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Key Observations

1) Executive Overview

Alcohol education directors employ demographic survey data about alcohol and drug use to identify campus needs and customize programming. Institutions with significant populations of binge drinkers (e.g., 60 percent of the student body) benefit from harms reduction campaigns. Harms reduction messages promote social aspects of drinking but teach students how to minimize risks. Contacts warn that copying programs from other institutions without customization to campus context often leads to program failure.

The most effective campaign strategies target culture and peer influence through social norms marketing and harms reduction messages. Contacts emphasize that substance abuse problems on campuses involve a culture of drinking and peer influence rather than solely individual choices and behavior. Subpopulations such as Greek students engage in binge and at-risk drinking more commonly than non-Greek undergraduates. Social norms marketing campaigns reinforce positive peer behavior. Campaigns promote mutual concern for each other’s safety (e.g., designation of a non-drinking driver) and negative perceptions of alcohol overconsumption.

Develop a consistent message to promote campus-wide. Successful messages include “Choose to drink what and when you want to,” and “Pressuring others to drink is not cool.” Contacts recommend that presentations deliver additional information specific to student subpopulations, such as the group’s statistical risks and perceptions about alcohol use. Altering messages at different groups’ requests dilutes the overall program impact.

Require alcohol abuse education courses for students who violate student conduct policies. Nearly all profiled institutions mandate Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) training for high-risk offenders. Alcohol and other drug (AOD) educators evaluate judicial incidents with an audit of students’ long-term drinking behavior to place students in appropriate courses. Students appreciate institutional policies that demonstrate the Administration’s commitment to their health and safety, rather than policies that seek to punish offenders.

Institutions address isolated cases of drug abuse through rehabilitative medical treatment. No contacts report systematic approaches to drug education and prevention. Concerns about alcohol abuse dwarf concerns about drug violations at profiled institutions.
2) Program Development

Student Survey

**Ascertain Current Campus Drinking Climate through Surveys**

Contacts underscore the importance of customizing alcohol and drug abuse prevention and education programs to campus’ culture and context. Substance abuse reduction strategies that effect change at campuses with high binge drinking rates do not perform well at campuses with low binge drinking rates. Student life administrators distribute a campus-wide survey, such as the National College Health Assessment, to measure their campus climate. Surveys gauge:

- Behaviors that students commonly engage in,
- Perceptions that students typically hold about campus drinking behaviors, and
- Harms reduction strategies that students employ.

Institutions require a sufficient sample of students (i.e., 15-30%) to assess campus behaviors accurately.

**Strategies to Increase Survey Response Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertise Incentives for Survey Completion</th>
<th>Grant students small monetary amounts, up to $5, upon survey completion. Give students charge cards or deposits in student accounts to spend at campus store and eateries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organize raffles for survey participants. For example, Virginia Tech raffles off five $100 Amazon gift cards for students who complete the survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandate Survey Completion as Entrance Prerequisite</th>
<th>Require all incoming students to complete the survey before registration. If students do not complete the survey, they cannot register for courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require Greek pledges to complete surveys to become official chapter members. Programs that cater to Greek life benefit from targeted outreach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys typically ask respondents to identify their demographic characteristics (e.g., upper vs. lower classmen, Greek vs. non-Greek, on-campus resident vs. non-residential), so researchers can disaggregate the resulting survey data by subpopulations.

Focus Groups

**Establish Focus Groups to Identify Student Concerns and Gauge Message Reception**

Survey data serve as starting points for prevention program design. Focus groups yield more targeted information about the content that resonates most with students. Contacts at Virginia Tech report the process to refine messages typically takes one to two years.

1) Read more about selecting survey methods in Program Operations.
Refine Program Content and Messages through Focus Groups

Focus Group Process at Virginia Tech

1. Recruit Students for Focus Groups
   Contacts recommend that educators assemble six to eight focus groups of ten to fifteen students. Although most students speak willingly and candidly about their drinking behavior and that of their peers, alcohol prevention coordinators compensate students to ensure steady participation. Students receive compensation in the form of gift cards to restaurants and cafes so that students cannot spend payment on alcohol.

