

Report of the Alcohol Policy Committee

Submitted to President Francis L. Lawrence

March 5, 1999

**Robert J. Pandina, Chair
Alcohol Policy Committee**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
An Overview	i
Rutgers' Leadership Role	ii
The Alcohol Policy Committee's Recommendations	iv
I. Introduction	1
The Committee Process	1
Format of the Committee Report	2
II. Profile of Alcohol Use and Related Problems and Rutgers University's Current Approaches in Addressing These Issues	3
Introduction	3
Definitions and Focus	3
The National Context for Understanding Drinking on the College Campus	4
Status of Implementing Alcohol Policies and Programs	4
College Student Drinking	4
Understanding Alcohol Use at Rutgers University	5
The Rutgers Context for Implementing Alcohol Policies and Programs	5
Drinking and Its Consequences at Rutgers University	6
Tracing Drinking Histories of College Students -- The New Jersey Middle School and High School Surveys	6
Sources of Data on Drinking at Rutgers	7
Surveys	7
University police	7
The Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students	8
Prevalence of Drinking and Heavy Drinking at Rutgers	8

Alcohol-Related Consequences of Drinking at Rutgers	10
Consequences to the individual	10
Consequences to others	10
Other Research Findings Related to Drinking at Rutgers	11
Preventing alcohol/drug abuse at Rutgers University: Involving students, parents, faculty, staff and community	11
Identifying young adult substance abusers: The Rutgers Collegiate Substance Abuse Screening Test	11
The New Jersey Collegiate Substance Abuse Program (NJCSAP)	12
Current Approaches to Addressing Alcohol Use at Rutgers	12
Alcohol Policy	12
Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students	13
Alcohol and Other Drug Education Program for Training	14
Employee Assistance Program	14
Other University Programs	15
Rutgers University Police Department (RUPD)	15
University Division of Intercollegiate Athletics	15
University Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs	16
Center of Alcohol Studies (CAS)	16
Sociology Department	16
Psychology Department	16
Department of Communication	17
Teaching Excellence Center	17
Summary and Conclusions	17
III. Policy Statements and Specific Recommendations	18
Guiding Principles	18
Structure of Policy Statements and Recommendations	19
Review of Current Policy	20
New Policy Statements and Recommendations	22
Policy A. Ongoing Commitment to Alcohol Issues and Programming	22
Policy B. Community-Wide Commitment to Prevention	25

Policy C. Clear Information and Consistent Enforcement	27
Policy D. Education and Training Enhancement	28
Policy E. Continuation and Enhancement of Intervention Services	29
Policy F. Enhancement of Campus-Centered Activities	30
Policy G. Development of a Coordinated Program of Research	32
IV. Final Comment	33
Addenda	
Table 1. College Student Drinking Practices: Summary Indicators	34
Table 2. Coding of Policy Recommendations	36
References	37
Appendix Materials	39

REPORT OF THE ALCOHOL POLICY COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 1998, President Francis L. Lawrence formed a committee to review Rutgers' existing alcohol policy, which was adopted in 1984. This review was prompted by recent incidents involving alcohol abuse at universities across the country and by a concern with current drinking patterns on college campuses.

The committee was charged with the task of examining and assessing current policy concerning alcohol use among all members of the Rutgers community. President Lawrence emphasized that this is an issue that must be addressed from the perspectives of health, safety, and academic and campus life.

The committee was asked to determine whether Rutgers' alcohol education programs are adequate and whether the university needs to enhance its education and prevention efforts. The committee was requested to make recommendations to President Lawrence in the spring semester 1999.

The Alcohol Policy Committee, chaired by Dr. Robert J. Pandina, director of the university's Center of Alcohol Studies, was convened in February 1998. The committee comprised 25 faculty, staff, administrators, and students from all three campuses.

An Overview

National, state, and local data indicate that high school students have extensive exposure to alcohol by the time they graduate. In general, high school students who plan to attend college are somewhat lower in use rates and heavy use experience than noncollege-bound students. Additionally, a significant number of young adults who do not attend college exhibit patterns of heavy drinking after they leave high school and enter the work force.

National data also indicate extensive exposure to and routine use of alcohol by college students. In fact, alcohol use may increase among some students during their initial college years, catching up to levels exhibited by graduating high school peers who choose not to attend college. However, most college students, including those who attend Rutgers, can be classified as infrequent or moderate alcohol users.

There is no standard or comprehensive method of capturing the complex nature of drinking practices among college students across the nation. Therefore, comparisons between drinking norms among Rutgers students and drinking norms for college students, generally, should be made cautiously. However, several global, though limited, indicators of drinking practices suggest that the Rutgers student population is at, or below, normative levels for college students nationally; further, preliminary information suggests the Rutgers student population as a whole may be

below national levels on indicators of rates of heavy drinking. This trend, however, does not mean that Rutgers has not experienced its own share of alcohol-related problems. During the 1997-98 academic year, for example, the Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program evaluated 430 students and provided about 4,400 counseling sessions. The University Emergency Medical Services transported 134 individuals (117 students) at various levels of intoxication to local hospitals. In 1998, RUPD made 172 alcohol related arrests; 227 students were cited for violations of open container laws. These statistics reflect incidents involving a small fraction of the 34,000 undergraduate and graduate students on the New Brunswick campus. However, they reinforce the view that the university must be innovative and continue to provide alcohol and substance abuse education programs.

Rutgers' Leadership Role

Rutgers has demonstrated leadership in alcohol studies for more than three decades. Faculty of the Center of Alcohol Studies, the oldest institute in the world devoted to the study of alcohol and other drugs, have been involved in studying alcohol use practices in an effort to respond to alcohol-related problems.

Given this strong tradition in the area of alcohol studies, it was not surprising that Rutgers formed its first university-wide alcohol policy committee comprising faculty, staff, students, and administrators in 1979. In 1981, the committee issued an extensive report that prompted the Board of Governors to adopt a university-wide alcohol policy (revised 1984). This policy established Rutgers as a leader among major universities in developing policy and creating comprehensive programming to address alcohol use. The Rutgers policy served as a prototype for efforts at many other universities.

As a result of these early policy efforts, Rutgers launched an extensive campaign to develop and implement comprehensive alcohol education and treatment programs for the campus community. These activities have continued to evolve over the past two decades. Major elements of the program include:

- A requirement that all members of the university community demonstrate respect and regard for the rights of individuals; demonstrate respect and regard for the property of individuals as well as University facilities; take responsibility for their own actions; be conscious of the consequences of their actions; and act to reduce risks of damage and harm.
- Any sale, possession, or consumption of alcohol, on any Rutgers campus, or at any University event, must comply with all state and local laws, including those prohibiting the consumption of alcoholic beverages by people under age 21. According to the current policy, the use of alcohol is restricted at events sponsored by university groups.

- Alcohol education that begins for first-year students before they even start classes. During a spring open house, students and their parents receive information about the university's counseling and alcohol abuse programs.
- A requirement of all first-year students to attend a program during orientation on social decision making, which includes how to make wise decisions about alcohol use.
- The Alcohol and Other Drug Education Program for Training (ADEPT), which is available for students, faculty, and staff throughout the university. Skilled student alcohol and drug educators lead programs upon request for fraternities and sororities, student organizations, residence halls, and classes.
- The Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program for Students (ADAPS), a counseling and information program for students who are concerned about their drinking or use of other drugs, about a friend's use/abuse, or about drug or alcohol misuse in their family.
- A counseling center at each college within the university for students needing help with such problems as alcohol and substance abuse. The centers provide or coordinate psychiatric consultation, evaluation and treatment, crisis intervention, counseling, short-term individual and group psychotherapy, and referral for long-term treatment.
- Special housing for students who are recovering from alcohol or other substance addiction.
- The distribution to Rutgers' faculty and staff information about the university's alcohol education and counseling services, and about how they can help students they believe may be having substance abuse problems.
- A comprehensive Employee Assistance Program designed to provide intervention services for faculty, staff, and administrators in need of assistance.
- "Safety Matters," an annual newsletter issued by the university's Division of Public Safety and distributed to all students and members of the Rutgers community. The newsletter includes the university's alcohol policy and phone numbers students can call for help with alcohol and substance abuse problems.

The Alcohol Policy Committee's Recommendations

The Alcohol Policy Committee endorses the current alcohol policy articulated by the Board of Governors in 1981 and concludes that current programs are appropriate responses to alcohol use and related problems among citizens of the university community. In addition, the committee has developed seven new policy statements intended to enhance the existing alcohol policy and to extend current program efforts. The committee also offers 43 specific recommendations keyed to the new policy statements. The new policy statements and accompanying recommendations emphasize the need to maintain ongoing review of alcohol use patterns as well as to periodically assess and augment programmatic activities. New policy statements are summarized below; selected recommendations are also presented.

Policy Statement 1. The university should maintain its ongoing commitment to assessing alcohol use and related problems, and should enhance its commitment to responsive programmatic activities. Specific recommendations include: establishment of a permanent alcohol policy committee with presidential authority to review and implement policy; development of a University Community Action Plan to coordinate policy and programmatic implementation; identification of special populations and implementation of appropriate programming; and providing for systematic evaluations of all program activities.

Policy Statement 2. The university should assure that prevention efforts extend to the entire campus community. Specific recommendations include: increase efforts for all university citizens (faculty, staff, administrators, and students); expand existing residence hall programs that emphasize substance-free living; and develop partnerships with communities surrounding the university community.

Policy Statement 3. The university should provide clear information about and consistent enforcement of alcohol policies and related procedures. Specific recommendations include: implement procedures for extensive and systematic dissemination of accurate policy information; and expand outreach, intervention, and support services.

