



**SAFE
LANES**

**ON
CAMPUS**

**A Guide for Preventing
Impaired Driving and
Underage Drinking**

SAFE LANES ON *A Guide for Preventing Impaired Driving and Underage Drinking* **CAMPUS**

Robert Zimmerman
William DeJong, Ph.D.

A publication of the
Higher Education Center for
Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education
and the U.S. Department of Transportation,
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

This publication was produced under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. ED-99-CO-0094 with the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention at Education Development Center, Inc., in a joint venture with the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Paul Kesner served as the contracting officer's technical representative (COTR) for the Department of Education and Ruth Esteban-Muir served as COTR for NHTSA. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Departments of Education or Transportation. No official endorsement by the U.S. Departments of Education or Transportation of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

Rod Paige
Secretary

Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

William Modzeleski
Associate Deputy Under Secretary

U.S. Department of Transportation

Norman Y. Mineta
Secretary

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Jeffrey W. Runge, M.D.
Administrator

2003

This publication is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, *Safe Lanes on Campus: A Guide for Preventing Impaired Driving and Underage Drinking*, Washington, D.C., 2003.

To order copies of this publication, write to

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention

Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02458-1060
(800) 676-1730
Fax: (617) 928-1537
HigherEdCtr@edc.org

This publication is also available on the following Web sites:

- ▶ Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osdfs/index.html>
- ▶ Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention at <http://www.higheredcenter.org>
- ▶ Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration at <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/>

*Layout and design by
Dorothy Geiser, Editing and
Design Services, EDC*

Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Organization of the Guide</u>	2
<u>Part 1: Scope of the Problem</u>	5
<u>Part 2: Environmental Management— Proven Prevention Practices</u>	7
<u>A Typology of Campus and Community Interventions</u>	9
<u>What Works? A Review of the Evidence</u>	11
<u>Part 3: Prevention in Action</u>	19
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Environmental Change.....	21
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions.....	31
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Health Protection.....	31
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Intervention and Treatment.....	32
<u>Part 4: Strategic Planning and Evaluation</u>	35
<u>Developing and Evaluating Prevention Policies and Programs</u>	38
<u>Meeting the Challenge</u>	42
<u>Part 5: Resources</u>	43
<u>CITED PROGRAMS</u>	45
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Environmental Change.....	45
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions.....	48
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Health Protection.....	48
<u>Area of Strategic Intervention</u> Intervention and Treatment.....	48
<u>Strategic Planning</u>	49
<u>PUBLICATIONS</u>	49
<u>RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS</u>	52
<u>References</u>	55



Introduction

The 1990s saw rising concern about heavy drinking at institutions of higher education and the risks alcohol consumption poses to student health, safety, and academic success. This manual is a response to requests from college and university administrators for guidance in preventing two of the most serious problems related to student alcohol consumption: (1) driving under the influence (DUI) and (2) alcohol use by students under the legal drinking age.

Awareness programs to inform students about the risks associated with alcohol use are familiar on the higher education scene. Experience has shown, however, that the link between providing basic information and reduced substance use is tenuous.¹ The most promising approach to preventing alcohol problems on and around campus is a broad-based and comprehensive effort to *change the physical, social, legal, and economic environment in which students make decisions about drinking*.² Accomplishing change of this magnitude requires a new type of town-gown partnership: a wide spectrum of campus and community leaders dedicated to shaping an environment that helps students make healthier choices.³

The operative word is *change*. Applying the prevention strategies introduced in this guide must start with a commitment to change by the senior administrators, faculty, and staff who are the principal custodians of the nation's colleges and universities. Likewise, a

similar commitment must be made by students, many of whom recognize the price they are paying by fostering or acquiescing to a culture of high-risk drinking. There must also be a commitment to change by community leaders and law enforcement agencies, whose actions influence both how much alcohol students consume and how they behave while drinking.

Senior administrators, faculty, and staff will see that their leadership is essential for organizing and planning prevention activities and for ensuring that the hard work of addressing student alcohol problems remains a high priority. Abandonment of the doctrine of *in loco parentis*, according to which campus officials used to think of themselves as surrogate parents to their students, has left many school officials in doubt about their responsibilities to monitor and shape student conduct. Recent court decisions have made clear that institutions of higher education have an obligation to take reasonable protective measures to reduce hazards and risks in the campus environment, although they are not expected to control student conduct.⁴ The time is long past when senior administrators could blithely disregard the effect of alcohol on student life or dismiss high-risk drinking as a “rite of passage” or an insoluble problem. Increasingly, academic leaders recognize that they have a responsibility—and an opportunity—to assemble a campus and community prevention coalition, formu-

late a strategic plan, guide its implementation, chart its progress, and assess its effect on student alcohol problems.

Students will see that they can also play a key part in making their college a better school if they are willing to assume a leadership role. Their challenge is to rise above the deep-rooted and often unquestioned mythology about student drinking by representing the often silent desire of the student majority for tougher policies to reduce alcohol's negative effect on campus life. Student participation is vital when assessing aspects of the environment that contribute to underage drinking and DUI, and when planning and implementing prevention strategies to change that environment—change that will safeguard students' well-being, improve the quality of the academic experience, and enhance the school's reputation.

Finally, community leaders, including those in law enforcement and the business world, will see the need to work cooperatively with campus officials to address this problem. College and university students are an integral part of the community in which they live, work, and study. Clearly, it is unfair and shortsighted for neighborhood residents, town officials, or other community leaders to expect campus administrators to solve this problem alone. A community problem requires a community solution. Because campus administrators are under intense pressure to reduce student alcohol problems, community leaders will find this an opportune time to reach out and offer to work in partnership.⁵

Safe Lanes on Campus describes a variety of prevention strategies that campus and community prevention coalitions can consider as they develop a strategic plan for combating underage drinking and DUI, with a particular emphasis on creating environmental change. This analysis is grounded in a summary of the research literature

published in 2002 by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges*.⁶ With *Safe Lanes on Campus* in hand, prevention planners can develop and implement strategies appropriate to their campus and community, based on an assessment of the environmental factors that encourage alcohol problems among local students and on the scientific evidence of what works.

Organization of the Guide

.....

Part 1 of the guide, **Scope of the Problem** (p. 5), gives a review of the scope of the problem, including recent estimates of the number of alcohol-related deaths and injuries among college students each year. These data make clear that underage drinking and DUI are major problems facing U.S. colleges and universities and deserve priority attention.

Part 2, Environmental Management—Proven Prevention Practices (p. 7), describes a classification or typology of campus and community interventions, which can be used to structure a review of current policies and programs and to organize subsequent strategic planning. The typology distinguishes five areas of strategic intervention related to what is called *environmental management*: (1) alcohol-free options, (2) normative environment, (3) alcohol availability, (4) alcohol promotion, and (5) policy/law enforcement.

This section also includes a summary of policy and program recommendations published by the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking. Based on expert review of the scientific literature, this summary underscores the value of environmental change strategies and points out those prevention tactics that

at present have the strongest evidence of effectiveness. Knowledge of what works to reduce college alcohol problems is sparse. Even so, prevention research that has examined the effect of policies and programs aimed at the general population does provide ample guidance.

Part 3, Prevention in Action (p. 19), provides descriptions of policies and programs currently being used throughout the United States to prevent underage drinking and DUI among college students. Program contact information can be found in the Resources section, Part 5 (see below).

Part 4, Strategic Planning and Evaluation (p. 35), begins with an overview of campus and community coalitions, which are the best vehicle for developing effective environmental management strategies. Next, this section outlines the basic elements of strategic planning and evaluation that campus and community coalitions should follow. Coalitions should incorporate evaluation as an integral part of program planning. Evaluation provides information needed to make midcourse corrections, but having an evaluator involved from the very beginning also improves the planning process itself.

Part 5, Resources (p. 43), provides contact information for programs cited in the guide, as well as a list of publications and organizations that might be helpful sources of information. An expanded and updated list of resources can be found through the Web site (<http://www.higheredcenter.org>) of the U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.



Scope of the Problem

Several major reports have pointed to the magnitude of alcohol problems among college and university students. In 1989, a survey of college and university presidents found that 67 percent rated alcohol misuse as a “moderate” or “major” problem on their campus.⁷ In 2002, the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking characterized heavy drinking by higher education students as “widespread, dangerous, and disruptive.”⁸

National surveys have found that approximately two in five college students can be classified as heavy drinkers, often defined as having five or more drinks in a row at least once in the previous two weeks.⁹ One study estimated that 31 percent of college students met the criteria for a diagnosis of alcohol abuse, while 6 percent could be classified as alcohol-dependent, according to self-reported drinking behaviors.¹⁰

The damage caused by alcohol consumption—to the drinkers themselves, to other individuals, and to institutions of higher education—is substantial. By one estimate, more than 1,400 students aged 18 to 24 years enrolled in two- and four-year colleges died in 1998 from alcohol-related unintentional injuries. Nearly 80 percent of these deaths were due to motor vehicle crashes. In addition, approximately 500,000 college students in this age range suffered alcohol-related unintentional injuries.¹¹

According to a National College Health Risk Behavior Survey by the Centers for Disease Control and

Prevention (CDC), in 1998 more than two million of the nation’s approximately eight million college students drove under the influence of alcohol, and more than three million rode with a drinking driver.¹² The 2001 College Alcohol Study (CAS) found that 30 percent of students who drank said they had driven after drinking during the previous 30 days.¹³

Research also shows that poor academic performance correlates strongly with higher levels of alcohol consumption. One national survey reported that students with an A average consumed an average of 3.4 drinks per week, while B-average students consumed 4.5 drinks, C-average students 6.1 drinks, and D- or F-average students 9.8 drinks.¹⁴ College administrators report that many of the large numbers of students who drop out each year do so because drinking has interfered with their studies, a problem that has both personal and institutional ramifications.¹⁵

Especially salient are the problems students experience due to other students’ misuse of alcohol—for example, interrupted study and sleep; having a serious argument or quarrel; having property damaged; being pushed, hit, or assaulted; and being a victim of sexual assault or acquaintance rape.¹⁶ In 1998, more than 600,000 students were assaulted by another student who had been drinking, while more than 70,000 students were victims of alcohol-related sexual assault or acquaintance rape.¹⁷

Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act

The need for colleges and universities to apply effective prevention measures is underscored by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA), which requires colleges and universities to adopt and enforce policies that include sanctions for illegal alcohol and other drug use and to provide students with appropriate information and services to back up those policies. A guide to meeting the requirements of the DFSCA is available from the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.²¹

Underage drinking is a big part of the problem. The 2001 CAS found that two out of three underage students reported drinking in the previous 30 days. Students under 21 tended to drink on fewer occasions than their older peers, but they drank more per occasion and had more alcohol-related problems than students of legal drinking age. Underage students also reported that alcohol is easy to obtain, usually at little or no cost.¹⁸

At present, all 50 states maintain a minimum legal drinking age of 21. The effect of these laws, despite their imperfect enforcement, is clear. A recent literature review documented a clear inverse relationship between the legal drinking age and alcohol use, with consumption decreasing as the legal age was raised. A higher legal drinking age is also strongly associated with decreased motor vehicle crash rates. Surprisingly, very few researchers have examined these associations for college students, but the handful of studies available has not found a significant relationship between the minimum legal drinking age and alcohol consumption or motor vehicle crash rates.¹⁹ Additional research is needed to gain a clearer picture of the effect of the age 21 limit on college students' alcohol consumption.

The influence of the higher minimum drinking age is also apparent from an analysis of alcohol-related fatal automobile crashes. While alcohol was involved in 57 percent of U.S. vehicular fatalities in 1982, the ratio today stands at about 40 percent. The raising of the legal drinking age to 21 throughout the country is credited with significantly reducing the death toll among younger drivers. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) estimates that state laws establishing 21 as the minimum legal drinking age have saved more than 20,000 lives between

1975 and 2000 and will continue to save 1,000 lives each year.²⁰

Preventing underage drinking and DUI among college students requires a large and sustained effort. Alcohol use and its consequences are among the most serious problems facing U.S. colleges and universities today. Clearly, the goal is worth the effort.

Research on the effect of raising the minimum legal drinking age also points to a fruitful new direction for prevention efforts: *using institutional, community, state, and federal policy and other programs to change the environment in which students make decisions about alcohol consumption.* Ultimately, an effective prevention program grounded in environmental management will enhance campus safety, improve the quality of academic life, and thereby help colleges and universities fulfill their basic educational mission.

Environmental Management— Proven Prevention Practices

A Typology of Campus and Community Interventions9

What Works? A Review of the Evidence11

 Tier 1: Evidence of Effectiveness among College Students12

 Tier 2: Evidence of Success with General Populations12

 Tier 3: Evidence of Promise15

 Tier 4: Evidence of Ineffectiveness15



Environmental Management—Proven Prevention Practices

Today's college and university students live in a world with confusing and contradictory messages about alcohol.

- ▶ Those under 21 are told that the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors is unlawful, yet they find that neighborhood liquor stores often fail to ask for proof-of-age identification.
- ▶ Underage students go to parties where beer is flowing freely, but no one questions their age before they step up to the keg.
- ▶ Students are warned that alcohol can affect their judgment and coordination and is in fact a drug, but advertising makes alcoholic beverages seem as harmless as soft drinks.
- ▶ Students are told that driving after drinking is risky, but they see partying students casually climb into cars for a ride back to campus with a drinking driver at the wheel.
- ▶ Students are urged to find entertainment and recreational opportunities where alcohol is not part of the scene, but such offerings are few and far between.

Given such an environment, routine warnings against underage drinking and driving under the influence (DUI) will have only a limited effect on students' behavior.

A prevention approach known as *environmental management* is the foundation for a broad set of policies and pro-

grams to reduce underage drinking and DUI among college students.

Environmental management rests on the principle that the decisions young people make about alcohol use are shaped by their environment, a complex of physical, social, economic, and legal factors that affect alcohol's appeal and availability. Accordingly, the most effective and efficient way of reducing substance use problems in the general population is to change that environment.

A Typology of Campus and Community Interventions

Prevention work in public health has been guided by a *social ecological framework*, which describes the following five levels of influence on health-related behavior, including college student drinking:

1. Intrapersonal (individual) factors
2. Interpersonal (group) factors
3. Institutional factors
4. Community factors
5. State and federal public policy

The U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention has expanded this basic framework to create a full classification or typology of campus-based prevention and treatment options.

