

**Report of the  
Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events  
Policy and Procedures  
At Brown University**

**March 8, 2006**



**Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events  
Policy and Procedures at Brown University  
Membership**

Margaret Klawunn, Chair  
Associate Vice President for Campus Life, Dean of  
Student Life

Dominique Cimina '06  
President, Key Society

Emil Fioravanti  
Executive Officer, Department of Public Safety  
[replaced on 2/17/06 by B. Kevin O'Connor, Interim  
Executive Officer, DPS]

Deepa Galaiya '08  
Sophomore Class President, Class Coordinating  
Board

Ricky Gresh  
Director of Student Activities

Jonna Iacono  
President, Graduate Student Council

Jason Lambrese '06  
RC Coordinator and member of Queer Alliance

Deborah Lister  
Manager of Events Support, Facilities Management

Karen McLaurin-Chesson  
Director of the Third World Center and Associate  
Dean of the College

Kathleen McSharry  
Dean for Chemical Dependency and Associate Dean  
of the College

Stephen Morin  
Director of Environmental Health and Safety

Grisel Murillo '07  
Vice-President, Brown Multicultural Greek Council

Sarah Saxton-Frump '07  
President, Undergraduate Council of Students

Anthony Sheets '06  
Vice-Chair, Greek Council and student facilitator of  
Social Function Manager Training

William Suggs  
Associate Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry,  
Faculty Fellow

Zachary Townsend '08  
Vice President, Undergraduate Council of Students

Kate Wolford  
Project Director, Campus Life and Student Services

# **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events Policy and Procedures at Brown University**

## **Executive Summary March 8, 2006**

### **Introduction**

In November 2005, the Ad-Hoc Committee to Review Social Events was formed by Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services David Greene and charged with the examination of social functions. The Committee was asked to consider how social functions are approved, promoted, managed, and staffed, focusing particular attention on practices that maximize student safety and well-being in an environment that encourages student initiated and directed programming. The Committee reviewed best practices at other universities and offers recommendations to minimize the risk factors in social function planning, including the problem of binge drinking or "pre-gaming," violent behavior, and the introduction of weapons into the community. The Committee considered the use of space on campus for large-scale social events and offers guidelines for the appropriate use of campus venues. Finally, the Committee's report identifies and comments on environmental and systemic issues that are beyond the immediate purview of this Committee but have an impact on its work, such as the enforcement of the alcohol policy, facilities constraints, and event funding.

The Committee met six times between December 2005 and the beginning of March 2006. Meeting topics included a review of current policies for social functions; event registration; door and bar management; admissions procedures; the staffing of events; training for social function managers; residential issues; venues; facilities; and costs. In February, student members of the Committee hosted a meeting with 20 campus leaders to get broader student input into our recommendations. Students discussed the challenges they face in planning events, the balance between their leadership and administrative support, recommendations for admission and advertising policies, perceptions around alcohol use and service, and revisions to current social event policies. A full report from this meeting is included as an appendix, and suggestions from this discussion influenced the Committee's final recommendations. The work of the Committee also included a review of policies and procedures at 21 peer institutions. The Committee considered effective strategies from other campuses in formulating the recommendations found here.

Our specific charge was focused on the remediation of problems associated with campus events on November 11 and 12, 2005, though the Committee undertook a broader review of existing policies informed by these and other events. An event on November 11 raised concerns about the behavior of the public drawn to broadly promoted University events, which, that night, resulted in fighting and violence on our campus. On November 12, a party that did not serve alcohol was connected to excessive pre-party drinking by students. Intoxication and significant problems with student behavior made the event difficult to manage, and a large number of students required medical attention. In addressing these specific problems, much of this report is directed at tightening procedures. It is important to note that, immediately following the problems in November, the University implemented some interim policies to address the areas of concern mentioned above. Student leaders have reported that there is a marked increase in the regulation of events and in the enforcement of policy. In formulating our recommendations, the Committee did not want to discourage campus events, nor employ policies and practices that would have the unintended and adverse consequence of encouraging drinking before attendance at social functions. For these reasons, we needed to attend to the larger

campus issues and take a comprehensive look at campus culture. While some of this report is very detailed in reviewing and improving current procedures, some of its scope suggests larger concerns. Most importantly, the work of this Committee was conducted in concert with a review of Brown University's alcohol policy by the Campus Life Advisory Board Subcommittee on Alcohol and Other Drugs. This subcommittee's work is still underway and will not be completed until the end of this spring semester. Our recommendations here are meant to fit into the work of this other group, which will more thoroughly and extensively focus on problematic behavior related to alcohol use at Brown.

This Committee's recommendations aim at supporting the educational mission of Brown University and affirm the importance first and foremost of students' academic work and the educational life of the University.

## **Summary of Major Recommendations**

### **1. Formal adoption of Interim Social Function Policies**

The Committee recommends formal adoption of the interim social function policies that have been in place since November, 2005. These changes include an additional weekend event manager, no readmission for large events, a mandatory per drink charge for Class F parties, the clarification of Department of Public Safety officer roles and student manager roles, more specific recommendations for ticket sales and admission procedures, and the establishment of a fund for creative, non-alcoholic Friday and Saturday night programming. The Committee determined that the interim policies worked well to improve some of the current procedures and to strengthen our capacity for monitoring policies and procedures.