2. Solicit Feedback on Preliminary Content Ideas
   Educators present different messages to focus group participants and ask what participants associate with the messages. Coordinators at Virginia Tech discovered that students perceived someone who engages in “low-risk drinking” to be dull and asocial while perceiving someone who “parties positive” to be fun-loving and friendly. Educators proceeded with the latter message as the basis for their harms reduction campaign.

3. Modify Content and Design Marketing Media
   Alcohol education offices incorporate recommendations from preliminary focus groups to rewrite campaign messages and design advertisements and giveaway items such as Frisbees and water bottles.

4. Present New Content and Media to Focus Groups
   Educators assemble new focus groups to measure student response toward modified messages.

Participation Incentive

$10/hour

Alcohol prevention coordinators offer $10 an hour to ensure steady focus group participation.
Divide Students into Groups by Demographics to Alleviate Social Pressure

Alcohol abuse educators separate students into focus group by demographics to lessen social pressure and better identify student communities’ concerns. Since each demographic possesses unique perspectives and issues, separate groupings allow members to share and echo each other’s concerns more clearly. Contacts observe that low-risk drinkers tend to communicate less volubly in groups with heavier drinkers, and that similarly men frequently talk over women. Focus groups separate high-risk drinkers from low-risk drinkers and men from women to control for these tendencies. Demographically distinct groupings enable student life administrators to identify what challenges groups such as Greek or off-campus students face when confronted with binge drinking. Researchers reorganize student participants into different groupings to maximize the time participants spend.

Reorganize Students in Focus Groups into New Designations

Focus Group Organization at Virginia Tech

After each focus group, reorganize students into new subgroupings

1. Female Students
   - High-Risk Drinkers
   - Low-Risk Drinkers

2. Male Students
   - High-Risk Drinkers
   - Low-Risk Drinkers

3. Greek Students
   - Non-Greek Students

4. On-Campus Students
   - Off-Campus Students

Deliver Group-Specific Information Aligned with Consistent Messages to Student Subpopulations

Student groups respond more positively to presentations that convey information relevant to the group. MIT’s instructors customize risk management presentations to specific audiences by incorporating statistical data and values of the target group. For example, presentations to sororities reveal drinking risks for women involved in Greek life. Ethnicity-focused Greek organizations receive disaggregated data about the statistical risks for their respective communities. Customization of presented data enables alcohol education programs to connect more effectively with target audiences while still allowing instructors to maintain consistent messaging across programs and campaigns.
**Identification of Campus Needs**

*Review Survey Results, Focus Group Responses, and Institutional Policies to Identify Campus Needs*

Committees such as student health advisory boards and alcohol and other drugs councils evaluate results from surveys, focus groups, and an audit of institutional policies. Committee participants include:

- Greek life coordinators,
- Alcohol education staff,
- University health services personnel,
- Student conduct committee members, and
- Student representatives.

Review procedures ensure that new programs target specific campus needs rather than replicate policies developed for other campuses. Developed policies must encompass prevention, which changes student behavior before alcohol consumption concerns become a problem, and intervention, which addresses student behaviors after problem incidents arise.