This framework can be used both to provide a systematic review of current efforts and to inform future strategic planning.²²

Table 1 below, called the “typology matrix,” illustrates the framework by showing the intersection of the levels of influence with different kinds of prevention approaches. The columns across the top of the matrix show the levels of influence listed above (individual, group, institution, community, and state and federal public policy). The rows down the side of the matrix show different kinds of approaches, called “areas of strategic intervention”:

1. Changing students’ knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions
2. Eliminating or modifying environmental factors that contribute to the problem
3. Protecting students from the short-

term consequences of alcohol consumption (“health protection” or “harm reduction” strategies)

4. Intervening with and treating students who are addicted to alcohol or otherwise show evidence of problem drinking

The matrix makes it clear that the different areas of strategic intervention can be pursued at several program and policy levels of the social ecological framework.

Areas of strategic intervention can be pursued at several program and policy levels of the social ecological framework. In the area of health protection, for example, a local community could decide to establish a “safe rides” program so that students who have been drinking will not have to drive to return home. This community-level program could be augmented by efforts at other levels. At the group level, for example, fraternity and sorority chapters might vote to

TABLE 1 Typology matrix for mapping campus and community prevention efforts

Areas of Strategic Intervention	Program and Policy Levels (Social Ecological Framework)				
	Individual	Group	Institution	Community	Public Policy
Knowledge, Attitudes, Behavioral Intentions					
Environmental Change 1. Alcohol-Free Options 2. Normative Environment 3. Alcohol Availability 4. Alcohol Promotion 5. Policy/Law Enforcement					
Health Protection					
Intervention and Treatment					

require members to pledge not to drink and drive and instead to use the new program. At the individual level, there could be a campus-based media campaign that explains how to access the new service.

Consider increased enforcement of the minimum legal drinking age. At the **community level**, local police could increase the number of decoy (or “sting”) operations at local bars and restaurants to see if servers are checking identification before serving alcohol. At the **institutional level**, school officials might require that trained bartenders be hired to serve alcohol at on-campus functions. At the **group level**, school officials—as part of a party registration procedure—might require student clubs to submit a plan for preventing alcohol service to underage students at planned social events. Finally, at the **individual level**, the orientation program for new students could publicize these policies, the greater level of enforcement, and the legal consequences of underage drinking.

Historically, campus-based prevention efforts have relied primarily on student awareness and education programs to address a mix of intrapersonal or individual factors, such as knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, skills (e.g., how to refuse an offer of alcohol), and behavioral intentions. Another mainstay of campus-based prevention has been the peer education program, which uses peer-to-peer communication to change student social norms about alcohol use. The largest such program is the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network. In general, there is little evidence that these types of educational programs, *when used alone*, are successful in reducing alcohol problems on campus;²³ however, *when used in combination with other prevention programs*, they can play an important role.

The prevention philosophy of environmental management hinges on a broader focus on combined institutional,

community, and public policy factors. The underlying premise of this approach is that college students do not make decisions about alcohol consumption in isolation, but in an environmental context that encourages or discourages high-risk consumption. The Higher Education Center urges college officials to take a hand in constructing an environment, both on campus and in the surrounding community, that will help students make healthier choices about drinking.

As shown in table 1, the Higher Education Center has identified five general types of environmental management strategies for effective prevention:

1. Offer and promote social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs.
2. Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms.
3. Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus.
4. Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus.
5. Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws.

Table 2 (pp. 16–18) shows that all five of these categories involve a wide range of possible program and policy options.

What Works? A Review of the Evidence

.....

Among these many options, which ones work best? To answer that question, the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking developed research-based recommendations to college and university presidents for effective prevention. Its findings were published in April 2002 in *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (see <http://collegedrinkingprevention.gov>).

Informed by the best scientific evidence available, this report strongly reinforces the environmental management approach. For prevention planners concerned about underage drinking and DUI, the NIAAA Task Force's list of effective and promising approaches should serve as the departure point for crafting a comprehensive prevention program.

The NIAAA report organizes current programs and policies into four tiers according to the quality of research evidence that is available at present.

TIER 1: EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Strategies included in tier 1 have two or more research studies that prove their effectiveness. Programs in this category are limited to educational and intervention programs that target students who are alcohol-dependent or problem drinkers. For example, based on the Alcohol Skills Training Program (ASTP),²⁴ the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) program uses two brief motivational interview sessions to give students feedback about their drinking level and an opportunity to craft a plan for reducing their alcohol consumption. High-risk drinkers who participated in the BASICS program significantly reduced their drinking relative to control group participants, a change that persisted even four years later.²⁵

The ultimate challenge may be figuring out how to establish the tier 1 intervention programs on a scale big enough to affect the behavior of large numbers of students, not just a small number of research participants. Using trained professionals to conduct one-on-one or small-group sessions, as was done in the research studies, would be prohibitively expensive. One alternative might be to use peer educators. Another alter-

native might be a Web-based screening tool with computerized feedback and guided development of an individualized drinking reduction plan.

Research studies currently under way will determine the feasibility and effectiveness of these and other low-cost options. Meanwhile, limited application of these programs using one-on-one or small-group procedures is clearly warranted for students who belong to high-risk social groups (e.g., fraternities and sororities, athletics teams), are being disciplined for violating the school's alcohol policies, or have identified themselves as alcohol-dependent or problem drinkers.

TIER 2: EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS WITH GENERAL POPULATIONS

Several environmental change strategies for reducing alcohol-related problems that have not yet been tested with college students nevertheless have been used successfully with the general population. These strategies, therefore, merit serious consideration:

► **Increased Enforcement of Minimum Legal Drinking Age.**

As noted, raising the minimum legal drinking age has proved very effective, resulting in substantial decreases in alcohol consumption and alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes. This is the case even though enforcement of the "age 21" laws has been spotty. Studies do show that increased enforcement can substantially reduce sales to minors.²⁶ By extension, college and community officials should seriously consider applying a variety of measures to prevent underage drinking, including cracking down on fake IDs, eliminating home delivery of alcohol, registering kegs, and so forth.

- ▶ **Implementation and Enforcement of Other Laws to Reduce Alcohol-Impaired Driving.** The best available estimate is that nearly 80 percent of alcohol-related fatalities among college students are the result of automobile crashes.²⁷ To date, well over 40 states and the District of Columbia have enacted *per se* .08 percent blood alcohol concentration (BAC) legislation. In those states that have not yet done so, campus and community officials should call for state laws that will lower the legal *per se* limit for adult drivers to .08 percent BAC, set legal BAC limits for drivers under age 21 at .02 percent BAC or lower, and permit adminis-

trative license revocation after DUI arrests.²⁸ Greater enforcement, including the use of sobriety checkpoints and targeted patrols, is also recommended.

- ▶ **Restrictions on Alcohol Retail Outlet Density.** The density of alcohol licenses or outlets is related to alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems, including violence, other crime, and health problems.²⁹ One influential study found that both underage and older college students reported higher levels of alcohol consumption when there were larger numbers of alcohol outlets within one mile of campus.³⁰ Additional research could test whether zoning and licensing regu-

Strong State Laws and Policies Make a Difference

A study reported in 2002 by the CDC confirms the value of strong state laws and policies directed against DUI, especially for drivers under the age of 21. Among the most significant tasks that a campus and community coalition can undertake is to influence state policymakers to pass more effective laws and regulations.

Researchers made use of ratings of state anti-DUI laws created by Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD).³⁴ MADD assigns states a grade from A to D based on the strength and comprehensiveness of their efforts to reduce alcohol-impaired driving. The MADD ratings for 2000 were compared with responses to the CDC's 1997 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey.

The number of survey respondents who acknowledged driving after drinking in the previous 30 days was lowest in states with the highest MADD ratings. Drivers in states with D ratings were 60 percent more likely to drive after drinking than those in states with an A rating.

Factors considered in the MADD ratings include (1) provisions of the DUI laws, (2) sanctions and penalties for violating those

laws, (3) resources devoted to enforcement, (4) alcohol licensing regulations and requirements (e.g., mandatory server training), (5) prevention and education programs directed at youth, (6) mandatory assessment and treatment for alcohol problems, and (7) political leadership by the governor and state legislature on the issue of DUI.

No state received an unqualified A unless it (1) had a .08 percent BAC *per se* law, meaning that anyone with a BAC at that level or higher is by definition impaired; (2) provided for automatic administrative revocation of driver's licenses after DUI arrests; and (3) mandated the use of seat belts.³⁵

Another CDC study rated the demonstrated effectiveness of five popular prevention strategies for reducing alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes. The study, published in 2001, found strong evidence for the effectiveness of .08 percent BAC *per se* laws, minimum drinking age laws, and sobriety checkpoints. It found sufficient evidence for the effectiveness of lower BAC limits for young and inexperienced drivers ("zero tolerance" laws) and RBS training programs for servers of alcoholic beverages.³⁶

The Silent Majority

Just as students typically overestimate how much their fellow students drink, many of them correspondingly underestimate how much their peers support new policies and stricter enforcement to reduce alcohol problems on campus.

The Social Norms Marketing Research Project, based at Education Development Center, Inc., in Newton, Massachusetts, asked students at 18 colleges and universities how they felt about each of a dozen alcohol policies, among them banning keg parties on campus, using decoys to monitor sales to minors, making all campus residences alcohol-free, restricting advertising that promotes alcohol consumption at on-campus parties and events, and imposing tougher disciplinary sanctions for students who repeatedly violate campus alcohol policies.

The proportion of students who personally supported each policy was consistently higher than the proportion thinking that other students felt that way. For example, 58 percent of students surveyed said they favored prohibiting kegs on campus, whereas only 26 percent said they believed there was general student support for this measure.

While 77 percent were in favor of stricter disciplinary sanctions for students who repeatedly violate campus alcohol policies, only 46 percent believed that other students supported the idea.³⁷

On a similar note, some campus administrators fear that parents of students will react adversely to tough policies that threaten to punish their children for violating college alcohol rules. Actually, in a survey conducted by the American Medical Association (AMA), 80 percent of parents said they would feel more comfortable sending their child to a college with strong policies or programs in place to deter underage drinking and heavy alcohol use.

According to the survey, 93 percent of parents believe easy access to alcohol is a major cause of heavy drinking by students, 80 percent believe that low prices for alcohol contribute to student drinking, and 79 percent believe advertising and promotion by alcohol companies add to the problem.

The survey was conducted as part of the AMA's A Matter of Degree program, which encourages alliances between campus and community organizations to reduce student alcohol problems.³⁸

lations can be used to help reduce alcohol-related problems, but the strong correlation between outlet density and alcohol problems suggests that this approach does have merit.

▶ **Increased Prices and Excise Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages.**

The effect of price on alcohol consumption is well documented. Studies have shown that when the price of alcohol goes up, many alcohol-related problems, including fatal motor vehicle crashes, go down. Price variations especially affect young people, even those who are already heavy drinkers.³¹ Price rises can be effected

through increases in alcohol excise taxes. Another tactic is to work out cooperative agreements with local merchants to institute minimum pricing or to limit low-price drink specials.³²

▶ **Responsible Beverage Service (RBS) Policies.**

RBS involves several policies to reduce alcohol sales to minors and intoxicated patrons at bars and restaurants, including checking for proof-of-age identification, serving alcohol in smaller standard sizes, limiting the number of servings per alcohol sale, restricting sales of pitchers, promoting alcohol-free drinks and food, eliminating

last-call announcements, and cutting off sales to patrons who might otherwise become intoxicated.

Studies suggest that such policies—reinforced by training for both managers and staff and by compliance monitoring—can reduce inappropriate alcohol sales significantly.³³

TIER 3: EVIDENCE OF PROMISE

The NIAAA Task Force report identified additional program and policy ideas that make sense intuitively or seem theoretically sound but so far lack strong research-based support. Table 2 (pp. 16–18) lists these ideas, along with additional promising ideas inspired by the Higher Education Center’s environmental management approach. Clearly, any tactics that might serve to increase alcohol-free options, change the normative environment, reduce alcohol availability, alter alcohol marketing and promotion, or increase the consistent enforcement of policies deserve to be tried and evaluated.

TIER 4: EVIDENCE OF INEFFECTIVENESS

The programs listed in this final category consistently have been found to be ineffective *when used in isolation*. Whether they might make an important contribution as part of a more comprehensive prevention program has not yet been demonstrated.

Basic awareness and education programs, although a major part of prevention work on most college campuses, belong to this tier. Typical among these efforts are orientation sessions for new students; alcohol awareness weeks and other special events; and curriculum infusion, through which instructors introduce alcohol-related facts and issues into their regular academic courses.³⁹ While college administrators have an obligation to make sure that students know the facts, such educational pro-

grams do not by themselves generally lead to widespread or consistent behavior change.

A second problematic tactic is using breath analysis tests to give students feedback on their BAC levels so that they can avoid impaired driving. According to the NIAAA Task Force, anecdotal reports suggest that some student drinkers will instead compete to reach the highest BAC possible.

TABLE 2 Strategic objectives and tactics focused on environmental change

Note: Tactics can be classified according to the level of research evidence for their effectiveness, as suggested by the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking:*

- Tier 1:* Evidence of effectiveness among college students
- Tier 2:* Evidence of success with general populations
- Tier 3:* Evidence of promise
- Tier 4:* Evidence of ineffectiveness

The Task Force did not list any environmental change tactics under Tiers 1 or 4. Tactics listed under Tier 2 are identified below. The remaining tactics can be classified under Tier 3, although the Task Force did not explicitly list all of them.

ALCOHOL-FREE OPTIONS

Problem: Many students, especially at residential colleges, have few adult responsibilities and a great deal of unstructured free time, and there are too few social and recreational options.

Strategic Objective: Offer and promote social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs.

Tactics (examples):

- Create new alcohol-free events.
- Promote alcohol-free events and activities.
- Create and publicize student service learning or volunteer activities.
- Require community service work as part of the academic curriculum.
- Open a student center, gym, or other alcohol-free settings.
- Expand hours for student center, gym, or other alcohol-free settings.
- Promote consumption of nonalcoholic beverages and food at events.
- Provide greater financial support to student clubs and organizations that are substance-free.

NORMATIVE ENVIRONMENT

Problem: Many people accept drinking and other drug use as a “normal” part of the college experience.

Strategic Objective: Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms.

Tactics (examples):

- Change college admissions procedures.
- Increase academic standards.
- Modify the academic schedule (e.g., increase the number of Friday classes).
- Offer a greater number of substance-free residence halls.
- Increase faculty-student contact.
- Employ older, salaried resident assistants.
- Create a social norms marketing campaign to correct student misperceptions of drinking norms.

* Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, 2002).

TABLE 2 Strategic objectives and tactics focused on environmental change (continued)**ALCOHOL AVAILABILITY**

Problem: Alcohol is abundantly available to students and is inexpensive.

Strategic Objective: Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus.

