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This study sought to determine the behaviors, opinions, attitudes, and beliefs of a national sample of students who had been found responsible by their campus conduct system to have violated campus alcohol policies. The primary purpose of the study was to ascertain the extent to which the sanctions they received were effective in deterring them from repeating their behavior. A secondary purpose was to determine whether the results of this study, using a larger national sample, would replicate an earlier pilot study conducted last year.

The study involved 777 students from across the country who completed a web-based survey in the spring of 2012. Students received the survey from student conduct administrators who volunteered to assist with the study by forwarding the survey by email to 10 or more students who had been found responsible for violating their institutional alcohol policies during the previous six months.

Although the earlier study only had 154 students who responded, the results of this study parallel those from the earlier study in several respects. In both studies the preponderance of violations involved underage drinking, often in combination with noise and other disruptive behaviors, most likely in residence halls since a large majority of the students in both studies lived on-campus and were under 21, and the incidents occurred on campus. Frightening was
the fact that in both studies about 20% of the students reported engaging in excessive drinking combined with behaviors that endangered or actually injured themselves or others.

Again, students in both studies said that colleges and universities were focused on less effective sanctions such as participating in alcohol education programs, disciplinary probation, warnings, and fines. In addition, as in the first study, the least used sanctions were reported by students to be the most effective in deterring them from repeating the behavior. Alcohol assessments, treatment programs, and involvement with the criminal justice system were each used 10% of the time or less, yet the majority of the students who received these sanctions said they were effective in deterring them from repeating their behavior. Parental notification was used somewhat more often (37%), but it was reported to be effective by most of the students whose parents were notified. Similar to the previous study, findings indicated that most institutions are not measuring students’ blood alcohol level (BAL)/blood alcohol concentration (BAC) when alcohol related incidents occur. Measuring students’ BAL could be used in cases of excessive drinking to justify assigning the student to an alcohol assessment or alcohol treatment program, both of which were reported by students as very effective sanctions.

In comparison to last year, gender differences in binge drinking rates were not as pronounced in this study. However, the overall binge drinking rates have increased. Last year, 40% of the students reported that they were binge drinkers at the time of the incident and 30% were binge drinkers at the time of the survey. This year 47% of the students indicated that they were binge drinkers at the time of the incident and almost 40% were binge drinkers at the time of the survey.

Finally, as was reported in last year’s study, most institutions failed to follow-up with students after sanctions were issued. Simply assigning sanctions without any follow-up is not a very educational experience for the student. Institutions that miss the opportunity to follow-up are passing on a teachable (and potentially very valuable) moment. Students need to process the experience to make meaning of it. Otherwise it is just punishment.

The data from this study show that institutions need to survey their own students to determine what they believe are effective sanctions for their particular institution.

The Century Council funded both studies in cooperation with the Association for Student Conduct Administration and The National Judicial College.
Given the many concerns about underage and excessive drinking within the college student population (Hingson, Heeren, Winter, & Wechsler, 2005), a national study funded by The Century Council (TCC) in cooperation with the Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) and the National Judicial College (NJC) was conducted by Donald D. Gehring, John Wesley Lowery, and Carolyn Palmer. The study involved a web-based survey completed by 154 students who had been found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies during the previous six months. The primary purpose of the research was to explore disciplinary sanctions issued to students who violate alcohol policies and the extent to which those sanctions are effective in deterring students from further violations. The results of the study are summarized in a document entitled “Students’ Views of Effective Alcohol Sanctions on College Campuses: A National Study” (TCC, ASCA, & NJC, 2012).

Student conduct administrators, student housing administrators, and others expressed great interest in the results of the first study, in which students reported that they were aware of both institutional alcohol policies and the negative effects that alcohol can have on their behavior, health, and safety, but chose to engage in underage and/or excessive drinking regardless of the consequences. The findings from the first study also had implications pertaining to institutional
measurement of the blood alcohol levels of students when violations occur; the need to follow-up with students after issuing discipline sanctions; the impact of alcohol-related incidents and their disciplinary consequences on binge drinking rates; and the effectiveness of alcohol education programs, warnings, monetary fines, alcohol assessment and treatment programs, parental notification, police involvement, and other sanctions in deterring students from violating alcohol policies initially and deterring students found responsible for violating alcohol policies from repeating their behaviors in the future.

Soon after the results of the first study were released, TCC, ASCA, and NJC commissioned the same researchers (Gehring, Lowery, and Palmer) to conduct a second study, which used the same survey form with only minor modifications, but with a larger sample of students. The purposes of using a larger sample were not only to assess the extent to which the findings would coincided with the findings from the first study, but to include large enough numbers of students within various categories to examine differences in the responses of men and women, students under and over the age of 21, students whose incidents did and did not involve police, and so forth.

The results of the second study, which involved a national sample of 777 students whose institutional discipline systems had found them responsible for violating alcohol policies during the previous six months, are summarized in this report.
The administrators participating in this study were selected from the membership of the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). Volunteers were sought in person at the 2012 ASCA Conference where the initial study results were presented as well as through email invitations to assist with the current study. These methods identified 125 student conduct administrators who expressed a willingness to participate in the next phase of the research.

In March 2012, these administrators were contacted by email to confirm their willingness to participate in the study (see Appendix A). Based upon this initial confirmation, a revised sample of 120 administrators were identified and emailed about the next phase in the research study (see Appendix B) the following week. Administrators were asked to forward an email message (see Appendix C) containing a link to the student survey (see Appendix D) to 10 or more randomly-selected undergraduate students who had been found responsible for underage or excessive drinking in the previous 6 months or alternatively to email all undergraduate students who had been found responsible for underage or excessive drinking in the previous 6 months. Several reminders were sent to administrators encouraging their assistance in the study and asking to send two reminders (see Appendix C for Student Messages 2 & 3) to students encouraging them to complete the survey approximately one week and two weeks after the
initial survey message was sent. Because of the precautions used to protect the anonymity of students, researchers could not contact the students directly to encourage their participation.

With two minor modifications (the additions of parental notification and police notification as discipline sanctions) the survey was identical to the survey used in the previous study. The survey was administered through the Qualtrics on-line survey management platform. To encourage participation in the study, students and administrators were offered the opportunity to enter into a drawing to win either a Kindle Fire or Nook Color. Students were provided the opportunity to submit their drawing entries after completing the survey. Administrators were entered into the drawing after they responded indicating that they had sent the survey information to students at their institution. There were 20 incentives (Kindle Fire or Nook Color) available to students and 5 incentives (Kindle Fire or Nook Color) available to administrators.

Ultimately 69 administrators responded indicating that the survey message had been forwarded to students. These administrators reported sending surveys to 4,059 students with administrators sending surveys to an average of 59 students each. Although 995 survey forms were submitted, a number of them were blank or only partially completed. For the purposes of this study a “completed survey” was defined as one with responses to at least three-quarters of the questions. After deleting incomplete surveys and surveys in which students’ text responses were inappropriate, 777 usable survey responses remained in the data set.

Microsoft Excel was used to analyze the data, and Microsoft Graph was used to create pie charts and bar graphs that illustrate the major findings.

This research project was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS’ INSTITUTIONS

The characteristics of students’ institutions are summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in Figure A. The majority of the respondents (64%) were enrolled at public institutions, whereas 27% and 9% were from private independent and private religiously affiliated institutions respectively. The majority of the students (79%) represented institutions offering both four-year undergraduate and graduate/professional programs, 20% were from institutions offering only four-year undergraduate programs, and 1% were from institutions offering only graduate/professional programs.

The two largest subgroups of students were from institutions enrolling 2,000-9,999 students (34%) and 10,000-19,999 students (31%), followed by 30,000 or more students (15%), 20,000-29,999 students (14%), and fewer than 2,000 students (7%). More than half of the participants (56%) were from institutions that provided on-campus housing for 1,000-4,999 students. The remaining represented institutions housing 5,000-9,999 students (23%), 10,000 or more students (15%), and fewer than 1,000 students (6%).
## TABLE 1

### Description of Students' Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Type (N = 776)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-Religiously Affiliated</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-Independent</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Note: 1 missing response)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Programs Offered (N = 776)**                |           |         |
| Four-year undergraduate only                 | 160       | 20%     |
| Four-year undergraduate and graduate/professional | 611   | 78.7%   |
| Graduate/professional only                    | 5         | 0.6%    |
| *(Note: 1 missing response)*                 |           |         |

| **Students Enrolled (N = 776)**               |           |         |
| Fewer than 2,000                              | 51        | 6.6%    |
| 2,000-9,999                                   | 261       | 33.6%   |
| 10,000-19,999                                 | 237       | 30.5%   |
| 20,000-29,000                                 | 110       | 14.2%   |
| 30,000 or more                                | 117       | 15.1%   |
| *(Note: 1 missing response)*                  |           |         |

| **Students Living On Campus (N = 772)**       |           |         |
| Fewer than 1,000                              | 49        | 6.3%    |
| 1,000-4,999                                   | 429       | 55.6%   |
| 5,000-9,999                                   | 179       | 23.2%   |
| 10,000 or more                                | 115       | 14.9%   |
| *(Note: 5 missing responses)*                 |           |         |
Description of Student Respondents

Characteristics of the students participating in this study are summarized in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure B. Almost two-thirds (62%) of the students are male and 38% are female. When the incidents for which they were found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies occurred, the vast majority (86%) were under 21 years old and 14% were 21 or older. Most of the students (86%) were living on campus and most (87%) indicated that the incidents occurred on campus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Student Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (N = 776)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Note: 1 missing response)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at the Time of the Incident (N = 776)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or older</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Note: 1 missing response)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence at the Time of the Incident (N = 777)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of the Incident (N = 776)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Note: 1 missing response)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B. 
Description of Student Respondents

**Location of Incident**
- Off Campus: 13%
- On Campus: 87%

**Sex**
- Male: 62%
- Female: 38%

**Age**
- 21 or older: 14%
- Under 21: 86%

**Residence**
- Off Campus: 14%
- On Campus: 86%

“I got written up for one of my guests being under the influence of alcohol.”
Alcohol Policy Violations

Students were limited to the selection of one type of policy violation that best describes the violation for which they were found responsible. Sixteen response options (including “Other (please specify)” were offered. One student did not select any of the options. As noted in Table 3, almost half of the remaining 776 students indicated that their violations involved either underage drinking (27%) or underage possession of alcohol (21%) “only” (that is, not in combination with other behaviors that violated institutional policies). The second largest subgroup said they had been found responsible for violating policies by either possessing (11%) or consuming (9%) alcohol in locations where alcohol is prohibited “only.” The third largest subgroup (13%) selected the “Other” option.