### **2. Address alcohol use through a variety of approaches**

This Committee will work closely with the Campus Life Advisory Board's Subcommittee on Alcohol to share our recommendations. Some specific recommendations in this report include increased monitoring of alcohol use in the residence halls during the peak hours for "pre-gaming" (9 p.m. to 11 p.m. on weekends) and revising the content of social function manager training to present more information on the consequences of alcohol use, with a specific suggestion to focus on the prevention of sexual assault. This Committee would like to see the culture of admission to events change with the aim of discouraging pre-drinking by making it clear that intoxicated students will not be admitted at social functions. Most significantly, the practice of refusing admission to intoxicated individuals must be enforced at the door, which can be managed more effectively if a professional contract security service oversees admissions at large events. The Committee discussed a number of other possibilities to shift student expectations and to reinforce the practice of declining admission to intoxicated individuals; one possibility considered was a line printed on advertising of social events stating, "Intoxicated individuals will not be admitted." The development of a guide for managers to evaluate intoxication, and with information about emergency medical and support resources, will also assist in managing the door.

### **3. Increase security to manage admission at large student events**

In our review of the difficulties faced by student function managers, it became clear that a significant problem for students is intervening with peers who may challenge admission procedures. In addition, the difficulty of managing long lines outside events and disruptive behavior as people depart events was determined to be beyond the purview of student hosts and should be the responsibility of the Department of Public Safety Officers who are assigned to these events. This Committee is

recommending that a contract security service be used to manage the door at large events (300 guests or more) to remove students from this role.

#### **4. Make metal detectors and wands available to campus groups**

This Committee is recommending that metal detectors and wands be available to campus groups. The Committee asks that the Public Safety Oversight Committee recommend a method for making detectors and wands available for campus events when requested. Detectors and wands might be purchased by the University or rented and available when there are concerns about safety at an event. When wands or detectors are in use, sworn officers of the Department of Public Safety must be available at the door.

#### **5. Reinforce student event planning**

Students have confirmed that the educational value for them in hosting events occurs during the event planning, when they are challenged to think through the purpose and structure of their event. This Committee would like to see additional resources directed at providing good advising for students organizing events. Specific recommendations include the development of an easy-to-use handbook for event planners, some standard plans for campus venues that show details for managing an event, and a system for assistance by experienced students to new organization leaders.

#### **6. Identify or create additional social event space**

The Committee is concerned that sufficient and adequate social event space does not currently exist on campus. There are not enough spaces for smaller social gatherings, particularly with many residential lounges in use as bedrooms for individual students. Spaces for larger events are limited in number and hampered by their inadequacy for the purposes of social functions. The Committee supports plans by the Division of Campus Life and Student Services to renovate additional lounges this summer and to increase housing stock so that lounges in residence halls can once again be common spaces. Some additional attention should be paid to encouraging social events and programming in the residence halls that can build community. The Committee would like to see the redesign and renovation of additional spaces for large events. For new University construction, the Committee recommends that attention to social spaces be considered during the initial design. Current problems with managing events are exacerbated by spaces with too many entrances and exits and other structural flaws that prohibit efficient management. The Committee also encourages the University to continue to pursue a more effective system of scheduling facilities.

#### **7. Enhance residential hall staffing and training**

Behavior at large social events indicates that students would benefit from additional guidance in the residence halls and from the leadership of older students. This Committee recommends collaboration with the Residential Peer Leaders to revise training and build the skills of counselors to intervene in disruptive behavior, including the misuse of alcohol, and to set community standards in the residence halls. The presence of older students, more juniors and seniors, in the counseling programs would assist in changing behavior.

## **8. Ensure resources are available to implement recommendations**

Members of the Social Event Review Committee expressed concern that a number of the recommendations contained in this report require additional University resources for implementation. Examples of recommendations that will require additional funds include hiring professional security to manage admissions at large events, the stipulation that groups serving alcohol provide substantial amounts of complimentary food and non-alcoholic beverages, and the development of additional social event space. Given the importance of these recommendations, the Committee wants to ensure the feasibility of their implementation by working with appropriate campus units to develop plans to make resources available to support these initiatives. Committee members will work with the Office of the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services, the Offices of Student Life and Residential Life, the Student Activities Office, the Undergraduate Council of Students, the Graduate Student Council, the University Finance Board, and others to develop budgets and suggestions for funding.

# **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events Policy and Procedures at Brown University**

From December 2005 through the beginning of March 2006, the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Social Events conducted a review of social function policies and procedures at Brown University. The Committee focused its review and recommendations on the whole context for social events at Brown. This included the impact of such campus climate issues as binge drinking, the role of peer counselors in relation to enforcement of University policy, the lack of access to lounges in residential spaces that prohibits small social gatherings, and complications with room reservations and scheduling social events. We affirmed our focus on maintaining the safety and security of students and want to promote opportunities for student leadership. We support the value of event planning and want to ensure that students receive good advising and support for their activities well in advance.