Tactics (examples):

- Ban or restrict use of alcohol on campus.
- Prohibit alcohol use in public places.
- Prohibit delivery or use of kegs or other common containers on campus.
- Prohibit tailgate parties.
- Control or eliminate alcohol sales at sports events.
- Disseminate guidelines for off-campus parties.
- Install a responsible beverage service (RBS) program (*Tier 2*).
 - ✓ Require use of registered and trained alcohol servers.
 - ✓ Provide training programs for both servers and managers.
 - ✓ Limit container size and number of servings per alcohol sales.
 - ✓ Restrict sales of pitchers.
 - ✓ Cut off sales to patrons who might otherwise become intoxicated.
 - ✓ Eliminate last-call announcements.
- Limit number and concentration of alcohol outlets near campus (*Tier 2*).
- Increase costs of alcohol sales licenses.
- Limit days or hours of alcohol sales.
- Eliminate home delivery of alcohol purchases.
- Require keg registration.
- Increase state alcohol taxes (*Tier 2*).

MARKETING AND PROMOTION OF ALCOHOL

Problem: Bars, restaurants, and liquor stores use aggressive promotions to target underage and other college drinkers.

Strategic Objective: Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus.

Tactics (examples):*On Campus*

- Ban or restrict alcohol advertising.
- Ban or restrict alcohol industry sponsorship of on-campus events.
- Limit content of party or event announcements.

Off Campus

- Ban or limit alcohol advertising in the vicinity of schools.
- Ban alcohol promotions with special appeal to underage drinkers.
- Ban alcohol promotions that show drinking in high-risk contexts.
- Require pro-health messages to counterbalance alcohol advertising.
- Institute cooperative agreement to institute minimum pricing (*Tier 2*).
- Institute cooperative agreement to ban or restrict low-price drink specials (*Tier 2*).

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 2 Strategic objectives and tactics focused on environmental change (continued)

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND ENFORCEMENT

Problem: Campus policies and local, state, and federal laws are not enforced consistently.

Strategic Objective: Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws.

Tactics (examples):

On Campus

- Revise campus alcohol and other drug (AOD) policies.
- Disseminate campus AOD policies and publicize their enforcement.
- Require on-campus functions to be registered.
- Increase ID checks at on-campus functions.
- Use decoy operations at campus pubs and on-campus functions.
- Increase patrols near on-campus parties.
- Increase disciplinary sanctions for violation of campus AOD policies.
- Increase criminal prosecution of students for alcohol-related offenses.
- Notify parents of rules violations.

Off Campus

- Enforce minimum legal drinking age laws (*Tier 2*).
 - ✓ Increase ID checks at off-campus bars and liquor stores.
 - ✓ Use decoy operations at retail alcohol outlets.
 - ✓ Enforce seller penalties for sale of liquor to minors.
 - ✓ Enforce penalties for possessing fake ID.
- Increase patrols near off-campus parties.
- Establish new DUI laws (*Tier 2*).
 - ✓ Set legal *per se* limit for adult drivers at .08% BAC.
 - ✓ Set legal limit for drivers under age 21 at .02% BAC or lower.
 - ✓ Establish administrative license revocation for alcohol-impaired driving.
- Increase enforcement of DUI laws.
 - ✓ Use targeted patrols.
 - ✓ Use sobriety checkpoints.
- Impose driver’s license penalties for minors violating alcohol laws.
- Change driver’s licensing procedures and formats.
- Pass ordinances to restrict open house assemblies and noise level.
- Educate sellers/servers about potential legal liability.

Prevention in Action

Area of Strategic Intervention Environmental Change.....	21
<i>Alcohol-Free Options: Offer and promote social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs (AOD).....</i>	21
▪ Alcohol-Free Events	21
▪ Volunteer Community Service	22
<i>Normative Environment: Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms</i>	22
▪ Social Norms Marketing Campaigns	22
▪ Focus on College’s Educational Mission	22
<i>Alcohol Availability: Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus</i>	23
▪ Responsible Beverage Service	23
▪ Closing Hours	23
▪ Laws That Confine Drinking	23
▪ Limiting the Density of Alcohol Outlets	23
▪ Keg Registration	23
▪ Campus Policies to Restrict Alcohol Availability	25
▪ Policies for Fraternities, Sororities, and Other Campus Organizations	25
<i>Marketing and Promotion of Alcohol: Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus</i>	25
▪ Alcohol Advertising	25
▪ Sponsorship of Sports Events	26
▪ Comprehensive Ban on Alcohol Advertising	26
▪ Price	26
▪ Voluntary Marketing and Advertising Guidelines	26
<i>Policy Development and Law Enforcement: Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws</i>	27
▪ Campus Regulations	27
▪ Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA)	27
▪ Parental Notification	28
▪ Alcohol Policy Violations off Campus	28
▪ Orientation Programs	28
▪ State and Local Laws	29
▪ Selling to Minors	29
▪ Underage Sellers	29
▪ Adults Providing Alcohol to Underage Drinkers	29
▪ Sobriety Checkpoints	30
▪ Fake IDs	30
▪ “Zero Tolerance” Laws	30
Area of Strategic Intervention Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions	31
▪ Effects of Alcohol on Ability to Drive	31
Area of Strategic Intervention Health Protection	31
▪ Designated Driver Programs	31
▪ Safe Rides Program	32
Area of Strategic Intervention Intervention and Treatment.....	32
▪ Interactive Course	32
▪ One-on-One Intervention	32



Prevention in Action

This section describes policies and programs currently being used throughout the United States to prevent underage drinking and DUI among college students. Program contact information can be found in part 5, Resources (p. 43). The descriptions are organized according to the typology of campus and community prevention efforts developed by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention (see table 1). The following section describes four areas of strategic intervention: (1) Environmental Change; (2) Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions; (3) Health Protection; and (4) Intervention and Treatment.

Area of Strategic Intervention

Environmental Change

ALCOHOL-FREE OPTIONS:

Offer and promote social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs (AOD).

Students seeking lively social contacts should be able to choose between more than either bars and nightclubs or alcohol-fueled parties. A comprehensive effort to reduce underage drinking and impaired driving should ensure that students, especially those under the legal

drinking age, have a choice of alcohol-free activities in a campus and community atmosphere that supports the decision to avoid drinking.

Alcohol-Free Events

Alcohol-free events might require more advertising and promotion than those relying on alcoholic beverages to help draw attendance. Creating and promoting such activities is a challenge and always runs the risk of failure, but a number of successful campus-based programs can be used as models:

- ▶ A program called ➡ **WVUp All Night** at West Virginia University has attracted up to 1,000 students on weekend nights with free food, comedy, bowling, live bands, and other activities.
- ▶ An annual dance for students sponsored by Boston College's alumni association became notorious for high-risk drinking and was canceled. In response, the alumni association ➡ **organized sports competitions and community service projects**, such as providing meals to local food banks.
- ▶ Through a program called ➡ **PRIDE (Promoting Responsible and Informed Decisions through Education)**, the University of Redlands in California offers screenings of current hit movies, a coffee and dessert bar, and weekly events featuring comedians, musicians, and other live entertainment.

➡ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Eyes on the Prize

Several chapters of the Automobile Association of America (AAA) and the U.S. Department of Education’s Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention cosponsor the annual **College and University Drinking and Driving Prevention Awards Program**. The program annually awards one \$5,000 grand prize and two \$1,000 prizes to colleges and universities in a six-state region (California, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah) for their innovative activities to reduce drinking and driving among their students. Other AAA chapters are considering joining this recognition effort, and it is hoped that it might some day become national in scope. Visit <http://www.higheredcenter.org/grants/aaa/> for more information.

➔ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Volunteer Community Service

Vacation periods are also a time of risk for student drinking problems. Across the nation, several campus organizations are now in place to arrange for students to do volunteer community service during spring break and other vacation periods. Central Michigan University’s ➔ **Alternative Breaks** provides opportunities during vacation breaks and on several weekends during the academic year. ➔ **Alternative Weekends** is a similar program based at the University of Michigan. Habitat for Humanity, an organization that enlists volunteers to help build houses in poverty-stricken areas, saw a 15 percent rise in student participation in its 2002 Collegiate Challenge program.

NORMATIVE ENVIRONMENT:
Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms.

Social Norms Marketing Campaigns

Social norms marketing campaigns are designed to convey accurate information to students about “peer drinking norms” or the drinking habits of other students. The idea is to undermine the wildly exaggerated views of student drinking that many students hold and thereby reduce the perceived pressure to drink alcohol in order to fit in.⁴⁰ This approach has been adapted to help dispel similar misperceptions about driving after drinking.

The University of Texas (UT) at Austin developed its campaign after a survey showed that seven out of 10 UT students do not drive after drinking, and that seven out of 10 UT students drink no more than three drinks at a party, if they drink at all. The ➔ **“7 out of 10”** message saturated the Austin campus during the 2000–01 academic year, appearing at orientation meetings for

first-year students, on posters, in newspaper ads, on radio and television, on a Web site, and on stickers worn by many staff and students.

➔ **MOST of Us**, a statewide campaign developed at Montana State University (MSU), used posters, media messages, and other information channels to get out the message that four out of five 18 to 21 year olds on the MSU campus do not drive after drinking. A follow-up survey found that only about 16 percent of those who recalled the MOST of Us message had driven after drinking in the previous month, compared with 25 percent of those not recalling any DUI prevention message.

Focus on College’s Educational Mission

The normative environment is also communicated by policies and practices that either promote or undermine the college’s educational mission. For example, some campus administrators have discovered that the convenience and popularity of scheduling all or most classes early in the week creates a “three-day weekend.” The NIAAA Task Force recommended **reinstating Friday** (and perhaps even Saturday) **classes** and exams as a means of reducing high-risk drinking by students.⁴¹

Initial resistance among students may diminish when voluntary activities once scheduled for Fridays are moved to Wednesdays and regular classes are scheduled on Fridays.⁴² At Clark University in Massachusetts, the faculty voted to schedule **more classes on Fridays** after a survey showed that there were almost three times as many class meetings on Mondays and Wednesdays as on Fridays. Similarly, Wesleyan College in Middletown, Connecticut, scheduled **more classes on Fridays** after students complained that there were too many classes in the middle of the week.⁴³

ALCOHOL AVAILABILITY:

Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus.

Responsible Beverage Service

RBS training for owners, managers, and employees of off-campus alcohol outlets is a key prevention tactic. **RBS training** is a means of reducing underage drinking and preventing intoxicated patrons from leaving an establishment to drive a motor vehicle. A special value of RBS training is that it **helps servers detect counterfeit proof-of-age documents** and teaches them how to refuse service in a way that avoids confrontation. Typically, RBS training also includes information about how to recognize signs of intoxication and prevent alcohol misuse.

Asking DUI offenders where they had their last drink before being arrested may indicate that certain establishments are routinely failing to cut off service to intoxicated patrons or not making an effort to keep them from driving while impaired. A **“last drink” survey** at the University of Delaware found that between 45 and 50 percent of students arrested for DUI had their last drink at a bar or restaurant, whereas 30 percent had their last drink at someone else’s home.⁴⁴

Closing Hours

If bars close at 2:00 AM in one city or county, drinkers might then go by car to an adjacent city or county where bars stay open until 3:00 AM. The risk this creates prompted a new ordinance changing the bar-closing hour in Union City, New Jersey, from 3:00 AM to 2:00 AM to bring it in line with closing times in surrounding towns. Obviously, earlier closing hours also give bar patrons less time to drink, thus reducing the risk of impairment before customers drive home.

Laws That Confine Drinking

Laws that confine drinking to licensed premises and set aside designated areas for alcohol sales and consumption at public events help discourage irresponsible behavior and public disturbances by students.⁴⁵ Such laws also increase vendor accountability by making it easier to track which alcohol outlets are serving underage drinkers or intoxicated persons. Also worth considering is enactment of alcohol bans at beaches, lakefronts, parks, and other public places in order to keep these locations safe for family recreation.

Limiting the Density of Alcohol Outlets

Research has shown higher levels of both underage and high-risk drinking when there is a heavier concentration of alcohol outlets near campus.⁴⁶ Although alcohol licensing might be a responsibility of state government, local communities can still use zoning powers to control the density of neighborhood alcohol outlets and to require that licensees engage in responsible business practices.

The city of Newark, Delaware, acted to reduce the density of bars in the vicinity of the University of Delaware by placing deed restrictions prohibiting the sale of alcohol on three properties. In Lincoln, Nebraska, the University of Nebraska worked for passage of an ordinance banning “bottle clubs” that provide drink mixers to patrons who bring their own alcohol.

Keg Registration

At least 13 states and the District of Columbia now have keg registration laws. The merchant records the buyer’s name, address, telephone number, and driver’s license number. If police confiscate a keg being used to supply underage drinkers, they can easily trace the purchaser and impose sanctions.

A Community Covenant

The College Bar Task Force in San Diego is on the front line in the battle against alcohol-impaired driving. Its focus is the beach areas of San Diego—miles from most of the large campuses, but popular with students who more than likely come and go there by car. The task force's mission is to get bar and restaurant operators who cater to students to subscribe to a ➔ **"community covenant"** pledging them to pursue business policies that will minimize such problems as underage drinking and DUI.

Working with the San Diego Food and Beverage Association and the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, the task force arranges free classes in RBS for owners, managers, bartenders, waiters, and other servers who come in regular contact with students. The servers learn to detect fake IDs, recognize when customers are becoming intoxicated, encourage patrons to eat as well as drink, and promote the use of designated drivers among groups of students. Doormen who check IDs also receive training in how to identify counterfeit documents. With the rise of "club drugs" as a new substance abuse problem, bar employees are also receiving training in ways to spot the presence of illegal drugs.

The task force focuses not only on what happens in the bars but also on the low-price drink specials and other lures commonly featured in bar advertising and promotion. One aim is to persuade bars not to compete with one another by cutting drink prices, says Marian Novak, director of San Diego's Collegiate-Community Alcohol Prevention Partnership (C-CAPP). Price specials tend to increase alcohol consumption and thus produce more drinkers at risk for impaired driving and other problems.

C-CAPP has a full menu of prevention activities aimed at reducing underage and other high-risk drinking among the 140,000 college students attending the San Diego

area's nine colleges and universities. Grants from the U.S. Department of Education and the NIAAA have helped underwrite this work. The coalition includes campus administrators, students, representatives of campus police, local police departments, the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, representatives of alcohol retailers and bars and restaurants, and prevention advocates from community agencies concerned with alcohol issues.

The coalition considers itself to be a prevention "system" rather than a program. It looks at alcohol problems in terms of several "subsystems," including advertising and promotion of alcohol, social norms influencing drinking behavior of students, policies and regulations, retail sales and availability, and drinking in high-risk contexts like tailgate and other student parties.