Many of the violations described as “Other” involved alcohol in combination with other offenses. For example, 11 students were found responsible for incidents involving both alcohol and marijuana. Other examples include alcohol combined with theft, fire, fighting, “peeing on a car,” and using fake IDs. Seven students indicated that they were found responsible for “public intoxication” or “public drunkenness.” And four additional students mentioned hospitalization as follows:

• Drinking that resulted in hospitalization as a precaution but was not alcohol poisoning.
• Drinking and loss of physical control that led to hospitalization.
• Drunk while hysterical from being mugged, sent to the hospital for being drunk.
• I was drinking and a friend required hospitalization for alcohol poisoning.
  I received medical amnesty.

The vast majority of the remaining incidents described as “Other” most likely occurred in on-campus residence halls. It should be noted that, because it is tempting for students of legal age who live in residence halls to purchase alcohol for their underage neighbors and friends, and because many institutions want to reduce excessive consumption, they have policies that limit the amount of alcohol students of legal age may possess. Seven students (all of them over the age of 21) said their offenses involved the possession of “too much alcohol,” “more alcohol than allowed,” “alcohol in excessive amounts,” “a keg,” “a 30 pack of beer [when] my university only allows me to have 12 packs,” and other “quantity violations.” Four other students who were of legal age to possess and consume alcohol were cited for “drinking in the presence of underage persons.”
With respect to underage students, the most common violations listed as “Other” involved being “in the presence of alcohol as an underage student,” “in a room with an open containers,” “in the presence of underage drinking,” “in a room where drinking was occurring,” “at a party where alcohol was present,” and otherwise “in the wrong place at the wrong time.” Several of the students in this sub-category said (in response to a subsequent survey item) that they were not responsible for alcohol violations because they were not the ones who possessed or consumed the alcohol that was in their presence. Examples of their comments include the following:

- Room searched and alcohol was present without my knowledge.
- I was in my room when the RAs came in and searched the refrigerator without my knowledge of there being alcohol in there.
- Caught in a room where others were drinking.
- Completely sober in a friend’s dorm room where there was alcohol.
- Present while others were consuming alcohol, but not drinking myself.
- Loud music and people drinking in my room, host (me) not drinking.

Finally, some expressed frustration with policies that hold them accountable for the behaviors of others. These include students who described the violations for which the discipline system found them responsible as follows:

- I got written up for one of my guests being under the influence of alcohol. Complicity - for not reporting that underage students were drinking in my room.
- Being in a room where people were drinking, although I was not. Held responsible for those students, like I’m their mother or something. Bullshit!

Blood alcohol content (BAC), also called blood alcohol concentration, blood ethanol concentration, or blood alcohol level is most commonly used as a metric of alcohol intoxication for legal or medical purposes.

Blood alcohol content is usually expressed as a percentage of alcohol in the blood. For instance, a BAC of 0.10 means that 0.10% (one tenth of one percent) of a person’s blood, by volume, is alcohol.

For purposes of law enforcement, blood alcohol content is used to define intoxication and provides a rough measure of impairment. Although the degree of impairment may vary among individuals with the same blood alcohol content, it can be measured objectively and is therefore legally useful and difficult to contest in court. Most countries disallow operation of motor vehicles and heavy machinery above prescribed levels of blood alcohol content.

From: The National Judicial College
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underage drinking (only)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage possession of alcohol (only; that is, not in combination with other behaviors that violated institutional policies)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of alcohol (regardless of age) on a campus or in a specific location where alcohol is prohibited (only)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking (regardless of age) on a campus or in a specific location where alcohol is prohibited (only)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking in combination with loud, rude, disorderly, or disruptive behavior that remained at the verbal level</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while intoxicated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol poisoning requiring hospitalization or medical treatment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking in combination with behavior that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damaged personal or institutional property</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endangered your safety</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endangered the safety of one or more other people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endangered the safety of one or more other people and yourself</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually injured you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually injured one or more other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually injured one or more other people and yourself</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing alcohol to one or more underage individuals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 1 missing response)
Alcohol policy violations by age and by sex.

One may reasonably hypothesize that the nature of alcohol policy violations differs for students who are under the age of 21 vs. those who are 21 or older, and for men vs. women. In an effort to confirm or disconfirm such hypotheses, the violations were sorted by age (and then by sex) and reexamined. The results for age and sex are summarized in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

The analysis related to age included 775 of the 777 students who participated in the study. Excluded were the one student who did not indicate a violation and the one student who did not answer the question regarding age at the time of the incident. For unknown reasons, three students who said they had been found responsible for underage possession or underage drinking also reported that they were 21 or older at the time of the incident. Nevertheless, because a much larger proportion of underage students (56%) chose one of these two response options (underage possession or underage drinking), it is not surprising that larger proportions of the older students chose some of the other response options provided on the survey form. For example, 28% of the older students (vs. 19% of the underage students) chose the options related to possessing or consuming alcohol in locations where alcohol was prohibited. This difference most likely a result of the fact that students were allowed to select only one violation on the survey form, and the primary violation of underage students who possessed or consumed alcohol in locations where alcohol was prohibited was considered to be underage possession or underage drinking. Students over the age of 21 (24%) were also more likely than underage students (11%) to choose the “Other” response option.

It is not surprising that students of legal age to purchase alcohol were more likely (4%) than underage students (0%) to say their offense involved providing alcohol to underage persons. However, although older and thus presumed by many to be more mature and to use better judgment, 17% of the students over 21, compared to 1% of the students under 21, had been found responsible for driving while intoxicated.
For the most part, differences between men and women were not pronounced. Perhaps one of the more intriguing findings is that, of the 23 students who had been found responsible for driving while intoxicated, 21 are men and only two are women. One interesting observation is that the men were somewhat more likely (35%) than women (27%) to have been found responsible for policies concerning the possession of alcohol (whether underage or in a location where alcohol was prohibited) “only,” but somewhat less likely (33%) than women (42%) to have been found responsible for actually drinking alcohol (whether underage or in a location where alcohol was prohibited) “only.” Men were slightly more likely than women to say that their violation involved drinking in combination with loud, rude, disorderly, or disruptive behavior and drinking in combination with behaviors that endangered the health and safety of, or actually injured, themselves and/or others, whereas women were more likely than men to indicated that they experienced alcohol poisoning. However, it must be emphasized that the numbers within these categories are small and the results should be interpreted with great caution.

The consequences of excessive and underage drinking affect virtually all college campuses, college communities, and college students, whether they are younger or older than the minimum legal drinking age and whether or not they choose to drink.

**Alcohol Consumption and Binge Drinking are Common Among College Students**

**Alcohol Consumption:** About four in five of all college students drink, including nearly 60 percent of students age 18 to 20.

**Binge Drinking:** Approximately two of every five college students of all ages—more than 40 percent—have reported engaging in binge drinking at least once during the past 2 weeks. However, colleges vary widely in their binge drinking rates—from 1 percent to more than 70 percent (Wechsler et al., 1994, 1998, 2000b and NSDUH 2006).

From: http://www.niaaa.nih.gov/AboutNIAAA/NIAASponsoredPrograms/StatisticalSnapshotCollegeDrinking.htm
## Table 4

### Alcohol Policy Violations by Age (N = 775)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violation</th>
<th>Age &lt; 21 (n = 668) Freq.</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>Age 21+ (n = 107) Freq.</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underage possession (only)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession – location (only)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage drinking (only)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking – location (only)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing to underage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while intoxicated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking in combination with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud, rude, disruptive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property damage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of self</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure self</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol poisoning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 2 missing responses)
### Table 5

**Alcohol Policy Violations by Sex (N = 776)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violation</th>
<th>Male (n = 481)</th>
<th>Female (n = 295)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underage possession (only)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession – location (only)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage drinking (only)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking – location (only)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing to underage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while intoxicated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking in combination with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud, rude, disruptive</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property damage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of self</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endanger safety of both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure self</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injure both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol poisoning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 1 missing response)
**Disciplinary Sanctions Issued**

The survey item asking students which disciplinary sanctions were issued was presented in a “check all that apply” format. This item listed 15 response options, including “Other (please specify).” As shown in Table 6 and Figure C, the most common sanction, reported by almost two-thirds (66%) of the students, involved participation in an alcohol education program. Other sanctions reported by more than a third of the students included disciplinary probation (59%), a warning not to repeat the behavior (52%), notification of parents (37%), and a monetary fine (36%).

Less common sanctions included community service (17%), completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol (15%), receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions (5%) or as a sanction itself (10%), notification of police (if the violation involved unlawful behavior) (8%), participation in an alcohol treatment program (8%), “other” sanctions (5%), eviction from on-campus housing (3%), creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol (2%), and suspension from the institution (1%).

Excessive and underage drinking by US college and university students continues to be a significant problem. Curtailing the misuse of alcohol on college campuses is an important goal of college and university administrators because of the many negative consequences resulting from alcohol misuse. As part of their prevention programs, US colleges and universities are required by law to make information about their alcohol policies available to students. Often the source of this information is the school’s website. The authors evaluated the alcohol-policy information that is available on the Web sites of the 52 top national universities listed in the 2002 rankings of *US News and World Report*. In general, they found that the information was difficult to find, was located in many areas of the website, and did not provide complete information about the school’s alcohol policy.

*From: http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/CollegePresidents/evalCollegeAlcoholPolicies.aspx*
The most common sanctions within the “Other” category involved counseling and/or writing, though not a “research” paper as had been specified in the list of sanctions provided. For example, one student said, “counseling with the substance abuse counselor on campus and writing a reflection paper.” Other essays concerned decision making, campus activities, what the student learned from the incident and its consequences, how the incident affected the community in which the student lived, the institution’s alcohol policy and why the student agreed or disagreed with various parts of it, and unspecified topics. One student also reported, “Writing a contract to agree there would no longer be drinking allowed in my dorm room”.

