical Services, staff in the Office of Student Activities, the student coordinators for the residential peer counseling programs, and others.

In the course of our review, we also spoke with members of the President's Executive Group, the Faculty Executive Committee, the Campus Life Corporation Committee, the Campus Life Advisory Board, the Undergraduate Council of Students, and the Brown University Community Council to include their perspectives as our work developed.

We examined the policies of peer institutions collected by the Ad Hoc Committee and conducted our own review of alcohol policies, including some interviews with individuals involved in policy reviews at other schools or involved in the provision of services at other schools. We used other national and local resources as well, including reports and recommendations produced by the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism's Task Force on College Drinking, and the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention.

While we are confident that we have incorporated a diverse range of opinions into our work to date, we recommend distributing this report widely, especially among students, before it is determined which of our recommendations will be implemented.

As a culmination of our work, we are hoping to host a conference on alcohol and drug policies and resources with Ivy peers in fall 2006.

ALCOHOL USE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Nationally

Among college students, approximately 68% report having drunk alcohol at least once in the past month (Johnston et al., 2005), with 42% reporting heavy episodic drinking (5 or more drinks in one occasion for men, 4 or more for women; Johnston et al., 2005). Excessive alcohol use in college students is linked to physical illness (Engs & Aldo-Benson, 1995), unintentional injury (Presley et al., 1996), and a wide range of behavioral problems, including fighting and physical aggression (Giancola, 2002), risky sexual behavior, and sexual assault (Abbey et al., 1998). College students often drink large quantities of alcohol over relatively brief time periods, which can result in dangerously high blood alcohol concentrations (Fournier et al., 2004). In a survey of 330 colleges and universities, Anderson and Gadaletto (1991) determined that college officials believe alcohol consumption to be a factor in 70% of all violent student behavior, half of students' physical injuries, and two-thirds of vandalism damage on campus. In national surveys, 21% of students report that they have performed poorly on tests or projects, 30% report having missed a class, and 23% report falling behind in schoolwork due to drinking in the previous year (Presley et al., 1996; Wechsler et al., 1998). Other alcohol-related disruptive behaviors that are relatively common in college are being interrupted while studying, having to take care of a drunk student, being insulted, or being a victim of unwanted sexual advances. (Wechsler et al., 2000). A leadership group of college presidents reported that, "student binge drinking and the many problems that arise from it are among the most serious threats faced by our nation's institutions of higher education" (Presidents Leadership Group, 1997, p. 5).

The early college years are a particularly risky time because drinking increases dramatically in the first year after matriculation (Schulenberg et al., 1996). Many college students have established patterns of use before they arrive on campus (Baer et al., 1995), but 25% of students who were not heavy drinkers in high school begin this pattern of consumption in their first year (Weitzman et al., 2003). In addition, about half of students who did not drink in high school start drinking during their freshman year (Lo & Globetti, 1993). First-year students are overrepresented in cases of alcohol-related emergencies and discipline (Bergen-Cico, 2000; Wright et al., 1998). Other groups that show higher risk than the general student population are athletes and members of the Greek system (Cashin et al., 1998; Wechsler et al., 1997).

A number of factors contribute to problematic levels of drinking that occur on college campuses, including the nature of the drinking behavior itself. Participation in drinking games and the practice of “pre-gaming” (drinking before an event, typically in one’s room or home) for example, are related to higher levels of intoxication and more alcohol problems (Borsari et al., 2003).

At Brown

Data recently collected from Brown freshmen and sophomores indicate that Brown students are not unlike other college students in their rates of heavy drinking. Data collected as part of ongoing research with Brown students indicates that 22-42% of Brown first year students report heavy drinking in the past week (Barnett, 2006). As in other college surveys, rates of heavy drinking at Brown are highest at the beginning of the semester and lowest at the end (thus the fluctuating rates above). In this research, rates of heavy drinking do not differ remarkably between first- and second-year students. During the school year, 13-43% of surveyed freshmen and sophomores report having one or more negative alcohol consequences (including blackouts, vomiting, regretted experiences) in the past week. Although we do not yet have data on juniors and seniors, studies of college students consistently show drinking stays relatively stable or shows slight declines over the college years (O’Neill et al., 2001).

Other information on alcohol consequences experienced by Brown students can be derived from EMS cases and disciplinary violations. Information collected over the past five years reflects increasing numbers of cases of EMS or Health Services evaluations for intoxication, from 96 cases in the 2000-2001 year to 176 cases in the 2004-2005 year. Although these numbers raise concern about the prevalence of extreme intoxication, it is not known if the increase reflects an increase in intoxication per se or if it reflects a successful education campaign about the service. As in other surveys, the Brown data indicate an overrepresentation of first-year students in cases of EMS evaluation. At the same time, discipline cases related to alcohol have declined in the past three years, from 150 in 2002-2003, to 109 in 2004-2005. Though initially reassuring, this reduction could be explained by the fact that Department of Public Safety officers no longer regularly patrol inside residence halls and that there has been no subsequent increase of residential staffing and enforcement.

Consistent with the national picture, there is growing concern on Brown’s campus about the practice of pre-gaming. Preliminary data indicate that 20% of students who drank in the past week participated in pre-gaming (Barnett, 2006). In addition, anecdotal evidence has emerged from the cases that are reviewed by the Office of Health Education to indicate that pre-gaming is an area to target at Brown.