A Safe and Responsible Party Task Force has developed a close relationship with the San Diego Police Department to carry out a program for quelling noisy parties in neighborhoods around campuses. The program uses a city antinoise ordinance to ban partying at private residences that have generated two or more police visits within a month. The program does not attempt to deal with partying at fraternity and sorority houses. Instead, these organizations are urged to invite nondrinking student monitors to their parties to prevent underage drinking and discourage driving after drinking.

In another activity, Associated Students, a San Diego State University organization, is providing free rides home to partying students who have been drinking at bars in the beach areas. An airport shuttle service under contract to Associated Students keeps three vans available between 11:00 PM and 3:00 AM on Friday and Saturday nights to pick up students who have been drinking and take them home.

➔ *Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.*

The effectiveness of keg registration has been challenged by the alcohol industry, which argues that the law merely induces party organizers to buy beer in six-packs or cases instead of kegs. Even if that is the case, this in itself might be a net benefit, as beer purchased in cans and bottles is more expensive than beer purchased by the keg, a factor that could drive down consumption.

Campus Policies to Restrict Alcohol Availability

On campus, an institutional policy that permits the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages by persons of legal drinking age should include provisions to help prevent underage drinking. Facilities where alcohol is sold—a faculty lounge, student union, or pub—should be required to adhere to the strictest possible RBS code, not only refusing to serve minors and intoxicated patrons but also refraining from any price reductions or promotions that encourage the choice of alcoholic over nonalcoholic beverages.

Many campuses specify times and places where alcohol cannot be consumed, such as substance-free residence halls or residence halls for students under 21. An alcohol-free policy can also be extended to all public areas of the campus, athletics facilities, parking lots, fraternity and sorority recruiting functions, and any social events where a significant number of those in attendance are under age.

Policies for Fraternities, Sororities, and Other Campus Organizations

Alcohol policies that affect fraternities, sororities, and other campus organizations should be adopted and enforced as part of an environmental prevention program. Now that fraternities and sororities increasingly face civil lawsuits connected with alcohol use, many campus chapters and their national offices have become potential sources of sup-

port for effective policies. Their active role in supporting these policies can range from requiring RBS training for alcohol servers at social events to outright bans on alcohol whenever events might attract persons under age 21. A rule requiring social events to be registered and approved by college administrators can help ensure that organizers know the school's policies. Sanctions against organizations can include temporary or permanent suspension, which would then preclude them from recruiting new members or otherwise participating in campus life.



The set of events covered by a **restrictive alcohol policy** should be clearly specified. The University of Tulsa makes its alcohol policy sweeping in its application: “The Alcohol Policy shall apply to every function or event, including but not limited to receptions, banquets, dinners, picnics, or any outdoor event, social event, and campuswide activity sponsored by organizations or individuals associated with the University of Tulsa. In addition, other off-campus University of Tulsa events that imply or express university affiliation are bound by this policy.”⁴⁷

MARKETING AND PROMOTION OF ALCOHOL:

Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus.

Alcohol Advertising

The National Commission on Drug-Free Schools has called for a prohibition of all alcohol advertising in campus newspapers, at sports stadiums, and at all campus events.⁴⁸ One justification is that alcohol marketing often targets youth and young adults without distinguishing between minors and those of legal drinking age, even though more than

Chief to Chief

According to the *Lincoln Star-Journal*, Police Chief Tom Casady of Lincoln, Nebraska, fired off a scolding letter to the police chief in a Florida beach resort after ads in the University of Nebraska campus paper suggested that underage drinking and drunkenness would be tolerated at the resort during spring break. The police chief in Florida responded that he too was upset about the implications of the advertising, and he assured Chief Casady that the laws would be enforced regardless of what the ads implied.

The Lincoln chief has been a supporter of tough enforcement of underage drinking laws in Lincoln as a member of the **➔ NU Directions** campus and community coalition, which pursues a number of strategies aimed at reducing alcohol-related problems among students. Chief Casady has complained about ads in homegrown publications, too, chastising several local bars for promotions that seem to encourage high-risk drinking.

The efforts of Chief Casady and the NU Directions coalition appear to be paying off. Their city had the lowest rate of alcohol-related motor vehicle deaths among the 97 largest cities in the country, according to a study released in 2001 by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.⁴⁹ The University of Nebraska has also reported lower rates of heavy drinking among its students, in contrast with national trends reported in the 2001 College Alcohol Study.⁵⁰

half the students on many campuses are under 21. Moreover, such advertising frequently associates alcohol consumption with tasks that require skilled and quick reactions, including operation of motor vehicles. Independent publications cannot be compelled to eliminate alcohol advertising, but a prevention coalition should still seek voluntary agreements with them to restrict the advertising's content.

Sponsorship of Sports Events

Sponsorship of sports events by alcohol manufacturers reinforces the mistaken idea that drinking goes with activities requiring physical agility and coordination, including operating a motor vehicle. Campuses such as Fresno State University, the University of Minnesota, the University of Kentucky, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill have successfully diminished their dependence on alcohol advertising for intercollegiate athletics, either removing promotional displays from arenas or shifting to other corporate sponsors for television and radio broadcasts.

Comprehensive Ban on Alcohol Advertising

A comprehensive ban on alcohol advertising and promotion should also exclude use of college logos, insignia, or mascots by alcohol manufacturers and prohibit their sponsorship of educational programs and fraternity and sorority events. In addition, these companies should be prohibited from placing sales or promotional representatives on campus.⁵¹

Some institutions might resist a policy banning or otherwise restricting alcohol advertising and promotion because campus publications, athletics departments, or other extracurricular programs have become dependent on advertising income from the alcohol industry. To gain acceptance of a ban, campus administrators should ensure that educational,

sporting, cultural, and prevention-oriented activities are adequately funded without the industry's money. Other potential sources of support include special contributions by alumni, paid advertising by other types of businesses (e.g., soft drink distributors, restaurants, sportswear companies), and higher student fees.⁵²

Price

College students, like other consumers, are sensitive to price in making decisions about drinking. Researchers at the University of Arkansas found that students agreed they would drink more when "all you can drink" specials were available. The study found that high-risk drinkers were more likely than others to drink more when prices were lower. Urging bars and restaurants to avoid price specials as an advertising lure is an important prevention tactic.⁵³

Voluntary Marketing and Advertising Guidelines

Led by the Albany, New York, mayor's office and officials from the University at Albany, State University of New York (SUNY), the city Committee on University and Community Relations worked with the Empire State Restaurant and Tavern Association to persuade owners of bars and restaurants in off-campus student neighborhoods to subscribe to the following **voluntary marketing and advertising guidelines**:⁵⁴

- ▶ Include a statement asking patrons to be respectful of neighborhood residents and to behave responsibly and in a civil manner when leaving the establishment.
- ▶ Eliminate low-price drink promotions, which encourage high rates of alcohol consumption.
- ▶ Emphasize the legal necessity of being 21 years of age or older, with a valid form of identification, to obtain alcohol.

▶ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

- ▶ Avoid language or illustrations that promote irresponsible alcohol consumption.
- ▶ Promote nonalcoholic beverages and food specials to the same extent as alcoholic beverage specials.

Establishments that agree to this advertising code are allowed to display a Cooperating Tavern logo in their ads. The committee monitors publications to assure compliance and works with tavern owners to revise ads that do not comply. Since the program's inception, hotline complaints about students' off-campus conduct have dropped dramatically.

Officials at SUNY New Paltz have also worked with local police and business leaders to promulgate a Tavern Owner's Agreement, with the following additional features:

- ▶ The campus newspaper will accept advertising only from establishments whose owners signed the agreement.
- ▶ A copolicing arrangement between SUNY campus police and the New Paltz police calls for collaborative problem solving, including policing of off-campus parties where underage drinking may occur.

The number of low-price drink specials advertised by local bars has dropped sharply since the inception of the Tavern Owner's Agreement.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT:

Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws.

Campus Regulations

Campus alcohol policies should be reviewed periodically to ensure that they are comprehensive, clearly written, consistently enforced, and include appropriate sanctions for violations. The policies must be specific and detailed so that all concerned understand precisely what is

expected of them. Various policy options and suggestions for wording can be found in *Setting and Improving Policies for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems on Campus: A Guide for Administrators* (see Resources, p. 43).

A participatory process will build greater support for new policies. Senior administrators should seek the participation of diverse campus constituencies in this process, including faculty, staff, campus police, alumni, students, and parents. Community activists, such as representatives from MADD or Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD), can provide community input for campus policy development.

Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA)

The DFSCA specifies important content for an institution's alcohol policies. The act requires institutions of higher education to maintain a written policy that sets forth standards of conduct clearly prohibiting the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of alcohol or illicit drugs on school property or as part of any school activity. The policy must also make clear that certain sanctions apply to student acts committed under the influence, such as public disturbances, endangerment to self or others, or property damage.

According to the DFSCA, the policy must include a clear statement that the institution will impose sanctions up to expulsion or termination of employment and referral for prosecution for violations of its standards of conduct.⁵⁵

Additional sanctions for violations might include mandatory attendance at a prevention education program, loss of privileges, community service, fines, or eviction from college-owned or college-controlled housing. The University of Kentucky's alcohol policy, for example, provides that an athlete convicted of DUI will be suspended from competi-

tion for a year and will be on probation while at the university.

Parental Notification

A survey of judicial affairs officers at 189 institutions in January 2000 by researchers at Bowling Green State University found that 59 percent had parental notification policies in effect, while 25 percent were actively considering adopting such a policy. Some institutions reported lower rates of recidivism after they began notifying parents of violations.⁵⁶

The University of Missouri at Columbia in 2001 adopted a two-step process for parental notification. First, an information packet is sent to underage students and their parents urging them to discuss drinking and other drug use. The materials explain that unless parents choose otherwise, they will be notified when the student commits an alcohol or other drug violation. With 13,600 packets mailed before the 2001–02 academic year, only 121 parents chose not to be notified. During the year, the university sent 48 letters informing parents that their underage children had committed violations. More than half of the violations were for DUI.⁵⁷

Alcohol Policy Violations off Campus

The jurisdiction of campus prevention policies should be carefully defined, generally including all college property as well as events controlled by or associated with the institution, including off-campus events.

The extent to which policies cover off-campus behavior should reflect community norms. Town-gown agreements sometimes provide for local police to notify campus authorities when a student is arrested or ticketed for an alcohol-related offense. Several colleges and universities have specified that an incident occurring off campus will still be considered a violation of the student conduct code.

Orientation Programs

The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience® and Students in Transition estimates that as many as 2,000 U.S. institutions of higher education offer a comprehensive orientation program that includes familiarizing new students with the school's alcohol and other drug policies and with substance-free activities both on and off campus.

Campus officials must also take steps to ensure that students—especially new students—are familiar with the policies, including sanctions. Potential civil liability should be discussed as well. For example, party hosts should be informed that they might be held legally responsible for having provided alcohol to a minor if underage guests are found to be drinking, and that they might be liable for any physical harm caused by an underage guest who was drinking.

At SUNY New Paltz the student handbook, ➡ **Campus Regulations and Judicial Procedures**, is distributed to both students and parents to clarify policies and sanctions concerning alcohol. An orientation program—called *Where's the Party?*—reviews the university's expectations for student conduct. The Collegiate-Community Alcohol Prevention Partnership in San Diego distributes door-hangers in campus neighborhoods to explain laws and penalties for providing alcohol to minors and local ordinances regarding noisy parties.

The Underage Drinking Enforcement Program at the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley offers ➡ **“Stop, Look, and Listen,”** a two-hour presentation on alcohol laws and policies, for students and parents attending summer orientation. During the academic year the program requires underage students who are ticketed for alcohol-related offenses (either on or off campus) to attend a six-hour seminar on alcohol issues.

➡ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

State and Local Laws

Campus and community coalitions should also work to ensure that prevailing state and local laws and regulations are enforced and that proposals for tougher laws receive vocal support from the community.

Selling to Minors

Youth in Action teams organized by local MADD chapters have enlisted underage high school and college students to serve as “decoys” for police patrols that monitor whether alcohol outlets are selling to minors. Most enforcement agencies have strict guidelines for such operations to ensure that they are fair to the alcohol licensees, for example, testing retail clerks only with would-be purchasers who have a youthful appearance and are carrying identification showing that they are indeed under age.

In Hawaii, a decoy operation testing 295 stores found that 39 percent were willing to sell alcohol to a minor. After a year of random testing, the number had declined to 19 percent. In Iowa City, home of the University of Iowa, police reported a 30 percent decline in DUI arrests involving underage drivers after the introduction of a decoy program testing compliance with the law at the city’s 50 bars.⁵⁸ Successful use of decoys in the community suggests that the same tactic could be used to test adherence to the law at on-campus pubs and events where alcohol is served.

The Century Council’s Cops in Shops[®] program uses law enforcement officers posing as retail clerks to deter attempts by underage customers to buy alcohol. The tactic has been used with some success in outlets that are considered popular sources of alcohol for underage drinkers, but its actual effect on illegal sales has not been measured. Some enforcement agencies avoid it

because of the amount of time and energy required to address each violation. A participating officer can monitor only one or two stores in an evening, whereas the same officer running a decoy program can test a dozen or more establishments for compliance in the same length of time.

Underage Sellers

The age at which young people can legally sell and serve alcohol ranges from 16 to 21 and varies from state to state. California, for example, allows 18 year olds to sell alcohol if they are under “continuous supervision” by someone over 21. Some state laws differentiate between those who serve alcohol and those who merely sell packaged alcoholic beverages over the counter in retail establishments.

Underage sellers have greater difficulty than those over 21 refusing sales to underage buyers. They are more likely to misjudge the customer’s age, make exceptions for friends and acquaintances, and respond to peer pressure. Even so, efforts to pass state laws that prohibit underage sellers may encounter resistance from the business community because of the effect such legislation would have on employment policies.

Adults Providing Alcohol to Underage Drinkers

Tougher state laws can also help discourage adults from providing alcohol to underage drinkers. In Minnesota, a recent law makes it a felony to have provided alcohol to a minor who suffers serious injury or death as a result, while another new law allows persons harmed by an underage drinker to sue any adults who provided alcohol to that person. Says an advocate of these recent Minnesota laws: “Our message is, selling or giving alcohol to kids is wrong and will get you in a world of trouble.”⁵⁹

Keeping Up with the Law

All states make it illegal to sell or provide alcohol to persons under age 21 and to intoxicated persons, but the way the laws are interpreted and applied varies from state to state. Generally, the laws provide for criminal penalties such as fines or administrative remedies, including forfeiture of alcohol licenses. Civil court decisions in different states have led to variations in legal liability for cases in which alcohol service can be linked to death, injury, or property damage. College and university administrators should work with legal counsel to keep careful watch on new legislation and case law in their state and to assess their implications for the school’s AOD policies.