**Prevention and Intervention Strategies Aligned to Institutional Concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student events consistently pose liabilities</td>
<td>Require Greek event coordinators to train in risk management strategies: Several institutions require that servers and event organizers at student events complete alcohol serving and liability reduction training.</td>
<td>Collaborate with local law enforcement to patrol events: Police liaisons at University of Wisconsin-Madison build rapport with Greek student leaders to ensure cooperation at tailgates and block parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students avoid calling emergency transport for intoxicated peers</td>
<td>Institute a Good Samaritan Policy: MIT directs students who use emergency transports to drug/alcohol counseling without disciplinary measures unless larger scale student conduct violations took place. Students perceive that the Administration placed their health first through this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions do not employ alcohol and drug abuse educational programs</td>
<td>Direct AOD offices to develop educational programs and campaigns: Effective strategies include mandatory programs for Greek pledges and campus-wide harms reduction campaigns.</td>
<td>Create mandatory courses for sanctioned students: Previously, students who violated alcohol conduct regulations at Virginia Tech only wrote reflection papers. The alcohol abuse prevention center developed three tiers of courses for conduct violations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Wisconsin-Madison recently instituted a policy that prohibits alcohol service at any student event in which more than one-third of attendees are below the legal drinking age. Results have yet to reveal how effectively the policy improves student safety.
Implement Harms Reduction Campaign to Reach Socially Oriented Students

Harms reduction campaigns teach students strategies to maximize the positive social outcomes of alcohol use safely and minimize dangerous consequences. At Virginia Tech, the PartyPositive campaign teaches students to:

- Estimate the amount of alcohol in various drinks using a standard drinks table,
- Calculate blood alcohol concentration (BAC) based on gender and weight,
- Pace drinks based on how quickly alcohol clears out of the body,
- Hydrate to prevent hangovers, and
- Eat before drinking to reduce inebriation.

The harms reduction approach never instructs students to drink less, but students who follow the approach inevitably imbibe less.

Harms Reduction Alcohol Consumption Formula

\[(0.5 \text{ oz. of alcohol/hr}) + 12 \text{ oz. of water} \leq 0.06 \text{ BAC}\]

Virginia Tech’s Party Positive campaign recommends that students drink no more than half an ounce of alcohol per hour (the rate at which alcohol clears the body) and hydrate with twelve ounces of water for every half ounce of alcohol they consume. The campaign recommends students maintain a blood alcohol concentration below 0.06 to maximize social pleasure but minimize harms such as loss of coordination, inappropriate behavior, and impaired speech.

Focus groups suggested that although harms reduction slogans were memorable, students required more specific information to act on messages. The alcohol education office developed submessages that gave guidance to accompany existing messages.

Messages and Submessages Employed in Harms Reduction Campaigns

*Developed at Virginia Tech*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Submessages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHOOSE When and What You Drink.</td>
<td>“Not drinking or only consuming what you want is always the right choice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Campaign educators recently added</em> “CHOOSE to Drink Legally” <em>(i.e., drink when you are of legal drinking age, not in violation of open container and public intoxication laws).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATE a Non-Drinking Driver.</td>
<td>“Consumption of even small amounts of alcohol will result in impairment and fatigue that will diminish your driving skills.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Virginia Tech Division of Student Affairs Campus Alcohol Abuse Prevention Center, “Know Standard Drinks.”

www.alcohol.vt.edu/Students/Party_positive/know_standard_drinks/index.html
Charge Fees for Disciplinary Programs to Fund Harms Reduction Campaign

Institutions that fine students for alcohol conduct violations possess a source of funding for education and prevention campaigns. Disciplinary course fees provide the primary source of funding for campaign marketing costs and the employment of peer educators.

### Alcohol Education Funding Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct Violations</td>
<td>Disciplinary Course Fee $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Students</td>
<td>Total Disciplinary Course Fees $90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Student Exemptions $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation Expenditures for Alcohol Education Office $55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Expenditures for Alcohol Education Campaign $35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, previous Forum research cautions against establishment of heavy fines (i.e., over $50) for alcohol violations since the policy disproportionately punishes low-income students. Alcohol educators discount or exempt course fees for low-income students to combat the asymmetrical financial impact.

---

Employ Guerilla-Style Marketing and High Quality Giveaway Items to Gain Visibility among Students

Alcohol educators employ guerilla marketing tactics most effectively. At Virginia Tech, coordinators set up an Interactive Bar intermittently in high-traffic student areas (e.g., student lounges) and invite students to the bar. Each time educators deploy the Interactive Bar, they reach one hundred students. The alcohol education center operates the bar approximately fifteen times throughout the school year.