“Other” sanctions included mentoring programs, notification of team coaches, “pay back” [for an incident involving alcohol and theft], having to pay for alcohol education programs or classes, an online quiz, an alcohol dependency evaluation, a meeting with a senior administrator, getting a strike, losing a merit point, and not being allowed to be on campus for time periods ranging from one weekend to all weekends during an entire semester. One student said “none . . . it [the sanction] was appealed,” and one said the sanction was yet to be determined.

Some of the sanctions described in the “Other” category may not have been issued by the discipline system, even though they were consequences of the incident. For example, “loss of Resident Assistant job” was most likely a personnel decision made by someone in Residence Life and not Student Conduct. Similarly, an Office of Student Conduct is not likely to require students to appear in a court of law or issue traffic tickets, police citations, or state minor in possession charges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sanction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in an alcohol education program</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary probation (which usually comes with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences)</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warning not to repeat the behavior</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of parents</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monetary fine</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment as a sanction itself</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of police (if the violation involved unlawful behavior)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in an alcohol treatment program</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction from on-campus housing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from the institution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure C

*Discipline Sanctions Issued*
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Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions as Deterrents

How effective were the sanctions in deterring the students from repeating their behaviors in the future? As shown in Table 7 and Figure D, student responses to this question varied widely, with the two largest subgroups saying the sanctions were “effective” (32%) and “not at all effective” (25%). However, substantial numbers of students also said the sanctions were “somewhat effective” (17%), “slightly effective” (15%), and “extremely effective” (12%).

Also summarized in Table 7 are responses to two questions regarding the effects of disciplinary sanctions on students (in general). While only 30% of the respondents said they believe that disciplinary sanctions deter students from violating institutional alcohol policies in the future, 85% said they believe that such sanctions “simply make students more cautious so they don’t get caught in the future.”

What disciplinary sanctions change behavior?

While some students stated that there was nothing to be done to stop college students from drinking, there were several disciplinary sanctions that deterred students from repeating behaviors that violated institutional alcohol policies. Sadly, few institutions utilized these sanctions.

Students required to have an alcohol assessment or to attend an alcohol treatment program said it deterred them from underage or excessive drinking in the future. These sanctions helped students to become aware of the negative effects of alcohol on their behavior, health and safety.

Parental notification is another noteworthy deterrent to repeated behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies. This sanction is most effective in deterring repeated behaviors when parents are notified by both the student and an institutional administrator, but also effective for more than half the students if the notification is made only by the student or only by the administrator.

Involvement with the criminal justice system is another sanction that has an impactful effect in deterring repeated behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies.

Finally, being subjected to the disciplinary system itself has a positive effect on women who were binge drinkers. Binge drinking among women decreased substantially after being disciplined for violating institutional alcohol policies.

From: The Century Council
### TABLE 7

**Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions as Deterrents to Alcohol Policy Violations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective were the disciplinary sanctions <strong>you</strong> received in deterring you from repeating the behavior? (N = 776)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly effective</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Note: 1 missing response)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Do you believe disciplinary sanctions deter **other students** from violating institutional alcohol policies in the future? (N = 774) |           |            |
| Yes                                                                             | 234       | 30.2%      |
| No                                                                              | 540       | 69.8%      |
| *(Note: 3 missing responses)*                                                    |           |            |

| Do you believe disciplinary sanctions simply make students more cautious so they don’t get caught in the future? (N = 777) |           |            |
| Yes                                                                             | 664       | 85.5%      |
| No                                                                              | 113       | 14.5%      |
Figure D:
Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions in Deterring Students from Repeating their Behavior
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Student Sense of Responsibility for the Current Violation and Involvement in Previous Violations for Which They Were Found Responsible

One survey item asked, “Do you believe you were in fact responsible for the violation for which the discipline system found you responsible?” Overall, 72% of the respondents said “yes.” It should be noted that many of those who said “no” had described “other” incidents where they were “in the presence of” alcohol, but said they were not “in possession of” alcohol (even though it may have been in their refrigerator or residence hall room) or not among those who were drinking alcohol in a residence hall room, at an off-campus party, or elsewhere when the incident occurred. Also among those who said they were not responsible for violating the alcohol policy were students who seemed to define their own terms. For example, one student who said she was under the age of 21 when the incident occurred said she was not responsible for underage drinking because “I only had one drink.”

Three-quarters (75%) of the respondents said this was the first time their institutional discipline systems had found them responsible for violating alcohol policies. For 19% it was the second time, for 4% it was the third time, and for 3% it was at least the fourth time. Because many institutions have what students refer to as “three strike” policies, the discipline sanctions issued to the 51 students who had been found responsible for violating alcohol policies three or more times were examined.

The vast majority of these students (80%) were under the age of 21 when the most recent incident occurred and 73% are men. Between one and eight discipline sanctions were issued to these students. Six students reported warnings, nine said they were placed on disciplinary probation (which generally serves as a warning that a subsequent violation will result in more serious consequences), and 22 said they received both warnings and probation. Thus, a total of 37 students (73% of the 51 students found responsible for violating alcohol policies three or more times) received warnings in some form. The next most common sanctions included participation in alcohol education programs (61%), notification of parents (53%), monetary fines (49%), and community service (29%). Fourteen percent of the students had to write research papers about alcohol and 4% had to create bulletin board displays or present programs to help educate other students about alcohol.
Six of the three-or-more-time repeat offenders were required to receive alcohol assessments; three were required to participate in alcohol treatment programs, and three were required to receive both assessment and treatment. Thus, a total of 12 students (24% of the 51) were issued sanctions associated with alcohol assessment and/or treatment programs. Finally, sanctions included eviction from on-campus housing (14%), notification of police (12), and suspension from the institution (8%). All students who were suspended said they had been found responsible for violating their institutional alcohol policies “4 or more” times.

**Student Knowledge and Awareness Before the Incidents**

Three survey items concerned student knowledge and awareness before the incidents for which they were found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies. As shown in Table 8, the vast majority of the students (86%) said they were “somewhat” (45%), “very” (32%), or “extremely” (9%) knowledgeable of the alcohol policies. Similarly, most of the respondents (80%) said they were “somewhat” (30%), “very” (35%), or “extremely” (14%) knowledgeable that their behavior would violate those policies. Perhaps a future study should also ask whether students knew that their behavior would violate the law. However, one might reasonably speculate that almost all college students under the age of 21 (which describes 86% of those who participated in this study) know that their possession and consumption of alcohol violates the law.

Like knowledge of policies and laws, awareness of the negative effects of alcohol does not necessarily deter students from participating in alcohol-related incidents. In fact, 94% of the respondents in this study said that before they participated in such incidents they were “somewhat” (18%), “very” (52%), or “extremely” (25%) aware of the negative effects that alcohol could have on their behavior, health, and safety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the most recent incident occurred, how knowledgeable were you of your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution’s alcohol policy? (N = 777)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all knowledgeable</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very knowledgeable</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat knowledgeable</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely knowledgeable</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the incident, how knowledgeable were you that your behavior would violate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your institution’s alcohol policy? (N = 773)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all knowledgeable</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very knowledgeable</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat knowledgeable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely knowledgeable</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: 4 missing responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the incident, how aware were you of the negative effects alcohol could</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have on your behavior, health, and safety? (N = 777)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all aware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very aware</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat aware</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very aware</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely aware</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure E. Student Knowledge and Awareness Before the Incident
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Institutional Responses to the Alcohol Policy Violations

One survey item asked, “Did the institution measure your Blood Alcohol Level at the time of your violation?” Only 19% of the 777 students said “yes” and the remaining 81% said “no.” Unfortunately, even when campus or community police are called upon to deal with alcohol-related incidents, the blood alcohol level/concentration of students involved in the incidents is seldom measured. Those who said “yes” included 33% of the students who said police were notified of or involved in their incidents and 4% of those who said police were not notified of or involved in their incidents. Although this finding shows that blood alcohol levels are most likely to be measured by institutions when police are notified of or involved in alcohol-related incidents, it should be emphasized that these results most likely underestimate the total number of students whose blood alcohol levels were measured. For example, consider a student whose incident involved driving while intoxicated off campus. He said not only that police were notified or involved, but also that he was arrested, went to court, and spent time in jail. He reported that his institution did not measure his blood alcohol level, but it is very likely that off-campus police did so. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask whether police or others measured the blood alcohol levels of students whose incidents happened off-campus.

Figure F.
Did Institution Measure Blood Alcohol Level at the Time of the Incident?
Two other survey items concerning institutional responses to alcohol policy violations asked who determined that students were responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies and who determined what the discipline sanction(s) would be. In both cases the response options were “a student conduct administrator,” “a disciplinary panel,” and “both a student conduct administrator and a disciplinary panel.” Two students did not respond to either question. “Of the 775 students who did answer these questions, 79% said responsibility for the violations was determined by student conduct administrators. The remaining students said responsibility was determined by disciplinary panels (8%) or both student conduct administrators and disciplinary panels (13%). Similarly, in the majority of the cases (73%) student conduct administrators determined the discipline sanctions, as did disciplinary panels in 14% of the cases, and both student conduct administrators and disciplinary panels in the remaining 13% of the cases.

**Parental Notification**

The survey contained four questions regarding parental notification. The first two asked (1) whether the student, and (2) whether the student conduct administrator or other institutional official, had ever told the student’s parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences. As shown in Table 9 and Figure G, 353 students (46% of the total) responded affirmatively to both questions; that is, both students and administrators had informed the parents. An additional 258 students (33%) said they had told their parents, but an administrator had not. Twenty-three students (3%) said they had not told their parents, but an administrator had done so, and the remaining 143 (18%) indicated that their parents had not been told by either their students or administrators. The first column total in Table 9 shows that a total of 611 students (79%) had informed their parents, whereas the first row total shows that the parents of 376 students (48%) had been notified by administrators.