“Shoulder-tap” enforcement programs use underage decoys to discourage adult purchases of alcohol on behalf of minors. The term derives from the image of minors approaching adults outside an alcohol retail outlet, tapping them on the shoulder, and asking them to purchase alcohol on the minors’ behalf. Retailers are often willing to help with shoulder-tap programs because laws in many states hold them responsible for such activities in the immediate vicinity of their establishments.

Sobriety Checkpoints

Sobriety checkpoints are an important tool for DUI enforcement. A police officer detecting evidence of alcohol use by a driver can ask the driver to take a breath test to establish BAC. In many states, refusal to take the test leads to immediate driver’s license suspension.

The value of sobriety checkpoints goes beyond apprehending drunken drivers. In fact, relatively few drivers are arrested at checkpoints. Yet with appropriate publicity, the checkpoints can have a significant dampening effect on impaired driving. The knowledge that police may be conducting checkpoints can be a deterrent to those who might otherwise decide to drive after drinking.⁶⁰

The Colorado State Patrol (CSP) works closely with city, county, and campus police forces during high-risk periods. In 2001, the CSP took note of the rising rate of alcohol use at Halloween parties. In response, more than 500 police and sheriff’s officers throughout the state were assigned to checkpoints and other DUI enforcement measures during the Halloween party season. Colorado members of the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network helped spread the word about the **Halloween crackdown** in order to enhance its deterrent effect and to

encourage partying students to use designated drivers or alternative transportation.

Fake IDs

Laws covering fake IDs vary from state to state, as do policies and programs for their enforcement. Police departments and other enforcement agencies can conduct workshops for alcohol licensees to teach them how to spot counterfeit or altered IDs, usually driver’s licenses. In Boston, fake IDs are confiscated by servers and retailers and turned over to police, who fax copies to college and university officials for whatever action they choose to take. At Boston College, for example, the consequences include a \$100 fine and suspension of eligibility for campus housing until the student reaches age 21. In addition to these sanctions, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts suspends the offender’s driver’s license for six months.

“Zero Tolerance” Laws

All states have adopted “zero tolerance” laws that set a lower (.00 to .02 percent) BAC limit for drivers under age 21. These laws have been credited with reducing alcohol-related automobile crashes among young people by 20 percent.⁶¹ Research shows that the deterrent effect of such laws is magnified through public awareness.⁶² Information about “zero tolerance” laws should be included in all alcohol education programs and orientation sessions for first-year students.

Young people taking part in MADD’s Youth in Action program have helped draw the attention of police departments to the importance of enforcing “zero tolerance” laws.⁶³ Police in some states have maintained that the laws, as written, make them difficult to enforce. In this case, a campus and community coalition can seek legislative changes to correct the problem.

➔ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Campus and community coalitions working on enforcement of zero tolerance and other traffic safety measures may find valuable assistance from the Governors Highway Safety Association. More information about this nationwide program is available at its Web site (statehighwaysafety.org).

Area of Strategic Intervention Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions

Effects of Alcohol on Ability to Drive

Students should make decisions about drinking based on fact rather than myth. For example, each semester Colorado State University (CSU) presents

➔ **Rights, Responsibilities, and Ramifications**, a workshop that tells students about the effects of alcohol on their reflexes and ability to drive, discusses what is likely to happen if they are caught driving under the influence, and explains their legal rights. Also included is a description of Colorado's "zero tolerance" law for underage drinking drivers. A CSU police officer and the university's director of legal services present the workshop.

The workshop features a demonstration of how alcohol can affect a would-be driver. Under police supervision, a resident assistant who is over 21 drinks to the point of impairment—a point that comes sooner than most students would expect. Students at the workshop are also invited to use goggles that simulate impaired vision and then ride tricycles through an obstacle course to get an idea of what driving after drinking can be like. By the time they leave, students not only know a lot more about driving after drinking but have also received

information about campus resources that can help them with alcohol problems.

Area of Strategic Intervention Health Protection

Designated Driver Programs

Since 1993, NHTSA and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention have recommended designated driver programs as a means for drinkers of legal age to avoid driving after drinking. With this strategy, a group going out to a social event where alcohol is to be consumed selects one person to abstain and be responsible for driving. An important aspect of designated driver programs is that publicity about them reminds the public that it is irresponsible to drive after drinking.⁶⁵

Designated driver programs have flourished in spite of reservations by some prevention advocates, who worry that the programs may encourage high-risk drinking by the designated driver's passengers. In fact, a 1993 survey of more than 17,000 U.S. college students established that designated driver programs have a net beneficial effect. Among drinkers, 1,908 students who could be classified as heavy drinkers reported not drinking heavily the last time they served as a designated driver. At the same time, only 1,031 students who normally would not be classified as heavy drinkers reported drinking heavily the last time they rode with a designated driver. The study's authors note, however, that the exact contribution of this strategy to reducing motor vehicle crashes still needs to be determined.⁶⁶

Some designated driver programs are based on working relationships with bars and restaurants popular with students.

Spring Break

Underage drinking and other alcohol problems during spring break have led authorities in many resort areas to step up enforcement when students flood their communities. The strain on local enforcement agencies may be such that they will need to seek special funding from the state government to cover the expense of enhanced patrols. In Texas, a state grant allowed the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission to assign 36 agents to join local law enforcement officers in patrolling beach areas near Brownsville and on South Padre Island during the 2002 spring break.

Other resort communities are trying to discourage the flood of vacationing students. In 2002, the influx of 150,000 students who converged on Daytona Beach, Florida, during spring break led to "fist-fights, underage drinking, trashed hotel rooms, and police-supervised evictions," according to local press reports. Under pressure from the Volusia County Council, the Daytona region's spring break advertising budget for the following year was cut in half (from \$125,000 to \$62,500); the goal of this down-sized campaign is to draw in more family-oriented tourists.⁶⁴

➔ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

"We Want You to Turn 22 . . . "

Many colleges and universities must cope with a recent tradition among some students calling for a night of heavy drinking to celebrate a 21st birthday, when purchasing alcohol becomes legal. Georgetown University's Health Education Services sends students turning 21 a birthday card with the message, "We want you to turn 22 . . . celebrate responsibly." Cal Poly, Pomona, came up with a variation on the same theme: a program reminding birthday celebrants that their 21st birthday "does not equal 21 drinks."

The establishment agrees to provide free beverages such as coffee or soft drinks to the designated driver and in return receives free publicity. A program at the University of New Mexico,

➔ **Designated Drivers Do It for Friends**, uses free movie passes and other rewards to enlist designated drivers. The program also has persuaded many local bars and restaurants to provide free non-alcoholic drinks and waive cover charges for the nondrinking driver.

Safe Rides Program

Designated driver programs work when drinkers are part of a group. For drinkers who would otherwise be driving home alone or riding with an impaired driver, an alternative is a "safe rides" program that provides safe and sober transportation. The ride home is provided free or at a reduced rate. A student-managed program called ➔ **CARPOOL** at Texas A&M University offers rides home to students on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights between 10:00 PM and 3:00 AM. The program uses rented cars and enlists and trains students as volunteer drivers. The \$200,000 budget is covered by fundraising events and donations from sources in the community.

Area of Strategic Intervention and Treatment

.....
A new study recommends that colleges and universities implement strategies to identify and screen high-risk student drinkers and to ensure that treatment is readily available for those who are diagnosed with alcohol disorders. The study, based on questionnaires filled out by 14,000 students at 119 four-year U.S. colleges, indicated that 31 percent of students meet the clinical criteria for

misuse of alcohol, while 6 percent meet the criteria for alcohol dependency.⁶⁷

Interactive Course

The University of New Mexico (UNM) developed the Alcohol Awareness and Education program for students adjudicated for first-time alcohol infractions. The UNM course is a ➔ **three-hour, interactive session** facilitated by a trained graduate student and an undergraduate assistant. The course emphasizes decision-making, risk reduction, and moderation in alcohol use rather than abstinence.

One-on-One Intervention

A program at Auburn University in Alabama calls for ➔ **one-on-one intervention** with students who violate an alcohol policy or are having other alcohol-related problems. The program provides a motivational interview conducted by a doctoral student in clinical psychology. The approach is neither punitive nor confrontational, but instead seeks to encourage a self-appraisal of the student's drinking habits and a full consideration of whether and how to make lifestyle changes.



While informative, this review of current prevention policies and programs cannot be translated into a simple formula to follow. Members of a campus and community coalition can learn from what others have tried, but ultimately they must devise, through trial and error, a tailored approach that fits the needs of their own community. This means, therefore, that each coalition will need to have a feedback and evaluation mechanism in place to monitor its prevention efforts, verify that they are being fully implemented as planned, and ensure that they are actually working well to reduce alcohol-related problems.

➔ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Reshaping the Campus and Community Environment at UC Santa Barbara—→ Case Study of a Comprehensive Approach

The University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), was one of the first universities in the nation to recognize alcohol use as a serious issue for students when it introduced an alcohol awareness program in 1980. In the 1990s, UCSB was also in the forefront in adopting an environmental management approach for AOD prevention efforts and in targeting DUI in particular.

UCSB has 17,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate students. Many of them drive regularly to the nearby city of Santa Barbara for the music, dancing, and alcohol outlets to be found there, creating obvious risks for alcohol-impaired driving. Those who stay closer to the campus—in the adjacent community of Isla Vista—are also at risk for injury due to alcohol. Because bicycles are the favorite mode of short-trip transportation in and around Isla Vista, UCSB's prevention program targets both DUI and BUI (*bicycling* under the influence).

Grants from the California Office of Traffic Safety helped cover the start-up costs for a set of prevention initiatives that ultimately evolved into a comprehensive program involving students, staff, faculty, administrators, and the Isla Vista community. UCSB received an award from the Automobile Club of Southern California for its concerted effort to reduce driving after drinking and other high-risk use of alcohol.

Before the students return each fall, a steering committee called the AOD Workgroup formulates a strategic plan for the coming year, based on a review of the prior year's prevention activities and what has been learned about their strengths and weaknesses. The committee, representing university departments and organizations responsible for prevention work, meets biweekly throughout the academic year to monitor programs and revise strategies as necessary. Once each quarter, a larger campus and community coalition and the Isla Vista Ad Hoc Task Force on Community

Standards come together to discuss the recommendations and strategies proposed by the AOD Workgroup.

UCSB's current program includes a range of activities, outlined below.

AREA OF STRATEGIC INTERVENTION: Environmental Change

Alcohol-Free Options: Weekly alcohol-free social activities are offered for students through on- and off-campus residence halls, sports clubs, and a recreation center. The Office of Student Life hosts student focus groups to plan and organize new activities that reflect current interests and popular tastes and can compete with entertainment and recreational activities where alcohol is available.

Normative Environment: UCSB students, like students at other colleges and universities, typically overestimate the amount of drinking that is "normal" in the campus population.⁶⁸ To correct this misperception, the university's social norms marketing campaign uses posters, cups, key chains, and media advertising to convey accurate information about current drinking levels.

Alcohol Availability: UCSB's Substance Abuse Policy Implementation Guidelines require training for all servers of alcoholic beverages at campus events. Through the Isla Vista Responsible Landlord program, the university works with landlords in the area to help them establish and implement policies that will reduce disorderly partying and other problems resulting from their tenants' alcohol use. The university also works with the district office of the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to maintain a moratorium on issuing new alcohol outlet licenses in Isla Vista.

Policy Development and Law Enforcement: Law enforcement officers from the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department, the California Highway Patrol, and the UCSB campus police jointly patrol

→ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Case Study of a Comprehensive Approach *(continued)*

the Isla Vista community, adhering to a policy of zero tolerance for alcohol violations. The university applies its campus policies covering alcohol use to several large, privately owned student residence halls in Isla Vista to maintain consistency in sanctions for violations. Managers of the residence halls welcomed the extension of university authority to their tenants as a means of reinforcing their own rules of behavior.

AREA OF STRATEGIC INTERVENTION: Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions

UCSB health educators produced "Drinking Stories," a video that recounts how AOD affected the lives of four typical UCSB students. The video is shown to stimulate discussions in workshops with students considered at high risk for alcohol problems, including first-year students and members of fraternities and sororities.

Sociology Department courses—"Drugs and Stress," "Substance Abuse," and "Community Health"—include lectures and assignments related to alcohol risks and DUI. Department faculty teamed up with colleagues from the Dramatic Art Department to teach a "Reader's Theater" class that trains students to perform skits and facilitate discussions with first-year students about AOD use, including driving after drinking and BUI.

AREA OF STRATEGIC INTERVENTION: Intervention and Treatment

Individual counseling and support groups are offered through the Career Services and Student Health and Counseling offices, including programs for DUI offenders under court mandate to participate. Staff members who work with large numbers of students, such as coaches and residence hall monitors, receive "gatekeeper training" so that they can assess and refer students who appear to need counseling. Similarly, parents of students are offered workshops to help them recognize and intervene if their child exhibits signs of AOD-related problems. The emergency room at a hospital near campus reports students involved in alcohol-related cases to the student health service for follow-up.

In its annual Core Survey, UCSB has found that rates of heavy, episodic drinking have not changed significantly in the last decade. Even so, there is substantial evidence that the program is changing student behavior. The number of students who say they have ever driven after drinking declined from 36 percent in 1992 to 24 percent in 2001. The percentage reporting some form of misconduct that got them into trouble with the police or other disciplinary action declined from 56 percent in 1992 to 41 percent in 2001.

Strategic Planning and Evaluation

Developing and Evaluating Prevention Policies and Programs	38
1. Conduct a Risk Assessment.....	39
2. Identify Specific Goals and Objectives.....	39
3. Review the Evaluation Research on Policy and Program Options.....	39
4. Outline How the Intervention Will Work.....	39
5. Create and Execute a Data Collection Plan.....	40
	◆ ◆ ◆
Meeting the Challenge	42



Strategic Planning and Evaluation

Community mobilization, involving a coalition of civic and governmental officials, is widely recognized as a key to the successful prevention of alcohol and other drug problems.⁶⁹ Recently formed campus and community coalitions have been inspired by several community-based interventions to reduce alcohol-related problems among youth and the general adult population.