**Personalized Alcohol Education at the Interactive Bar**

Students come up to the bar and pour their own drink with fake alcohol into Solo cups, then explain how many drinks they think they poured. Educators measure the poured drink and inform students of the actual number of standard drinks (i.e., 0.5 oz. of alcohol) the poured cup holds. Students tell educators how many of the simulated drinks they typically consume over the course of a night. Based on number of drinks consumed, alcohol educators calculate students’ average BAC and discuss harms reduction strategies.

High profile marketing and publicity maximizes campaign messages’ reach among students. Alcohol educators begin with traditional paper media such as posters and flyers in academic buildings and dorms and table tents in dining halls. Campaign coordinators then emblazon harms reduction campaign messages on high quality giveaway items, including:

- Reusable water bottles,
- Flashlight key chains,
- Carabiners,
- Whammo Frisbees, and
- Reusable grocery bags.

Contacts emphasize that giveaway items should be high quality (e.g., Whammo Frisbees instead of cheaply produced ones) to gain student use; otherwise, students simply throw items away.

**Respond to Political Resistance with Explanation of Motives and Proof of Efficacy**

Contacts report that students’ parents and senior administrators do not easily adopt harms reduction campaigns due to political concerns. Critics at Virginia Tech charge that harms reduction does not focus enough on underage drinking and “teaches students how to drink.” Alcohol education coordinators respond that students make the personal choice to drink illegally; counselors and the university best respond by reducing the associated harms. Coordinators field concerns from parents, but once staff explain the motivations behind the strategy and its efficacy at changing student culture, parents and administrators alike support the harms reduction campaign.
Social Norms Marketing Campaign

Complement Harms Reduction Strategies with Social Norms Messages to Draw Awareness to Campus Perceptions and Statistics

Baseline survey data show that students overestimate the amount of alcohol their peers consume, yet students binge drink to keep pace with the incorrectly assumed social norm. Social norms marketing campaigns employ statistical information to correct mistaken perceptions, promote accurate information, and alter substance abuse culture. The University of Arizona employs its social norms marketing campaign “to advertise campus norms around alcohol use and change existing misperceptions.” Normative messages convey information about lesser known or understood facts related to alcohol safety.

Contacts advocate that social norms campaigns start with positive messages. If a majority of students engage in dangerous substance behaviors, administrators focus campaign messages on harms reduction strategies (e.g., 80 percent of students hydrate before drinking alcohol). Campaigns publicize normative drinking behavior statistics if the student body demonstrates safe habits. Alcohol education coordinators develop social norms messages based on survey results, focus group feedback, and academic data from the registrar. At Virginia Tech, normative messages complement the harms reduction strategies campaign.

Social Norms Message Selection and Design

Conduct survey:
What percentage of students imbines five drinks in a sitting more than twice a week?

Survey Results: <50%

If a minority of students binge drink: Focus social norms messages on moderate drinking behaviors, incorrect perceptions toward campus alcohol consumption, and positive academic data.

Survey Results: ≥50%

If a majority of students binge drink: Focus social norms messages on harms reduction strategies that students typically employ and positive academic data and attitudes.

Re-administer survey one year later to identify any progress made. Advertise any statistical declines.

Conduct Social Norms Campaign via Campus Media and Giveaways

Similarly to harms reduction campaigns, alcohol education coordinators employ campus media and branded giveaways to ensure regular and frequent exposure to the normative messages. High traffic media that raise campaign visibility include:

- Campus newspaper advertisements,
- Posters,
- Bulletin board displays and newsletters,
- Campus shuttles,
- Bumper stickers,
- Magnets,
- Mouse pads, and
- Screen savers.