Addressing alcohol use and problems

Although most universities have developed alcohol prevention and intervention programs (Wechsler et al., 2000), and a good deal is known about effective approaches (NIAAA, 2002), research indicates that even when alcohol intoxication or other alcohol-related consequences occur, most college students do not seek out campus-based treatment or intervention (Colby et al., 2000). Furthermore, many individuals who are not at apparent risk for a chronic alcohol problem by virtue of their prior behavior or alcohol use history are nevertheless at risk for having an acute alcohol-related consequence. In fact, the largest proportion of alcohol-related consequences among college students is experienced by non-dependent drinkers (Institute of Medicine, 1990). Therefore, although targeted intervention with students who have been identified by the University is a promising mechanism to effect change, it is only one facet of what ultimately must be a multi-pronged approach to addressing alcohol-related harm. In addition to individual-level interventions, efforts must also integrate the University community at large, preferably in combination with the local surrounding community to implement environmental level prevention efforts. This “3-in-1 Framework” is recommended by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2002. The Subcommittee therefore focused our recommendations on the health and welfare of all students - with particular focus on harm reduction, the specific needs of individuals who have been identified as having had alcohol-related incidents or more chronic problems, and the needs of the college and local community.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW SOCIAL EVENTS

The Subcommittee on Alcohol and Other Drug Use recommends the adoption of the following recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. These selected recommendations, which pertain to alcohol and drug use, are listed below with additional suggestions for implementation from the Alcohol Subcommittee indicated through the underlined comments.

A. Casual Events and Gatherings in Residences

The Ad Hoc Committee recommended increased monitoring in the residence halls during peak hours for pre-gaming. Considered by the Ad Hoc Committee but not specifically recommended was to evaluate staffing and to consider adding additional staff in residence halls on the weekends during the hours before parties (9 p.m. to 11 p.m.) to address pre-gaming. The objective of such monitoring would be to ensure the safety of students, prevent heavy drinking, and avoid alcohol-related consequences. The Alcohol Subcommittee recommends using a variety of strategies with a focus on student safety and implementing those strategies in such a way as to avoid unintended consequences (e.g., more secretive alcohol use).

B. Admissions and Door Policies for Social Events

The Ad Hoc Committee established the guideline that visibly intoxicated students should be denied admission to events and recommended that a structure be developed to help students and staff evaluate whether someone should be granted admission to a social event. The “four stages of intoxication” protocol is currently in use for this purpose and party managers are also trained on how to determine when to call EMS. Having professional staff at events is an approach that has been recently implemented and is receiving positive feedback from students.

C. Weapons, Bags, and Containers

Guests should not be permitted to bring in beverage containers, and an adequate supply of non-alcoholic beverages and food should be provided free of charge. Non-alcoholic beverages should be provided in individual sealed containers.

D. Alcohol Service

A committee has been formed in the Student Activities Office that will consider the following recommendations and their implementation. We also recommend additional consideration of the following elements by the Subcommittee.

1. Registered social functions may only be held after 5 p.m. on Friday through 2 p.m. on Sunday.
2. Roaming managers should be required.
3. Per drink charges should be required. Free alcohol at events should not be allowed.
4. Persons may only be served one drink at a time.
5. A recording procedure for keeping track of drinks served to each person should be implemented with a limit on the number of drinks each person can receive.
6. Non-alcoholic beverages and food need to be provided in sufficient quantities, and non-alcoholic beverages should be free. Providing a subsidy for organizations to support the provision of free non-alcoholic beverages should be considered.
7. Bartenders should receive additional training. Requiring certification using a server training program should be considered.

- E. Pre-gaming and Nonalcoholic Events
1. Funding for alcohol-free programming should be available for days/evenings/times of the year that are typically high alcohol use times.
 2. Because of concerns about students' drinking and using drugs outside parties and returning to the parties, the party planning process should include discussions with SAO about whether readmission to alcohol-free events should be allowed.
 3. To detect and prevent pre-gaming, increased training of residential staff and evaluation of the residential environment should be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CAMPUS LIFE ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS

A. Alcohol in the Residences

The committee had extensive discussion about alcohol use in the residence halls; in addition to the standing members of the committee, we heard from invited students, Residential Peer Leader (RPL) coordinators, RPLs, and other supervisors. We consistently heard that students are frequently disturbed by noise, parties in individual rooms, garbage, and alcohol-related damage to the living quarters. The frequency with which students are disturbed by the alcohol-fueled behavior of other students is of great concern and was one of the highest priorities this committee addressed. We learned from several sources that complaints about vandalism, vomit in the bathrooms, and damage occur in some residence halls at least once a week, that vandalism happens on many weekends and is not consistently responded to in terms of disciplinary sanctions, and that frequently individuals are not held responsible for behavior that disturbs a residential area. It is evident that many of these incidents are not reported and/or responsible individuals are not identified.

When alcohol-related misbehavior is brought to the attention of the Office of Student Life, there is always an investigation, but it is clear that there are many more incidents that are not reported by residents or Facilities Management. It is apparent that weekend drinking in particular has become normalized in the residences, so much so that residents who are disturbed by this behavior have difficulty confronting other residents or reporting the behavior. The frequency of alcohol-related damage or vandalism and the lack of visibility of disciplinary responses because of the confidentiality of sanctions create the perception that misbehavior is tolerated and that policies are not consistently applied. The goal of the recommendations below is to begin a culture shift in the residence halls such that alcohol use and the resulting problem behaviors are prevented, the norms for appropriate behavior are adjusted, and students have a positive, healthy, and safe community experience. In order for such a culture shift to occur, the leaders in the residence halls must work with their community members to establish behavioral expectations, and provide direct feedback when those expectations are not met.