It is the opinion of the Committee that our existing policies, put into place by a previous review committee in 1996, have served us well and will continue to do so. Evaluation and review was overdue and served as an opportunity to update and strengthen policies, particularly after the recent changes in Rhode Island fire safety codes and policies that have affected existing practices and protocols for social functions. Many of these issues were addressed by the interim protocols put into place by the Student Activities Office (SAO) with the support of this Committee. The most critical issues identified by this Committee were related to aspects of the broader campus culture surrounding events and the infrastructure of effective support for the 1996 policies, including appropriate funding, staffing, facilities, and oversight.

Recommendations contained in this report are as follows:

- Identification and/or development of appropriate social function venues on campus, with a focus on venues between 150 and 250, and more than 500
- Greater focus on support, resources, and advising for pre-event planning
- Adoption of interim social function policies
- Review of informal social spaces and systems within residence halls, including staffing, policies, monitoring, and venues. Such review should consider strategies for curbing excessive pre-gaming
- Availability and use of paid students and/or security services to support implementation of admissions policies and door management at larger events
- Funding for non-alcoholic events and non-alcoholic beverages and food at events with alcohol

## **Background**

Following the events of November 2005, Student Organization Hearings were conducted by the Office of Student Life to investigate the sponsoring organizations of the dance on November 11 and the party known as SexPowerGod on November 12. As a result of the investigation and hearing processes, the organizations were sanctioned. Alpha Phi Alpha and the Brotherhood, hosts of the November 11 event, were placed on probation until May 31, 2006, for failing to notify University authorities when they became aware that their event had been advertised on a national website. The Queer Alliance, host of SexPowerGod, was placed on probation until December 31, 2006, for failing to comply with the management plan for their event. During these probationary periods, the organizations are required to develop comprehensive plans for any events they would like to host; such plans are subject to review by the Associate Vice President for Campus Life. Leadership in both organizations are expected to attend the social function manager and harm reduction training program sponsored by the Student Activities Office and Health Education.

While these specific sanctions were put into place to address areas of student management for which these organizations were responsible, it is important to note that, in both cases, larger campus issues outside of the control of these groups influenced the complications with these events. This comprehensive review is intended to look at policies and procedures to prevent the complications faced by these organizations, and also to make recommendations to address the larger climate issues that influenced expectations about these events and about the behavior that would be tolerated.

## Definitions

*Event Registration* is required for all events or activities at which alcohol will be served; all events or activities where anticipated attendance is 100 or more; and other events or activities when required by specific campus departments or under specific circumstances.

A *Social Function* is defined as any event where alcohol will be served or any event with an anticipated attendance of 100 or more that has the primary characteristics of a “party.” These characteristics include socialization as the primary purpose and activity, dancing, and/or music (DJ, band, etc.).

*Large events:* Some discretion must be provided to define, but generally events where more than 300 guests will be expected and/or held in venues holding more than 300 guests and/or those expecting a significant attendance by those outside of the Brown community.

## Philosophy

It was evident in the Committee’s discussions that, while there was contentious debate regarding specific policies and issues, we approached our work from a shared philosophical framework.

It was not our intention to develop policies that will work for every event, but to review and develop a standard for social functions at Brown that would be effective for most events. We did not want to have so many procedures in place that it would become prohibitive to plan an event on campus. Consequently, we have worked to establish procedures that balance safety and security with the promotion of social life.

To guide decision-making, the Committee offers the following statement of philosophy for social functions and, to some extent, student events in general at Brown:

The ability of students to organize and host social events on campus is an important and valued component of campus life at Brown. Such events should primarily serve the Brown student community. Social functions should not undermine student safety or compromise Brown’s educational endeavors. Safety and liability issues must be at the forefront of consideration, but events should also be fun. Student ownership of events should be guided by a set of best practices and policies to provide a level of consistency and to help build a culture of responsible hosting. Students should drive the development and implementation of events (ownership and pride are critical) and should be encouraged to think through the purpose of their events, as well as the safety and management aspects. Students know students best and should be able to use that knowledge to foster and manage life on campus. At the same time, the University should consider what constitutes good uses of student time and resources and what elements of an event provide the most educational value without putting an undue burden or excessive expectations on students. The University must provide the resources and support while also appropriately promoting campus social life.

## **I. Casual Events and Gatherings in Residences**

While the work of our Committee primarily focused on registered social functions, it was immediately apparent that there were levels of social life on campus for which appropriate support and resources do not exist.

The Committee was concerned that there are not enough constructive opportunities for students to gather in the residence halls, either for programs or for more informal social interaction. These opportunities have been limited in part by the need to convert some of the residential lounges into bedrooms because of the housing shortage. Consequently, students are frequently hosting parties that exceed the capacity of their rooms. These smaller events in the residence halls can create health and safety issues. For example, when events take place in residence hall rooms or lounges on a Friday or Saturday night, the garbage is not removed or attended to until Monday morning, which can lead to unsanitary, unpleasant, or unhealthy conditions for those living in the residence hall. The Committee recommends that attention be paid to encouraging non-alcoholic programming and social events in the residence halls with the support of the residential peer leaders.