Social Norms Marketing Campaign Posters

Minority of students binge drink

Most University of Arizona Students

Work Hard
- 88% take 12 or more units per semester
- 61% work at a job 11 hours or more per week
- 85% talk to faculty about coursework outside of class
- Earn a B average GPA

Drink Moderately
- 64% have 4 or fewer drinks when they party
- Most average 1 drink per hour when they party
- 73% do not miss classes due to drinking
- 88% do not perform poorly on tests due to drinking

 Majority of students binge drink

Virginia Tech Students Party Positive

- 58% of Virginia Tech students have eight or fewer drinks per week or do not drink
- 76% of students drink two or fewer times a week or do not drink
- 74% of students indicate that not drinking or having only a few drinks is more fun than getting drunk
- 72% of students believe that encouraging someone to engage in high-risk drinking is not cool
- 92% of Virginia Tech students believe that bragging about drinking is not cool
- More than 15,000 students do not miss class because of drinking or attend class with a hangover

KEY TO DATA SOURCES

- Drinking behavior statistic
- Harms reduction strategy
- Academic Data
- Attitudes and perceptions

---

5) National Social Norms Institute at the University of Virginia, “University of Arizona: 29% Reduction over 3 Years.”
www.Alcohol.vt.edu/Students/VT_alcohol_use/VT_student_party_positive/index.html
**Fulfill Greek Organizations' Liability Requirements with Interactive, Small-Group Risk Management Trainings**

Governing councils of national Greek organizations frequently mandate local chapters budget for annual risk management training. MIT’s Greek life offices require that two-thirds of each chapter’s members train in risk management annually before chapters can host social events; while the University of Wisconsin-Madison requires all students to attend an alcohol education program upon joining a Greek chapter.

Interactive approaches to risk management result in greater student engagement and improved response to educational content. MIT’s alcohol prevention office offers PartySafe Social Host trainings that educate the Greek community about BAC concentrations, high-risk drinking, and best practices for events to reduce safety risks. Instructors present ten scenarios as case studies; students break out into smaller groups to discuss how to manage the situation. Interactive case studies engage students in real world situations in an action-oriented manner. Similarly, the University of Arizona’s game show-style “Buzz” program provides social normative information to the Greek community. Students report that they enjoy the competitive format, and the program exhibits positive post-participation results.

---

**Do Not Convene Large Group Risk Management Trainings**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, students have lost interest in a neurology professor’s lecture called “Alcohol Effects and Awareness” delivered to all Greek organization members. This lecture typically addresses 450 to 500 students simultaneously. Greek life coordinators propose smaller group sessions instead to engage students more directly.

---

**Risk Management Curricula Focus on Practical Steps to Reduce Liability Instead of Abstinence Advocacy**

Contacts at Virginia Tech’s alcohol abuse prevention center warn that Greek leaders often believe that because no measures can prevent all underage students from obtaining alcohol at social events, chapters can take no steps to manage risk. The alcohol education director advises that even if universal prevention proves impossible, Greek event organizers can take practical steps such as:

- Check identification of event attendees
- Place wristbands on students of legal drinking age
- Instruct bartenders to refuse drinks to underage students without wristbands
Online Education Programs Reduce Institutional Liability but Do Not Produce Demonstrable Effects

Different pricing and incentive models make each preventative approach optimal for different-sized institutions.

Assess Need for Prefabricated Online Modules Based on Budget and Student Population Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the student affairs unit budget for a university-wide alcohol course?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the student body encompass fewer or more than 5,000 undergraduates?</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller schools target students with incentives to utilize resources more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger schools benefit from the systematic coverage of Alcohol.edu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Institutions with Budgets for University-Wide Programs

Smaller institutions benefit from low cost programs with incentivized participation and targeted intervention. MIT’s substance abuse prevention staff offer students $5 incentives to complete the online program e-CHUG; the office also offers students who recognize that they have a heavy drinking problem $30 incentives to complete a motivational interviewing intervention program. The sum of participation incentives for MIT’s small student body results in costs lower than the $25,000 to $28,000 subscription to Alcohol.Edu.