Policy Statement 4. The university should enhance current education and training opportunities for all members of the community. Specific recommendations include: integrate appropriate and comprehensive education and training efforts as part of the University Community Action Plan.

Policy Statement 5. The university should continue and enhance its existing system of intervention services. Specific recommendations include: develop methods to reach and engage individuals in need of treatment services; and expand support programs (including special living situations) for students in recovery.

Policy Statement 6. The university should explore methods for enhancing campus- centered activities that would heighten the sense of “local community”. Specific recommendations include: assess community interests for campus events; more closely tailor campus services and special events to match student interests, needs, and schedules; and increase formal and informal venues for social activities.

Policy Statement 7. The university should develop a coordinated program of research focusing on alcohol use and related issues in the campus community. Specific recommendations include: develop and implement ongoing research to accurately characterize drinking practices and associated risks among members of the university community; and monitor and evaluate intervention efforts.

The committee concludes that additional resources would be necessary to accomplish the ambitious objectives set forth in the new policies and related recommendations. However, the committee believes that the allocation of such resources would yield significant benefits to the university community for decades to come.

Traditionally, our university has engaged in significant efforts to deal with alcohol use and its consequences in a responsible and responsive manner. The recommendations made by this committee are viewed as ideas that will enhance existing efforts, generate creative programming, and ensure the university's flexibility in adapting its responses to emerging and reoccurring problems. The committee recognizes that no one action, however dramatic, is likely to be universally effective. Likewise, no series of actions taken at a single point in time is a guarantee of continuing efficacy. Rather, the university community is best served by an alcohol policy that permits careful monitoring of the existing and emerging problems, and provides for responsive, flexible, and effective programming.

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 30, 1998, President Lawrence charged a university committee of faculty, staff, administrators, and students with the task of examining and assessing current policy governing alcohol use among all members of the Rutgers community. The full charge to the committee is appended to this report. The President acknowledged the fact that Rutgers has been a pioneer in developing and implementing programming in this area for almost two decades. Nonetheless, the President was concerned about the adequacy of existing policy and practices to reduce the potential impact of detrimental alcohol use behaviors on the health, safety, and academic mission of our university's citizens. His concern was triggered, in part, by the recent experiences of the national community of colleges and universities, many of whom were exposed to the tragic consequences of drinking, including deaths on several university campuses. The President's concern also grew out of an ongoing commitment to development of policy that fosters a nurturing academic and social environment and a desire to develop proactive programming that anticipates and meets the needs of the Rutgers community. This report presents the results of the efforts of Alcohol Policy Committee to meet the challenges embodied in the President's charge.

The Committee Process

The first meeting of the Alcohol Policy Committee convened on February 18, 1998, at the Center of Alcohol Studies. The initial twenty-five members were faculty, key administrators, and staff representing collegial units from New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden campuses, and students representing a broad cross section of government and leadership groups. At the first meeting, members identified the need to broaden representation particularly among student groups. As a result, several other individuals were invited to participate as full members. At the end of the Spring, 1998 semester, several of the graduating members of the committee were replaced by appropriate student representatives. The full list of members (with affiliations and dates of service) is in the appendix.

In order to complete its tasks, the committee formed three working groups: *outreach*, *profile*, and *policy* sub-committees. The *outreach* sub-committee was asked to devise a plan that would permit members of the university community, particularly student citizens, to provide information and feedback regarding the nature and scope of issues and problems, adequacy of present policy and practices, and perceived needs. The *profile* sub-committee was asked to develop material that would permit the full committee to document and place in perspective alcohol use and consequent problems at Rutgers and to place our community's status within a national perspective. This working group was also asked to outline Rutgers' current efforts to respond to the perceived problems. The *policy* sub-committee was asked to review and document the status of current university policy and, where necessary, to draft additional policy

statements and make recommendations to enhance current policy and programming. The policy group was also asked to review Rutgers policies within a national perspective. Obviously, the three groups worked closely together to share information and perspectives.

The full committee met formally twelve times from February, 1998, through January, 1999. Each of the subcommittees met on at least six other occasions. The outreach sub-committee meetings included three public forums in association with student government groups on Rutgers College, Cook, and Livingston-Busch campuses. Student input was obtained from Camden and Newark campuses through leadership focus groups who met with appropriate deans and student representatives from the Alcohol Policy Committee. Forums were attended by the Committee chair and the majority of committee members. Dates of formal committee meetings and related activities are listed in the appendix.

Drafts of sub-committee reports were distributed to all committee members. The text of all sub-committee reports were discussed in detail at full-committee meetings. The resultant report presented here represents the collaboration and consensus of the full committee.

Format of the Committee Report

The findings of the committee are presented in two parts. In section II. Profile of Alcohol Use and Related Problems and Rutgers University's Current Approaches in Addressing These Issues, alcohol use and its consequences are discussed in terms of current social norms in the United States, in general, and, more specifically, in New Jersey. Review of these national and local trends provides a context for the current situation in the Rutgers community. Several key sources of information are used to provide an assessment of the nature and extent of alcohol use and its consequences for the university. Section II concludes with a discussion of the history and current status of the university's approaches to addressing alcohol issues.

Section III, Policy Statements and Specific Recommendations, reviews the current alcohol policy approved by the Board of Governors in 1984 and articulates seven new policy statements. These statements represent global principles intended to guide future programmatic actions. Specific recommendations have been made for each policy statement. Forty-three specific recommendations are made.

The material reviewed by the committee during its deliberations is voluminous. Many of the core documents relied upon by the committee are provided in the extensive appendix attached to this report. In addition, a list of key source references used to document the committee's major findings is provided. Observations and conclusions of the committee are based upon summaries of a large number and wide range of information sources. Hence, it was decided that documentation should be provided in

summary fashion rather than in specific citation format used in academic journals. Also, the committee believed this format would render the document more "reader friendly".

II. PROFILE OF ALCOHOL USE AND RELATED PROBLEMS AND RUTGERS UNIVERSITY'S CURRENT APPROACHES IN ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES

Introduction

The deliberations of the Alcohol Policy Committee were informed by multiple sources of information and data. This section of the report provides a contextual framework for understanding the recommendations that follow. The committee made a deliberate decision to focus on specific aspects of drinking; these are detailed in the **Definitions and Focus** section. Both national and local contexts for understanding drinking at Rutgers were considered. The prevalence of drinking, heavy drinking, and drinking-related consequences were examined. Current campus efforts to address alcohol use and related problems were reviewed. It was concluded that heavy drinking is a concern at Rutgers, as are alcohol-related consequences both to the drinker and to those around the drinker. The best data available, however, about drinking at Rutgers suggest that the prevalence of heavy drinking and drinking-related consequences may be below national norms. Given the diversity of the student body and the large commuter population, drinking-related problems may be concentrated in specific settings and among specific subgroups of students, rather than being pandemic. The university's long-standing commitment to addressing drinking and drinking-related problems and the extensive and coordinated set of current policies and programs have probably contributed to a rate of heavy drinking and drinking-related problems that appears to be below national norms. The current profile of strong programs and policies and the university's commitment to alcohol concerns provide a positive context for considering policy recommendations that should further enhance the gains already made.

Definitions and Focus

Concerns about alcohol use on the college campus may be framed in a variety of ways -- illegal use by underage drinkers, heavier drinking regardless of the age of the drinker, drinking that results in adverse consequences to the individual or to others, or diagnosable alcohol abuse or alcohol dependence. For the purposes of this report, the committee focused on *potentially harmful drinking* -- drinking that may lead to negative consequences for the individual drinker, negative consequences for those around the drinker, or the community at large. Negative consequences may occur in the academic, social, health, or legal domain. We focused less on drinking that did not have the potential for harm, recognizing that many individuals consume alcohol in a manner that is personally safe and respectful of others in their environment.

The National Context for Understanding Drinking on the College Campus

Status of Implementing Alcohol Policies and Programs

Concern about drinking on the college campus is reflective of larger societal concerns about the adverse effects of alcohol consumption. A number of national trends suggest decreased societal acceptance of behaviors that previously were tolerated or perhaps seen as inevitable. The legal age of purchase was increased from age 18 to age 21, largely because of concern about the high rate of alcohol-related traffic fatalities among young people. Drinking and driving laws are more strict than ever before, enforcement is much more uniform and automatic, and the blood alcohol level considered as legally intoxicated has decreased in many states. Host and server liability laws are now in effect, and new laws related to underage drinking are being implemented. Grassroots organizations such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) have provided an impetus to focus on drinking and driving.

National attention has also been directed toward college student drinking. Every year, college students die in alcohol-related tragedies. Extensive media coverage of these deaths has underscored the concern that these deaths raise on the campus. Litigation has become one response to these deaths, and universities must be attentive to the potential legal ramifications of their policies and procedures. Several national initiatives have further increased the focus on college student drinking. National surveys, funded by private foundations, have detailed the prevalence of heavy, or "binge" drinking on college campuses, and several campuses have been funded by private foundations to develop integrative, campus-community partnerships to decrease heavy drinking and alcohol-related consequences on the campus. Media attention to these efforts has increased their salience. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism has launched a national initiative to develop methods aimed at understanding and addressing alcohol-related problems. Also, several major reports have been distributed to college and university presidents to encourage them to actively address drinking on the college campus.

Colleges and universities across the country have developed and implemented alcohol policies, and some have initiated alcohol education or alcohol assistance programs for students. Many campus alcohol policies are modeled on Rutgers' 1981 campus alcohol policy document. Current efforts at Rutgers to address drinking on the campus must therefore be seen as part of a larger national effort to reduce harmful drinking throughout society, and specifically on campuses across the United States.