The third question appeared on the web-based survey only if students had responded affirmatively to one or both of the first two questions. It asked, “Did your parents’ knowing about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Of the 634 students whose parents had been notified by the students and/or administrators, 313 (49%) said, “yes” in response to this question. They included 22% of the students whose parents had been notified by administrators only, 47% of those whose parents had been told by students only, and 53% of those whose parents had been informed by both students and administrators. This finding suggests that parental notification may be most effective as a deterrent when both students and administrators are actively engaged in the process.
Figure G. Parental Notification
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Parents Notified by Students Only

Parents Notified by Administrators Only

Parents Notified by BOTH Administrators and Students
The fourth question was asked of all students. “Would the student conduct officer or other institutional official notifying your parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Of the total 777 students, 294 (38%) said “yes.” They included 47% of the students whose parents had in fact been notified by administrators and 30% of those whose parents had not been notified by administrators. Perhaps some students in the latter group simply underestimate the potential impact of parental notification by institutional officials.

| Did a student conduct administrator or other institutional official ever tell your parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences? | Did you ever tell your parents about this incident and/or its disciplinary consequences? |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| Did a student conduct administrator or other institutional official ever tell your parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences? | Yes | 353 | 45.5% | 23 | 3.0% | 376 | 48.4% |
| | No | 258 | 33.2% | 143 | 18.4% | 401 | 51.6% |
| Column Total | 611 | 78.6% | 166 | 21.4% | 777 | 100.0% |
Involvement with the Criminal Justice System and its Effectiveness as a Deterrent

Table 10 summarizes the responses to six survey questions concerning involvement with the criminal justice system and its effectiveness as a deterrent to repeated behavior. In response to the first question, 327 students (42.1% of the total sample) said that police were notified of or involved in the incident for which their institutions found them responsible for violating alcohol policies. The second, third, fourth, and fifth questions did not appear in the web-based survey unless students said “yes” to the first question. As shown in Table 10, of the 327 students whose incidents involved or were reported to police, 31% were arrested, 44% had to go to court, and 17% spent time in jail.

Overall, 196 (60%) of these 327 students said their involvement with the criminal justice system deterred them from repeating the behavior in the future. However, it should be noted that those who reported being deterred included only 42% of 159 students who reported only that police had been notified or involved (i.e., the students were not arrested, did not go to court, and did not spend time in jail). In contrast, 81% of those who were arrested, 79% of those who had to go to court, and 89% of those who spent time in jail said they were deterred. (Please see Figure Z.)

The sixth and final question in this series was asked of all students. “Would involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Of the 777 students in the total sample 65% said “yes.” They included 69% of those who had been involved with the criminal justice system in some way and 62% of those who had not been involved with the criminal justice system in any way.

# TABLE 10

Involvement and Effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=777)</th>
<th>If Police Notified or Involved (n=327)</th>
<th>If Police Not Notified or Involved (n=450)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were police notified of or involved in the incident?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you arrested?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your case ever go to court?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have to spend any time in jail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 11, 48% of the students said that, whether or not it was required, they received an alcohol assessment as a result of the incident, and 30% said they participated in an alcohol treatment program as a result of the incident. How effective were these assessments and treatment programs in deterring students from repeating the behavior in the future? Although “somewhat effective” was the most common response in both cases, Table 11 and Figure I show that the reported effectiveness of both alcohol assessments and alcohol treatment programs varied widely among students.

Although only those students who had received assessments or participated in treatment programs were asked about their effectiveness, all students were asked the final question in this portion of the web-based survey: “Do you believe being in an alcohol treatment program would make you more aware of the negative effects that alcohol can have on your behavior, health, and safety?” Ten students did not answer this question; of the 767 who did answer, 39% said “yes.” They included 62% of those who indicated that they had in fact participated alcohol treatment programs, in contrast to only 29% of those who had not participated in such programs. Although there are many plausible explanations for this discrepancy, one is that students who have not been involved in alcohol treatment programs may simply underestimate the potential impact that such programs might have on their awareness of the negative effects that alcohol can have on their behavior, health, and safety.
### TABLE 11

**Alcohol Assessments, Alcohol Treatment Programs, and Their Effectiveness as Deterrents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not it was required, did you receive an alcohol assessment as a result of this incident? ( (N = 776) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: 1 missing response)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective was the assessment in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future? ( (N = 369) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly effective</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you participate in an alcohol treatment program as a result of this incident? ( (N = 775) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: 2 missing responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued...
How effective was the treatment program in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future? (N = 232)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly effective</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**
Effectiveness of Alcohol Assessments and Treatment Programs in Deterring Students from Repeating the Behavior in the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of Alcohol Assessments (N = 369)</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Alcohol Treatment Programs (N = 232)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21% Not at All</td>
<td>21% Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% Slightly</td>
<td>23% Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% Somewhat</td>
<td>35% Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% Very</td>
<td>21% Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Extreme</td>
<td>6% Extreme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increased Awareness and its Effectiveness as a Deterrent

Three survey items concerned the impact of the incident and its consequences on student awareness, along with the impact of that awareness on repeated behaviors. Fifteen students did not answer any of these three questions. Of the 762 students who did answer, 404 (53%) said “yes” in response to the first question, which asked, “As a result of the incident and its consequences, did you become more aware of the negative effects that alcohol can have on your behavior, health, and safety?” Only these 404 students were asked two follow-up questions. The first asked, “Did that awareness deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Two-thirds (67%) of the 404 students said “yes.”

The second follow-up question asked, “How has that awareness deterred you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Most responses fell into the following general categories:

The deterred behaviors are those blamed for “getting caught”. To be sure, fear of disciplinary consequences does not deter all students from violating institutional policies. In fact, some students indicated that they drink more now [for example, “twice as much” or “more than I have in my whole lifetime”] in spite of being found responsible for violating alcohol policies and facing disciplinary sanctions as a result. Many students want to avoid future sanctions, but do not necessarily want to change drinking behaviors that violate institutional policies. They simply do not want to “get caught” again. Most of these students blame specific locations and people with authority in those locations for “getting caught,” and simply changed the locations of their drinking. Since the large majority of the students participating in this study lived on campus and were involved in violations that occurred on campus, it is not surprising that RAs, along with police, were often blamed for students “getting in trouble.” [RAs are Resident Assistants, part-time student employees who work in residence halls. Among their many duties are enforcing institutional policies and reporting violations of those policies.]
Below are a few examples of comments made by students in this category:

• It has not deterred me from drinking one bit. I just know how to avoid getting caught now.

• I’m more aware of the school’s policies and how to violate them without getting caught.

• I don’t want to risk getting caught again, so if I am going to drink, I am a lot more careful.

• I still drink and am just more cautious to not get caught.

• I just know who [sic] to avoid when doing that behavior. For example, RAs.

• I just don’t drink in the dorms anymore.

• I choose where I drink more wisely.

• I am 20 years old and was 3 months away from being 21 at the time of my ticket.

• Although I know I made a mistake and error in judgment, I wasn’t endangering others or myself. I am very responsible when I drink so although I will not go to bars again until I am 21, I will continue to underage drink.

• Honestly, I try to stay put wherever I’m at. I don’t walk to nearby parties. I’m even afraid of enjoying myself at bars, even if they’re a close distance away, because if the police decide to stop you, you’re screwed.

• I simply avoid the police.

• I don’t drink in public anymore.

• I know not to drink on campus, because I’ll get in trouble.

• Don’t drink on school grounds; go off campus.

• Don’t drink on campus. If someone decides to screw you over, you will pay the price.
Experiencing the Incident Itself (Along with its Immediate Aftermath in Some Cases) Served as the Primary Deterrent

Several students indicated that they had learned “the hard way” that their drinking behavior jeopardized their own health and safety and/or the health and safety of other people. Some said they had learned that intoxicated people do not necessarily realize they are intoxicated. For example, consider three students who were arrested for driving while intoxicated. One said she was not feeling “drunk,” or even feeling the effects of the “few drinks” she had consumed at the time. Another said, “It made me realize how quickly drinking can get out of hand even when you do not feel the diminished body control.” A third added that he will not drink and drive again because he does not want to hurt anyone.

A fourth student arrested for driving while intoxicated, simply said that what he learned “first-hand” from that experience deterred him from repeating the behavior.

Another subgroup within this category includes several students who experienced alcohol poisoning requiring hospitalization, along with students who experienced drinking in combination with behavior that endangered their health and safety. One such student said she had learned that “there were real consequences to heavy drinking, such as alcohol poisoning.” Another student said she experienced “the full effects of alcohol” on her body, and added, “I know that I never want to have a similar experience again.” And yet another woman said, “It was scary enough that I would not want to repeat it again EVER.”

Three men made similar comments regarding the effects of their experiences as deterrents. One said, “it [the incident] let me know how harmful it [alcohol] was to my

What disciplinary sanctions change behavior?

While some students stated that there was nothing to be done to stop college students from drinking, there were several disciplinary sanctions that deterred students from repeating behaviors that violated institutional alcohol policies. Sadly, few institutions utilized these sanctions.

Students required to have an alcohol assessment or to attend an alcohol treatment program said it deterred them from underage or excessive drinking in the future. These sanctions helped students to become aware of the negative effects of alcohol on their behavior, health, and safety.

Parental notification is another noteworthy deterrent to repeated behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies. This sanction is most effective in deterring repeated behaviors when parents are notified by both the student and an institutional administrator, but also effective for more than half the students if the notification is made only by the student or only by the administrator.

Involvement with the criminal justice system is another sanction that has an impactful effect in deterring repeated behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies.

Finally, being subjected to the disciplinary system itself has a positive effect on women who were binge drinkers. Binge drinking among women decreased substantially after being disciplined for violating institutional alcohol policies.

From: The Century Council
body and myself – and how easily I could lose control.” Another said, “My shocking experience in detox made me realize I was drinking way more in a night than I should be.” The third student said, “For me, the hospital was enough of a wake-up call that I realized I had to calm myself down. I know that I could have died, theoretically, but it was my first time trying really hard liquor and I didn’t know better.” This third student emphasized that his personal choices regarding the consumption of alcohol were unrelated to alcohol education programs that “just parrot what we already know” or any other discipline sanctions. He concluded his comments by saying, “If I’m going to drink, I’m going to ignore your sanctions and just not get caught next time. If I’m not going to drink, I’m going to ignore your sanctions because they don’t apply to me.”