Large Institutions with Budgets for University-Wide Programs

Larger institutions benefit from high cost programs that ensure universal reach. Virginia Tech’s alcohol education director characterizes Alcohol.edu as institutional liability protection rather than an effective educational tool; the university has not witnessed quantifiable results. Students likely click through the course and the program allows for little campus-specific customization. However, the program allows the institution to demonstrate that all students received alcohol education.

Lowest Priority

Contacts report that they would prioritize Alcohol.edu and other liability protective online programs last among education and prevention initiatives.
4) Intervention and Disciplinary Programs

**Prioritize Student Rehabilitation over Punishment through Educational Sanctions**

Disciplinary programs should address a pattern of behavior rather than punish single incidents. Identification of risk patterns enables directors to dedicate the most resources to the highest risk cases. Alcohol education directors triage students toward the correct educational resource using alcohol survey audits.

**Levels of Alcohol Education Courses for Student Conduct Violations**

- **Low-Risk Drinkers**
  - Group classes led by peer instructors: Students who commit lowest level violations and exhibit no pattern of dangerous drinking on screenings attend courses with ten to fifteen other students. Trained student educators lead sessions.
  - Two 90-minute small group sessions: A clinical psychology doctoral student conducts a group BASICS motivational interviewing session for two to eight students who exhibit moderate risk drinking behaviors. A licensed clinical psychologist supervises.

- **High-Risk Drinkers**
  - One-on-one BASICS intervention conducted by trained health services staff or alcohol center educators: At the University of Arizona, university health services reserves BASICS for students with repeat violations because BASICS is highly resource-intensive.

- Referral to medical rehabilitative program: Health services coordinators at Auburn University refer students to clinical psychologists for treatment if screening shows that the students experience complex mental health and/or drug problems.

**Institutions Most Frequently Employ BASICS Motivational Interviewing Program as Intervention Strategy with At-Risk Students**

The Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention of College Students (BASICS) program employs a discussion-based intervention to identify harmful behaviors and offer students strategies to change. Trained medical providers conduct two one-on-one interviews with participants for an hour each session. Contacts agree that the BASICS program demonstrates the most effective and replicable results of all researched alcohol intervention programs in higher education.
BASICS Program Components

- **Pre-Program Screening**
  Participant completes a pre-program survey that details drinking behaviors.

- **First Interview**
  The first interview gathers information about the student’s alcohol consumption pattern, personal beliefs about alcohol, understanding of social alcohol norms, and family history.

- **Second Interview**
  A week later, the counselor interviews the student to provide personalized feedback on misperceptions about alcohol’s effects, facts on alcohol norms, techniques to reduce future alcohol consumption risks, and personal decisions to change.

- **Post-Assessment**
  Three months later, participants complete a survey that mirrors the questions in the initial screening to register any changes in behavior.

Adapt BASICS Training to Small Group Setting for Prevention Program

Alcohol educators at the **University of Arizona** employ BASICs as preventative training for all fraternity and sorority pledges before students immerse themselves in Greek community culture. However, one-on-one interventions exhaust resources, require significant commitments from participants, and are not scalable without external grants and student support.

Small group BASICS sessions offer similar engagement but require fewer resources. **Auburn University** employs the program both one-on-one and in small groups. Group counselors pose open-ended questions that do not pressure any single participant to share personal information on drinking habits, but rather enable students to speak more generally on good choices everyone could make. Sample questions include:

- “How do you define binge drinking?”
- “What harm reduction tips can you share?”

Encourage Greek Chapter Participation

Alcohol and other drugs specialists liaise closely with chapter leaders at the presidents’ council to convince leaders to join and support the program. Chapter presidents receive BASICS training first to understand the program and to explain it to their chapters.