1. **Modify the Residential Peer Leader positions.**

Residential Peer Leaders have a critical role in supporting the standards of a respectful community. Under the current job description, RPLs are available as a resource to residents and are responsible for educational programming, promoting safe behavior, and helping students have a positive community experience. There are strengths in the current system, including that peer counselors appear confident in their ability to intervene in dangerous situations related to alcohol, such as the need for medical attention. However, there are concerns that peer counselors have difficulty with more

subtle situations or overt behavior that does not require EMS response. Specifically, there is concern that peer counselors in first-year units do not consistently intervene with alcohol-related behavior or noise when reported by a resident. For example, counselors report that it is difficult to intervene on noise complaints that occur outside of quiet hours. This may be because peer counselors are so close in age to their residents that it is difficult to be an authority figure. RPLs prefer to be in a counseling relationship with the students in their residence rather than an enforcement role, because they are not sure how to respond, or because the behavioral norms in the residence halls are extreme and difficult for anyone to address. Specific recommendations about changes to the role of peer counselors are as follows:

- a. *Promote greater involvement of juniors and seniors in the peer counseling programs.* RPLs work with another layer of staffing provided by graduate students who serve as Community Directors (CDs). The Community Directors currently have more responsibility to intervene in incidents. The effectiveness of the CDs, aided by their maturity, suggests the potential for other types of staffing, particularly providing more intervention by older students with additional training and expanded expectations around intervention. It is possible that older students would carry greater authority and have more skills to handle these challenging situations.
- b. *Provide more extensive training of RPLs at the beginning of the year and in an ongoing manner throughout the year.* The information and training provided to RPLs about alcohol and other substances, how to detect problems, and how to address specific kinds of problems should be revised. Training might include information about the development of specific intervention skills for example, through modeling and role-playing. It might also include information about the importance of correcting misperceived norms, and establishing in advance the expectation of behavior in a residential area.
- c. *Oversight of RPLs should include supervisor review of reports of alcohol use and EMS responses to the residence hall.* Currently a report of the weekend's events is conducted on Mondays within the Office of Student Life. For behavior change to occur on campus in general and in the residences in particular, regular feedback about alcohol-related problems should be provided to the RPLs and RPL coordinators with the expectation that they would then follow up with a targeted intervention, like an educational program or a unit meeting to discuss community expectations.
- d. *Consider establishing a way for RPLs to issue warnings to students in their residence (e.g., for the possession of alcohol, for noise, or for other violations or behaviors that do not rise to the level of discipline or Public Safety).* Currently there is no mechanism for providing a formal warning to violators of the community standards within a residence. Lower level behaviors (e.g., noise) would not typically result in a formal complaint or a call to DPS and so may not be addressed. The Subcommittee acknowledges that a system for tracking warnings and for establishing appropriate consequences would need to be developed, and more significantly, that this would put RPLs in a new role vis-à-vis the students in their residence. Though we understand implementing such a procedure will create challenges, we think it is worth serious consideration.
- e. *As expectations of training, supervision, intervention and enforcement change, the stipend for these positions should increase proportionately.* The responsibility of RPLs is great, and compensation for their job should be commensurate with its requirements. The small stipend that RPLs currently receive could contribute to the perception that their role is limited, or that they should not be required to intervene

frequently in the residences. One suggestion would be to have a greater incentive for those who return for a second year in an RPL position.

2. Encourage greater involvement of community residents in addressing alcohol-related behavior. Regional peer review boards for residential areas would serve this purpose and would provide direct feedback to the community about the response.

Students are often hesitant to become involved with another resident whose alcohol use is negatively affecting them. As part of the overall objective of changing the culture in the residences, the residents themselves should be supported in intervening appropriately with others. This should start with establishing community standards at the beginning of each year, including expectations of acceptable behavior and a response to misbehavior that comes from fellow residents. Plans are in place to pilot peer community standards boards within residences. This Subcommittee recommends starting the pilot in fall 2006, evaluating its progress, and considering implementation on a wider scale.

B. Prevention of alcohol problems

During the course of this review, the Subcommittee heard information about various approaches to preventing alcohol problems on campus, including details about current prevention programming, information that first-year students receive during orientation, and University support of alcohol-free events.

1. Address risks specific to the first-year experience

As described above, a number of elements in the first year of college put first-year students at risk of having alcohol-related consequences.

- a. *Revise and extend the alcohol education for freshmen that occurs during orientation.* Specifically, students report that Class Meeting II ("Your Responsibilities as a Member of the Brown Community: Safety, Student Conduct, Alcohol and Other Drugs," which includes approximately 45 minutes of alcohol and drug education) was impersonal and that they retained very little of the presented information. Suggestions for revising this component of orientation including providing information about alcohol and other drugs in advance of this session, and focusing the session itself on avoiding alcohol-and drug-related harm. Other suggestions included asking older students to present. A more substantial change would be to have smaller group meetings, for example, in residence halls. This approach would be consistent with the overarching intention of changing the culture within the residential halls.
- b. *Evaluate the possibility of shortening Orientation.* Any time on campus during which there are few academic responsibilities is a high risk time for drinking. In our meetings, RPLs reported that Orientation is typically the time when a heavy drinking culture is established in a residence hall. Shortening Orientation has the potential to decrease the incidence of dangerous drinking before classes start and to more quickly focus students on their academic life at Brown.
- c. *Increase monitoring and provide additional resources during the first several weeks of the school year.* Parties that serve alcohol are not currently allowed during Orientation, but it is evident that students are able to get alcohol relatively easily and that some first-year students drink soon after arriving on campus. Increased staffing in the residence halls during this time may keep some students from drinking to

- excess. Moreover, providing additional University sponsored social events and/or other late-night programming would offer students alternative social activities.
- d. *Provide information about Brown's alcohol policy and prevention of alcohol problems to students and their parents prior to the students' arrival.* The Office of Student Life is currently planning to pilot an on-line orientation to student life policies with the class of 2010. This quiz will include information about health, risky alcohol use, and behavioral expectations, and the consequences of violating the University policies. Incoming students will be required to complete this quiz on the policies prior to arrival on campus.

There is emerging empirical evidence that engaging parents in their child's transition to campus can lessen problematic alcohol use (Turrisi et al., 2001). This approach involves providing information to parents about alcohol use on college campuses, suggestions on how to discuss the issue with their child, and encouragement to do so. One possibility would be to add a program for parents during Parents Weekend that would provide information about college alcohol use and some strategies for having conversations with their students. This program could be aimed at parents of first-year students but also be available to others. The Subcommittee would also recommend sending information about alcohol use, campus policies, and resources to parents of incoming students during the summer before their son or daughter's first year at Brown.