Several other students commented that, as a result of the incident itself, they “know the true consequences of drinking” and are more aware of the effects that alcohol can have on their minds and bodies (e.g., “I know what alcohol does to me”). Many of the students within this category stated or implied that they now drink more responsibly, more cautiously, more carefully, more wisely, or more safely. However, they still drink. Why? According to one student, “because it’s exciting, fun, and part of the subculture.” Finally, one student said “now I drink more responsibly without passing out, but let’s be honest. I’m going to drink regardless. College is a bad influence.”

**Discipline Sanctions Served as Deterrents**

Students who described increased awareness and/or deterred behavior most often attributed those changes to alcohol education classes and other alcohol awareness endeavors (including participation in meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous). These students indicated that the classes increased their awareness of “the effects and risks of drinking alcohol,” “the dangers of drinking,” and “a lot of things that can affect me in the future.” They also said the classes taught them to “make better decisions,” “be more careful of what I do with my body,” “drink more responsibly,” “make better decisions,” “make smarter choices,” “have a plan, and “be prepared for unforeseen circumstances.” Comments included the following:

- It made me aware of exactly how much alcohol I was consuming, as stupid as that sounds. I would drink a lot and then wake up and do it again the next day. After completing a short online class, it really put it into perspective the quantity I drink and how much I spend on drinking a month. Before I took the online class I was pretty oblivious.
• Going to the AA meetings taught me that alcohol can really mess up your life and relationships with your friends and family.

• Made me think of how your life can be wasted by just drinking alcohol all the time.

• By me telling my story to others, it made me realize I made dumb decisions involving alcohol.

Not all students found alcohol awareness endeavors to be helpful, in part because “Everyone knows all of the information prior to attending a class” or “it just told me everything I had learned in middle school health class about drinking.” One emphasized, “We are adults and make our own decisions. In the class I took, I bet 19/20 drink regularly.” Another said, “All the programs did was tell me I had problems. Actually make the programs of use and in the programs give kids different ideas of how to fix their problems.” Nevertheless, some claimed that alcohol education classes had a deterrent effect because “It’s too much work that I’m not willing to do ever again,” or “It was very interesting, but I don’t want to take it again.” One said, “Honestly, the deterrence was less from the actual program and more from not wanting to go through the hassle again.”

Other deterrents mentioned by students were monetary fines, community service, and not wanting to “let my counselor down.” However, many more students said they were deterred from repeating their behaviors because they had gained greater awareness of “the law,” “the intimidation of police,” “the consequences that society will enforce upon me,” “worse consequences,” “more severe consequences for a second drinking [violation],” the risk that “If I repeat the behavior I can lose all of the privileges to enter dorms and possible probation from [name of institution],” and the “threat of suspension.” One said such awareness of possible consequences “has me think about my actions before I do something that could get me in trouble again.”

One student simply said, “Not drinking anymore,” another said “I have no urge to drink anymore,” and still another said “Makes me not want to drink at all anymore. It’s kind of sad that I can’t go out anymore.” One said “The awareness has deterred me from drinking and instead just focus on schoolwork.” One said, “I realize now what my priorities are, those being staying in school and maintaining healthy relationships with my peers.” And one said, “I have realized that I can have fun without drinking — and that peer pressure is never worth it.”
Binge Drinking

The survey included three questions pertaining to binge drinking. A total of 13 students did not answer any of the three questions, which were preceded by the generally accepted definition of a “binge drinker.” Students were then asked, given this definition, whether they were binge drinkers at the time the incident occurred and whether they are binge drinkers “now” (at the time they completed the survey). As noted in Table 12, and illustrated in Figure 1, 32% of the 764 responding students answered “yes” to both questions, indicating that they were binge drinkers at both of the times in question. An additional 15% said they were binge drinkers at the time of the incident, but are not binge drinkers now, and 6% said they were not binge drinkers at the time of the incident, but are binge drinkers now. The remaining 47% said they were not binge drinkers at either time. The first column total shown in Table 12 indicates that a total of 359 students (47%) indicated they were binge drinkers when the incident occurred, and the first row total shows that a total of 295 students (39%) said they are binge drinkers now.

The third binge drinking question asked students whether, to their knowledge, the student conduct administrator or other institutional official had ever referred to them as “binge drinkers.” Ninety-one students (12% of the respondents) said “yes.” Of these 91 students, 75 (82%) had indicated in the previous two questions that they were indeed binge drinkers when the incident occurred and/or when they completed the survey.

Data from several national surveys indicate that about four in five college students drink and that about half of college student drinkers engage in heavy episodic consumption. Recent concerns have, therefore, often focused on the practice of binge drinking, typically defined as consuming five or more drinks in a row for men, and four or more drinks in a row for women. A shorthand description of this type of heavy episodic drinking is the “5/4 definition.” Approximately two of five college students—more than 40 percent—have engaged in binge drinking at least once during the past 2 weeks, according to this definition. It should be noted, however, that colleges vary widely in their binge drinking rates—from 1 percent to more than 70 percent—and a study on one campus may not apply to others (Wechsler et al., 1994, 1998, 2000b).

See: http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/NIAAACollegeMaterials/TaskForce/HeavyEpisodic_00.aspx
**TABLE 12**

**Binge Drinking (N = 764)**

Before responding to the following questions, please note that the generally-accepted definition of a “binge drinker” is someone who consumes four or more drinks at one sitting (for women) or five or more drinks at one sitting (for men) at least once in a two-week period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given this definition, were you a “binge drinker” at the time the incident occurred?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given this definition, are you a “binge drinker” now?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Column Total | 359 | 47.0% | 405 | 53.0% | 764 | 100.0% |

**Figure J.** Were/Are Students Binge Drinkers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Then No, Now Yes</th>
<th>Then Yes, Now No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then No, Now Yes</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** “Then” refers to when incidents occurred. “Now” refers to when students completed the survey.
Gender differences in binge drinking rates. Last year’s study, which had a much smaller sample than the current study, found substantial sex differences in binge drinking rates, as well as and changes in binge drinking rates between the time incidents occurred and the time the survey was completed. Consequently, responses to the questions concerning whether the students were binge drinkers at the time of their incidents and the time they completed the survey were analyzed separately for men and women. Not included in the analyses are the 13 students (10 men and 3 women) who did not respond to the binge drinking items, along with the one student who did not indicate his/her sex. Included in the analyses were the responses of the remaining 763 students (471 men and 292 women).

The results, as summarized in Table 13 and Figure K, show that men (38%) were more likely than women (24%) to say they were binge drinkers at both of the times in question. In contrast, women (58%) were more likely than men (40%) to say they were binge drinkers at neither of these two times. Many fewer students of both sexes said they changed their binge drinking status between the two times. One interesting finding is that although men (15%) were slightly more likely than women (14%) to say they were binge drinkers when the incident occurred and not binge drinkers when they completed the survey, the men (7%) were also slightly more likely than women (5%) to say they were not binge drinkers at the time of the incident, but were binge drinkers at the time they completed the survey.

Within-sex changes in binge drinking are also noteworthy. For example, of the total of 250 men who said they were binge drinkers when the incident occurred, 71 (28%) said they were not binge drinkers when they completed the survey. In comparison, of the 109 women who self-identified as binge drinkers at the time of the incident, 40 (37%) were not binge drinkers at the time they completed the survey. This suggests that the female binge drinkers may have been more inspired than male binge drinkers to stop binge drinking as a result of their experiences with and the consequences of their alcohol policy violations.

Findings that may be discouraging (though not surprising) to student conduct administrators are that of the 221 men who did not self-identify as binge drinkers when the incident occurred, 33 (15%) said they had become binge drinkers by the time they completed the survey; and of the 183 women who said they were not binge drinkers at the time of the incident, 14 (8%) said they were binge drinkers when they completed the survey. Many factors undoubtedly contribute to these changes from not binge drinking to binge drinking. Student comments suggest that among these reasons are a lack of follow-up with students found responsible for violating alcohol policies and adverse reactions to discipline sanctions. For example, when asked what follow-up occurred, one student said, “None. They decided it was a one-time incident, [but] in fact, I’ve consumed more alcohol more regularly since.” And when asked about the effectiveness of disciplinary sanctions as deterrents to repeated behavior, one said, “They just made me mad and want to drink more. Punishment only increases drinking. If you were not to [sic] strict, this would not be a problem.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binge Drinkers</th>
<th>Male (n = 471)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female (n = 292)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes when the incident occurred, Yes when the survey was completed</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes when the incident occurred, No when the survey was completed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No when the incident occurred, Yes when the survey was completed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No when the incident occurred, No when the survey was completed</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 14 missing responses)

**Figure K.** Were/Are Men and Women Binge Drinkers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men (n=471)</th>
<th>Women (n=292)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then No, Now Yes 24%</td>
<td>Then No, Now Yes 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Yes, Now Yes 58%</td>
<td>Then Yes, Now Yes 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Yes, Now No 15%</td>
<td>Then No, Now No 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

“Then” refers to when incidents occurred.

“Now” refers to when students completed the survey.
Disciplinary Sanctions Students Believe Would Be Most Effective in Deterring Other Students From Violating Institutional Alcohol Policies

The final objective item on the survey asked students to choose up to five disciplinary sanctions they believe would be most effective in deterring other students from violating institutional alcohol policies. This item listed 16 response options, including “None of these sanctions would be effective” and “Other (please specify below).” Thirty-five students did not respond. Results from the 742 students who did respond are provided in Table 14 and illustrated in Figure L.

The two sanctions selected by the most students were a warning not to repeat the behavior (47%) and disciplinary probation (which usually comes with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences) (42%). Other sanctions chosen by approximately a third or more of the students were community service (38%), a monetary fine (38%), participation in an alcohol education program (36%) and notification of parents (32%).