Collaboration with Law Enforcement

**Invite Local Police Liaison to Greek Council Meetings to Establish Rapport with Chapter Leaders**

Weekend parties and large sporting events generate greater alcohol safety concerns such as public inebriation and property damage. To ensure greater safety, police liaisons from the local city police department and campus police cultivate robust relationships with Greek student leaders and Greek life office staff. Liaisons frequently attend monthly presidents’ council meetings. Police liaisons deliver information sessions on topics such as alcohol safety.
and sexual misconduct, and field students’ questions on event regulations in the weeks prior to large events such as homecoming and annual campus-wide student festivities. Police liaisons also frequently check in on regular weekend events at chapter houses to establish rapport and familiarity.

Avoid Ineffective Peer Monitoring Systems in Greek Community

Contacts at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and MIT warn against the efficacy of Greek-run event monitoring systems. Student monitors who complete pre-event checklists do not preclude police investigation and action, and social pressure within the Greek community often prevents underclassmen monitors from examining gatherings behind closed doors in Greek upperclassmen residences.

5) Program Operations

Staffing and Collaboration

Designate a Coordinator to Help Students Navigate Units’ Resources

At institutions with multiple units dedicated to alcohol education and recovery, students and student groups struggle to navigate options. Resources include:

- Clinical psychology research centers,
- Alcohol education offices,
- Student health services, and
- Greek life administration.

Auburn University employs a director of health and wellness services to coordinate and connect resources in alcohol and drug abuse prevention. For free trainings and intervention sessions, the coordinator directs student groups to health services. The coordinator refers students who struggle with complex mental health issues or drug addictions to the clinical psychology center.

Coordinators send outside referrals to fee-based campus auxiliary services. For example, students who face judicial charges for alcohol violations often go to clinical psychology centers to complete a rehabilitative program; attorneys assert that completion letters from licensed clinical psychologists convey greater legitimacy in the court of law for student clients found guilty of alcohol violations than completion letters from student health services.

Convene Regular Meetings among Constituents to Connect Services

Effective alcohol abuse prevention, education, and intervention for Greek organizations depend on cooperation between alcohol education, health services, and Greek life. Health
services and alcohol education staff must be able to approach Greek life office administrators with data-driven, results-oriented programs. Rather than stigmatizing the problems that Greek students face, health services demonstrate a common interest in students’ health.

Greek life administrators participate in student health advisory boards to establish open communication and seek advice freely. At the University of Arizona, the Director for Fraternity & Sorority Programs participates in the Alcohol and Other Drugs Council. At Auburn University, faculty, administration, students, Greek representatives, and police form an ongoing coalition to discuss alcohol use. During meetings, coalition members coordinate initiatives including:

- Reviews of campus policies, and
- Development of services for students recovering from alcohol addiction.

Assessment

**Select Surveys that Enable Comparison to National and Peer Data**

Programs most frequently use Southern Illinois University’s CORE Drug and Alcohol Survey and the American College Health Association’s National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA). Each research organization administers surveys online on behalf of institutions. The ACHA charges $0.40 to $0.80 for each survey it distributes; CORE charges by the number of pages and customization within the survey. The ACHA survey asks students:

- How many drinks they had and how long they drank the last time they “partied”/socialized;
- How many drinks other students had the last time they “partied”/socialized;
- How many times in the past year they avoided drinking games, determined not to exceed a set number of drinks, and stayed with the same group of friends while drinking; and
- How many times in the past year students did something they regretted or forgot where they were while drinking.

Institutions can also request that survey administrators include customized questions, such as inquiries about campaign exposure (e.g., “Have you seen alcohol education campaign messages?”).

If alcohol education coordinators distribute surveys to only a fraction of the student body, coordinators send disproportionately more surveys to populations that exhibit lower response rates, such as fourth-year male students. To ensure sufficient representation from Greek organizations, Virginia Tech’s alcohol education director requests chapter rosters from the Greek life office to send targeted survey mailings.

---

6) American College Health Association (2012). American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment II: Undergraduate Students Reference Group Data Report Spring 2012, questions 10-17B.
Use Post-Intervention Assessment Surveys to Evaluate Disciplinary Programs

Health counselors administer the BASICS post-assessment three months after the final interview session. The post-assessment mirrors the pre-program survey with the exception of previously answered biographical information (e.g., whether family members struggle with alcohol abuse). Post-assessments reveal whether students have changed their behavior.