A question was raised about those events that are not under the social function definition and thus are not registered. These are generally events with less than 100 participants and are regularly brought to the attention of the non-academic discipline system. While these events would not be covered by the social function policy and some are not on campus property, they do indicate a cultural issue that this Committee should address.

Members identified 9 p.m. to 11 p.m. as the key time for pre-gaming. Therefore, it was suggested that some extra effort be made to monitor behavior in the residence halls during those hours on weekends, particularly during weekends when there are large, popular campus events for which pre-gaming may be anticipated.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Residential Life and the Residential Council should conduct a review of casual events and gatherings in residence halls. While the closed nature and small scale of such events creates fewer management challenges, a system should exist for students to hold such events in appropriately sized venues, where safety issues are taken into consideration and the impact on neighbors and other residents can be evaluated. Particularly in Program and Greek Houses, there also needs to be clarification on what is considered normal social activity of a house and what constitutes an event that must be registered with the SAO.
2. It is clear that inadequate informal gathering spaces exist within the residence halls and that, in considering the creation of additional bed spaces, the University must consider not only the development of appropriate shared gathering spaces in new buildings but also the creation or restoration of such spaces within existing residences.
3. The University should clarify how many guests a student can have in his/her room without breaking fire capacity limits.
4. The Committee encourages the University to examine ways to provide custodial services on campus every day of the week.
5. Residential staffing and oversight needs to include a system to enable and support safe, informal gatherings that are important for building community and that fit with the aims of our residential programming.

## II. Roles and Responsibilities

Student hosts should have ownership and accountability for their events, meaning they play a critical role from the very conceptualization of the event idea through post-event evaluation. While students appreciate and support the addition of event managers by the Student Activities Office, the Committee felt that the most critical time for an event is the event planning, in terms of not only building an effective management plan but also developing both excitement and expectations among potential guests. The development of a comprehensive social function plan is a critical part of the process for students. Plans should ask groups to consider their event's purpose and how that is reflected throughout the event, including the content and distribution of advertising.

Student leadership and ownership of the planning phase is critical, but the University should provide more support and resources during this time. The recent addition of a second evening manager by the SAO who is also available during the week has provided not only additional support during the pre-event planning phase but has also provided more consistency between the pre-event phase and the event itself. Students have asked to be able to meet with the event manager before the event; for major events, the ability to connect with the Department of Public Safety (DPS) officer for the event would also provide for better management and coordination.

In confirming the importance of pre-event planning, the Committee made a number of suggestions to improve this part of the process, requesting accessible resources for student event planners, clear methods for ensuring compliance with regulations, and the availability of on-line training for managers. Members noted that it is important for students to begin their planning with enough time to complete all required steps; some students who do not allow enough time (at least two weeks in advance of their event) may have their event registration declined.

Second to event planning is effective implementation at the overall event, most critically at the door. An event must have adequate staffing and a plan in which staff roles are clear. Some of the issues related to the events of November 11 and 12, 2005, and many events prior to that weekend, may be due to some confusion related to roles/responsibilities of student management and University staff. The Department of Public Safety and Student Activities Office's articulation of standard roles and responsibilities was a welcome addition and is endorsed by the Committee. While there was consensus that DPS, when present, has responsibility for the exterior integrity of the event, there was also consensus that, especially for larger events and/or those open to non-Brown guests, student hosts are not in the best position to have sole responsibility for managing the door and monitoring other potential entrances.

While student ownership is critical to the success of the event, the Committee was asked to consider and discuss which aspects of event management were productive and useful for students to manage and which ones could be reassigned or examined as areas where additional support could be provided to student event hosts. Overall, the culture of choice at Brown leads to additional difficulties in door management. Students do not want to be denied admission and are not willing to wait in line. Further, students tend to arrive late to parties. As a result, the admission process is difficult for students to manage without more support. Committee members agree that managing the door is critical to the success of the event (keeping out those who do not belong, refusing admission to intoxicated individuals, turning away those without proper admission or identification, etc.), but that for large functions this role is beyond what should be expected of student hosts. Student hosts, in particular the two primary event coordinators, who know their event and the plan best, must continue to be involved in decision-making, even if additional staffing is provided. While it is important to know that DPS, SAO, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), and in some cases the Providence Police, might be there to assist students managing social events, the presence of each of these authorities should be considered in the context of the event.

As an example of employing an outside agency to assist student managers, the Key Society and Senior Class have hired a local caterer, Atomic Catering, to work the door and bar with positive results. In these cases, the student leadership of the hosting organization works with the professional staff to ensure that the admission process runs smoothly. After this success, organizers sought to hire students to duplicate the efforts of the professional staff without success. It was recommended that events at which alcohol is served and that anticipate 300 people hire external door managers.