Approximately one-sixth of the students chose suspension from the institution (18%), eviction from on-campus housing (17%), completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol (17%), participation in an alcohol treatment program (17%), and notification of police (if the violation involves unlawful behavior) (16%). Fewer students selected creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol (9%), receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions (7%) or as a sanction itself (6%), and “other” sanctions (3%). Finally, ten percent of the students indicated that none of the listed sanctions would be effective.

Not all of the 24 students who checked “other” specified discipline sanctions. Some simply took advantage of the opportunity to offer opinions pertaining to a variety of topics. For example, some students noted prevention measures that include making sure that all students are “informed of the school’s policies regarding alcohol,” conducting “casual drinking events with faculty and other adults to promote responsible drinking and encourage appropriate behavior,” and providing “positive reinforcement” for students who do NOT want to drink (e.g., by sponsoring more weekend social events that do NOT involve alcohol). With respect to discipline sanctions, one simply said, “It really depends on the situation,” and another noted that “there is a difference between problem binge drinking and not.”
The most common recommended sanctions involve counseling and athletics. For example, one student said, “Don’t send them to classes they don’t care about; send them to counselors who can help them with their problems”, while another recommended “meeting with a counselor to discuss drinking habits.” One said, “If on athletic team, notify coach,” while another recommended “suspension from intramural and club sports.” Other recommendations included “projects related to their chosen field of education,” “free alcohol programs” [students must pay for these programs at some institutions], “warning to not cause harm when drunk,” “alcohol assessments after 10 [ten] or more alcohol offenses”, and parental notification that “warns them that their child is getting his first free strike and any other violation will result in a costly fine.”

Students who may have been tired or frustrated by the time they reached the end of the survey also recommended various forms of corporal punishment ranging from “a slap on the wrist” to the “death penalty.” One recommended, “getting rid of [name of individual], Dean of Students at [name of institution]. One student said administrators should be “not so quick to always involve campus police because campus police have nothing better to do than harass students,” while another said, “Get cops involved to scare them, but not actually press charges or anything like that.”

Although one student said, “disciplinary sanctions should only be given to those who exceed the limits of safety and present an imminent threat to themselves or others,” several others appear to believe there should be no sanctions at all. Like many other students who participated in this study, some emphasized “it’s college,” a phrase that seems synonymous with “everyone here drinks and there’s nothing anyone can do to stop it.” For example, one said, “It’s college. Don’t be out to get every kid for a stupid noise violation,” another said, “Nothing is going to work. It’s college,” and yet another said, “Nothing can deter college students from drinking.”

One student asked, “Why do there have to be sanctions? It’s obvious that the 21-year-old drinking age is an outdated law. A law that the student body voluntarily breaks obviously shouldn’t be a law.” Some emphasized that students are “grown adults” and should be allowed to make their own decisions regarding the use of alcohol. One emphasized that “The school should mind its own business,” and another said “Leave it to the courts.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sanction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A warning not to repeat the behavior</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary probation (which usually comes with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monetary fine</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in an alcohol education program</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of parents</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from the institution</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction from on-campus housing</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in an alcohol treatment program</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of police (if the violation involves unlawful behavior)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment as a sanction itself</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure L

Discipline Sanctions Students Believe Would Be Most Effective in Deterring Other Students From Violating Institutional Alcohol Policies
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Institutional Follow-up

One open-ended item asked, “What, if any, follow-up has your institution had with you after you completed the disciplinary sanction for your alcohol violation?” Of the 777 students in the total sample, 398 (51%) did not answer this question. Since there were only 35 missing responses to the previous item, it is likely that the vast majority of those who did not answer the question regarding follow-up simply had no follow-up to report.

The single word “none” was the response of 175 students, and an additional 22 wrote “none” in combination with a few other words (e.g., “Absolutely none,” “None whatsoever,” “None, really” “None I can think of,” “None currently,” “None yet,” “None since the incident,” “none, they’re stupid”). Examples of other comments within the “none” category are as follows:

- None, all they did was yell at me for not doing it on time and threaten to pull me from my classes halfway through the semester.
- None, I completed the two classes and then voluntarily left the residence halls.
- None. I was never notified or contacted again.
- They have done none, just made sure I had paid the fine.
- None except to remind me to pay for the alcohol class. None, and I am supposedly [sic] on probation.
- None and if they did, it wouldn’t be effective because people around the GLOBE drink. Slapping sanctions will not do a thing to get them to stop drinking.
- None. They decided it was a one-time incident, [but] in fact, I’ve consumed more alcohol more regularly since.
- None. However, maybe it would make their job more effective if they did.

Twelve students responded with the single word “nothing,” and five said “nothing” in combination with other words such as in the following examples:

- After everything was said and done, including the counseling program and monetary fines, nothing.
- Nothing really after my submission of a research paper pertaining to alcohol abuse.
- Nothing. [Names of administrators] are very biased and think that every student that comes into their office is “bad.”
Seventeen students said there had been “no” follow-up or “not any” follow-up, and five others used different words to make the same point. Another six students said follow-up had been scheduled for some time in the future, and three students (including one who said he felt “belittled” by the institution and referred to “an alcohol class I bullshitted and didn’t even finish”) said or suggested that they had not cooperated with attempted follow-ups. In addition, one student (who had been found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies four or more times) said, “They basically told me I have really bad alcohol problems and just suspended me from the institution.” Other examples are as follows:

• There hasn’t been any follow-up whatsoever.
• No one from the institution has followed up with me.
• I have not received any kind of follow-up since my second violation.
• There was no follow up other than a rude encounter where I had to turn in a paper and the administrator ignored me.
• Honestly, I met with the staff member in charge of my quad, was told I was being written up, getting a fine, and my parents would be notified. No follow-up has occurred. I have yet to receive a notice about the fine and my parents haven’t been notified, though I told them myself.
• I was never contacted after completing and emailing my write up on alcohol in my life.
• My institution has stayed out of it, but I have been in contact with the police.
• I was supposed to do a follow up meeting with the conduct officer guy, but I didn’t go.

“There hasn’t been any follow-up whatsoever.”
Only the remaining 133 students (17% of the total sample) indicated that there had been some type of follow-up. However, some of what they described was not necessarily follow-up by their institutions. For example, 33 students said the follow-up consisted of being asked to complete various surveys, questionnaires, evaluations, and tests, but 11 of them simply said “This survey” or “The only follow-up has been this survey.” Other comments within this category include the following:

• I had to complete a follow-up survey after my online alcohol class.
• A survey before and after the alcohol class.
• A few mandatory surveys had to be filled out.
• Alc test.
• They kept making me take tests online about what I know about alcohol.
• They had me fill out how much I drank.
• Will have to take another assessment about drinking later in the semester.
• I had to fill out a post-incident survey about 2 months after the incident happened. Since then, there has been no follow-up.

Only two students said they and/or their parents had received letters from the student conduct administrator, but ten said they had received e-mail messages. Although some students did not specify the contents of this correspondence, it apparently included confirmation that sanctions had been completed, reminders to pay fines and registration fees for alcohol classes, and “notifications not to go to football games post-drinking.” One student indicated that her letter said “We were mistaken to have disciplined you for that incident,” and another said, “Occasional emails to check up on how we are doing and to encourage us to take part in events.”

Seven students said their follow-up focused on individual or group counseling. For example, four of these students said, “They had me see a counselor,” “They recommended I speak to a counselor at the clinic to cope with the stress and everything,” “Six weekly group counseling sessions,” and “After completing the online class, I had to attend two group classes, which were kind of like AA meetings.”
Eight students described follow-up contacts, most likely with student conduct administrators, but they did not specify whether these contacts were made by e-mail, by telephone, or in person. Their comments included, “They checked to make sure I did everything they asked of me,” “Making sure I completed the alcohol education class,” “Just to make sure I knew the consequences and to see if I am an alcoholic,” “Made sure I did not violate the terms of my conduct probation,” “A follow up 3 months later to make sure I wasn’t getting into any more trouble,” and “Checking up to see how I am doing and ensuring that I have not had any repeat offenses since the event.”

Eight students suggested that follow-up consisted of their submission of materials they had completed as judicial sanctions (e.g., paper, video, Power Point) or contact with administrators that the students initiated. Their comments included the following:

• By a certain date I had to give a certification.
• I handed the dean of judicial affairs my letter saying my court case was dismissed.
• [After] a letter was sent to both me and my parents, I scheduled to meet again with the administrator for further clarification.
• One mandated meeting with an Area Coordinator. Everything else after my sanction I did of my own volition.
• Met with the assistant dean, but I set that up, not the university. No official follow-up was ever done.

“I consistently have conversations with my Resident Director about my social life on campus. We have developed a lot of respect for each other.”
Three students said they had “exit interviews” (including one with a psychologist) and the remaining 62 students met with various institutional administrators and staff members, including student employees and graduate assistants who work in “the dorm,” “judicial affairs,” and “the alcohol program.” Examples of responses in the “meeting” category are as follows:

- I met with a student administrator after completing my alcohol class. After that nothing else.
- Two weeks after completing the alcohol education program I had to meet with the instructor for another assessment.
- I had a follow up meeting with a girl who was in charge of the alcohol class.
- A meeting in which I told them how much I drank the week after my alcohol education class.
- Meet with the Residence Hall Director.
- I consistently have conversations with my Resident Director about my social life on campus. We have developed a lot of respect for each other.
- I had to meet with our complex director once right after the incident, but since then I have not had any follow-up.
- Required to have a follow up meeting with the housing administrator.
- I met with the Dean and Housing supervisor
- A meeting with the campus administrator who assessed how I would be disciplined.
- I met with the coordinator of [name of program]. There we talked about how I should be more careful when I’m drinking.
- Meeting with the administrator to explain why I did what I did.
- The student conduct administrator discussed the issue with me.
- A meeting to discuss grades and involvement on campus two months after the violation.
- I met with the Dean of Students a few times to talk about how things were going.
- Met with a dean to discuss how things went.
- I had to meet with the Dean of Students and let her know I completed my sanction.
- Final meeting with student administrator.
- A sit down meeting of what I learned in a safe and healthy environment. Really enjoyable under the circumstances.
Final Comments and Suggestions

The survey’s final question asked, “In your opinion, what programs, policies, or actions could your institution have in place to deter alcohol policy violations such as the one you were cited for before they happen? (Please explain below.)” Four hundred five (52%) of the 777 participants in this study left the free-response block blank. Comments provided by the remaining 372 [48%] were sorted into several broad categories and are summarized in this section of the report. However, it should be emphasized that the categories are not mutually exclusive and the numbers of responses cited do not sum to 372 because many students made extensive comments that fell into two or more categories.