College Student Drinking

Drinking is common among college students, with most (88%) college students reporting that they have used alcohol, and two-thirds reporting drinking within the

previous month. Drinking is more common among college students than nonstudents of the same age. Heavier drinking (five or more drinks per occasion, which has been called "binge" drinking by some researchers) is also common, with about 40% of college students reporting drinking heavily at least once in the past two weeks. White students are more likely to be heavy drinkers; Asian and African-American students are less likely. Students older than the traditional age for college students (i.e., over age 23) drink less than students of traditional college age. Students who are part of the Greek system experience more drinking occasions and drink more heavily than non-Greeks. Similar patterns have been detected for student athletes. Students who live off-campus drink less than students living in either on-campus housing or in a fraternity or sorority house. National data suggest that heavy drinkers are more likely to damage property, have school problems, exhibit greater sexual aggression, and engage in more unplanned sexual activity than students who are not heavy drinkers. The impact of heavy drinking is not solely on the individual drinker. Students who live on campuses with a higher proportion of heavy drinkers experience more secondary effects (e.g., assaults, unwanted sexual advances) than students who live on campuses with a lower percentage of heavy drinkers.

Understanding Alcohol Use at Rutgers University

The Rutgers Context for Implementing Alcohol Policies and Programs

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, is one of the most complex institutions in the country. Its 48,000 students (36,000 of whom are undergraduates) and 8,000 faculty and staff are distributed among three regional campuses (Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick), each of which has its own administrative structure. Each campus has its own distinctive culture that is not easily captured even by an extensive listing of demographic characteristics. Moreover, substantial diversity of faculty, staff, and students is apparent within any given location. Individuals who form the university community are drawn from a wide range of geographic locations, national and international. Further, they are remarkably diverse in terms of important dimensions (e.g., gender, age, race, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, family composition). The university pursues its three-part mission of education, research, and public service through approximately 100 bachelor, 100 master, and 80 doctoral and professional degree programs offered by twenty-nine schools and colleges. These programs accomplish their goals by offering over 4000 courses in 100 majors. The social environment is enriched through the activities of 400 clubs, 32 NCAA athletic teams, and a wide array of cultural and social events. In addition, the university features more than 100 specialized research centers, bureaus, and institutes. Over 280,000 alumni hold degrees from Rutgers and about 10,000 new degrees are conferred annually.

Faculty, staff, and students who participate in the day-to-day life of the university community may return at the end of their day to two states other than New Jersey (New

York and Pennsylvania). Students who remain in the immediate vicinity of one of the many university campuses may live in housing not under the direct supervision of the university. For example, it is estimated that fully two-thirds of the student body who attend classes at the many colleges of the New Brunswick campus live in off-campus housing. About half of those living in off-campus housing live in one of the several communities that immediately surround the university. A high concentration of these students live in the fifth and sixth wards in the city of New Brunswick. The remaining half commute from more remote locations, often living in the same communities in which they attended high school. Even higher proportions of those students who attend Camden and Newark live off-campus. Adding to the complexity of the university's community is the fact that about one-quarter of the student body turns over each year as students graduate or leave for other reasons and are replaced by incoming students. Further, the majority of the student body ranges in age from 17 to 24, with a significant proportion being younger than 21. Hence, a large proportion of community residents is in the age range that, according to national data, is developing drinking behaviors even though many of these individuals are prohibited by New Jersey laws from possessing, drinking, or purchasing alcohol.

In essence, the university community's residents (faculty, staff, and students) represent a diverse cross section of individuals blended together in a dynamic and rapidly paced environment. Many of the university community's residents are developing adult patterns of behaviors, including those that involve alcohol use. The attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of our residents (including those related to alcohol use) clearly reflect the range and fluidity of a dynamic population. This brief profile serves to illustrate the complexity of attempting to understand, let alone have an impact on, significant social norms and practices of the Rutgers community and its residents.

Drinking and Its Consequences at Rutgers University

Tracing Drinking Histories of College Students -- The New Jersey Middle School and High School Surveys

It would be a mistake to believe that alcohol use begins when students start their college experience. Both national and New Jersey data indicate that patterns of drinking and heavy drinking are often firmly established prior to college. A New Jersey survey of substance use in middle schools indicated that 57% of seventh and eighth grade students had used alcohol, almost half had consumed alcohol in the past year, and the probability of use was equal for girls and boys. The mean age of first use of alcohol was between 10 and 11 years of age; typically use took place at home with parents for cultural, familial, and religious reasons.

A comparable survey of New Jersey high school students revealed continuing increases in alcohol use as students go through high school, with 78.8% of high school

students reporting that they had used alcohol at some time during their lives. The proportion of high school students who drank regularly (i.e., 10 or more times in the past year) was about 35%. Older high school students (seniors) were more likely to drink than younger students, with 84% of high school seniors reporting that they had consumed alcohol; Whites were more likely to drink than African-Americans or Hispanics; and females were more likely to drink than males. Alcohol use was associated with a somewhat higher probability of poorer academic performance -- 63% of students who performed at the "mostly A" level had consumed alcohol in past year; 79% of students who received "mostly D's and F's" had consumed alcohol.

Sources of Data on Drinking at Rutgers

Three major types of data provide a picture of alcohol use and consequences at Rutgers:

Surveys. Since the late 1980's, several studies have been undertaken to understand more about drinking-related behavior at the university and to develop prevention interventions based on research findings. Three major surveys of the campus have been undertaken: 1987, 1995, 1998. The Personal Report of Student Perceptions (PRSP) is an alcohol and drug survey instrument developed by the Communication and Health Issues Research Group (CHI) at Rutgers in 1998. The PRSP contains questions previously incorporated in the 1987 Rutgers Student Alcohol and Drug Survey, relevant questions selected from the Campus Survey of Alcohol and Other Drug Norms (CORE Survey), and specific questions that address students' perceptions of their behavior and its consequences. The PRSP was administered in the Spring of 1998 to a random sample of 5,000 Rutgers students on both New Brunswick and Newark campuses (the Camden campus conducted its own CORE survey). The return rate for the PRSP survey was 26%. Students who completed the survey, 63% of whom were females, were evenly distributed across the four years of college, and they came from a range of ethnic backgrounds -- 58% were White, 9% were African American, 22% were Asian, 8% were Hispanic, and 3% came from other ethnic backgrounds. The respondents lived in a range of housing situations -- 55% lived on campus in university housing, 2% lived in fraternity or sorority houses, 23% lived off campus, and 20% were commuters. The survey provides the largest and most recent set of data for examining drinking patterns on the New Brunswick and Newark campuses. In addition to the campus surveys, the incoming first-year class in 1998 was surveyed during orientation about alcohol and drug use patterns. A total of 702 surveys were completed.

University police. RUPD collects data on alcohol involvement in emergency transport cases, alcohol-related arrests, alcohol-related violations of municipal ordinances, and alcohol involvement in several offense categories.

The Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students. This program maintains records of client contacts and presenting problems.

Prevalence of Drinking and Heavy Drinking at Rutgers

As would be expected from the New Jersey high school surveys, the 1998 survey of the incoming first-year class revealed that 76% of incoming students had used alcohol at some point prior to college. Almost one-third (31%) had consumed five drinks or more at least once in the prior month (37% of males; 25% of females). In the past decade, surveys of the Rutgers campus have consistently found that students at the university apparently are less likely to drink and drink less in amount than students at other universities. In the 1998 PRSP survey of Rutgers students, almost 19% of the respondents indicated that they did not drink. About 58% of respondents drank between one and four drinks the last time they drank. Almost 24% were heavier drinkers who indicated that they had five or more drinks the last time that they drank. The range of quantity consumed was from zero to 24 drinks on a drinking occasion. Based on the amount consumed the last time the respondents drank, the mean number of drinks was 3.06. The 1998 survey also found that heavy drinkers (who drank five or more drinks at their most recent drinking occasion) at Rutgers were most likely to be White males and were more likely to be enrolled on the New Brunswick than the Newark campus. Heavy drinkers in the survey were generally in the first four years of school; the percent of heavy drinkers declined slightly as the year increased, with 28.5% of the first-year students and 17.3% of the seniors being heavy drinkers. Students responding to the 1998 survey also reported a wide range in how often they drank. About 21% drank once a month or less frequently, about 31% drank once or twice a month, and 28% drank weekly or more frequently. More students (24.9%) reported a decrease in their use of alcohol within the past year than reported an increase (21.8%). The most frequent response from drinkers was that alcohol consumption remained the same (37.0%) in the past year. The majority of students misperceive drinking norms, thinking that drinking is even more widespread than it is. Heavy drinkers, much as their non-drinking and moderate-drinking counterparts, share the misperception that everyone drinks a lot in college.

It would be desirable to examine Rutgers within the context of broad national trends in alcohol use practices by making direct comparisons with other similar academic communities. However, differences in study methodologies (e.g., sampling techniques, survey instruments, analytical frameworks, time frames) and research emphases make comparisons of drinking practices among various groups (including universities and student groups) a challenging endeavor. Further, there are no convenient or comprehensive methods for comparison such as those often used to compare academic communities (e.g., SATs and grades of incoming students, retention rates, faculty publications, external funding). Such problems place significant limitations on the validity, reliability, and generalizability of conclusions. Hence, comparisons

among universities or among sub-groups (e.g., colleges) within a given university must be made with caution.