### **Recommendations:**

1. The Roles and responsibilities for students, DPS, and the SAO at the event itself should be a permanent addition and integrated into training not only for students but also for DPS Officers.
2. Students should continue to drive the development of plans with support and guidance from SAO, DPS, and others. The additional provisions for aspects of an effective plan outlined in the interim protocols should be adopted.
3. Additional advising, training, and support should be provided to students during the event planning phase. The availability of SAO staff dedicated to Friday and Saturday event management during the event planning phase is critical. The Committee recommends that the second event manager position be continued, with availability during the week.
4. DPS protocols should be evaluated to enable the identification of the lead officer for major events in time to allow that individual to be involved in final pre-event planning the week of the event.
5. Student ownership of events is critical to their success. Students know their event's goals/purpose and need to play a key role in decisions at the event. The two primary event coordinators must not be assigned to specific roles so that they have the flexibility to respond to issues and to monitor the overall event. One of the two event coordinators should be assigned to the primary door to provide oversight and coordination to this most critical part of the event.
6. Event management staff should be available, particularly for larger events and/or those that expect a significant non-Brown audience, to work with the event hosts to manage the door and other potential entrances. Potential options include a paid student event management service, the hiring of professional event management services, the development of University staff, and/or some combination of the above. The pros and cons as well as costs of the various options should be evaluated in addition to sources of funding; evaluation should be sure to consider the issue of using amateurs when professionals are available. For the remainder of the spring 2006 term, professional staffing services should be hired while options are being evaluated. Please note that event hosts should still be responsible for ticket sales.
7. For large events at which alcohol will be served, student hosts should not be in the position of having primary oversight over the service of alcohol. The Committee recommends a professional bartender for events with over 300 guests.
8. Relevant parts of event management must stay intact for the full event because problems often happen later in the event. Recent protocols implemented by DPS to more effectively manage how and when their staff respond to issues away from the event must also continue.

### **III. Admissions and Door Policies**

While Brown hosts many events for the general public that serve as opportunities to bring others into the life of the campus, the Committee agrees that social events on campus are generally meant to serve Brown students, their guests, and members of social organizations connected to Brown (e.g. city-wide organizations with Brown student members).

The Committee also discussed the role of pre-gaming. While most aspects of pre-gaming are beyond the control of event organizers, event organizers contribute to incentives to pre-gaming when events

are structured to accept and thereby encourage guests to arrive late and/or when intoxicated students are admitted to the event.

It is important to support a strong response by student organizers when intoxicated students try to gain entry to events. The Committee endorses changing campus culture so that it becomes an expectation of students that they will be denied entry to events if they are intoxicated or under the influence of any controlled substances. The Committee considered the responsibility of student organizers and under what circumstances should Emergency Medical Technicians be requested at events. (The Key Society paid for two EMTs to be on duty at the Fall Ball, paying \$160, an amount that was felt to be worthwhile.) The Committee noted the limited entrance or “door” space in many Greek and Program houses, and would like the SAO to partner with Greek and Program Houses to examine this issue and develop appropriate strategies.

Re-admission at events is also an issue for policy review. Committee members noted that students often want to leave events to smoke, which adds to the difficulty in managing capacity; however, smoking is not supposed to be permitted within 50 feet of a University building. Several groups have successfully adapted a no-reentry policy for events over 200 people. Door management is easier without monitoring who is going in and out. In terms of safety, when events are over, individuals should be permitted to and encouraged to leave through any door.

#### **Recommendations:**

1. Any student who is visibly intoxicated or exhibits any signs of substance abuse must be denied admission. A structure should exist to help students and hired staff, including DPS, to evaluate whether someone should be granted admission or not. The four stages of intoxication protocol developed by the SAO and Health Education during January 2006 is supported by the Committee and should continue to be in use. (See appendix)
2. The standard Admissions Policy developed as part of the interim protocols should be adopted with the understanding that exceptions may be granted by the SAO if appropriate for the event and if the exceptions are in keeping with this Committee’s recommendations for appropriate audiences for on-campus social events.
3. It is not recommended that students leave their IDs at the door (IDs are often needed at the bar, and safety issues arise if students forget to reclaim their ID, thus being locked out of their residence hall).
4. The group discussed the pros and cons of asking students to sign a guest book (slow entry and long lines due to students signing in, signatures being illegible, and the impracticality of having to sign out). Guest lists, submitted before an event, are useful and should be encouraged to monitor attendance.
5. The University should consider the addition of birthdates on University identification cards for students.
6. As stated in the interim protocols, IDs must be checked at point of sale and at the door in alignment with the stated admissions policy for the event and tickets must remind all guests that IDs will be re-checked at the door.
7. To the extent possible, lines should be organized, kept outside of the event venue, and should not crowd door areas.
8. Signs should be clearly posted to indicate what is needed for admission. The statement that “Intoxicated students will not be admitted” should be posted as well.
9. A policy of no readmission should be adopted for large events.
10. Plans and staffing must ensure that every potential exit and entrance to the event is monitored.