2. Expand current harm reduction programs

- a. *Develop approaches to prevent high-risk drinking practices.* As mentioned above, specific drinking rituals and practices common among students are particularly dangerous, including pre-gaming and drinking games. This Subcommittee paid considerable attention to the topic of pre-gaming, as it appears to be widespread at Brown, and has contributed to the volume of problems occurring on campus. Pre-gaming is a particularly challenging practice to target because it occurs in private rooms and residences. Several approaches are recommended, including providing education about the risks of drinking alcohol quickly, monitoring locations where pre-gaming and drinking games are likely to occur, providing alternative alcohol-free experiences on weekend nights, and enforcing sanctions when the policy is violated.
- b. *Provide formal training about alcohol and University policies to students and staff working in Residential Life at strategic times throughout the academic year.* Training that occurs once a year or infrequently is not adequate for a problem that continues throughout the year and that takes many forms. This report has previously addressed content for the initial training of RPLs—the focus here is on on-going training because there needs to be a consistent understanding of the issues and the relevant policies in an ongoing fashion to best detect emerging problems. Furthermore, feedback from Residential Life staff about the issues that are occurring across campus and problem solving about how to address those issues would be facilitated by regular meetings with alcohol use as the focus. These sessions could include facilitated discussions about prevention, enforcement of policies, and specific training on how to intervene with problematic behaviors.
- c. *Increase support for empirically-supported programs.* There is little empirical support that generic education/informational programs have an impact on alcohol use or related behaviors, but there are some empirically supported and targeted educational programs that show promise and should be supported, including widespread social norms campaigns. Additional recommendations about prevention programming include 1) programming that specifically targets first-year students, and 2)

- programming that focuses on students helping each other. For example, the Office of Health Education has a sexual assault prevention program that includes the distribution of cards that explain the importance of staying with friends throughout an evening and not leaving with others. This programming could be expanded and might include direct skill-training of peer counselors about bystander intervention.
- d. *Provide adequate staff and funding for Health Education.* As stated above, some recommendations in this report will require additional resources. The current funding and staffing of the Office of Health Education may not be adequate to implement the above prevention programming recommendations. Peer institutions have greater staffing and resources to address alcohol and other drug use, and the budget of Brown's Health Education Office should be evaluated accordingly
 - e. *Consider providing an alcohol harm reduction and prevention orientation program for students who join Greek or program houses or athletic teams.* The transition into college is only one that college students experience; exposure to high-risk drinking is also more likely to occur when students join fraternities, sororities, and athletic teams. There is evidence that the relationship between student patterns of drinking and group membership is bidirectional. For example, students who drink more gravitate toward Greek organizations, and they are also influenced by the higher levels of drinking once they are members (Kahler et al., 2003). Since many Class F parties (i.e., parties where alcohol will be sold that require a license from the city) are sponsored by fraternities or sororities, we might provide workshops for new members that focus on promoting social function policies and reducing heavy drinking and its harms. As noted above, athletes are at higher risk than non-athletes, especially when they are not in their competitive season. The Athletic Department has provided alcohol-related programming to first-year students for several years and will continue to do so. Given the higher risks of alcohol-related consequences in these groups, providing the Athletic Department with additional screening and prevention programs should be considered.
 - f. *Provide funding for professional media campaigns.* Beyond a limited number of required meetings, students are unlikely to attend alcohol education programs voluntarily. Therefore, passive education methods are required (poster campaigns, newspaper advertisements, etc.) to reach the majority of students. Potential topics for a media campaign include normative information about drinking on campus including how many students choose not to drink, gender differences in the metabolism of alcohol, and information about specific high-risk behaviors such as drinking games.

3. Support alcohol-free events and provide alternative social gathering spaces

The Subcommittee heard from students that there are insufficient weekend activities that do not involve alcohol. We heard that some students who were light drinkers or who do not drink have felt compelled to drink at the popular and high visibility parties with alcohol because other students were, or because they thought they "might as well." Providing varied alternatives that do not involve alcohol would balance the availability of activities so students who do not wish to drink would not feel subtle or overt pressure to do so. This recommendation is considered a "promising practice" by the NIAAA, in that there is converging evidence that it can reduce drinking on college campuses (NIAAA, 2002).

- a. *Provide additional guidance or support for alcohol-free events that occur at a time when alcohol use is common.* Students should have viable social alternatives to weekend parties that serve alcohol and should be able to participate in activities that do not make them feel pressured to drink. These events should focus exclusively on

nights when drinking is likely to occur and should specifically substitute for drinking, in that they are social, fun, and provide relief from academic stresses. Critical to this recommendation is providing incentives for these student-directed events, including financial support. A positive addition to social planning in the spring semester of 2006 has been the establishment of the "Late Night Fund," which provides funds for student-planned alcohol-free events. Impressions are positive about how this fund was received by student groups. The Subcommittee recommends close evaluation of how the program was utilized and what adjustments might be necessary. If the fund continues, the Subcommittee recommends more widely publicizing the availability of this resource and how to apply for the funds.

Developing alcohol-free programs can be challenging and can require more time from advisors. As an example, the Late Night Fund was managed by two staff who had weekly meetings to advise and organize students and who supported a small student committee. Therefore, if the Fund is continued, additional support for staffing would be needed. This staff might also provide dedicated advising and support for the Greek community to help them develop more balanced programming.

- b. *Expand the hours of social gathering places, including the physical education facilities on weekend nights.* Having more social space on campus could decrease the tendency for students to attend on- or off-campus parties with alcohol and could increase the visibility of non-drinking activity.
- c. *Encourage students to incorporate elements into their party planning that will reduce the likelihood of excessive drinking.* Examples offered by members of the committee include having alcohol-free pre-parties with good entertainment, which would draw students to the event earlier and reduce pre-gaming.