Nevertheless, it seemed worthwhile to attempt comparisons along several conceptual dimensions often used to characterize drinking among students. However, it must be noted that these comparisons should be viewed as global indicators, at best. Table 1 presents information on several common indicators of drinking practices among high school, college, and young adult population: prevalence and frequency of alcohol use, occurrence of heavy drinking (defined as drinking five or more drinks in a row on a drinking occasion), and average number of drinks consumed on a drinking occasion. Data are presented from several sources including national surveys of college students (designated as CORE/National and Harvard), the Rutgers PRSP (encompassing samples of students from New Brunswick and Newark campuses), and a survey of Camden students that employed the CORE methodology (designated as CORE/Camden). In addition, data are presented from a national survey of high school seniors and young adults (ages 19-28, including both college students and individuals not attending college). Data derived from this survey (designated as MTF, Monitoring the Future) is included to provide a basis of comparison between college students and high school seniors and young adults in the general population on selected drinking practices. Care is taken to specify actual probes used to characterize indicators; note that several indicators (e.g., infrequent use, heavy drinking) are characterized by somewhat different definitions. Also, all surveys may not contain information that permits direct comparison on all indicators. In spite of these limitations, the comparisons provide a useful backdrop for discussion.

In general, comparisons between Rutgers surveys and those for other college students suggest that drinking prevalence among Rutgers students is at or below normative values for college students nationally. Likewise, prevalence rates are similar for young adults in general (e.g., 30 day rates, 59% versus 68%). Note, also, that high school seniors exhibit relatively high 30 day prevalence rates (e.g., 51%), reinforcing the earlier observations regarding the developmental nature of alcohol use behaviors. Results for Rutgers students are also similar to other college students in terms of percentages of infrequent and moderate drinkers. Rutgers samples appear to be somewhat lower in terms of percentages of frequent drinkers; Rutgers samples also appear to have lower rates of heavy drinking compared to other college samples. However, note that differences in definitions used in the PRSP survey may account for some of the differences. Finally, the Rutgers survey results suggest that the average quantity of alcohol consumed is lower per drinking occasion than for other college samples among those who choose to drink.

This brief synopsis does not begin to portray the complexities involved in characterizing and understanding drinking among young adults, including college students. The interested reader is encouraged to review the primary sources that provided data included in this overview as well as background material cited in the selected reading list appended to this report and provided in the appendix. This

overview does suggest that, based on information currently available, drinking norms at Rutgers are apparently similar to those observed nationally on most indicators and may be below national norms on several important indicators such as heavy drinking. This is not to say that the university community is free from consequences related to alcohol use. The next section explores in greater depth some of those consequences.

Alcohol-Related Consequences of Drinking at Rutgers

Consequences to the individual. The 1998 PRSP survey indicated that students experience a range of undesirable consequences as a result of drinking, including being tired or hungover (56% of drinkers in the sample), experiencing nausea or vomiting (45% of drinkers in the sample), experiencing some loss of memory after a drinking episode (22% of drinkers in the sample), feeling depressed (18% of drinkers in the sample), or fighting (18% of drinkers in the sample). The probability of experiencing each of these problems increases with the intensity of the student's drinking.

Data from the Rutgers University Police Department also show that many of the problems and offences addressed by RUPD involve alcohol. In 1998, the Rutgers University Emergency Medical Services transported 134 intoxicated individuals, 117 of whom were university students, to one of the local hospitals. (Students transported by Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital or St. Peters Medical Center ambulances are not included in these figures.) RUPD made a total of 172 alcohol-related arrests in 1998: 79 for Driving While Intoxicated, 62 for Underage Possession of Alcohol, and 31 for Serving Alcohol to Minors. A total of 227 students were cited for alcohol-related municipal ordinances: 160 for Open Container, and 67 for Open Container by an Underage Person.

Information from the Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students (ADAPS) provides another view of the extent of alcohol and drug problems on the Rutgers campuses. Over the 15 years that ADAPS has been providing services at the university, thousands of students have been seen for evaluation and counseling. In the 1997-1998 academic year, ADAPS provided 4400 counseling sessions to Rutgers students, and 430 students came in for an evaluation. In general, most students who come to ADAPS for counseling have been referred by departments of the university, by agencies in the community, or by their families. A majority of the students seen (70%) are under 21 years of age. Although most are not diagnosed with alcohol or drug dependence, they are at high risk for a variety of problems, including academic difficulties, accidents, health problems, violence, social difficulties, etc. Approximately 20% of students seen are diagnosed with an alcohol or drug use disorder and are offered treatment through ADAPS, and are thus able to remain as students at Rutgers while receiving assistance.

Consequences to others. In the 1998 PRSP survey, students reported that

drinking by other students interfered with their life on or around the campus in a variety of ways. More than 20% reported that others' drinking interrupted their studying or affected the cleanliness or neatness of their physical living space, and approximately 15% reported that others' drinking made them feel unsafe or had led to loss of friendships. About half, however, reported that others' drinking did not affect them, either because they lived off campus, or they were simply unaffected.

In 1998, RUPD investigated a total of seven reported sexual assault cases (one of which occurred off campus); two of these cases involved the use of alcohol by both the victim and offender. Similarly, RUPD investigated seven aggravated assault cases; it was confirmed that in one of these both the offender and the victim used alcohol. A total of 47 simple assault cases were processed; it was confirmed that eight of these cases involved the use of alcohol by the offender, and two involved the use of alcohol by the victim. RUPD conducted formal investigations of 56 disorderly conduct complaints; it was confirmed that 30 of these cases involved use of alcohol by persons involved in the incident.

Other Research Findings Related to Drinking at Rutgers

A number of other research initiatives have examined aspects of drinking at Rutgers:

Preventing alcohol/drug abuse at Rutgers University: Involving students, parents, faculty, staff and community. This research was underwritten by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education. A three-year comprehensive study was conducted at Rutgers University with two major goals: to develop an understanding of student, parent, administrator, and faculty perceptions of the nature, extent, and origins of students problems; and to develop effective interventions based on this research. There were several key findings from this study. Although only about one-fifth of students reported high-risk drinking, there was a perception among students that heavy drinking and "hooking up" (one-night sexual encounters) were the norm. Parents perceived much lower than actual rates of alcohol use.

Identifying young adult substance abusers: The Rutgers Collegiate Substance Abuse Screening Test. Lisa Laitman, the director of ADAPS, developed an alcohol and drug screening measure. Formal psychometric studies of the instrument were undertaken in conjunction with researchers at the Center of Alcohol Studies. In this study, a team of researchers investigated the reliability of the Rutgers Collegiate Substance Abuse Screening Test (RCSAST), a 25-item, true/false questionnaire tailored to the specific experiences of young adults based on the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test. The RCSAST proved to be an excellent instrument for identifying problem alcohol and drug users. A number of colleges and universities around the country have asked permission to use the RCSAST on their campuses.

The New Jersey Collegiate Substance Abuse Program (NJCSAP). This program was a demonstration project to examine the feasibility of delivering intensive on-campus alcohol and drug treatment services to students. NJCSAP was a collaborative program of the Center of Alcohol Studies, ADAPS, and Rutgers Student Health Services. The program was housed within the Hurtado Health Center, and offered detoxification, 24-hour residential services, and intensive outpatient services to students from Rutgers and other New Jersey colleges and universities. Evaluations of NJCSAP demonstrated that students receiving services had fairly severe alcohol and drug problems, with more than 50% having other concurrent psychiatric conditions. Although students who received the services had excellent outcomes in terms of their alcohol and drug use, it was not feasible to maintain the program financially.

Current Approaches to Addressing Alcohol Use at Rutgers

Current approaches to dealing with alcohol use have been implemented within the complexities of Rutgers as a university. Rutgers University has a long history of addressing alcohol use through specific policies and practices, educational and student assistance programs, research, and education.

Alcohol Policy

In 1981, a university-wide alcohol policy committee recommended a specific set of policies concerning alcohol use on the campus. These recommendations were adopted by the Board of Governors as the current Alcohol Policy (revised 1984), which is still the formal policy that guides the use of alcohol at Rutgers University. Specific principles served as the underpinnings for the 1981 policy statement: (1) Knowledge matters and once possessed, can make a difference in individual behavior. (*Policy: comprehensive program of alcohol education and training*). (2) Freedom is important. If individuals are to act freely, they must have options; individuals should not be coerced. (*Policy: requiring alternative beverages and food at parties*). (3) Individuals taking responsibility for their own actions present the best hope for overall responsibility, improvement in behavior and reduction of undesirable consequences. (*Policy: promote activities that do not promote drinking alcohol for its own sake*). (4) Individuals and groups tend to obey best those rules that they believe are fair and that they have a genuine opportunity to create. (*Policy: individual groups, e.g., residence halls, should have the opportunity to develop rules and regulations for themselves*). (5) The university has certain obligations to promote well-being, reduce danger, and limit liability. (*Policy: prohibition of alcohol in athletic facilities*). (6) The integrity of the institution is, in part, dependent on reasonable enforcement of rules and regulations. (*Policy: develop a discipline procedure and a student assistance program to aid in rehabilitation*). (7) To the extent that alcohol use -- or any other subject of positive law requiring distinctions to be made on arbitrary or suspect grounds (such as age) -- is permitted to control activities at the university, the university's stated ideals are

threatened. (*Policy: the focus of activities should be examined to eliminate exclusions based on alcohol*). (8) The rules of the university should be applied to all members of the university community. (*Policy: all rules proposed for students are proposed equally for faculty and staff*). From these principles grew a complex array of policies and programs. In 1984 the University Policy on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages was passed by the Board of Governors and remains in force today. This policy is the overriding guideline for the multitude of policies that currently exist. Many of the university's individual colleges have alcohol policies that extend beyond those expressed in the formal written policy adopted by the Board of Governors in 1981 (revised in 1984) that currently sets guidelines for alcohol use. Further, procedures for implementing policy differ somewhat for different college jurisdictions. Differences in policies and procedures reflect the need for adaptation to suit the local needs of college units. Such local adaptations are permitted under the current university policy as long as standards set forth in the formal policy are maintained. Residence hall, student center, club and organization, and student activity policies are slightly different from college to college and campus to campus. All of them, however, are within the guidelines of the 1984 university policy. Two specific programs were recommended by the 1981 alcohol policy committee; both were initiated in the 1983 academic year and have continued to the present. The Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students (ADAPS) provides drug/alcohol/nicotine counseling for Rutgers students. The Alcohol and Other Drug Education Program for Training (ADEPT Unit), created within the Department of Health Education, delivers substance use/abuse services to the Rutgers community.

Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students

Services include assessment of students' use of these substances, identification of problems and appropriate interventions when needed, provision of outpatient treatment of addictions and support for recovery, or provision of counseling to students who have family members or close friends with addictions. All students are seen initially for individual treatment; some are then recommended to group counseling. ADAPS conducts three different types of groups: (1) Alcohol/Drug Awareness Group -- a six-week prevention program offered several times during the academic year; (2) Early Recovery Support Group -- an abstinence support group for students in the early stages of recovery from an addiction; and (3) Adult Children of Alcoholics Groups. Other services provided by ADAPS include consultations to assist in referrals for treatments. ADAPS staff also train residence life staff and are represented on university committees to assist in university policy-making decisions, and work collaboratively in research activities. ADAPS developed and provides support for a unique housing option at Rutgers. Recovery Housing is an on-campus residence for students in recovery from addictions that provides community support for recovery. The ADAPS staff screens prospective residents, provides counseling, and conducts monthly "house" meetings.

As an outgrowth of the work of ADAPS, the university has made space available for meetings of self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous. ADAPS was instrumental in introducing Substance Free Housing as one of the undergraduate colleges' housing options. Currently, two of the colleges offer Substance Free Housing to those students who prefer to live with other students who do not use alcohol, nicotine, or other drugs.

Alcohol and Other Drug Education Program for Training

This is a university-wide educational program with the chief aim of creating a balance of campus norms that promote health and offer strategies to reduce harmful and other high-risk behaviors. The ADEPT Unit goals are: to create an on-campus environment that generates the increased development of critical thinking skills among the university community; to present educational information/materials that enhance the elements of active learning, including talking and listening, reading, writing, and reflecting; to assist the university community in determining where intervention information/techniques would be most effective; and to develop a campus community environment that supports decision-making that enhances campus norms that lead to low-risk behaviors.

The ADEPT Unit works in partnership with key constituents among student, faculty, and staff groups to foster a healthy campus environment. The work of the ADEPT Unit is carried out through a variety of venues to infuse the campus community with information and materials that promote healthy decisions. The major efforts of ADEPT include: teaching (e.g., four credit undergraduate course, "Theories, Assessment and Practice of Health Behavior"); training (e.g., orientation for first-year students among all four colleges); educational assistance programs (e.g., mandatory small group classes for students who have violated the alcohol/drug policy of their college); and research.

Employee Assistance Program

In addition to these important services for students, the university provides an employee assistance program. The Rutgers University Personnel Counseling Service is the oldest university-based employee assistance program in the United States. It is also one of only two such programs currently accredited by the Employee Assistance Society of North America (EASNA).

The University Personnel Counseling Service provides free assessment, short-term counseling and referral services to all Rutgers faculty and staff and their immediate families. Help is available for a variety of issues, including, but not limited to, drug and alcohol addiction, family and marital problems, workplace issues, stress, etc. Expert consultation is also available to supervisors to aid them in working with problem

employees.

Rutgers UPCS strives to make its services available to all employees and family members. In-service trainings on a variety of EAP and organizational topics have been, and are, available to departments on all campuses. UPCS will work closely with supervisors, peers, and employee organizations and unions to help ensure maximum utilization of its services.

Other University Programs

Numerous departments and administrative units of the university have initiatives related to alcohol and drug use. The *Rutgers University Police Department (RUPD)* has a number of initiatives in place to address the enforcement of drug and alcohol laws, including: (1) DWI patrols on campus and off campus in the areas surrounding the campus. This program has been in place for approximately ten years. (2) RUPD police officers are trained in DWI procedures such as the use of a breath analyzer. (3) Participation in a state-wide program to train officers to be Drug Recognition Experts. This program was developed by the state approximately four years ago, and the RUPD has been involved since its inception. RUPD currently has two Drug Recognition Experts. (4) RUPD participates in the committee to develop rules and regulations for the annual Ag-Field Day at Cook College. (5) RUPD participates in the committee to develop the Emergency Transport Protocol. (6) RUPD Officers are trained in the detection of counterfeit ID, and also train local tavern owners in the detection of counterfeit ID. (7) RUPD is responsible for the expedient delivery of information regarding students involved in drug/alcohol violations to the appropriate university disciplinary officers. (8) RUPD maintains statistics on the different alcohol/drug violations on the Rutgers Campus and makes these data available to the university community. (9) RUPD works closely with ADAPS in developing policies and procedures that assure that students with alcohol-related difficulties are appropriately referred to ADAPS. (10) RUPD officers conduct Alcohol Awareness programs for students. (11) RUPD maintains formal agreements with many of the surrounding municipalities. These agreements extend jurisdiction to the university police to enforce a wide range of codes including those pertaining to alcohol ingestion, possession, and sale.

The *University Division of Intercollegiate Athletics* has a formal written policy regarding alcohol and drug use and abuse that governs all teams and student athletes. The policy has been in place for the past decade. The policy mandates alcohol and drug education programs for all incoming student athletes and selected teams on a yearly basis. Coaches, trainers, and other staff receive training on a periodic basis. Each athletic team is also governed by a code of conduct; all codes of conduct are required to address issues of drug and alcohol use and abuse. The Division's policy requires mandatory random drug testing of athletes. The policy prohibits use of alcohol

and drugs while student athletes are formally participating in sports programs. Use during "out of season" periods is strongly discouraged. The policy requires mandatory evaluation and treatment of student athletes found in violation. The policy is monitored through the Division's medical staff. The Division has made special arrangements with ADAPS to assure that student athletes receive appropriate levels of service. All student athletes are governed by drug policies that include drug-testing provisions, which are enforced independently by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

The *University Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs* has undertaken a number of initiatives related to alcohol use within the Greek system. Most recently, Rutgers has joined Select 2000, a national effort to renew the emphasis on service, community involvement, and leadership development in Greek organizations. Developed by the National Interfraternity Conference, Select 2000 includes a renewed commitment to academic achievement, integrity, community service, and the recruitment of value-centered leaders. The program also calls on parents and alumni members to be more involved as advisors and mentors to the chapters. Each university develops its own plan for implementing these goals. The Rutgers' Select 2000 committee has established several goals: to realize academic potential, develop value-centered leaders, and create a healthy environment. A major goal of Select 2000 is to ensure substance-free chapter houses. Select 2000 requires that organizations remove all alcohol from chapter houses by a date yet to be determined. The removal of alcohol will affect 15-17 chapter houses at Rutgers; the remaining houses have already implemented a ban on alcohol.

The *Center of Alcohol Studies (CAS)*, part of Rutgers University since 1961, is a multidisciplinary center that conducts research on the etiology, course, and consequences of alcohol and drug use as well as approaches to the prevention and treatment of alcohol and drug problems. CAS provides extensive continuing education programs to the community within and outside the university, and has a library that contains the largest collection of alcohol-related documents in the world. CAS faculty have been actively involved in surveys of drinking on the Rutgers campus, have consulted with ADAPS on the development of treatment strategies for specific subgroups of college drinkers, and have completed, in conjunction with ADAPS and the Student Health Services, a 5-year, intensive treatment demonstration project for students with severe alcohol and drug problems.

An undergraduate survey course on alcohol has been taught by faculty of the Center of Alcohol Studies through the *Sociology Department*, and CAS faculty also teach an undergraduate honors course on social and neurobiological aspects of alcohol use and abuse. An undergraduate course on drugs and human behavior is offered through the *Psychology Department*. Researchers at CAS offer undergraduate and graduate research opportunities to students in psychology, sociology, and biochemistry. CAS also has an Institutional Training grant from the National Institute on Alcohol

Abuse and Alcoholism to train graduate students in clinical psychology in clinical research methods related to alcohol. Graduate courses, including Assessment and Treatment of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and Foundations of Alcohol Studies, are offered by faculty from CAS. CAS also provides two days per week clinical practicum training opportunities to graduate students in clinical psychology, social work, and counseling, as well as applied prevention practicum experiences.

Since 1991, several courses in the *Department of Communication* have included materials on college drinking as part of the curriculum. In 1991, students in Administrative Communication, a senior level advanced course, worked with Health Services to design and produce RU Aware?, a prevention campaign; in 1992 and 1993 the same course was used to design and distribute IMAGINE THAT!, a simulation of drinking-related decisions, now disseminated by the Health Services (to more than 300 colleges and universities in the US and Canada); and in 1995 and 1996 an upper level Communication course, Health Communication, was used to provide students with the experience of creating strategies to encourage other students to drink less, in the LESS (List of Experienced Students' Suggestions) campaign. In Spring, 1999, the Department of Communication will offer an advanced health communication course, designed to provide students with a semester long experience in working on the design and evaluation of a campaign to reduce college drinking. In addition, senior faculty from the Department of Communication have worked with health educators from the Department of Health Education and the Health Services to conduct qualitative studies of drinking on the campus. These studies have provided materials for the design of prevention materials and interventions for heavy drinkers.

The *Teaching Excellence Center* has also offered to provide seed grants for faculty interested in including modules on health issues in their courses.

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, it is clear that concern about alcohol use at Rutgers University reflects a larger societal focus on drinking in general, and the drinking and attendant consequences of drinking within the college population. Students who come to Rutgers usually have previous experience with alcohol, and patterns of use are often already established. About one-quarter of Rutgers students can be considered to be heavy drinkers, a number that, although below national averages, is of concern, as students do experience adverse consequences of their drinking. Rutgers already has in place an impressive array of initiatives to deal with alcohol use on the campus: a carefully conceived and well articulated alcohol policy; alcohol education programs; counseling services for students, staff, and faculty; housing options that support students' decisions not to drink; academic experiences; active programs of research; and a unique center devoted to alcohol research. Additional policies and programs can build on existing strengths within the university.