Observe Recidivism Rates as Indirect Measures of Program Success

Previous Forum research recommends recidivism rates to measure policy success.\(^7\) Low rates of repeat conduct violations demonstrate that students make healthy and legal decisions. Students most likely make mistakes regarding alcohol during their first and second years, especially during orientation. If institutions demonstrate that they do not tolerate dangerous behavior and educate students to make smarter choices, students very rarely commit multiple violations. Multiple violations usually indicate a larger problem such as addiction or mental health problems.

Contacts warn against measuring impact through number of violations. Higher numbers potentially indicate increased vigilance or increased student reporting instead of increased drinking. Similarly, increased hospitalization rates potentially indicate that students increasingly respond appropriately to imperiled peers.

Leadership at a member institution approached the Forum with the following questions:

- What alcohol and other drug prevention and education programming do contacts offer?
- What costs do contacts report for alcohol and other drug prevention and education programs?
- What strategies increase Greek students’ attendance at alcohol and other drug prevention and education events?
- What programming do contacts offer in response to campus events that present the highest risk for alcohol and other drug abuse on campus?
- What metrics evaluate the effectiveness and impact of alcohol and other drug educational efforts in Greek Affairs?
- How do contacts apply alcohol and other drug use data to inform Greek-related programming and Greek Affairs unit decision-making?

The Forum consulted the following sources for this report:

- Education Advisory Board’s internal and online research libraries (eab.com)
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (http://nces.ed.gov/)
- Institutional websites
  - National Social Norms Institute at the University of Virginia, "University of Arizona: 29% Reduction over 3 Years." [http://www.socialnorms.org/CaseStudies/uainter.php](http://www.socialnorms.org/CaseStudies/uainter.php)
  - Virginia Tech Campus Alcohol Abuse Prevention Center, “Know Standard Drinks.” [www.alcohol.vt.edu/Students/Party_positive/know_standard_drinks/index.html](http://www.alcohol.vt.edu/Students/Party_positive/know_standard_drinks/index.html)
- American College Health Association
- The Department of Education
The Forum interviewed alcohol and other drugs education directors, directors of Greek life, student health services researchers, and clinical psychologists at research universities with significant student participation in Greek organizations.

### A Guide to Institutions Profiled in this Brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Approximate Institutional Enrollment (Undergraduate/Total)</th>
<th>Percent of Students Involved in Greek Life</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>20,200 / 25,100</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Research universities (high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>4,500 / 11,200</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Research universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Mountain West</td>
<td>31,600 / 40,200</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Research universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>30,300 / 42,300</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Research universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech)</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>23,900 / 31,100</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Research universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Networking Contacts

| Auburn University | Dr. Chris Correia  
| --- | ---  
|  
**Professor, Department of Psychology**  
(334) 844-6480  
correcl@auburn.edu |  

| Massachusetts Institute of Technology | Don Camelio  
| --- | ---  
|  
**Director, Office of Community Development and Substance Abuse**  
(508) 838-8015  
dcamelio@mit.edu |  

| Marlena Martinez Love  
| Director, Fraternities, Sororities, and Independent Living Groups  
(617) 258-9762  
marlenam@mit.edu |  

| University of Arizona | Dr. Peggy Glider  
| --- | ---  
|  
**Coordinator, Evaluation and Research, Campus Health Service**  
(520) 621-5973  
glider@email.arizona.edu |  

| University of Wisconsin-Madison | TJ Sargent  
| --- | ---  
|  
**Greek Life Coordinator**  
(608) 890-3329  
tsargent@studentlife.wisc.edu |  

| Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University | Dr. Steven Clarke  
| --- | ---  
|  
**Director, Campus Alcohol Abuse Prevention Center**  
(540) 315-2430  
sclarke@vt.edu |  

---