4. Insure that alcohol policies are consistent with the academic mission of the University.

It is a national trend for college classes to be limited on Friday, which may be both a consequence and a cause of Thursday night drinking. A promising approach recommended by the NIAAA is a renewed focus and emphasis on academic activities on Fridays, which may result in reduced drinking on Thursday. The social events regulations recommended in this report address this issue to some extent by restricting social events to a 5 p.m. or later start time on Fridays. An assessment of the number of classes at Brown on Fridays shows that Brown has a good number of regularly scheduled classes on Friday afternoons until 5 p.m. The Subcommittee affirms the importance of consistent and regular signs that the academic life of the University is primary and that social events must not interfere with classes.

5. Maintain support for students in recovery.

Students in recovery are particularly vulnerable to a culture in which alcohol is easily available and frequently misused. Students who are referred to the Dean of Chemical Dependency have individual counseling and an early sobriety group available. In addition to maintaining these programs, the recommendation to provide more alcohol-free alternatives is of direct importance for these students, along with a more effective enforcement of residential life policies in substance-free housing.

C. Alcohol service and purchase

Several recommendations about modifying the regulations for alcohol service on campus were made by the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events and are summarized earlier in this

report. This Subcommittee also reviewed the same issue at length. The Subcommittee focused on recommendations that would 1) reduce the likelihood of underage drinking; 2) slow down consumption; and 3) provide methods for tracking the amount of alcohol consumed by an individual, all of which should serve to reduce over-consumption.

1. Require that mixed drinks and punch be prepared in a standard way and be well labeled.

It is critical that students know what and how much they are consuming. Students commonly report in post-intoxication follow-ups that they drank punch and did not realize how much alcohol they had ingested. Bartenders should be trained in how to pour a standard drink. Mixed drinks and punch should have alcohol content equivalent to a standard drink and should be well-labeled. Drinks labeled with type and amount of alcohol would result in students having more accurate knowledge about alcohol content, and would make keeping track of the number of drinks they consume easier.

2. Consider increasing the minimum price per drink.

There is evidence that an increase in the price of alcohol results in a decrease in consumption, and that younger people who drink heavily are quite sensitive to price. Multiple studies (see Hingson et al., 2005 for details) have found that increasing the price of alcohol has the greatest effect on young people who drink frequently, but also reduces the amount consumed for young people who drink infrequently. The Ad Hoc Committee recommended requiring a per drink charge, and the Subcommittee is further emphasizing that the minimum cost per drink should be evaluated. Concerns raised by Subcommittee members about these recommendations include the possibility that they would result in more intensive pre-gaming, so implementation of such recommendations would need to be accompanied by enhanced monitoring of pre-party behavior.

3. Restrict the bulk purchase of alcohol.

Student organizations in the past have purchased large amounts of alcohol for delivery directly from the alcohol distributor. The committee is concerned that this practice can easily lead to extreme consumption and availability of alcohol to underage members of the community.

4. Require sexual assault training for student groups that serve alcohol.

Alcohol consumption is consistently identified as a risk factor for sexual assault. Student groups that serve alcohol need to be aware of this risk, and recognize that they have a responsibility to recognize the warning signs for sexual assault and to interrupt situations where someone's ability to consent may be in question. Additional training topics could include date rape drugs, myths about sexual assault, and available resources for information, counseling, and medical care.

5. Revisit the use of the Underground.

The Underground is a student-run bar in the ground floor of the Faunce House that serves alcohol on Friday and Saturdays only. Students use their Brown ID to verify their age; students under 21 are allowed in but cannot drink. Due to the size of the space and its lack of a kitchen, large groups of students generally do not gather at the Underground, and for the past several years this bar has not been identified as a source of alcohol-related misbehavior. However, the Subcommittee is aware that other options for use of the space on the ground level of Faunce House are currently under consideration, including opening the area up to create a larger space for entertainment (A review conducted on the use of the Underground was completed in February 2003).

The resulting report is attached as an Appendix to this report). It is the Subcommittee's belief that management of that enlarged space would be difficult if alcohol were served, so we recommend that, if the Underground is expanded, alcohol service be eliminated. This would result in a public, centrally located, alcohol-free space that could draw students, staff, and faculty. The Subcommittee believes it is symbolically important that the center of the campus have non-alcoholic events that would appeal to the entire community.

6. Include alumni in the discussion about how to reduce problem drinking by undergraduates.

Alumni at times provide financial support for student-run events at which alcohol is served. We recommend adding a member of the Alumni Association as a standing member of this subcommittee, and continuing discussions about the promotion of alcohol use and the purchase of alcohol by alumni for student events.

D. Emergency Medical Services, University Health Services, and the Office of Health Education

The gravest concern about alcohol use on Brown's campus is the serious medical complications that can occur as a result of extreme intoxication. Brown has a strong history of being committed to the principle that students should not fear disciplinary sanctions if they seek help for themselves or another in an emergency related to alcohol or drugs. Indeed, the committee believes that one of the most effective components of Brown's policy is the availability of EMS and Health Services staff for students who may be medically compromised as a result of drinking. We are in full support of the current policy that students who are evaluated and/or transported by EMS or who present to Health Services for treatment for intoxication do not receive disciplinary sanctions. The Subcommittee received consistent feedback that students are familiar with the EMS service, and the "amnesty" policy appears to be well understood by students and consistently followed by staff and administrators.