III. POLICY STATEMENTS AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

This section contains basic policy statements and specific recommendations resulting from the committee's deliberations. Policy statements are intended to serve as global principles and philosophical guidelines for development and implementation of strategic programmatic activities. Recommendations outline specific objectives and activities that should be implemented by the university community in order to achieve the implicit and explicit goals of the existing alcohol policy and the new policy provisions outlined by the committee. The recommendations focus upon catalytic activities that are expected to be, themselves, generative. Policy statements and recommendations are based upon the information summarized in Section II, Profile of Alcohol Use and Related Problems and Rutgers University's Current Approaches in Addressing These Issues. They are also based upon a series of guiding principles, outlined below, that are derived from the reviewed information and the deliberations of the current committee.

Guiding Principles

Alcohol is consumed by the majority of Americans at some time during their lives. Typically, individuals are introduced to practices and beliefs about alcohol use at an early age; introduction often occurs with parents for familial, religious, and/or cultural reasons. Patterns of alcohol consumption and attendant consequences are complex and varied. By the time students, faculty, and staff arrive at colleges/universities throughout the country, including Rutgers, they have accumulated a wide range of pre-existing attitudes and behaviors regarding the use of alcohol. Campus communities are complex and dynamic environments with a high concentration of young adults experiencing growth and transition in many areas. Problems and consequences related to alcohol use, abuse and dependence may differ substantially in terms of their nature and causes among members of so diverse a society. Any member of the university community may be directly or indirectly affected by alcohol use practices that diminish safety, health, or pursuit of academic goals. The issue of drinking on campus is also framed by the fact that there are national, state, and local laws regarding who may purchase alcohol, where alcohol may be consumed, etc. Further, there are specific federal and state statutes mandating special concern, regulation, and programming for university environments as regards alcohol use and related matters, above and beyond those in place for the general public. The university must mandate compliance with the law by all segments of our community.

Hence, policy and programs should:

- take into account the nature and diversity of alcohol use practices and outcomes among all members of the university community.

- support responsible decision making regarding the use and non-use of alcohol.
- comply with all federal and state regulations, statutes, and laws.
- support the reduction of harmful drinking practices and their consequences that may interfere with any individual's opportunity to reach his/her full potential.
- reflect the fact that alcohol use that negatively impacts campus and community life in any way and at any level requires intervention.
- support approaches to alcohol issues and problems that are caring, broad-based, comprehensive, and relate to all segments of our community.

The committee acknowledged that no single approach or program will be able to achieve the important goals set forth in the President's charge. Only implementation of the policy recommendations as a whole could have a chance of adequately meeting the challenges he outlined. The committee views policy implementation as an evolutionary process and that changes in use behaviors, attitudes, and consequences will necessarily lag behind programmatic changes. Hence, ongoing supervision of policy development and implementation, along with persistent evaluation and study of progress, will be required.

The committee also recognized that Rutgers has committed significant resources over the long term to ongoing programs related to alcohol use. Many of the policy recommendations contained in this report will require that the university commit additional **new** resources. These resources should be allocated to create a permanent infrastructure positioned in key areas to assure that the recommendations are implemented successfully and, equally important, to assure that the alcohol policy initiative is sustained. Key resources should include permanent staff positioned in strategic program locations and limited discretionary funds to stimulate new initiatives.

The committee did not believe it was in its purview to determine the extent of resources necessary or sources of support. Nor did the committee feel it would be appropriate to set priorities for support among the many implementation strategies and programs suggested in its recommendations. Nevertheless, the committee wished to express clearly that such a commitment of resources would be necessary and that such an investment would pay substantial dividends to the university community.

Structure of Policy Statements and Recommendations

Prior to making new recommendations, the committee first reviewed and commented upon major aspects of the university's existing alcohol policy as it was articulated in the 1984 policy adopted by the University's Board of Governors. The

review served as a jumping-off point for the policy statements and specific recommendations developed by the committee. Seven policy statements were then formulated. Each policy statement is accompanied by specific recommendations that outline programmatic activities that would serve as spring boards to actualize the policy statement. It should be noted that the seven policy statements each represent a major focal area (e.g., prevention, treatment, social environment). Although they are listed in a logical sequence, priority should not be assumed, as the committee believes that each area is a necessary part of the university's approach.

Review of Current Policy

The Committee recommends that the following basic tenets of the current alcohol policy, passed by the Board of Governors in 1984, be reinforced and continued:

- Any sale, service, possession or consumption of alcohol, on any Rutgers University campus, or at any university event, must comply with all local, state, and federal laws and ordinances.
- Alcohol may only be served at Rutgers' social functions that are restricted to members of the sponsoring organization and their invited guests. One individual must take responsibility for the event. Such functions must have the approval of, and be restricted to areas designated by, the appropriate dean or designee.
- Supervision by appropriately trained individuals must be provided at any activity that includes alcohol. The service of alcohol must be restricted to those of legal drinking age.
- Whenever alcohol is served, an equal quantity of non-alcoholic beverages, and food in a sufficient quantity for the number of guests, must also be served and noted in any advertisements. The sale and service of alcohol must be discontinued for a reasonable amount of time prior to the end of the activity.
- Departmentally allocated funds may not be used for the purpose of purchasing alcoholic beverages destined for personal consumption.
- Funds raised by student organizations may be used to purchase alcohol in conjunction with a social activity, with the approval of the appropriate dean.
- The provosts and deans of each campus and college, following standard procedures and including consultation with the affected bodies, may

develop and issue regulations regarding the use of alcohol. Such regulations must be within the university policy as stated here. (*The 1984 policy notes that uniformity of policies, while desirable, is not required. The committee suggests that this issue be reviewed by the recommended ongoing committee.*)

The only departure from the current written policy that we suggest involves the use of student activity funds and admission fees for the purchase of alcohol. The current written policy permits the use of student activity funds and admission fees for the purchase of alcohol. However, in practice, no Rutgers University unit could be identified that currently permits this practice.

- The current policy should be amended to prohibit the use of student activity funds and admission fees for the purchase of alcohol.

New Policy Statements and Recommendations

The policy statements and recommendations offered here are intended to support existing policies. Many of the suggested policies and specific recommendations complement policy and related programmatic activity already in place. Each policy statement is followed by specific recommendations. Each recommendation is coded in order to indicate if the action represents a new initiative **{N}**, enhancement of an existing program or activity **{E}**, or continuation **{C}** of an existing activity or program at the same level of effort. The coding scheme is, of course, not exact; it is meant as a quick indication of the level of effort necessary to implement the recommendation. Table 2 presents a summary of the recommendations and necessary levels of effort.

Policy A. Ongoing Commitment to Alcohol Issues and Programming. Issues related to alcohol use are an inevitable and ongoing consequence of the fact that any university community is a part of the greater society that must deal with alcohol use behaviors and their consequences. It is unlikely that any program implemented at any specific point in time could anticipate all potential problems and all possible solutions. It is, therefore, necessary to have in place appropriate mechanisms that can address alcohol issues not only as they emerge but also proactively. Thus, the university should be in a position to anticipate needs and implement appropriate programmatic responses.

Recommendations:

1. A permanent working committee with wide representation from the university (i.e., public health, public safety, student life, and academic life) should be formed to provide ongoing review of policies and recommend updates when appropriate. Representatives of all parts of our community (e.g., university leadership, faculty, students, etc.) should be appointed to this committee. This committee should be convened with Presidential authority to propose solutions and should have the power to implement specific recommendations. **{N}**
2. Every major segment of the university should be required to participate in the development and implementation of a coordinated University Community Action Plan. Where possible, major university units (e.g., individual colleges, campuses, RUPD, Office of Public Safety, OFSA, Student Health Services) most likely to be concerned with alcohol issues should develop a formal written document to guide program implementation. It is anticipated that elements of the plan may differ among college units on the same campus as well as across different campuses. Local adjustments are permissible under the current policy. However, each unit's plan should include an overall rationale including reasons for deviations from broad policy recommendations. This effort should be overseen by the permanent working committee. **{N}**

3. Even though formal membership in fraternities and sororities is limited to a relatively small number of students, the Greek community continues to be an important focus of social and recreational activities for a significantly larger proportion of the non-Greek student body. In addition, activities (including social, recreational, and service) of fraternities and sororities are often highly visible in the university community and to the public at large. For these reasons, the Greek community requires special attention. The Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs (OFSA) is charged with assisting local chapters in fulfilling their missions as well as assuring that local chapters adhere to university policies and regulations, including those relating to alcohol use. Currently, Student Affairs has insufficient resources to address the alcohol-related issues that face the Greek community. We recommend that new resources be directed to Greek Affairs so that mechanisms and programs are developed to bring Greek Life into a closer working relationship with the university community. Such efforts should be coordinated and integrated with university wide initiatives; coordination and integration should occur through the efforts of the ongoing alcohol policy committee. {E}
4. Communication among the various segments of the university community should be increased; strategies to meet this goal should be integrated into various programs. {E}
5. Guidelines for university functions held both on and off campus should be reviewed; all individuals who will serve or sell alcohol should be trained in server and host responsibilities. {C}
6. A coordinated university effort should be established to assure that actions intended to address problems in one area (e.g., differential enforcement, regulation of social activities) do not create problems in other areas. {N}
7. Discussion of present policies and practices should be expanded and be consistent with existing programs for other substances, since alcohol is not the only substance used on campus. {E}
8. Although the problems related to academic retention are beyond the scope of this committee, another charge to the ongoing committee should be to include alcohol as a possible underlying retention problem. It is anticipated that identifying and assisting the university community with problems related to alcohol will impact positively on the retention rate. Alcohol-related policy initiatives (e.g., disclosure of alcohol violations to parents) contained in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (see Appendix) and other such federal and state mandates should be reviewed and considered as they evolve. {N}

9. Evaluations should be built into regular aspects of all policies and programs; such evaluations should be used by the permanent committee to determine program effectiveness. {E}

Policy B. Community-Wide Commitment to Prevention. Prevention efforts to reduce harmful drinking and its consequences, including the effect of harmful drinking on others, are the shared responsibility of the entire university community, including individuals responsible for overseeing public health, public safety, and academic and campus life.