## **IV. Advertising**

The Committee was asked to consider how advertising content relates to the promotion of an event's purpose and whether expectations of those who attend a social function can be shaped by the advertising campaign. This discussion used as a particular example the campaign to advertise SexPowerGod in fall 2005. Student members felt strongly that word-of-mouth communications affected expectations for SexPowerGod and other events much more than any advertising. Some mention was made of the role that peer counselors and coordinating counselors can play with first-year students in terms of shaping ideas and expectations about particular campus events. There was a discussion that caused some mixed reaction about whether advertisements for larger (300 people or more) events should include the tagline, "Intoxicated individuals will not be admitted." Student members of the Committee strongly opposed requiring imposition of this line on advertising. Nevertheless, this suggestion warrants further consideration for its efficacy as one part of a comprehensive approach to changing students' expectations about admission to events.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Advertising should communicate policies relevant to the event, including who is permitted (i.e. Brown students only, etc.), time after which no additional guests will be admitted, and items that are permitted or prohibited (such as bags and containers).
2. Because word-of-mouth is generally more critical on campus than advertising for an event, the training for Residential Peer Leaders should include a segment on responsible communications about campus events.
3. As part of a comprehensive strategy of advertising that will promote change in the campus culture, further consideration should be given to a mandatory tagline for social event advertising stating, "Intoxicated individuals will not be admitted."

## **V. Weapons, Bags, and Containers**

The Committee reviewed other schools' policies related to these issues. It was generally felt by the Committee that while, in general, weapons and related issues are not a concern at most Brown events, the option should exist for using metal detectors or other screening devices. It was noted by the Committee, for example, that Alpha Phi Alpha and the Brotherhood had expressed an interest in using metal detectors at their November 2005 event, but Brown did not have a mechanism in place to accommodate this request.

Allowing individuals to bring beverage containers (bottles, cans, etc.) into the event is problematic with regard to the monitoring alcohol consumption. However, if guests cannot bring their own beverages, there should be an adequate supply of free, non-alcoholic beverages; adequate funding must be provided to groups to enable this. In addition, these beverages should be served in such a way as to give guests confidence that no tampering has occurred. It was noted in the Committee's discussion that some guests may want to bring their own beverages so they know what they are drinking.

### **Recommendations:**

1. As outlined in the interim protocols, guests should not be permitted to bring in beverage containers. Groups must provide an adequate, secure supply of non-alcoholic beverages and food free of charge; funding must be provided to support this policy.
2. Some detectors and some wands should be available to groups hosting events at Brown when they determine it would be helpful to use them, when events are expected to draw a large non-Brown population, when important or controversial speakers will be present, or for major events such as the Spring Concert. When they are in use, sworn officers must be hired for the door to handle incidents when someone has a weapon.

3. The Public Safety Oversight Committee should be requested to examine what kinds of detectors should be obtained, to recommend whether they should be purchased or rented, and to review procedures for their use.
4. Event spaces and buildings should be cleared prior to an event to ensure that alcohol or other items are not stashed and that no guests have entered before admission.

## **VI. Alcohol Service**

Students on the Committee agreed that the wristband system works well to manage admission and identification of those of legal age. The question of limiting drinks arose and was met with cautious optimism, with some wondering if it would encourage pre-gaming. One suggestion for enabling bartenders and managers to better monitor consumption and/or a drink limit involves marking the drinkers' bracelets with permanent ink each time they order a drink. It is important to note that wristbands should be provided by SAO at the event to ensure that wristbands cannot be distributed in advance. Several Committee members suggested that non-alcoholic beverages should be complimentary. All agreed that the issue of serving food at events with alcohol needed to be examined more closely, i.e. the quantity of food, purchasing of food within Undergraduate Finance Board's guidelines, etc. The issue of groups relying on the use of alcohol as a fundraiser was briefly discussed, and it was felt that this practice should be discouraged, with an agreement that more events that are non-alcoholic needed to be sponsored by students.

### **Recommendations:**

1. In keeping with our stated philosophy, social functions with alcohol may only be held after 5 p.m. on Friday and through 2 a.m. on Sunday morning; during Spring Weekend, events with alcohol where food is a significant presence could be permitted on Sunday afternoon.
2. Additional roaming managers should be available to monitor guest safety and ensure that unattended alcohol is discarded.
3. A stamp-per-drink policy should be implemented to regulate how much people have had to drink and to prevent over-drinking.
4. Only one drink may be served to a person at a time.
5. "Bring Your Own Beverage" is currently not permitted, and this prohibition should be explicitly stated.
6. Require events with alcohol at which money will be collected to adopt a per drink charge in keeping with the interim policies and the dominant practice on campus; in general, situations where students may obtain to alcohol at events for free should be discouraged.
7. Non-alcoholic beverages and food need to be provided in sufficient quantities.
8. Bartenders should receive additional training (TIPS program should be considered).
9. Attention should be paid to the most effective way to hire bartenders, whether in shifts or for the night.

## **VII. Pre-Gaming and Nonalcoholic Events**

Committee members considered how nonalcoholic events contribute to pre-gaming and what strategies can be used to combat pre-gaming, including discussing incentives for encouraging arrival at events earlier in the evening (varying admissions charge, planning pre-party events such as banquets or performances, and ensuring popular bands or acts are scheduled earlier in the evening, to name a few).

Students reported that attendance at alcohol-free events for first-year students is low despite publicity; additional effort is required to build the popularity of such events.

In this discussion, it was affirmed that alcohol policy regarding admission to events should be made known and publicized to students so they do not arrive at parties intoxicated.