Students can receive an evaluation and treatment for intoxication or an injury either by walking into Health Services or by calling EMS. When EMS responds to a call, they first evaluate the student. If the student passes a mental status exam and is determined by the EMS staff to be able to waive treatment, the student may sign a form and choose not to be transported. If the student agrees to treatment or is unable to pass the mental status exam, he/she is transported to Health Services or to the Rhode Island Hospital Emergency Room for further evaluation, treatment, and monitoring. Students who receive EMS evaluation have had serious incidents of intoxication; as such, it is necessary to follow these students after the incident to provide evaluation and support. Currently students who are evaluated by EMS (regardless of the outcome of that evaluation) receive a post-intoxication follow up with a staff person in the Office of Health Education. These sessions entail administration of a brief screening measure and an extensive discussion about the incident, the student's motivations for drinking, specific personalized risks, including family history of alcohol problems, strategies for avoiding problems with alcohol, and available resources. There was general agreement on the Subcommittee that the current policy of mandatory alcohol education does not create a deterrent for calling EMS, but if more intensive follow-up were required, it might keep students from calling EMS. Additional follow up is conducted and referrals are sometimes made for students who are identified as being at high risk of further problems. An individual student with repeated EMS contact will have an individual meeting with a Dean in the Office of Student Life for further evaluation and support. Repeat incidents may result in parental notification as well as additional

action, including required counseling, recommendations of medical leave, and possible sanctions for violation of the alcohol policy.

This committee is in full support of maintaining the current amnesty policy and required post-intoxication evaluations with some additional recommendations about the implementation of EMS services.

1. Provide additional education about the signs to look for in a person to help students decide when to call EMS.

Though students reported confidence in their knowledge about what happens when EMS is called, they are less confident that first-year students in particular know how to evaluate an individual's level of intoxication (i.e., they are not always sure *when* to call). Additional education should be provided in key locations so students are confident that they know the signs to look for in another person that would indicate the need to call EMS.

2. Consider adding an ambulance on historically heavy drinking nights.

There are specific nights and weekends during the academic year that have a history of high volume of calls to EMS. When Brown EMS is on another call and not available, or when a student accesses emergency response by dialing 911 instead of contacting Brown's Department of Public Safety, Providence Rescue responds. Providence Rescue only transports students to Rhode Island Hospital, which results in significant costs to the student or his or her family as well as potential disclosure to the student's family because of insurance companies' billing procedures. There is also concern that if response from Providence Rescue were to become more frequent, students would hesitate to call EMS due to the cost and concerns about confidentiality. Furthermore, when Brown EMS transports students, accurate information is immediately available about the student's condition and any medical treatment required, and we therefore have greater confidence that student needs are being addressed and that students are closely followed. In the spring 2006, a second ambulance was added on a trial basis for Spring Weekend; the cost and effectiveness of this should be evaluated.

3. Information provided about EMS should include an emphasis on avoiding heavy drinking in the first place.

Some concern has been noted that students may not take as much care as they could since they know they can call EMS if they need to. Though these reports are anecdotal, it is important to emphasize to students the importance of avoiding dangerous outcomes when they choose to drink.

E. Disciplinary Violations and Enforcement of Policy

There were a number of issues discussed during this review with regard to how alcohol and alcohol-related misbehavior is addressed through the non-academic disciplinary system. As described above, it is evident that disciplinary cases related to alcohol are numerous; at Brown, approximately 50% of all disciplinary cases involve alcohol. There is currently a procedure in place for triaging these cases to (in increasing order of severity of offense) a peer community standard board hearing, a dean's conference, a dean's hearing, or to a University Discipline Council or Administrative Hearing (see Appendix for further description). In addition to sanctions that include restitution, a letter of apology, and social probation among other

consequences, students who are found guilty of violating the conduct policy relative to alcohol are typically required to attend an individual session of alcohol education in the Office of Health Education or with the Dean of Chemical Dependency.

The number of disciplinary violations involving alcohol at Brown has declined in the past year or two. The impression among campus administrators is that this decline results from the elimination of DPS patrols in the residence halls without increasing residential staff and other enforcement mechanisms. The reduction in cases does not appear to reflect a reduction in alcohol-related misbehavior, in that there are consistent reports that in the past year the environment in the residences has become more problematic with regard to noise, vandalism, and garbage. Student members of this committee and invited guests reported that monitoring enforcement in the residences is lacking. Furthermore, there are concerns that the consequences of discipline cases are not known to the residents who were affected by the misbehavior, and that minor offenses have no consequences. This leads to a perceived or real lack of accountability to those who are most affected by the misbehavior. In summary, it is evident that greater institutional response to alcohol-related behavior, especially in the residences is needed. Behavior that disturbs the residential community should not be considered "something to put up with," and those who are responsible for disruptive behavior should be held accountable.

1. Prohibit drinking game paraphernalia.

Examples of paraphernalia that promote problematic levels of consumption and disruption of residence halls include funnels and Beirut tables. Such items are inconsistent with a culture of safety and of drinking moderation.

2. Consider additional monitoring and enforcement in the residence halls.

Other sections of this report (see pp. 10-11) review specific suggestions.

3. Consider implementing an RPL warning system or a residence community review board.

Peer review boards in the residences would allow for peer self-governance, restitution to those negatively affected by alcohol-related behavior, and greater transparency of the process. As an example, recent changes to the practices of the Greek Council with regard to monitoring individual houses has led to a more proactive response by the council and an apparent increase in accountability.

4. Disseminate information about the consequences for violating the alcohol policy and/or student rights and responsibilities.

This recommendation could be accomplished by summarizing violations and their outcomes each semester, which would provide feedback to the campus while maintaining confidentiality of the individual cases. Timely and well-publicized information, for example in monthly reports to the Brown Daily Herald or on posters in residence halls, about violations and possible consequences would also make more transparent the response students can expect from the University for infractions, thereby improving the perception of consistency.