The *Community Prevention Trial* (CPT), for example, was implemented in three small towns in California and South Carolina.⁷⁰ Community coalitions were formed to drive several major environmental change strategies: RBS training; zoning restrictions to reduce alcohol outlet density; stricter enforcement of underage drinking laws; and enhanced DUI enforcement, which included police officer training, additional officer enforcement hours, monthly sobriety checkpoints, and use of passive alcohol sensors. Results included the following:⁷¹

- ▶ Increased adoption of RBS policies
 - ▶ Reduced alcohol sales to minors
 - ▶ A 6 percent decline in self-reported alcohol consumption
 - ▶ A 51 percent decline in self-reported driving after drinking
 - ▶ A 6 percent drop in single-vehicle nighttime crashes (a proxy measure for alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes)
 - ▶ Fewer drivers with measured BACs of .05 percent or higher
- ▶ A 43 percent decline in assault injuries reported by emergency departments

For many years, community-based prevention coalitions have made changes in state, local, and institutional policy a priority. Part of what is happening today is that campus officials are beginning to think about a similar set of prevention strategies. Where a community prevention coalition already exists, college officials should be invited to join. Where no coalition is in place, higher education officials, especially college and university presidents, can take the lead with community partners to form the coalition and move it toward an environmental management approach to prevention.

The planning committee or task force charged with organizing a campus and community coalition should seek the broad participation of campus and community leaders. Possible choices for coalition membership include the following:

- ▶ **Campus leaders:** senior administrators, faculty and staff, students, campus police chief
- ▶ **Business representatives:** liquor store owners, bar and restaurant owners, apartment owners
- ▶ **Local government leaders:** elected officials, public health director, community development and zoning officials
- ▶ **Local law enforcement officials:** municipal police chief, alcohol beverage control (ABC) officials

- ▶ **Prevention and treatment experts:** AOD treatment directors, community-based prevention leaders (e.g., MADD representative), community-based traffic safety leaders
- ▶ **Other community leaders:** neighborhood coalition leaders, faith-based organization leaders, local news media representatives

Potentially conflicting viewpoints among the coalition members can be reconciled when all segments of the community work together and eventually agree on the need to take action to reduce the incidence of underage drinking and alcohol-impaired driving, not just among college students but among all young people in the community.

As the campus and community coalition begins its strategic planning work, it should embrace intervention development and evaluation as an iterative process, in which evaluation findings help to inform midcourse corrections and alterations.⁷² This approach requires prevention planners to consider evaluation from the beginning, not as an afterthought.

Developing and Evaluating Prevention Policies and Programs

The process for developing and evaluating prevention policies and programs can be divided into five basic stages: (1) conduct a risk assessment, (2) identify specific goals and objectives, (3) review the evaluation research on policy and program options, (4) outline how the intervention will work, and (5) create and execute a data collection plan. Basic considerations for each stage are described below. A fuller description of these steps can be found at the Web site of the U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention (<http://www.higheredcenter.org/eval>).

Two Enforcement Systems

Working out a collaborative relationship between campus-based and community law enforcement agencies is vital if there is to be a comprehensive and coordinated effort to address underage drinking and DUI in the community. Meeting this challenge requires careful negotiation, open communication, and an understanding of agency differences in their approach to enforcement. This can come about more easily when law enforcement officials fully understand the organizational pressures and cultural context in which the other agency operates.

In Ames, Iowa, the 30 officers of the Iowa State University campus police collaborate closely with the 50 officers of the Ames Police Department. Charles Cychosz, who

served on the faculty and staff of the university before becoming an administrator in the Police Department, notes that both enforcement agencies are represented on the campus and community alcohol task force, which meets once a month. One result is that campus and city police sometimes **operate joint enforcement teams** to check for fake IDs at the city's bars.

For more on the issue of campus and community law enforcement collaboration, see *Law Enforcement and Higher Education: Finding Common Ground to Address Underage Drinking on Campus*, published in 2001 by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

▶ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

1. CONDUCT A RISK ASSESSMENT

Conducting a risk assessment is an essential first step in understanding the problem and identifying the factors that might be supporting or encouraging underage drinking and DUI. The *College Alcohol Risk Assessment Guide*⁷³ provides a step-by-step procedure and several worksheets for conducting such an assessment. Depending on the time and resources available, the assessment can range from focus groups, one-on-one interviews, and a tour of entertainment spots on weekend nights to conducting student surveys and analyzing data on DUI arrests, emergency room visits, and other alcohol-related incidents on campus and in the surrounding community. The typology of campus and community prevention efforts presented in table 1, combined with the list of strategic objectives and intervention tactics presented in table 2, can be used to generate a list of assessment issues and questions.

2. IDENTIFY SPECIFIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Program planners should take sufficient time to specify their precise goals and objectives. This guide focuses on reducing underage drinking and DUI, but that still leaves open several other possible goals. Should campuses try to prevent underage drinking? Eliminate all student drinking? Limit excessive consumption? Reduce alcohol-related behavior problems? Protect students from harm? Significantly, having an evaluator be part of the planning process will help the planning group develop clear and specific goals and objectives.

Caution should be used in stating that a prevention intervention program's goal is to eliminate underage drinking. Upholding the law is an appropriate goal. But with the widespread use of alcohol among underage college stu-

dents, a bold declaration of this intent may badly undermine support among those administrators, faculty, and students who deplore the "age 21" laws. In many cases the coalition might be on surer footing politically—and therefore have a greater chance of success—if it were to focus on addressing alcohol-related problems in the community, especially DUI. Such an approach would likely produce a list of policy and program objectives not very different from what would emerge from a narrower focus on alcohol consumption—for example, cracking down on the manufacture and use of fake IDs, checking compliance at retail alcohol outlets, eliminating home delivery of alcohol, increasing alcohol excise taxes, eliminating low-price drink specials, and installing RBS programs.

3. REVIEW THE EVALUATION RESEARCH ON POLICY AND PROGRAM OPTIONS

The next step is to review policy and program options that might be applied to achieve the outlined goals and objectives. A review of available research, plus consultations with other prevention specialists, will suggest a set of programmatic options that can be adopted. As noted in part 2, Environmental Management—Proven Prevention Practices (p. 7), the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking identified several effective and promising approaches in its report *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges*. Additional information describing selected policies and programs can be found in part 3, Prevention in Action (p. 19).

4. OUTLINE HOW THE INTERVENTION WILL WORK

The next planning step is to outline the chain of events that will lead from each policy or program to its specific and measurable objective, and from there to its ultimate goal. Describing this chain of

events is often called building the *logic model* for the intervention. In essence, the logic model clarifies the intervening steps that are projected to lead from specific activities to specific outcomes. For the evaluation, data can be collected to document progress at each step. With this information in hand, evaluators can diagnose what went wrong if a program or policy fails to meet its ultimate objective.

5. CREATE AND EXECUTE A DATA COLLECTION PLAN

Self-report surveys are a primary data source for policy and program evaluations, especially if the goal is to reduce consumption or alcohol-related problem behaviors. Several alternative survey instruments can be used as sources of questions.⁷⁴ Surveys should be administered at a time that reflects typical

drinking patterns. Surveys conducted shortly after the start of the school year, after traditional social events (e.g., homecoming), or close to midterms or final exams will not provide representative data. Hence, most national student drinking surveys are conducted in the early part of the spring semester before spring break.

Most important, the sample of students asked to participate in the survey must be drawn at random. It may be tempting to administer the survey in classrooms, but this will not result in a sample that is truly representative of all students. There must also be a set of procedures in place to boost the response rate. Achieving a response rate of 70 percent or more for student surveys is extremely difficult. More typical are rates between 50 and 60 percent.

Going Statewide

More than 40 states are working with the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention to explore the benefits of having their institutions of higher education adopt unified policies and strategies to combat underage drinking and impaired driving. These statewide initiatives call for unprecedented levels of cooperation among state and local agencies and college and university systems.

The Ohio College Initiative to Reduce High Risk Drinking brings together more than 40 public and private institutions in a shared effort to change the college and community environment surrounding alcohol use. The president of each institution has made a commitment to address high-risk drinking and to "encourage and support the collaboration of **➔ campus and community** in approaching this issue."

The California State University (CSU) system has entered into a **➔ formal partnership** with six state agencies to develop

coordinated policies and programs aimed at reducing alcohol problems among the 388,000 students at 23 CSU campuses throughout the state. A memorandum of understanding setting up the partnership was signed by the CSU chancellor and representatives of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, California Highway Patrol, Department of Motor Vehicles, Office of Traffic Safety, and the Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing.

The California partnership commits both the state university system and the state agencies to work cooperatively on prevention, jointly collecting and sharing data; develop joint alcohol education, enforcement, training, and prevention programs for campus and community leaders; cooperate on a legislative agenda; and participate in an annual conference on alcohol issues. Underage drinking and DUI prevention figures prominently in plans for the California initiative.

➔ Please refer to the Resources section for contact information.

Colleges and universities should also put in place a system for recording alcohol-related incidents involving students. Especially important are incident-reporting forms used by the campus police, which should require officers to indicate whether a student being investigated, cited, or detained has been using alcohol. A direct BAC reading using a “passive” breathalyzer, which analyzes exhaled air in front of the mouth, is the best means of assessment. Absent that, the officers can be asked to

make a judgment about alcohol involvement.

Ideas regarding evaluation can also be found in NHTSA’s booklet *The Art of Appropriate Evaluation: A Guide for Highway Safety Program Managers*.⁷⁵ In addition, the U.S. Department of Education’s Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention maintains an evaluator database as well as other evaluation resources, including a guide on how to work with an outside evaluator.⁷⁶

Getting MADD

MADD, which has more than 600 affiliates across the country, states that its mission is to “stop drunk driving, support the victims of this violent crime, and prevent underage drinking.” In pursuit of that mission, local MADD affiliates are urged to participate in campus and community coalitions to assist with planning and implementing prevention strategies to combat underage drinking and DUI. In 2001, the organization launched a program to create on-campus MADD chapters led by students (UMADD).

These efforts are in line with a report by MADD’s College Commission, which offered the following recommendations:

- Work with researchers and practitioners to set a national standard for college alcohol policies.

- Assess institutions of higher education on the basis of their alcohol policies and offer that assessment to parents and students as a guide in selecting colleges and universities.
- Involve college students in prevention activities through policy summits, advocacy training programs, and student-led college chapters of MADD.
- Support campus and community coalitions in their efforts to reduce underage and heavy drinking.
- Create a campaign to support and promote campus alcohol policies.

More information about MADD and its campus initiatives can be obtained at MADD’s Web site: <http://www.madd.org>.

Meeting the Challenge

.....

This guide cites numerous examples of how U.S. colleges and universities, in partnership with their communities, have approached the issues of underage drinking and DUI. Obviously, there is no one-size-fits-all formula for this type of prevention work. The environmental management strategies outlined here have had good results where they have been implemented, but each campus and community environment is different, shaped by its own blend of history, tradition, politics, economics, and other influences. What is important, therefore, is that prevention planners use the research literature to identify potentially useful policies and programs but then evaluate how well these efforts can work on their own campus.⁷⁷

Campus and community leaders must be prepared to overcome indifference, if not outright hostility, toward certain prevention efforts. Many faculty, staff, and students over the age of 21 drink alcohol in ways that incur little risk to themselves or others and therefore may object to policies that limit their own access to alcohol in the name of preventing underage drinking and impaired driving.

Students in their late teens are often reluctant to accept restrictions on their behavior that appear to be coming from adult authorities. Many regard alcohol as a helpful social lubricant and are quick to reject what they hear about the risks associated with drinking. Still other students, as well as faculty and staff, might argue that hard drinking by students, even those who are under age, is a part of long-standing campus traditions or that being introduced to alcohol is a “rite of passage” from adolescence to adulthood.

Even those who sympathize with prevention goals might be doubtful that anything can be done. Skeptics may argue

that many students begin drinking in high school, so that by their college years it is too late to do anything about it. Others think that bearing down on enforcement of the minimum legal drinking age simply will not deter young people from seeking out other opportunities to obtain alcohol. Some have even argued that cooperating with enforcement agencies regarding students’ off-campus behavior is inappropriate for an educational institution.

A successful prevention program must recognize the ambivalence felt by many adults toward underage drinking. Even law enforcement agencies might resist giving priority to underage drinking on the grounds that their limited resources can better be devoted to crime problems they regard as more serious—even though underage drinking is a factor in many community problems that townspeople do take very seriously.

In response, campus and community leaders must remind people that underage drinking and DUI are serious problems affecting the entire community, not just the drinkers themselves. They need to highlight the fact that colleges and universities have a legal duty to take reasonable protective measures to reduce hazards and risks in the campus environment.⁷⁸ They should cite research evaluations showing the positive effect of the increased minimum legal drinking age and other policies and programs that can change the environmental context in which young people make decisions about drinking.

Most of all, town and gown leaders need to dedicate themselves to working on this problem over the long term. There is no quick fix, but over time a persistent and multifaceted effort can succeed in changing the culture of drinking, building a safer and healthier campus and community environment, and maximizing the opportunity for all students to achieve their potential.

Resources

CITED PROGRAMS 45

Area of Strategic Intervention Environmental Change 45

Alcohol-Free Options: Offer and promote alcohol-free social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs.....45

- **Alcohol-Free Events**.....45
- **Volunteer Community Service**.....46

Normative Environment: Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms46

- **Social Norms Marketing Campaigns**.....46

Alcohol Availability: Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus.....46

- **A Community Covenant**.....46

Marketing and Promotion of Alcohol: Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus47

- **Alcohol Advertising**.....47
- **Voluntary Marketing and Advertising Guidelines**.....47

Policy Development and Law Enforcement: Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws47

- **Orientation Programs**.....47
- **Sobriety Checkpoints**.....47
- **Two Enforcement Systems**.....47

Area of Strategic Intervention Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions 48

- **Effects of Alcohol on Ability to Drive**.....48

Area of Strategic Intervention Health Protection 48

- **Designated Driver Programs**.....48
- **Safe Rides Program**.....48

Area of Strategic Intervention Intervention and Treatment 48

- **Interactive Course**.....48
- **One-on-One Intervention**.....48
- **Case Study of a Comprehensive Approach**.....49

Strategic Planning 49

Going Statewide: Develop a statewide or regional prevention initiative to develop and support new campus and community coalitions49

- **Formal Partnerships**.....49

PUBLICATIONS 49

From the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration49

From the U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention50

From the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism51

From the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.....51

RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS 52

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).....52

Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS).....52

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.....52

Automobile Club of Southern California.....53

BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network53

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD).....53

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (NCADI).....54

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA).....54

The Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues.....54



Resources

The resources listed here include a selection of the programs cited in the guide, publications, and resource organizations. No official endorsement by the U.S. Departments of Education or Transportation of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred. To identify additional resources, contact the U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention (see below for complete contact information).

CITED PROGRAMS

The following section provides contact information for the college-based programs (in order of appearance) described in part 3, Prevention in Action. The programs are organized according to the typology matrix for mapping campus and community prevention efforts (see table 1, p.10) and cross-referenced to their description in the main text.

Area of Strategic Intervention Environmental Change

ALCOHOL-FREE OPTIONS:

Offer and promote alcohol-free social, recreational, extracurricular, and public service options that do not include alcohol and other drugs.