**There is nothing institutions can do to deter students from underage and/or excessive drinking.** Fifty-eight students simply said “Nothing,” “None,” “No comment,” “n/a,” “unknown,” “undecided,” “not sure,” “I don’t know,” or “no idea.” Many others used these terms in combination with other words that are cited as examples throughout this section of the report.

By far, the single largest subgroup of responses (made by 62 students) reflect what some students refer to as the “reality” that there is nothing institutions can do to deter underage and/or excessive drinking. Although many other responses suggest that more students share this belief, these 62 students specifically stated it by making comments such as:

- **Students are going to drink in college. It’s a reality. Accept it.**
- **It’s college. Kids are going to drink. A lot. Regardless of what you do.**
- **Realize we’re kids in college and we are going to drink whether they like it or not.**
- **Alcohol is a part of college life. Get over it.**
- **Come on, we both know kids will be kids and it’s going to happen.**
- **Nothing. Just relax and let kids be kids. We’re all adults, and you used to drink at 18, so what makes you so special?**
- **None. What can they do? It’s college. It happens.**
- **Nothing. The reality is that drinking is going to happen on campus no matter what they do.**
- **It is college. Get over yourselves. We all drink.**
- **They cannot deter them. It is going to happen and trying to control it is a waste of time.**
• None. Kids in college want to drink, and they’re going to. The ones getting us in trouble I can promise have no fun in their lives.

• I don’t believe any program or policy will stop students from drinking. Too many people participate, and alcohol is too easily accessible for students.

• Students are going to drink regardless of the consequences. It’s an integral part of the college experience for most students.

• None, really. The overwhelming appeal of alcohol to college students in the United States (due to a combination of social, media-related, and legal factors) is not easily overcome. College is seen as a time where irresponsibility is acceptable and consequences can be ignored. This stigma would need to be removed from college before the rampant alcoholism on campus can be slowed.

• Honestly, no matter what programs or policies the school puts into effect, they will not stop students from drinking.

• I don’t believe there is anything the school can do about binge drinking because it’s such a staple of college life and is something that seems almost expected of college students. Until that changes, I can’t see anything that the school does making any sort of change besides making students more cautious. According to the definition, I still binge drink, but I’m much more careful about not getting caught.

• None, students will never be deterred from drinking. The more you punish them, the more they work to stay hidden about it. It is a waste to fight it. You cannot stop them from drinking.

• It is never going to stop. That’s just the way it is, the way it always has been, and the way it always will be.

**Deterring violations by changing or eliminating laws and policies.** Of course, deterring underage and/or excessive drinking is not necessarily the same as deterring violations of alcohol-related laws and/or policies. For many students, deterring violations is as simple as changing or eliminating their corresponding laws and/or policies. For example, five students said, “Change the drinking age,” “Make the drinking age 18,” “Lower the drinking age back to 18 - I can get killed abroad but do not have the freedom to drink a beer,” “Lower the drinking age to 18 so no more students would be breaking the law and everything would be smooth,” and “Make 18 the legal age for drinking on campus and you wouldn’t see these problems – simple as that.” Another student said, “The United States Government should reduce the drinking age to 18. It’s an outdated law.”
An additional three students recommended “de-criminalizing drinking for young adults in the U.S.,” emphasized that the current drinking age “is both unreasonable and unenforceable for a college campus environment,” and said, “Lowering the drinking age would create an environment where young adults are taught to drink in a mature fashion (as is done in nearly every country in the world) rather than a society of immature binge drinkers as is created in the U.S.A.”

The final two comments regarding the drinking age pertained specifically to international students:

• I am an international student from Scotland on a study abroad program. Back at home, the drinking age is 18, and I have been drinking for a number of years. Coming to the USA was confusing as to what the rules and regulations were in terms of drinking. I wasn't told of them and so had no way of knowing.

• They could be more lenient with international students because the drinking age is 18 in other countries, but that doesn’t mean they shouldn’t be penalized at all.

As was true of the drinking age, some students said that if institutions changed or eliminated various policies, then there would not be as many – or any – violations of those policies. These students include four who recommended that institutions simply “Allow drinking,” “Let them [students] do it [drink] on campus,” “Get rid of the ban on hard alcohol,” and “Let people of legal age drink beer in any quantity they deem acceptable.” Another student said, “Don’t make it [underage drinking] a violation, and it wouldn’t be a problem.” One whose campus is currently “dry” said, “A wet campus would stop all violations.” One said, “If my school changed the rule about the quantity of alcohol that one is allowed to possess, a lot less people would be in trouble/on probation.” And two students recommended the elimination of all alcohol-related policies, programs, and actions:

• Get rid of them all. Not wanting to get caught just makes it more of a challenge to most college students. Get rid of the policies, programs, and actions and nothing will change other than no one will have to go through the hassle of it all. “Binge drinking” may even decrease.
• None. And I will explain why. In the battle against racism two main theories have been presented. The first involves everyone being made aware of different races and cultures by educating them through all different programs, classes, movements, actions, etc. The other is simply to STOP. This theory uses culture to destroy racism. If we as a society stopped being racist, we would stop the problem in its tracks and eventually create a race-blind society in which there are just people. I agree with the second of these theories and I’m applying it to this scenario. If society stops addressing alcohol as this horrible drink that teenagers imbibe and binge drink, then society will inherently produce teenagers who will approach alcohol with maturity and responsibility. Culture will produce a positive age of alcohol such as sitting in the pub having a conversation with a friend or family member instead of wild college students getting hammered and driving drunk. So I repeat, just STOP.

Policies regarding off-campus behaviors. One student said, “Stop looking through police reports for ‘minors in possession’ that occurred off campus. This would statistically lower the amount of people violating the policies.” Eleven additional students made it clear that they do not support policies that make students accountable for their off-campus behaviors, including those that occur in a “Greek residence.” In reference to an off-campus incident, one student said, “The school shouldn’t have been involved at all.” Another student said, “If the incident occurs off campus and the police are involved, the university shouldn’t do anything. They need to let the criminal justice system handle it.” Examples of other comments addressing this issue include:

• Nothing you can do will make us stop. We are in college and we like to [expletive] drink. And if we get in trouble off campus then it shouldn’t affect the school at all. It’s [expletive] bullshit.

• It’s ridiculous that the institution penalizes you for getting an underage consumption OFF CAMPUS. College students are going to drink. If we can get [high] enough grades to be on the Dean’s List, it shouldn’t matter if we want to go out and have a couple of beers on the weekend.

• [What happens] off-campus should not be the school’s concern in any way. Students pay too much to this school already. STOP LOOKING FOR WAYS TO LINE YOUR POCKETS!!! “
Three other students expressed concerns about having to deal with both the institution’s discipline system and the criminal justice system.

• The student should have to meet with the judicial administrator AFTER their court hearing. NOT BEFORE. Also, if the student has violated the policy OFF campus, the school should let law enforcement deal with it. I don’t understand why it has to matter what happens outside the university.

• I think it’s completely ridiculous that the university is notified what so ever [sic] of my actions. I wasn’t on campus or doing anything that is affiliated with the campus, only fueling my anger towards this entire situation. We go through enough just simply having to go through the courts to get the matter resolved, let alone dealing with it through the school.

• None. I am a graduate student who made a stupid decision to drive after two rum and cokes and got arrested by the state police. The state police informed the university and the university added disciplinary probation to the punishments that will be imposed by the state. The university had nothing to do with the situation, could not have prevented it, and should not have gotten involved in it.

Policies regarding “wet” and “dry” campuses. Eight students mentioned “wet” and “dry” campuses. One student said, “I think since freshmen are overpowering this campus and there are not as many people of age like myself that the policy should be NO alcohol on campus, PERIOD!” In contrast, two other students said, “I don’t even think turning the whole county into a dry one would stop the use [of alcohol on campus]” and “Make it a wet campus.” Three other students made the following comments:

• Despite having a “dry campus” we’re the 25th ranked party school in the country. You’re obviously doing something wrong, so you should just give up.

• Since no alcohol is allowed on campus, that should include the stadium, regardless of what the alumni think. Of course that will never happen at [name of institution].

• Well, we (supposedly) have a dry campus, but we allow alcohol for sporting events. If you want to punish a 23 year old for having a drink on campus, then ban everyone from alcohol on campus, including the suites at the stadium. That idea will fall on deaf ears at [name of institution].
Policies prohibiting students of legal age from possessing excessive amounts of alcohol and “hard” alcohol. Four students commented on quantity policies. All of them believe policies should be eliminated or altered to increase the amount of alcohol students of legal age can have on campus. For example, one said, “People of age can only have a 12-pack on them, meaning they can take a 30-pack away from a 21 year old. Ridiculous.” Four students also commented on policies prohibiting hard alcohol. Two believe these policies should be eliminated, and two said institutions should “Be more lenient on beer than hard alcohol” and “Make penalties for beer much less severe than for hard alcohol.”

Educational programs as prevention endeavors

Thirty students mentioned educational programs or classes that would teach students about alcohol. Another 24 students recommended educational endeavors that would teach students about alcohol policies and laws, along with the consequences of violating them. Yet another eight students did not specify the topics that educational programs should address. Rather, they simply made recommendations such as “Information programs on campus,” “Mandatory seminars during orientation,” “More informational sessions,” “More awareness programs” or “Student-run programs. Students don’t listen to administrators.” One said, “Educating the students really doesn’t change anything. They’re still going to do what they want to do.”

Recommendations pertaining to alcohol education programs or classes are that they “provide food”; “are not too long”; “are part of orientation”; and are mandatory for “all freshmen,” “all first-time offenders”, and “the severe drinker who is caught frequently.” One student said, “Someone needs to teach incoming students how to drink responsibly if they are going to choose to drink. This probably wouldn’t deter them from drinking, but it would certainly curb all the negative effects that come with alcohol consumption.” Another said, “Don’t say no, just give everyone the facts to be responsible for themselves and their friends.”