5. Sanctions for behavior should include more letters of apology and specific restitution to the affected community.

F. Off-Campus Community

1. Off-campus purchase of alcohol

Much of the alcohol that is consumed by Brown students is purchased at stores or restaurants immediately off campus. A few of these establishments have been the source of recent problems, including serving to underage students. One club in particular has “Brown night” on Wednesdays with low drink costs, which has resulted in a number of problems, including assaults and community disturbances, as students travel back to campus from this establishment. DPS has worked well with Providence Police in the past in addressing specific issues that arise with Brown students. Nevertheless, the Subcommittee feels that improvements can be made in the relationships with local liquor stores and restaurants that serve liquor.

- a. *Work closely with liquor stores and restaurants to improve methods for avoiding selling alcohol to students who are underage and for overselling to legal age students.* Suggestions include supporting the implementation of improved methods of checking IDs (including identifying fake IDs and improving the adequacy of checks of IDs of underage drinkers). These efforts might be best focused on historically problematic times of the year. Representatives from DPS have worked closely with clubs near the Brown campus with some effect, but this effort needs to be on-going.
- b. *Prioritize a relationship with the liquor licensing board of the Providence Police Department.* DPS currently has a working partnership with this board but the Subcommittee thinks this could be improved by having a representative from the Board attend meetings of the Subcommittee to generate ideas about how to address concerns.

2. Off-campus residences

The behavior of Brown students living off campus has a direct impact on our East Side neighbors. Common complaints from neighbors of Brown students and neighborhood organizations include excessive noise, vandalism, urinating on neighbors’ property, and garbage, all of which tend to be related to student alcohol use. Students who live off-campus are expected to behave with the same respect as their on-campus peers, and violations of standards of behavior should result in similar consequences. Currently the practice is to communicate to students who live off campus that the on-campus standards apply to them, and that violation of these standards result in the same process of review and possible sanctions as for on-campus students. Students who are planning to live off-campus are required by the Office of Residential Life to view a videotaped presentation and to sign an agreement stating that Brown student rights and responsibilities policies apply to their off-campus living situation. However, in these materials there is no reference to the responsible use of alcohol. There is also an indication that students who live off campus are not wholly aware that they can receive the same disciplinary consequences as students who live on campus.

- a. *Augment the videotape and the materials that are provided to students who wish to move off campus.* Specific areas for emphasis include informing students about community norms, expectations, and responsibilities for behavior and alcohol use.
- b. *Provide a direct and clearly communicated method for residents in the neighborhood around campus to work with students to improve their neighborhood conditions and neighbor relations.* One suggestion for involving students directly in this process is to require that one student within a house or apartment be designated the contact person for their housemates. The purpose of this is to establish a single individual

who can be known to neighbors and to Brown in case there is a community issue that needs to be resolved.

- c. *Develop a set of recommendations for groups who are planning off-campus events.* Campus staff are less able to monitor off-campus events than on-campus events, but a number of strategies could be provided to groups hosting events in their off-campus residences or planning events at off-campus restaurants or bars. Topics that should be considered include safe transportation to these events, checking licenses and venue capacity, providing free food rather than discounted drinks, and having an alcohol-free pre-party with food and entertainment.

3. Neighborhood relations

There are active neighborhood groups that work with the community relations committee. Several members of our Subcommittee are members of the Community Relations Committee as well. This overlapping membership should assure that this report is viewed by the Community Relations Committee and that relevant issues are brought back to this Subcommittee.

G. Dissemination

The Subcommittee heard concerns from students that information about Brown's alcohol policy, what happens in the process of responding to an alcohol violation, and how to get help for an alcohol or drug concern for oneself or someone else is not well disseminated. The Office of Health Education has a comprehensive website with information about alcohol and other drugs, and has direct links to the alcohol policy and other relevant sites at Brown including the Office of Student Life, the Office for the Dean of Chemical Dependency, and other resources on campus.

- 1. Publicize that the Office of Health Education website is the central Brown site for information about alcohol and drug use.**
- 2. Include links to the alcohol policy on other relevant websites.**
- 3. Clearly articulate the medical amnesty policy on relevant sites.** Details that should be included are that a) information obtained by EMS or the subsequent post-intoxication follow-ups is confidential, b) exceptions to the policy are made, for example, when a significant violation of the law or University policy (such as violation or vandalism) is identified by DPS during an EMS run, and c) medical attention for drug use falls under the amnesty policy.

H. Evaluation of implemented changes to policy and practices

As stated earlier, the committee has made recommendations that it considers to have solid theoretical and/or empirical foundation and that it believes fit with Brown's current practices and educational philosophy. Some of the recommendations in this report will obviously require further review before being implemented. In addition, it is critical that implemented practices be fully evaluated through qualitative and quantitative methods. Measures of student use of campus services and current research on alcohol use patterns and problems that include Brown students as participants can be used for this purpose. However, the Subcommittee recommends supporting additional data collection, for example on student perceptions about the quality of the residential environments. Changes to the policy and to current or new programs should be based on these outcome evaluations.

I. Brown University's Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs

As discussion of the Subcommittee's recommendations unfolds, and as we finalize the recommendations and work toward implementation of some of them, we will need to revise the University's Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs. The Subcommittee reviewed the policy and made some suggestions for revision. These suggestions will have to be appropriately reviewed and finalized as part of the process of reviewing the recommendations in this report. This report takes a much broader focus on campus climate and community factors and prevention programming, with the University policy and its features as the primary place where expectations of student behavior and institutional response are articulated. The Subcommittee's suggestions for revising the alcohol policy include the following:

- add a section on the philosophy of the policy consistent with the harm-reduction approach expressed in this report;
- add information on expectations in the residence halls (see recommendations for this area contained in this report);
- clarify the policy of follow-up for students who contact and who are treated by EMS for alcohol-related incidents;
- remove information that is fully articulated on other sites (e.g., Health Education, the Dean of Chemical Dependency, and Rhode Island Law) and provide links to these other sources within the policy; and
- amend Social Event policies (see report of the Ad Hoc Committee) and provisions of the alcohol policy related to social functions as the recommendations in this report are implemented.