Alcohol-Free Events

- ➔ **WVUP All Night**, West Virginia University, Office of Student Affairs, Morgantown, WV 26506. (304) 293-5811. A social and recreational program that provides free food and entertainment to students as an alternative to the weekend bar scene (p. 21).
- ➔ Boston College, Office of the Dean for Student Development, 140 Commonwealth Avenue, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467. (617) 552-3470. A **community service program** and **sports competition** designed to replace an annual dance notorious for high-risk drinking (p. 21).

- ➔ **PRIDE (Promoting Responsible and Informed Decisions through Education)**, University of Redlands, Student Services, P.O. Box 3080, Redlands, CA 92373-0999. (909) 335-4079. An ambitious social and recreational program that features a weekly schedule of alcohol-free events, including live entertainment and hit movies (p. 21).

Volunteer Community Service

- ➔ **Alternative Breaks**, Central Michigan University, Volunteer Center, Mount Pleasant, MI 48859. (989) 774-7685. A community service program that organizes groups of students for off-site, community-based volunteer work during holiday breaks (p. 22).
- ➔ **Alternative Weekends**, University of Michigan, Center for Community Service and Learning, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. (734) 936-2437. A community service program that organizes groups of students for local, community-based volunteer work on weekends (p. 22).

NORMATIVE ENVIRONMENT:

Create a social, academic, and residential environment that supports health-promoting norms.

Social Norms Marketing Campaigns

- ➔ **7 out of 10**, University of Texas, Longhorns Against Drunk Driving, Student Health Center, Austin, TX 78712. (512) 475-8465. A social norms marketing campaign based on a student survey showing that 7 out of 10 UT students don't drink and drive. The 7 out of 10 Web site is at <http://www.socialnorm.org/texasaustin.html> (p. 22).
- ➔ **MOST of Us**, Montana Social Norms Project, Montana State University, Department of Health and Human Development, Bozeman, MT 59717. (406) 994-7873. A social norms marketing project based on a random sample survey indicating that four out of five 18 to 21 year olds in Montana don't drink and drive (p. 22).

ALCOHOL AVAILABILITY:

Limit alcohol availability both on and off campus.

A Community Covenant

- ➔ San Diego State Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-1931. (619) 594-6859. A "**community covenant**" by which bar and restaurant operators catering to students pledge to pursue several policies to minimize underage drinking and driving under the influence (p. 24).

MARKETING AND PROMOTION OF ALCOHOL:

Restrict marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus.

Alcohol Advertising

- ➔ **NU Directions**, University of Nebraska, Student Involvement, Lincoln, NE 68588. (402) 472-2454. A campus and community coalition, funded by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, emphasizing enforcement of underage drinking laws and restrictions on alcohol advertising and promotion (p. 25).

Voluntary Marketing and Advertising Guidelines

- ➔ University at Albany, State University of New York, Coordinator for Alcohol and Drug Prevention, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222. (518) 442-5800. A joint university-community committee that works with owners of bars and restaurants in off-campus student neighborhoods to implement a **voluntary set of guidelines** to reform alcohol advertising and promotion (p. 26).

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT:

Develop and enforce campus policies and local, state, and federal laws.

Orientation Programs

- ➔ State University of New York, University of New Paltz, Division of Student Affairs, 75 S. Manheim Boulevard, New Paltz, NY 12561. (845) 257-3261. A handbook, *Campus Regulations and Judicial Procedures*, distributed to both parents and students that explains campus policies and state and local laws regarding alcohol use and what disciplinary actions can result for violations (p. 28).
- ➔ University of Northern Colorado, Student Activities, 501 20th Street, Greeley, CO 80639. (970) 351-2245. A summer orientation for new students and parents, which includes “**Stop, Look, and Listen,**” a two-hour presentation on alcohol laws and policies (p. 28).

Sobriety Checkpoints

- ➔ The BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network, BACCHUS and GAMMA, P.O. Box 100430, Denver, CO 80250-0430. (303) 871-0901. A collaborative effort with the Colorado State Patrol to crack down on DUI during Colorado’s “**Halloween Heatwave**” (p. 30).

Two Enforcement Systems

- ➔ Ames Police Department, Ames, IA 50011. (515) 239-5311. Contact: Charles Cychosz, Support Services Manager. A **joint enforcement program** in which campus police officers join city police on random patrols to bars in the city to check drinkers’ IDs (p.38).

Area of Strategic Intervention

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions

.....

Effects of Alcohol on Ability to Drive

- ➔ Colorado State University, Center for Drug and Alcohol Education, Fort Collins, CO 80523. (970) 491-0262. **Rights, Responsibilities, and Ramifications**, a workshop that informs students about alcohol's effect on their reflexes and driving ability and what is likely to happen if they are caught driving under the influence (p. 31).

Area of Strategic Intervention

Health Protection

.....

Designated Driver Programs

- ➔ University of New Mexico, Campus Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, Albuquerque, NM 87131. (505) 277-2795. A program called **Designated Drivers Do It for Friends** uses free movie passes and other rewards to enlist designated drivers (p. 32).

Safe Rides Program

- ➔ **CARPOOL**, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 77843. (979) 693-9905. A student-managed program, which provides rides home to students on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights between 10:00 PM and 3:00 AM (p. 32).

Area of Strategic Intervention

Intervention and Treatment

.....

Interactive Course

- ➔ University of New Mexico, Campus Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, Albuquerque, NM 87131. (505) 277-2795. A **three-hour course**, emphasizing decision making, risk reduction, and moderation in alcohol use rather than abstinence, for students who violate the university's alcohol policies (p. 32).

One-on-One Intervention

- ➔ Auburn University, Health Behavior Assessment Center, Auburn, AL 36849. (334) 844-4889. A brief, **one-on-one motivational interview** for students who violate the school's alcohol policies or have other alcohol-related problems (p. 32).

Case Study of a Comprehensive Approach

- ➔ University of California, Santa Barbara, Alcohol and Other Drug Program, Student Health Service Building 588, Santa Barbara, CA 93106. (805) 893-2263. A comprehensive approach that includes environmental change as well as intervention and treatment (pp. 33–34).

Strategic Planning

GOING STATEWIDE:

Develop a statewide or regional prevention initiative to develop and support new campus and community coalitions.

Formal Partnerships

- ➔ Ohio College Initiative to Reduce High Risk Drinking, Ohio Parents for Drug Free Youth, 6185 Huntley Road, Suite P, Columbus, OH 43229-1094. (614) 540-9985. A statewide initiative that brings together **campus and community** coalitions representing more than 40 public and private institutions of higher education in Ohio (p. 40).
- ➔ California State University (CSU) Partnership, Office of the Chancellor, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802-4210. (562) 951-4000. A **formal partnership** with six state agencies to develop coordinated policies and programs aimed at reducing alcohol problems among students at 23 CSU campuses (p. 40).

PUBLICATIONS

The publications listed here can provide additional information on underage drinking and DUI prevention, environmental management approaches, coalition building, strategic planning, evaluation, and other subjects covered in this guide.

FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Alcohol and Highway Safety 2001: A Review of the State of Knowledge (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2001). Available only at <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/research/AlcoholHighway/index.htm>.

“Alcohol Poisoning” [Fact Sheet] (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1998).

“Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention in the Medical Setting” [Kit] (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2002).

The Art of Appropriate Evaluation: A Guide for Highway Safety Program Managers (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1999).

Balmforth, D. *National Survey of Drinking and Driving, Attitudes and Behavior* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1997).

“Card Tricks: How to Spot Fake ID Cards” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1992). Available on 1/2 inch VHS Video [item 2A0107], with accompanying brochure [item 2P0908].

Community How-to Guides on Underage Drinking Prevention (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2001).

Designated Driver/Safe Ride Program: Community Action Guide (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2002).

“Designated Driver/Safe Ride Program: Community Action Guide” [CD-ROM] (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2001).

The Economic Impact of Motor Vehicle Crashes 2000 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2002). Available only at <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/economic/EconImpact2000/>.

A How-to Guide for Victim Impact Panels (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2001).

State of Knowledge of Alcohol-Impaired Driving: Research on Repeat DWI Offenders (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2000).

“Traffic Safety Facts 2001” [Fact Sheet] (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2001).

FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER FOR ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION

DeJong, W. *Preventing Alcohol-Related Problems on Campus: Impaired Driving* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, reprinted 1998).

DeJong, W., and Langenbahn, S. *Setting and Improving Policies for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems on Campus: A Guide for Administrators* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, reprinted 1997).

DeJong, W.; Vince-Whitman, C.; Colthurst, T.; Cretella, M.; Gilbreath, M.; Rosati, M.; and Zweig, K. *Environmental Management: A Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Use on College Campuses* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1998).

Presidents Leadership Group. *Be Vocal, Be Visible, Be Visionary: Recommendations for College and University Presidents on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention* (Newton, Mass.: Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention/EDC, 1997).

Ryan, B. E.; Colthurst, T.; and Segars, L. *College Alcohol Risk Assessment Guide: Environmental Approaches to Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, revised 1997).

Ryan, B. E.; and DeJong, W. *Making the Link: Faculty and Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1998).

FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2002).

Goldman, M. S.; Boyd, G. M.; and Faden, V. (Eds.). "College Drinking, What It Is, and What to Do about It: A Review of the State of the Science." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14, March 2002.

Saltz, R. E.; and DeJong, W. *Reducing Alcohol Problems on Campus: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2002).

FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Costs of Underage Drinking (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1999).

A Guide for Enforcing Impaired Driving Laws for Youth (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2000).

Law Enforcement and Higher Education: Finding Common Ground to Address Underage Drinking on Campus (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2001).

A Practical Guide to Preventing and Dispersing Underage Drinking Parties (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2000).

Regulatory Strategies for Preventing Youth Access to Alcohol: Best Practices (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, undated).

Strategies to Reduce Underage Alcohol Use: Typology and Brief Overview (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1999).

RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)

400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/>
(888) 327-4236

Established under the U.S. Department of Transportation by the Highway Safety Act of 1970, NHTSA is responsible for reducing deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes. The agency investigates safety defects in motor vehicles; sets and enforces fuel economy standards; helps states and local communities reduce the threat of drunken drivers; promotes the use of seat belts, child safety seats, and air bags; investigates odometer fraud; establishes and enforces vehicle antitheft regulations; and provides consumer information on motor vehicle safety topics. NHTSA also conducts research on driver behavior and traffic safety to develop the most efficient and effective means of bringing about safety improvements.

Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS)

U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6123
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osdfs/index.html>
(202) 260-3954

OSDFS supports efforts to create safe schools, respond to crises, prevent alcohol and other drug abuse, ensure the health and well-being of students, teach students good citizenship and character, and provide national leadership on issues and programs in correctional education. The agency provides financial assistance for drug abuse and violence prevention activities and activities that promote the health and well-being of students in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education. OSDFS participates in the development of Department program policy and legislative proposals and in overall administration policies related to drug abuse and violence prevention. It also participates with other Federal agencies in the development of a national research agenda for such prevention.

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention

Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02458-1060
<http://www.higheredcenter.org>
(800) 676-1730

Established by the U.S. Department of Education in 1993, the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention is the nation's primary resource center for alcohol, other drug, and violence prevention at U.S. colleges and universities. In addition to providing leadership in defining the nation's college prevention agenda, the Center acts as a catalyst to advance collaborative campus and community teams across the nation. The Center offers an integrated array of services to help campuses and communities come together to identify problems; assess needs; and plan, implement, and evaluate alcohol and other drug prevention programs. Services include training; technical assistance; publications; support for The Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues; and evaluation activities. The Center's publications are free and can be downloaded from its Web site.

Automobile Club of Southern California

2601 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90007
<http://www.aaa-calif.com>
(213) 741-3686

The Automobile Club of Southern California organized the College and University Drinking and Driving Prevention Awards Program in 1997. It is now run jointly by several chapters of the American Automobile Association (AAA) and the U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention. The program's goal is to identify and disseminate innovative and effective approaches to reduce drinking and driving on campus and prevent AOD use that can result in impaired driving. Since its inception, the program has presented 22 awards to schools in a six-state region (California, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah).

BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network

P.O. Box 100430
Denver, CO 80250-0430
<http://www.bacchusgamma.org>
(303) 871-0901

BACCHUS (Boosting Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students) and GAMMA (Greeks Advocating Mature Management of Alcohol) is an international association of college- and university-based peer education programs focusing on alcohol abuse prevention, sexual assault prevention, and other student health issues. The group provides training, technical assistance, educational materials, and national and regional forums to support campus peer educators and offers specialized materials for use with fraternity and sorority chapters. BACCHUS and GAMMA has more than 700 campus chapters and 25,000 active members around the country.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)

National Headquarters
511 East John Carpenter Freeway
Suite 700
Irvine, TX 75062
<http://www.madd.org>
(800) GET-MADD (438-6233)

MADD's mission is to stop drunken driving, support the victims of this violent crime, and prevent underage drinking. A grassroots organization, MADD has more than 600 chapters nationwide. MADD's program to prevent underage drinking and DUI includes improving enforcement of the minimum legal drinking age, adopting tougher alcohol advertising standards, encouraging enforcement, and increasing awareness of the law. MADD has several programs and resources designed to help get youth, including college students, involved in creating change in their communities.

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (NCADI)

11426-28 Rockville Pike, Suite 200
Rockville, MD 20852
<http://www.health.org/>
(800) 729-6686

NCADI is the information service of the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. NCADI is the world's largest resource clearinghouse for current information and materials concerning substance abuse. NCADI distributes publications and other materials on substance abuse from various federal government agencies (e.g., study reports, surveys, guides, videos), many of which are free of charge.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)

6000 Executive Boulevard, Willco Building
Bethesda, MD 20892-7003
<http://www.niaaa.nih.gov/>
(301) 496-4000

NIAAA supports and conducts biomedical and behavioral research on the causes, consequences, treatment, and prevention of alcoholism and alcohol-related problems. In 2002, NIAAA's Task Force on College Drinking published the first National Institutes of Health report on college drinking, *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges*. The report reveals new findings on the extent and nature of the problem, reviews the current research literature, and provides guidance to college presidents, administrators, and other policymakers on effective programs and policies. NIAAA offers a Web site on college drinking prevention: <http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/>.

The Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues

c/o The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention
Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02458-1060
<http://www.thenetwork.ws/>

The Network (formerly known as the Network of Colleges and Universities Committed to the Elimination of Drug and Alcohol Abuse) is a national consortium of colleges and universities formed to promote healthy campus environments by addressing the issues of alcohol, other drugs, and violence. Begun in 1987 by the U.S. Department of Education, The Network comprises member institutions that voluntarily agree to adhere to a set of standards aimed at reducing AOD problems at colleges and universities. It has close to 1,500 members nationwide. The Network develops collaborative alcohol and other drug prevention efforts among colleges and universities through electronic information exchange, printed materials, and sponsorship of national, regional, and state activities and conferences.