Recommendations:

1. Mechanisms should be developed to engage the university community (i.e., administration, faculty, staff, and students) in ongoing dialogue about alcohol use that leads to programmatic action involving all elements of the university community. {N}
2. Educational sessions about alcohol use should be conducted during orientation, residence hall meetings, etc. {C/E}
3. Existing substance free living arrangements should be expanded. {C/E}
4. Courses should be provided (e.g., First Year Experiences) on significant issues related to college life, including alcohol and other drug use. {C/E}
5. Peer programs that provide information on alcohol use, stress relief, violence, etc. should be supported. {C/E}
6. Since its inception, the Department of Health Education has continued to expand the scope of its activities. Resources should be made available on all campuses so that current activities can be maintained and new efforts initiated. Activities should be accessible to students across all campuses. Strategies should include those that enable the infusion and integration of substance use/abuse education throughout the university community for administration, faculty, staff, and students. {N/E}
7. Strategies with documented effectiveness in reducing alcohol-related harm should be implemented and evaluated (e.g., beverage server training, programs to target high-risk drinkers, programs to target high-risk settings). {N/E}
8. A partnership between the university and the community should be developed to cooperatively address methods to minimize risks related to alcohol use (e.g., Hospitality Resource Panels). {N}
9. Publicity, in general, and advertisement practices, in particular, that promote alcohol can be powerful inducements to alcohol use. Such practices may be indirect or informal (e.g., inclusion of availability of alcohol in announcements

about university functions) or more direct and formal (e.g., advertisements in student newspapers, university brochures). Publicity and advertising practices of the university community that relate to alcohol use should be carefully reviewed and guidelines should be developed and implemented. Practices that promote alcohol use should be discouraged. Further, communications that promote or depict alcohol use in an inappropriate manner should be discouraged. In all cases of formal advertising (e.g., ads in newspapers), such advertising must comply with state and federal regulations. {N/C/E}

10. Entertainment and social policies for the university as a whole should be developed; the key elements of training and community responsibility are essential. {N}

Policy C. Clear Information and Consistent Enforcement. Consequences for individuals found to be in violation of the university and college alcohol policies, or federal, state, and local laws and ordinances should be articulated clearly and enforced consistently in steps that may include: (1) college social/disciplinary sanctions; (2) referral for an alcohol/drug assessment to a counselor from the Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program for Students (ADAPS) or the Employee Assistance Program. An educational component should be made available in conjunction with the above steps.

Recommendations:

1. The alcohol policy and the Code of Conduct should be articulated, codified, and disseminated in a clear fashion to every member of the university community. {C/E}
2. The current methods of documenting and reporting cases of students who are experiencing alcohol-related problems and live on-campus should be reviewed and enhanced. {C/E}
3. A large percentage of Rutgers students live off-campus. These students, when involved in harmful drinking, are less likely to receive assistance and referral. There are many complicated issues involved in extending the university's response to alcohol use off-campus, including the students' right to private lives, the large number of communities in which members of the Rutgers community live, and the difficulty in having a fair and consistent reporting system. Therefore, it is recommended that the ongoing committee study the development of a mechanism to provide outreach and assistance to members of the university community who are experiencing alcohol and other drug problems and live off-campus. {N}
4. Although assistance should continue to be the foremost university response, procedures to deal with infractions that have a judicial consequence should continue to be enforced. Individuals making high-risk decisions should continue to be helped to change their pattern of drinking or to be treated for an alcohol problem. Deciding which type of intervention (i.e., judicial vs. assistance) should be implemented in individual cases should continue to be the duty of professionals on campus. {C}
5. Existing intervention and support services offered through ADAPS and University Personnel Counseling should be expanded. {E}
6. High-risk individuals and groups on campus should be identified and programs should be designed (i.e., prevention, intervention, and treatment) to effect a positive change in life style for the individuals and groups. {N/C/E}

Policy D. Education and Training Enhancement. Key segments of the university community (e.g., faculty, student groups, residence hall counselors, enforcement) should be trained in a uniform protocol to assure that information on alcohol issues, policies, problems, and sources of help are widely and consistently disseminated. Alcohol information should be infused into the curriculum via specific courses and/or lectures. Educational programs should be designed for all segments of the university community (e.g., Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty).

Recommendations:

1. Key segments of the university community (e.g., dining services, hearing officers, campus police) should be trained at all campuses. Significant segments of the local community (e.g., police and bar/restaurant owners) should also be trained; information on university resources should be included in the sessions. **{N/C/E}**
2. The University's Community Action Plan should include a training plan consisting of multiple stages, such as convening the deans/directors for a planning strategy session and conducting training sessions for the administration, faculty, staff, and students. The purpose of these sessions is to assure that all members of the university community are aware of the alcohol policies, existing support services, and available resources. **{N}**

Policy E. Continuation and Enhancement of Intervention Services. The university should continue to provide, and potentially expand, the structure for dealing consistently with alcohol issues and problems (i.e., educationally, programmatically, procedurally, and judicially) and to provide intervention and counseling services.

Recommendations:

1. The alcohol policy should be disseminated using a variety of mechanisms (e.g., orientation programs, permanent web page, student handbooks). **{N/C/E}**
2. A handbook on alcohol issues and concerns and lists of university offices of assistance should be developed; the handbook should be distributed to families of all incoming students (i.e., first years and transfers). **{N}**
3. A person in the Office of Student Affairs or Dean of Students should be identified to act as an Ombudsperson for students to discuss a problem confidentially (e.g., a faculty member only sporadically appears at class, roommate returns to the room intoxicated on many occasions); follow-up action related to the problem would be left in the hands of the Ombudsperson. If an administrator, faculty member or staff person wishes to discuss a problem confidentially (e.g., a colleague is not showing up to teach class), a person in the Employee Assistance Program Office should be identified to act in this role; follow-up action related to the problem should be this person's responsibility. **{N}**
4. For the last 11 years, as part of the addiction treatment program of the Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program for Students (ADAPS), a special housing option has been offered to students in recovery. Recovery Housing is on-campus housing that is open to all Rutgers University students and is located on Cook College Campus. The ADAPS staff select the students and provide counseling and monthly house meetings for the residents. Maintenance and expansion of this program is recommended. **{E}**

Policy F. Enhancement of Campus-Centered Activities. Throughout discussions with all elements of the university community including students, a continued theme has been the perceived lack of university-sponsored and campus-centered activities. This issue is related to the perceived need to develop a heightened sense of "local community" in various campus locations; local community is viewed as a physical, psychological, and social entity. One task of the ongoing working committee should be to review and to recommend events that would be campus community support mechanisms to enhance the social environment in New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden.

Recommendations:

1. Students should be surveyed to determine the types of activities they would like to have on campus during evenings and weekends. {N}
2. The types of activities (e.g., high-profile events) recommended by the majority of students should be supported. {E}
3. Movement from campus to campus and to public transportation should be facilitated by expanding bus service on nights and weekends. Transportation services should be made available for athletic and other special events. This action would promote a safe and supportive environment for wider participation in campus activities. {E}
4. Student centers and locations in the centers (e.g., fast food/convenience stores, coffee houses/cafes, video rental establishments) should be kept open to 2:00/3:00 A.M.; also late movies and other entertainment events should be offered in the student centers. {N/C/E}
5. Non-alcoholic clubs (i.e., places to get together to listen to music, dance, etc.) should be established. {N}
6. The possibility of opening theme restaurants and dance clubs where alcohol may or may not be served should be explored; establishments of this type would have to comply with the university's alcohol policy. {N}
7. The number and variety of "special" campus events should be increased; more one-day-type social and recreational programs (e.g., Rutgers Fest, AG Field Day, Livingston Spring Fest, Midnight Madness) should be conducted. {E}
8. Charges for students to use student centers for social events where alcohol is not available should be reduced to the absolute minimum. This action would provide incentives to encourage more campus-centered events. {N}

9. Residence preceptors/residence hall advisors and other relevant staff should be encouraged to be visible on social activity nights to cover the period of time when incidents usually occur. {C/E}
10. The establishment of commercial and retail districts in locations central to campuses other than College Avenue should be encouraged. {N}

Policy G. Development of a Coordinated Program of Research. University departments and administrative units (e.g., the Center of Alcohol Studies, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, Community and Health Issues Research Group at Rutgers, and other relevant university units) should conduct and coordinate an ongoing program of research into the drinking behavior of individuals and the environmental context of alcohol use. Other departments should provide necessary data to enable meaningful research to be conducted. Such research should be conducted in coordination with the ongoing alcohol committee.

Recommendations:

1. Accurate normative data of drinking on campus should be collected on a regular basis; methods to disseminate this information should be developed. {N}
2. Alcohol use and problems related to alcohol on campus should be studied to determine a baseline for evaluation; this will enable the effectiveness of strategies to be determined. {N/C/E}

IV. FINAL COMMENT

Alcohol use is a normative behavior in our society. Concern about forms of alcohol use that result in harmful consequences to individuals and to society, in general, has led to extensive debate and action focused upon reducing inappropriate use. In spite of society's focused attention, problems related to alcohol use appear endemic, even in communities that maintain and support active prevention programs. Hence, it is critical that appropriate diagnostic and treatment services remain available to address problems when they arise. Likewise, it is necessary to initiate appropriate programmatic responses when new problems arise or old problems reappear.