Debate continued about whether restricting alcohol service at events would promote pre-gaming. The role of the Residential Peer Leaders was discussed and it was decided that further consideration shall be given to how residential peer leaders, especially in first-year units, might interrupt dangerous drinking.

**Recommendations:**

1. Interim policy recommendations on setting a time after which no readmission will be permitted should be formally adopted as one strategy to discourage pre-gaming.
2. Continue funding for nonalcoholic programming on Friday and Saturday nights.
3. Residential environment and increased training of residential staff needs additional consideration.
4. Funding for incentives to encourage people to come early to events should be considered, including the scheduling of good bands early and food/banquets/performances before the event.

### **VIII. Advising, Training, and Communication**

Student feedback indicates that the SAO is a great resource, but more effort needs to be made to communicate and explain policies. Students noted that Friday afternoon training comes too late for event coordinators. While the SAO has organized social chair training in the past, additional incentives to motivate students to participate in this training should be considered. Another option that would improve event planning is the development of a manual of contact information, which would assist with the hard-to-navigate bureaucratic network of University administration involved in events. An on-line database with information for students about social event space and requirements would be helpful. The Committee recommended a regularly scheduled time when offices that assist in event planning (DPS, Health Education, Catering, Event Support, Environmental Health and Safety) could have representatives available in SAO to advise student leaders.

The Committee identified the qualities of good student event advising by examining what has worked for the Key Society. A write-up of recommendations about advising developed by the President of the Key Society is included in the appendix.

The issue of sexual assaults and problematic sexual situations was also discussed; the Committee was reminded that situations regarding sexual assaults were a major contributor to the need to create many of our existing policies in 1996. While this issue is always important, it is most critical at the beginning of the academic year, when first-year women are statistically more likely to experience an assault. Currently, sexual assault information is provided to social function and party managers. This information is specific about date rape drugs in drinks and encouraging bystanders to interrupt behavior that seems suspicious. Current practice of bartenders at Brown is such that they do not mix beverages in advance to decrease the chance of drinks being spiked with drugs. For the same reason, party managers are supposed to dispose of drinks that are left unattended. While current policy requires bathroom managers, it was suggested that guidelines be developed for residential-based parties to monitor the traffic to private rooms as a sexual assault prevention effort. The goal is to move campus culture from being hesitant to intervene in potentially problematic sexual situations to taking proactive steps to prevent such situations from developing in the first place; event hosts are a critical part of this. The Committee supported recent efforts by Health Education to distribute cards to social function managers with emergency resource information. These cards can be placed in the restrooms at events.

**Recommendations:**

1. Bartenders should receive intensive training for their specific role, separate from the other social function managers.

2. Additional communication and education needs to be offered to the student organizations that will be operating under these policies.
3. The practice of having all event staff and volunteers meet at least 30 minutes before doors open must be continued to enable everyone to review plans and roles/responsibilities of one another and with DPS, SAO, etc.
4. Event organizers should meet with DPS officers prior to the day of the event, particularly for large events; the importance of these personnel reviewing the plan for the evening before an event begins was stressed.
5. Standard end-of-event protocols should be adopted. The Committee endorses the interim policies and the Roles and Responsibilities document.
6. Training should be reviewed for sexual assault intervention content and consideration be given to improving residential counselor training in this area, as well.

## **IX. Policy Enforcement and Monitoring**

The Committee examined infractions of social event management and of the code for student conduct when infractions relate to social events. It was suggested that the meeting before an event could include a review for event hosts of policies regulating infractions. Weekend event managers of the SAO would carry out this recommendation. There was a recommendation that a second violation by a bartender (eg. drinking while tending bar) would result in those privileges being suspended permanently, not just for a limited period of time, because of the severity of the offense. Another area of concern is damage to venues that are not caused by the group sponsoring the event. Currently, there are no funds to cover these damages. The Committee discussed whether host groups should be billed even if their members or their invited guests did not cause the damage; ultimately, it was suggested that the University consider developing a fund to cover this category of damage.

Members noted that there have been difficulties when the SAO Manager is delayed at one event and cannot monitor other functions. During the weekend in November 2005, the manager had to divide his time between the major events and other events on campus that weekend. The addition of a second event manager was identified as critical for many reasons, including these.

For Greek Council organizations, the Council has played a critical role in enforcing policies and building a culture of responsibility, including taking leadership on developing appropriate sanctions for violations. The SAO and Student Life have adopted the standards developed by the Council as possible sanctions. For all other organizations, this level of student involvement in enforcement has not been possible. The Committee would like to see an expansion of student involvement in reviewing and monitoring social functions. A system of sanctions should more closely monitor and place more stringent protocols on groups with a history of problematic events. Sanctions should also be creative in encouraging and supporting alternative programming and more effective event management on campus. The Committee supports the changes implemented in January 2005 whereby a formal structure exists for the SAO to adjudicate policy before referring groups to Student Life; the goal of the process, except for gross and/or repeated violations, should be to encourage effective event planning at Brown.

In addition, Brown should not wait for problematic incidents to trigger review of social event policies. A social function committee comprised primarily of students should be developed to work with the Student Activities Office to periodically review policies, develop training, and assist in the adjudication of social function policy violations.