References

- ¹ Larimer, M. E., and Cronce, J. M. “Identification, Prevention, and Treatment: A Review of Individual-Focused Strategies to Reduce Problematic Alcohol Consumption by College Students.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 148–163, 2002.
- ² DeJong, W.; Vince-Whitman, C.; Colthurst, T.; Cretella, M.; Gilbreath, M.; Rosati, M.; and Zweig, K. *Environmental Management: A Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Use on College Campuses* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1998).
- ³ Hingson, R. W., and Howland, J. “Comprehensive Community Interventions to Promote Health: Implications for College-Age Drinking Problems.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 226–240, 2002.
- ⁴ Bickel, R. D., and Lake, P. F. *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risks of College Life?* (Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1999).
- ⁵ DeJong, W., and Epstein J. C. *Strategizer 34: Working in Partnership with Local Colleges and Universities* (Alexandria, Va.: Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, 2000).
- ⁶ Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, 2002).
- ⁷ Presidents Leadership Group. *Be Vocal, Be Visible, Be Visionary: Recommendations for College and University Presidents on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention* (Newton, Mass.: Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention/EDC, 1997).
- ⁸ Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, 2002).
- ⁹ O’Malley, P. M., and Johnston, L. D. “Epidemiology of Alcohol and Other Drug Use among American College Students.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 23–39, 2002.
- ¹⁰ Knight, J. R.; Wechsler, H.; Kuo, M.; Seibring, M.; Weitzman, E. R.; and Schuckit, M. “Alcohol Abuse and Dependence among U.S. College Students.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 263–270, 2002.
- ¹¹ Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *A Call to Action: Changing the*

- Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, 2002).
- ¹² Hingson, R. W.; Heeren, T.; Zakocs, R. C.; Kopstein, A.; and Wechsler, H. "Magnitude of Alcohol-Related Mortality and Morbidity among U.S. College Students Ages 18–24." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 136–144, 2002.
- ¹³ Wechsler, H.; Lee, J. E.; Kuo, M.; Seibring, M.; Nelson, T. F.; and Lee, H. "Trends in College Binge Drinking during a Period of Increased Prevention Efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study Surveys, 1993–2001." *Journal of American College Health* 50: 203–217, 2002.
- ¹⁴ Presley, C. A.; Meilman, P. W.; and Cashin, J. R. *Alcohol and Drugs on American College Campuses: Use, Consequences, and Perceptions of the Campus Environment Vol. IV, 1992–94* (Carbondale, Ill.: Core Institute, Southern Illinois University, 1996).
- ¹⁵ Perkins, H. W. "Surveying the Damage: A Review of Research on Consequences of Alcohol Misuse in College Populations." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 91–100, 2002.
- ¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷ Hingson, R. W.; Heeren, T.; Zakocs, R. C.; Kopstein, A.; and Wechsler, H. "Magnitude of Alcohol-Related Mortality and Morbidity among U.S. College Students Ages 18–24." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 136–144, 2002.
- ¹⁸ Wechsler, H.; Lee, J. E.; Nelson, T. F.; and Kuo, M. "Underage College Students' Drinking Behavior, Access to Alcohol, and the Influence of Deterrence Policies: Findings from the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study." *Journal of American College Health* 50: 223–236, 2002.
- ¹⁹ Wagenaar, A. C., and Toomey, T. L. "Effects of Minimum Drinking Age Laws: Review and Analyses of the Literature from 1960 to 2000." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 206–225, 2002.
- ²⁰ National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). *Alcohol and Highway Safety 2001: A Review of the State of Knowledge* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, 2001).
- ²¹ Pittayathikhun, T.; Ku, R.; Rigby, D.; Mattsson, M.; and DeJong, W. *Complying with the Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations [34 CFR Part 86]: A Guide for University and College Administrators* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1997).
- ²² DeJong, W., and Langford, L. M. "A Typology for Campus-Based Alcohol Prevention: Moving toward Environmental Management Strategies." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 140–147, 2002.
- ²³ Larimer, M. E., and Crouce, J. M. "Identification, Prevention, and Treatment: A Review of Individual-Focused Strategies to Reduce Problematic Alcohol Consumption by College Students." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 148–163, 2002.
- ²⁴ Baer, J. S.; Marlatt, G. A.; Kivlahan, D. R.; Fromme, K.; Larimer, M.; and Williams, E. "An Experimental Test of Three Methods of Alcohol Risk Reduction with Young Adults." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 60: 974–979, 1992.
- ²⁵ Baer, J. S.; Kivlahan, D. R.; Blume, A. W.; McKnight, P.; and Marlatt, G. A. "Brief Intervention for Heavy Drinking College Students: Four-Year Follow-Up and Natural History." *American Journal of Public Health* 91: 1310–1316, 2001.

- ²⁶ Wagenaar, A. C., and Toomey, T. L. "Effects of Minimum Drinking Age Laws: Review and Analyses of the Literature from 1960 to 2000." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 206–225, 2002.
- ²⁷ Hingson, R. W.; Heeren, T.; Zakocs, R. C.; Kopstein, A.; and Wechsler, H. "Magnitude of Alcohol-Related Mortality and Morbidity among U.S. College Students Ages 18–24." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 136–144, 2002.
- ²⁸ DeJong, W., and Hingson, R. "Strategies to Reduce Driving under the Influence of Alcohol." *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 359–378, 1998.
- ²⁹ Toomey, T. L., and Wagenaar, A. C. "Environmental Policies to Reduce College Drinking: Options and Research Findings." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 193–205, 2002.
- ³⁰ Chaloupka, F. J., and Wechsler, H. "Binge Drinking in College: The Impact of Price, Availability, and Alcohol Control Policies." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 14: 112–124, 1996.
- ³¹ Toomey, T. L., and Wagenaar, A. C. "Environmental Policies to Reduce College Drinking: Options and Research Findings." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 193–205, 2002.
- ³² Gebhardt, T. L.; Kaphingst, K.; and DeJong, W. "A Campus–Community Coalition to Control Alcohol-Related Problems off Campus." *Journal of American College Health* 28: 211–215, 2000.
- ³³ Saltz, R. F. "The Roles of Bars and Restaurants in Preventing Alcohol-Impaired Driving: An Evaluation of Server Intervention." *Evaluation in Health Professions* 10: 5–27, 1987.
- ³⁴ Russell, A.; Voas, R. B.; DeJong, W.; and Chaloupka, M. "MADD Rates the States: A Media Advocacy Event to Advance the Agenda against Alcohol-Impaired Driving." *Public Health Reports* 110: 240–245, 1995.
- ³⁵ Shults, R. A.; Sleet, D. A.; Elder, R. W.; Ryan, G. W.; and Sehgal, M. "Association between State-Level Drinking and Driving Countermeasures and Self-Reported Alcohol-Impaired Driving." *Injury Prevention* 8: 106–110, 2002.
- ³⁶ Shults, R. A.; Elder, R. W.; Sleet, D. A.; Nichols, J. L.; Alao, M. A.; Carande-Kulis, V. G.; Zaza, S.; Sosin, D. M.; Thompson, R. S.; and Task Force on Community Preventive Services. "Reviews of Evidence Regarding Interventions to Reduce Alcohol-Impaired Driving." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 21(4S): 66–88, 2001.
- ³⁷ "New Study Results Demonstrate Strong Student Support for Alcohol Prevention Policies" (press release). Newton, Mass.: Education Development Center, February 28, 2001.
- ³⁸ "What Do Parents Think about College Drinking?" *Prevention File: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs* 16: 4, Fall 2001.
- ³⁹ Ryan, B. E., and DeJong, W. *Making the Link: Faculty and Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1998).
- ⁴⁰ Perkins, H. W. "College Student Misperceptions of Alcohol and Other Drug Norms among Peers: Exploring Causes, Consequences, and Implications for Prevention Programs." In U.S. Department of Education, *Designing Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Programs in Higher Education: Bringing Theory into Practice* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1997).

- ⁴¹ Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, 2002).
- ⁴² DeJong, W., and Winsten, J. "The Use of Designated Drivers by U.S. College Students: A National Study." *Journal of American College Health* 47: 151–156, 1999.
- ⁴³ "Some Colleges Call an End to Fridays off," *Boston Globe*, May 3, 2002.
- ⁴⁴ "Alcohol Ingrained in Local Social Culture," *Newark Post*, January 8, 2002.
- ⁴⁵ Toomey, T. L., and Wagenaar, A. C. "Environmental Policies to Reduce College Drinking: Options and Research Findings." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 193–205, 2002.
- ⁴⁶ Chaloupka, F. J., and Wechsler, H. "Binge Drinking in College: The Impact of Price, Availability, and Alcohol Control Policies." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 14: 112–124, 1996.
- ⁴⁷ DeJong, W., and Langenbahn, S. *Setting and Improving Policies for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems on Campus: A Guide for Administrators* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1995, reprinted 1997).
- ⁴⁸ National Commission for Drug-Free Schools. *Toward a Drug-Free Generation* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1990).
- ⁴⁹ Cohen, D. A.; Mason, K.; and Scribner, R. "The Population Consumption Model, Alcohol Control Practices, and Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities." *Preventive Medicine* 34: 187–197, 2002.
- ⁵⁰ Wechsler, H.; Lee, J. E.; Kuo, M.; Seibring, M.; Nelson, T. F.; and Lee, H. "Trends in College Binge Drinking during a Period of Increased Prevention Efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study Surveys, 1993–2001." *Journal of American College Health* 50: 203–217, 2002.
- ⁵¹ Ryan, B. E., and Mosher, J. F. *Progress Report: Alcohol Promotion on Campus* (San Rafael, Calif.: Marin Institute for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems, 1991).
- ⁵² DeJong, W., and Davidson, L. *Building Long-Term Support for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Programs* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 2000).
- ⁵³ Gardner, A. "Don't Drink and Drive? Binge Kids Don't Care." *HealthScout*, February 6, 2002.
- ⁵⁴ Gebhardt, T. L.; Kaphingst, K.; and DeJong, W. "A Campus-Community Coalition to Control Alcohol-Related Problems off Campus." *Journal of American College Health* 28: 211–215, 2000.
- ⁵⁵ Pittayathikhun, T.; Ku, R.; Rigby, D.; Mattsson, M.; and DeJong, W. *Complying with the Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations [34 CFR Part 86]: A Guide for University and College Administrators* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1997).
- ⁵⁶ Zweig, K. L., and Thompson, J. *Prevention Update: Parental Notification* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 2001).

- ⁵⁷ “Misdeeds Prompt MU Letters: Campus Issues Data on Parental Notification.” *Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune*, August 4, 2002.
- ⁵⁸ “Alcohol Arrests Climb: OWIs Decline as Other Citations Rise,” *Iowa City Press-Citizen*, July 22, 2002.
- ⁵⁹ Minnesota Institute of Public Health. “Effective Response to College Drinking Exists” (press release, <http://www.jointogether.org/y/0,2521,266187,00.html>), February 23, 2001.
- ⁶⁰ DeJong, W., and Hingson, R. “Strategies to Reduce Driving under the Influence of Alcohol.” *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 359–378, 1998.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Balmforth, D. *National Survey of Drinking and Driving, Attitudes and Behavior* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1997).
- ⁶³ Stewart, K. *A Guide for Enforcing Impaired Driving Laws for Youth* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2000).
- ⁶⁴ “Ax Falls on Spring-Break Cash,” *Orlando Sentinel*, July 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁵ Winsten, J. A., and DeJong, W. “The Designated Driver Campaign.” In Rice R. E., and Atkin, C. K. (eds.), *Public Communication Campaigns*, 3d ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2000), pp. 290–294.
- ⁶⁶ DeJong, W., and Winsten, J. “The Use of Designated Drivers by U.S. College Students: A National Study.” *Journal of American College Health* 47: 151–156, 1999.
- ⁶⁷ Knight, J. R.; Wechsler, H.; Kuo, M.; Seibring, M.; Weitzman, E. R.; and Schuckit, M. “Alcohol Abuse and Dependence among U.S. College Students.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 263–270, 2002.
- ⁶⁸ Perkins, H. W. “Social Norms and the Prevention of Alcohol Misuse in Collegiate Contexts.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 164–172, 2002.
- ⁶⁹ Hingson, R. W., and Howland, J. “Comprehensive Community Interventions to Promote Health: Implications for College-Age Drinking Problems.” *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, supplement no. 14: 226–240, 2002.
- ⁷⁰ Holder, H. D.; Saltz, R. F.; Grube, J. W.; Treno, A. J.; Reynolds, R. I.; Voas, R. B.; and Gruenewald, P. J. “Summing Up: Lessons from a Comprehensive Community Prevention Trial.” *Addiction* 92, supplement 2: S293–S301, 1997.
- ⁷¹ Holder, H. D.; Gruenewald, P. J.; Ponicki, W. R.; Treno, A. J.; Grube, J. W.; Saltz, R. F.; Voas, R. B.; Reynolds, R.; Davis, J.; Sanchez, L.; Gaumont, G.; and Roeper, P. “Effect of Community-Based Interventions on High-Risk Drinking and Alcohol-Related Injuries.” *Journal of the American Medical Association* 284: 2341–2347, 2000.
- ⁷² Saltz, R., and DeJong, W. *Reducing Alcohol Problems on Campus: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation* (Rockville, Md.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2002).
- ⁷³ Ryan, B. E.; Colthurst, T.; and Segars, L. *College Alcohol Risk Assessment Guide: Environmental Approaches to Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, revised 1997).

- ⁷⁴ Presley, C. A.; Austin, B. S.; and Jacobs, J. *Selecting the Right Tool: A Compendium of Alcohol and Other Drug Assessment and Evaluation Instruments for Use in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 1998).
- ⁷⁵ National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). *The Art of Appropriate Evaluation: A Guide for Highway Safety Program Managers* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, 1999).
- ⁷⁶ For the evaluator database and other evaluation resources, visit <http://www.higheredcenter.org/eval>; for the guide, see Langford, L. M., and DeJong, W. *Prevention Update: How to Select a Program Evaluator* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, 2001).
- ⁷⁷ Saltz, R., and DeJong, W. *Reducing Alcohol Problems on Campus: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation* (Rockville, Md.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2002).
- ⁷⁸ Bickel, R. D., and Lake, P. F. *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risks of College Life?* (Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1999).



**Office of Safe and
Drug-Free Schools**



U.S. Department of Transportation
**National Highway Traffic Safety
Administration**