Social concern about problems related to alcohol use is heightened in university communities for a variety of reasons. Universities have a high concentration of young adults who are experiencing a host of life transitions. By nature, these communities are highly volatile and charged environments. By design, there are high rates of change among individuals and of ideas. It seems inevitable that alcohol use and related problems should occupy so much attention in university communities given the centrality of alcohol issues in our society.

Traditionally, our university has engaged in significant efforts to deal with alcohol use and its consequences in a responsible and responsive manner. The recommendations made by this committee are viewed as ideas that will enhance existing efforts, generate creative programming, and ensure the university's flexibility in adapting its responses to emerging and reoccurring problems. The committee recognizes that no one action, however dramatic, is likely to be universally effective. Likewise, no series of actions taken at a single point in time is a guarantee of continuing efficacy. Rather, the university community is best served by an alcohol policy that permits careful monitoring of the existing and emerging problems and provides for responsive, flexible, and effective programming.

Table 1. College Student Drinking Practices: Summary Indicators

	CORE/ National ¹	Harvard ²	PRSP-RU ³	CORE/ Camden ⁴	MTF ⁵	
Year of Survey	1997	1997	1998	1998	1997	1997
Location	54 colleges	116 colleges	New Bruns/ Newark	Camden	146 high schools	national y.adults
Sample Size	21,727	14,521	1,208	183	15,963	6400
DRINKING PREVALENCE						
% drinking in last year	84 ^(a)	81	81	75	75	84
% drinking in last month	71	**	**	59	51	68
% drinking at least monthly during prior year ^(b)	**	**	59	**	**	**
DRINKING FREQUENCY						
Infrequent Use:						
% drinking 1-6x last year	18	**	**	24	**	**
% drinking less than once/month last year ^(b)	**	**	21	**	**	**
Moderate Use:						
% drinking 1x/week to 1x/month	43	**	47	37	**	**
Frequent Use:						
% drinking 3x or more/week, last 30 days	22	**	**	14	**	**
% drinking 2-3x or more/ week, during last year ^(b)	**	**	13	**	**	**
HEAVY DRINKING						
% 5 or more drinks 2 prior weeks	44	43	**	35	31	34
% 5 or more drinks last occasion ^(b)	**	**	23	**	**	**
% 5 or more drinks more than once during past 2 weeks	32	21	**	14	**	**
ALCOHOL QUANTITIES						
average # drinks/week	5.9	**	**	3.4	**	**
# drinks last occasion ^(b)	**	**	3.1	**	**	**

Notes:

** = not available.

(a) = Percentage rounded to nearest whole number.

(b) = In cases where probes differed, alternate forms are presented.

Sources:

¹ Presley, C.A., Leichter, J.S., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: A report to college presidents*. Carbondale, IL: The Core Institute, Southern Illinois University.

² Wechsler, H., Dowdall, G.W., Maenner, G., Gledhill-Hoyt, J., & Lee, H. (1998). Changes in binge drinking and related problems among American college students between 1993 and 1997. Results of the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 57-68.

³ Lederman, L.C., Stewart, L.P., Kennedy, L., Laitman, L., Powell, R., Goodhart, F., & Barr, S. (1998). *A study of drinking on the Rutgers University Campus: Preliminary findings of the Personal Report of Student Perceptions (PRSP)*. Unpublished, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

⁴ The Core Institute. (1998). *Executive Summary: CORE-Camden Drug and Alcohol Survey*. Unpublished, Camden, NJ: Rutgers University.

⁵ Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. (1998). *National survey results on drug use from The Monitoring the Future Study, 1975-1997. Volume I, Secondary School Students* (NIH Publication No. 98-4345). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Table 2. Coding of Policy Recommendations

POLICY A: Alcohol Issues and Programming	POLICY B: Prevention	POLICY C: Information and Enforcement	POLICY D: Education and Training	POLICY E: Intervention	POLICY F: Campus- Centered Activities	POLICY G: Program of Research
1. N	1. N	1. C/E	1. N/C/E	1. N/C/E	1. N	1. N
2. N	2. C/E	2. C/E	2. N	2. N	2. E	2. N/C/E
3. E	3. C/E	3. N		3. N	3. E	
4. E	4. C/E	4. C		4. E	4. N/C/E	
5. C	5. C/E	5. E			5. N	
6. N	6. N/E	6. N/C/E			6. N	
7. E	7. N/E				7. E	
8. N	8. N				8. N	
9. E	9. N/C/E				9. C/E	
	10. N				10. N	

Code:

N = New initiative

C = Continuation of an existing program or activity at the same level of effort

E = Enhancement of an existing program or activity

REFERENCES

- Anderson, D.S., & Milgram, G.G. (1997). *Update 1997-98. Promising Practices: Campus Alcohol Strategies*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Audits and Surveys Worldwide, Survey Division & Division of Addiction Services, Research and Information Systems. (1996). *The New Jersey Middle School Survey on Substance Use: Grades 7 & 8*. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services.
- Bennett, M.E., McCrady, B.S., Frankenstein, W., Laitman, L.A., Van Horn, D., & Keller, D. (1994). Identifying young adult substance abusers: The Rutgers Collegiate Substance Abuse Screening Test. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 54, 522-527.
- Cashin, J.R., Presley, C.A., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 59, 63-70.
- The Core Institute. (1998). *Executive Summary: CORE-Camden Drug and Alcohol Survey*. Unpublished, Camden, NJ: Rutgers University.
- Fisher, W.S. (1996). *Drug and alcohol use among New Jersey high school students*. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Department of Law & Public Safety.
- Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (selected provisions related to alcohol policy initiatives).
- Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. (1998). *National survey results on drug use from The Monitoring the Future Study, 1975-1997. Volume I, Secondary School Students* (NIH Publication No. 98-4345). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lederman, L.C., Stewart, L.P., Kennedy, L., Laitman, L., Powell, R., Goodhart, F., & Barr, S. (1998). *A study of drinking on the Rutgers University Campus: Preliminary findings of the Personal Report of Student Perceptions (PRSP)*. Unpublished, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.
- Meilman, P.W., Leichliter, J.S., & Presley, C.A. (1999). Greeks and athletes: Who drinks more? *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 187- 190.
- Meilman, P.W., Presley, C.A., & Cashin, J.R. (1997). Average weekly alcohol consumption: Drinking percentiles for American college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 45, 201-204.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (1995). College students and drinking. *Alcohol Alert*, 29.

Presley, C.A., Leichliter, J.S., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: A report to college presidents*. Carbondale, Il.: The Core Institute, Southern Illinois University.

Presley, C.A., Meilman, P.W., Cashin, J.R., & Leichliter, J.S. (1997). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: Issues of violence and harassment. A report to college presidents*. Carbondale, Il.: The Core Institute, Southern Illinois University.

Straus, R., & Bacon, S.D. (1953). *Drinking in College*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wechsler, H., Dowdall, G.W., Maenner, G., Gledhill-Hoyt, J., & Lee, H. (1998). Changes in binge drinking and related problems among American college students between 1993 and 1997. Results of the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 57-68.

APPENDIX MATERIALS

Charge to the committee

Alcohol Policy Committee member list (with dates of service)

Report of The Rutgers University Committee on the Use of Alcohol, 1981

Board of Governors Minutes, May 30, 1975, Alcoholic Beverages (pp. 4-5)

Board of Governors Minutes, Sept. 13, 1980, Policy on Alcoholic Beverages (p. 12)

University Policy on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages, Board of Governors, 1984

Regulations Governing the Use of Alcoholic Beverages, New Brunswick Campuses, 1984

Alcohol Policy, Camden Campus

Policy to Prevent the Use of Illicit Drugs and the Abuse of Alcohol, Rutgers University, 1990

Policies on Alcohol, Drugs, Weapons, and Criminal Records, *Safety Matters*, 1998-1999

Intercollegiate Athletics Alcohol and Drug Policy

Select 2000 Fact Sheet

Alcohol and Drug Assistance Program for Students Brochure

University Personnel Counseling Services Brochure

Anderson, D.S., & Milgram, G.G. (1997). *Update 1997-98. Promising Practices: Campus Alcohol Strategies. Sourcebook*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.

Anderson, D.S., & Milgram, G.G. (1998). *Promising Practices: Campus Alcohol Strategies. Highlights*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.

Anderson, D.S., & Milgram, G.G. (1998). *Promising Practices: Campus Alcohol Strategies. Task Force Planner Guide*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.

Cashin, J.R., Presley, C.A., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). Alcohol use in the greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 59, 63-70.

The Core Institute. (1998). *Executive Summary: CORE-Camden Drug and Alcohol Survey*. Unpublished, Camden, NJ: Rutgers University.

Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (relevant sections)

Inter-Association Task Force on Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse Issues (1998). Collegiate Alcohol Abuse: Recommendations and Guidelines. *The National Symposium on Campus Alcohol Practices*. Williamsburg, VA: College of William and Mary.

Presley, C.A., Leichliter, J.S., & Meilman, P.W. (1998). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: A report to college presidents*. Carbondale, IL: The Core Institute, Southern Illinois University.

Presley, C.A., Meilman, P.W., Cashin, J.R., & Leichliter, J.S. (1997). *Alcohol and drugs on American college campuses: Issues of violence and harassment. A report to college presidents*. Carbondale, IL: The Core Institute, Southern Illinois University.