It is recommended that the Subcommittee's on-going work include finalizing a new Alcohol and Other Drug policy consistent with the recommendations and approach of this report and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. This policy will be drafted and presented to the appropriate review bodies over the course of the 2006-2007 academic year. Until these changes are finalized, the current policy is our operational policy. For the next academic year, it is fully adequate as a statement of institutional policy and for reference in follow-up and adjudication of student violations involving alcohol and other drugs.

J. Additional recommendations

1. Review alcohol policies as they relate to faculty, staff, and alumni.

Faculty, staff, and alumni provide models of alcohol use to Brown students. We have intentionally not included a review of the alcohol policy as it applies to these groups, but suggest some review of policies as they relate to faculty, staff, and alumni to establish a consistent approach to the issue of alcohol use and misuse on- and off-campus.

2. Review Brown's policies relative to drugs other than alcohol.

Because of the prevalence of problematic behavior on our campus related to alcohol use, this review did not include any systematic or comprehensive review of other drug use among Brown students. We did hear from students and other members of the community that there is concern about the number of students who use recreational drugs, (some of whom have known or emerging problems.) Concern was also expressed that some students may be underestimating their level of risk related to other drug use. This Subcommittee will address other drug use as a part of its ongoing work and make specific policy recommendations pertinent to other drug use at Brown.

References

- Abbey, A., McAusian, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, sexual beliefs, and experience. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17*, 167-195.
- Anderson, D. S., & Gadaletto, A. F. (1991). *Results of the 1991 College Alcohol Survey*. Fairfax, VA: Center for Health Promotion.
- Baer, J.S., Kivlahan, D.R., & Marlatt, G.A. (1995). High-risk drinking across the transition from high school to college. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 19*, 54-61.
- Barnett, N. P. (2006). Unpublished data.
- Barnett, N.P. (2006). [Heavy drinking and alcohol consequences in freshmen and sophomores]. Unpublished raw data.
- Bergen-Cico, D. (2000). Patterns of substance abuse and attrition among first-year students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience, 12*(1), 61-75.
- Borsari, B., Bergen-Cico, D., Carey, K.B. (2003). Self-reported drinking-game participation of incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 51*(4):149-54.
- Cashin, J.R., Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*, 63-70.
- Colby, J. J., Raymond, G. A., & Colby, S. M. (2000). Evaluation of a college policy mandating treatment for students with substantiated drinking problems. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 395-404.
- Engs, R. C., & Aldo-Benson, M. (1995). The association of alcohol consumption with self-reported illness in university students. *Psychological Reports, 76*, 727-736.
- Fournier, A. K., Ehrhart, I. J., Glindemann, K. E., & Geller, E. S. (2004). Intervening to decrease alcohol use at university parties: Differential reinforcement of intoxication level. *Behavior Modification, 28*, 167-181.
- Giancola, P. R. (2002). Alcohol-related aggression during the college years: Theories, risk factors and policy implications. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement No. 14*, 129-139.
- Hingson, R., Heeren, T., Winter, M., Wechsler, H. (2005). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18-24: Changes from 1998-2001. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26*, 259-279.
- Institute of Medicine. (1990). *Broadening the Base of Treatment for Alcohol Problems*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. (2005). *Monitoring the Future National Survey Results on Drug Use, 1975-2004. Volume II: College students and adults ages 19-45*, NIH Publication No. 05-5728. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Kahler, C. W., Read, J. P., Wood, M.D., Palfai, T.P. (2003). Social environmental selection as a mediator of gender, ethnic, and personality effects on college student drinking. *Psychol Addict Behav.*17(3):226-34.

Lo, C. C., & Globetti, G. (1993). A partial analysis of the campus influence on drinking behavior: Students who enter college as non-drinkers. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 23, 715-725.

National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2002). *A call to action: Changing the culture of drinking at US colleges*. Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. NIH Publication No: 02-5010.

O'Neill, S.E., Parra, G. R., & Sher, K. J. (2001). Clinical relevance of heavy drinking during the college years: cross-sectional and prospective perspectives. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 15(4):350-9.

Presidents Leadership Group (1997). *Be vocal, be visible, be visionary: Recommendations for college and university presidents on alcohol and other drug prevention*. The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Newton, MA.

Presley, C. A., Meilman, P. W., & Cashin, J. R. (1996). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: Use, consequences, and perceptions of the campus environment. Vol. IV: 1992-94*. Carbondale, IL: Core Institute, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Schulenberg, J., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., Wadsworth, K. N., & Johnston, L. D. (1996). Getting drunk and growing up: Trajectories of frequent binge drinking during the transition to young adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 57, 289-304.

Turrisi, R., Jaccard, J., Taki, R., Dunnam, H., Grimes, J. (2001). Examination of the short-term efficacy of a parent intervention to reduce college student drinking tendencies. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 15(4):366-72.

Wechsler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Grossman, S.J., & Zanakos, S.I. (1997). Binge drinking, tobacco, and illicit drug use and involvement in college athletics: A survey of students at 140 American colleges. *Journal of American College Health*, 45, 195-200.

Wechsler, H. & Dowdall, G. W. (1998). Changes in binge drinking and related problems among American college students between 1993 and 1997. *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 57-68.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J, Kuo, M, & Lee, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990s: A continuing problem--Results of the Harvard School of Public Health 1999 College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 199-210.

Weitzman ER, Nelson TF, Wechsler H. (2003). Taking up binge drinking in college: the influences of person, social group, and environment. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32(1):26-35.

Wright, S. W., Norton, V. C., Dake, A. D., Pinkston, J. R., & Slovis, C. M. (1998). Alcohol on Campus: Alcohol-related emergencies in undergraduate college students. *Southern Medical Journal*, 91(19), 909-913.