### **Recommendations:**

1. The Student Activities Office should create a student Social Function Oversight Team or Committee to assist the office in the oversight and management of the social function system. Members of the Committee should be experienced social function managers. It is recommended that the SAO ensure at least one member has experience managing social functions for each of the following groups of organizations on campus: Greek Council, the Student Union, Key Society, Class Coordinating Boards, SPEC, Multicultural Greek Council, and cultural student organizations. The involvement of the Team in the facilitation of training and the evaluation of infractions would likely necessitate that the positions be paid.
2. By eliminating some student responsibility for staffing doors, student organizers can refocus some of their attention on monitoring guests and their safety inside the event, primarily through additional roaming managers.
3. The SAO should formalize hiring of second evening manager to be used on nights when two major events or many smaller events are scheduled. At least one of the evening managers should have significant availability during the week to assist with pre-event planning and to provide more consistency and better coordination.

## **X. Facilities, Venues, Finances, and Incentives**

In general, venues and access to venues continue to be critical issues at Brown. Because students have difficulty gaining access to adequate spaces for social functions, they often reserve rooms that are not ideally suited. These spaces can contribute to managements problems during the events; for example, in fall 2005, some of the problems in managing events were functions of the design and interior features of Sayles Hall, a historic space on the campus that is not appropriately used for social functions. Since November 2005, Sayles Hall cannot be reserved for social functions which means currently that there are even fewer locations for social events. The University needs to look broadly at space planning and consider more carefully the daytime, academic use of buildings and the potential for flexible and creative use during evenings and weekends.

In January 2005, staff and students conducted a preliminary review of alternative social event and party locations and issued a report. This report is attached for reference and outlines some of the elements that make for functional event space. The Social Event Review Committee endorsed the following criteria for event spaces: accessibility, sprinkler protection, proximity of restrooms, low cost, convenient location on campus, adequate storage space for furniture and equipment, and flooring for dances. The Committee's aim is to have at least two mid-sized venues (150-250) available on any given Friday or Saturday night and one large-scale venue (over 500).

The Committee would like to see further exploration of some issues raised in the January 2005 report, particularly in regard to rethinking some current spaces on campus. Andrews Dining Hall, which is a potentially desirable space for social events, currently has a rental fee that the Committee would like to have waived for student events. The Bear's Lair, a large space in the Graduate Center housing complex, could be renovated as a flexible space for students events and programs, as well as for residents living in that complex. In the Vartan Gregorian Quad on Thayer Street, there are some rooms that could be made available for student use. There are also rooms in the Sharpe Refectory which could be redesigned and utilized for student functions.

Campus scheduling contributes to some of the difficulty with spaces. Many departments currently control rooms, which makes it hard for student organizations to make reservations or to get advice on appropriate spaces. Some oversight of all available spaces could assist students by more equitably distributing reserveable spaces to groups. Parameters and policies for restricted use rooms, like Sayles

Hall, would also be more readily available. Committee members would like standard plans for all rooms to be available through the Student Activities Office.

Committee members recommended a fund be available to cover maintenance and damage to spaces when an individual organization is not responsible for damage. The Committee encourages the University to increase custodial coverage over the weekend. Members noted that spaces could be available more readily for multiple uses if more custodial staffing was available.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Two mid-sized (150-250) venues and one large (over 500) venue should be available for reservations every Friday and Saturday night.
2. Current campus spaces should be examined and some renovations should be done to increase appropriate social event space.
3. A fund should be established to pay for wear and tear and damage to spaces when expenses are not billable to individuals or organizations.
4. Room reservations should be more student-friendly, with advising provided at the time the reservation is booked about the appropriateness of certain spaces and with some examination of the distribution of spaces to groups.

### **Next Steps**

In the coming weeks, this report will be shared broadly across campus.

In addition:

- Recommendations from this Committee will be passed along to the Campus Life Advisory Board's Subcommittee on Alcohol for their continuing work this spring.
- Planning will begin with the Offices of Residential Life and Student Life to design training for residential peer leaders that addresses the issues identified here, specifically skills training around intervening in alcohol misuse and additional monitoring of behavior in the residence halls during the hours associated with pre-gaming. Planning for evaluating adequate staffing and to increase leadership of older students in the residence halls will also begin this spring.
- The Student Activities Office will develop some additional materials and resources to ease the process for student organization leaders planning events.
- Discussion and consultation with the Student Activities Office, the Undergraduate Finance Board, and other offices that work on event planning (Health Education, Department of Public Safety, etc) to develop plans to fund the additional security presence at large events and to support sufficient food and non-alcoholic beverages at functions where alcohol is served.
- The Division of Campus Life and Student Services will examine social event space. There are plans for the renovation of some residential lounges this summer. We will develop additional plans for the renovation and redesign of larger campus spaces to develop more venues that will be suitable for large campus events.

### **Appendix:**

- I. Interim social function policies implemented in November
- II. A report from the meeting with student leaders
- III. A compilation of information on policies at peer institutions
- IV. An overview of the relationship of Key Society and advisor
- V. The January 2005 space report and appendixes
- VI. The four stages of intoxication protocol