Other students said alcohol education programs should “inform students of the dangers of binge drinking,” “warn them about the dangers and how to avoid putting themselves in risky situations,” “help you understand how much alcohol can hurt you,” “bring students’ attention to the hazards of drinking,” and “show the negative effects that alcohol can have on someone’s life after college.” Two students said programs should provide “information on how our bodies react to binge drinking to get across how detrimental it is” and “more information about the dangers of underage drinking, because the only information we have is the fact that it is illegal.” And one student recommended “Gruesome and true stories about the consequences of alcohol. Some video mandatory to see and so gory and heart-wrenching that it could scare someone into not excessively drinking.”
One student said that alcohol education programs should provide “an in-depth explanation of the potential legal, medical and social consequences of possessing alcohol and/or drinking irresponsibly.” One said institutions “should teach more about how society pressures young adults to drink and how the alcohol industry targets them.” One recommended an “online course,” but another said that students need a “more extensive alcohol education program, not just something to be completed online, but a discussion, perhaps with older students who have gotten into trouble with alcohol and would have advice on what knowledge they wish they’d had that could have prevented it.” And still another recommended “Groups where students talk about their alcohol use, problems it creates, and opportunities lost as a result.”

One student recommended “An incentive program to prevent people from binge drinking and drinking and driving,” but did not specify the form that such an incentive program should take. Finally, one student said:

• I do not believe any more programs, policies, or actions will help the matter. Almost on a daily basis since middle school . . . [students] have been informed of the dangers of drinking and drugs and sex. By the time they reach college they should be well informed enough that any additional activities just waste time and cause a slight disruption in academic work.

As was true with alcohol education programs, many students recommended that programs concerning alcohol-related laws and policies be offered early in a student’s life on campus. For example, one said, “The student code of conduct should be discussed during freshman orientation” and another said, “Inform students of what is illegal and what is not, and any new laws that have been passed. This should be done in freshman orientation.” One student recommended “A freshman seminar on alcohol policies for the school,” and one said, “All the rules and consequences” should be included in “the 1-credit first-semester course.”

One student said, “They need to be more clear about the policies of what you can and cannot have. My violation was just for possession of alcohol related paraphernalia. It’s an unfair policy to be honest.” Another student recommended that institutions “Put up clear alcohol policies around campus so students know exactly what is allowed and not allowed.” Students also recommended that institutions “Teach the policy and rules.”

“Provide more information on policies,” “Make the alcohol policy more well known,” and “Make the policy more prominent, not something you find out when you’re involved in it.” One student who recommended “alcohol policy education” added, “I would have been less likely to violate the policy if I had known what it was.”
Other students recommended a “Program detailing the [disciplinary] consequences [of violating policies],” “A list of possible consequences of alcohol related troubles,” “Anything that shows what the consequences could be,” and “More information about what will happen in realistic situations. I had no idea it would be this serious.” Three students said, “It is important for students to know what can happen to them, even if they are 21,” “Let people know of the punishments they will face if charged with a violation, because no one really knows what will happen to them until after the violation already occurs,” and “Informing students about what could happen to them would be effective in deterring them.” And another student said:

• Honestly I think the policies we have now ($35 alcohol responsibility, 1 year probation, and notification of parents and coaches) are pretty effective. The problem is no one believes they are going to get caught. If at the beginning of the year, for especially freshmen, if they heard how many people actually get caught and stuff like that then I think they would be less likely to attempt it.

Alternative Activities as Prevention Endeavors.

Ten students said that students would drink less often if they were engaged in other activities, including studying; performing community service; and participating in social, cultural, and athletic activities. Two of these students said, “My school could have more activities on weekend nights to encourage students to participate in campus activities instead of drinking and violating the school’s policy,” and “More on-campus activities would deter drinking on campus. There needs to be more advertising of things like night movies, competitions, and sporting events. Two students recommended that institutions “promote and organize activities that create bonding within the student body” and provide “more night life programs on campus. One recommended, “Weekend trips for ice fishing and camping only to get the student away from campus, which is where drinking is usually instigated.” Two others said:

• Make them [students who had been found responsible for violating alcohol policies] participate in activities such as club sports, lifting, theater or something else on a Friday or Saturday night so they can’t go out and drink.

• Make academics harder. I came here thinking this would be a haven for thought. All I find is lazy professors more interested in “restorative programs” than teaching. Challenge me so I won’t have time to drink, and I won’t. To me, it’s simple.
General Comments Regarding Policies, Programs, and Sanctions

More leniency and less harshness are needed or don’t matter. Two students recommended making alcohol policies “more lenient” and “less strict.” Two others said, “Reduce the severity of the alcohol policy” and “More leniency is needed. This is college.” Two students said, “They should be more understanding of the reality that nearly everyone drinks in college. This is a fact, and I feel the sanctions are too harsh on first-time offenders” and “Stop being so hard on students. If penalties were not as stiff, drinking could be done in a more accepting environment where it would not have to be hidden.” Two other students called for “less punitive consequences” and “punishment that is not as harsh.” Yet another student said, “College students need to learn from their mistakes and shouldn’t be harshly punished for a simple alcohol violation.”

One student recommended, “A better understanding of the student body in regards to social pressures,” and one said, “Many students in college will act in this manner no matter the consequences. It is typically a popular form of socializing and to me it seems hard to avoid.” Two said “Drinking alcohol in college is an accepted idea culturally and is supported by the media” and “The university has a drinking culture and nothing the university does can change that.”

Four students (all of them underage) asserted their intentions to continue drinking in spite of laws, policies, or the consequences of violating laws or policies. One said, “I will continue to drink underage regardless.” One who cited a high GPA said, “I work hard, so I drink hard.” One asserted, “I’m an adult and what I do in the privacy of my room is my business,” and one said, “I think that I’m mature and responsible enough to enjoy a glass of wine after a long day, and no policy or sanction is going to make me think otherwise.”

“ I work hard, so I drink hard. ”
Focus on excessive drinking and “more serious” behaviors.

One student said, “It is impossible to stop underage drinking, but at least we can cut down on the accidents that end up happening by making sure students are fully aware of the dangers of alcohol and watch out for others.” Two others recommended that alcohol education programs “just try to lower the volume consumed” and “focus on not over-drinking rather than not drinking at all.” Another said, “The focus should be on maintaining good behavior, even when drunk, instead of on stopping them from getting drunk.” And one said:

- I honestly believe there is only so much an institution can do to try and get kids not to drink. I think that the overall feeling for most is that we are now officially adults in college. We have all been pretty well educated about the effects of alcohol from elementary school onward, and we drink knowing and being fully aware of those risks. Because of that, most of us don’t “over do” it. Not over doing it in a technical sense might still be binge drinking, but not completely stupid behavior or ending up in the hospital.

Fourteen students recommended that police, RAs, and other policy enforcers focus on violations that are more serious than underage drinking or responsible drinking. One said, “Drugs are more prominent on campus, so start busting people for cocaine instead of beer.” Another said, “Focus on serious incidents, like brawls, rather than worrying about social drinkers.” Two students recommended that assessments be completed before disciplinary actions are taken. Another said, “Ask some simple questions and assess the situation based on a logical cost analysis. Is this person a detriment to anyone else? Does he have a problem where he cannot control himself? Then take action.”

One student said, “I think that varying consequences should be designed for specific levels of intoxication,” and six other students recommended that institutions measure alcohol levels or use breathalyzers. One said, “Measure the alcohol content on any belligerent drunk rather than giving people who have only had one beer a grievance.” Another said, “They should breathalize [sic] everybody instead of busting everybody.” And yet another said, “Have police come so they can breathalize [sic] people to see if they have been consuming alcohol, because if that happened in my case, then I would not be taking this survey right now.”
One student suggested an educational program wherein breathalizers would be used in an effort to provide:

• [An] opportunity for individuals to get a personalized description of what their BAC level will be with each drink and what effect this will have on their bodies, so that they will know their limit before they test it themselves.

**Putting safety first.** Ten students mentioned safety in their responses. With respect to educational programs, one student said that college students are going to drink, “just as kids are going to have sex, so just concentrate on teaching them to be safe. There will always be the statistics of those who are hurt, but that is a fact of life. No system is perfect.” In reference to policies, one student said, “Rules should aim to keep students safe while drinking instead of trying to prevent them from drinking at all. Current rules just promote binge drinking behind closed doors.”

The remaining eight student indicated that students would be safer if they were allowed to drink on campus, or more specifically, in on-campus housing units, where drinking can be “contained” or “monitored more carefully.” One said, “We are college students and we are going to drink” and added, “all it [the current policy] does is encourage drunk driving. Prohibiting partying on campus will just provoke it elsewhere. It’s not going to make people stop.” Another said, “I just think it’s ridiculous. People who drink in the comfort of their own room/apt are just being safe. We could be out getting into a lot more trouble.” One student said, “What schools should be focusing on is how to keep students from leaving campus to drink so that they are able to participate in this TRADITION in a safe environment.” Two additional students made the following comments regarding drinking in residence halls:

They just need to be more reasonable. By that I mean they should focus on safety. My incident involved “loud” noise and a write-up from the RA because people were drinking in my room. Everyone there was perfectly safe. I was watching out for them and would not hesitate to stop someone from doing something stupid. Furthermore, getting in trouble for something like this makes me think most people would take their partying off campus. This cannot be what the school wants because it will lead to drunk driving and other related and possibly criminal violations. I think the school should try to contain drinking on campus and be more lenient about it instead of driving those who do drink off campus because they are afraid of getting in trouble with the school again.
• None, college students drink alcohol no matter where you go or what you do. Being so strict with policies isn’t preventing anyone from drinking. It actually PROMOTES binge drinking because students feel that they have to get “drunk enough” before they leave their rooms to go elsewhere. Many times I’ve seen people (myself included) drink far more than they would if they were allowed to drink outside of their rooms. If students didn’t feel as though they had to hide what they were doing, they wouldn’t be binge drinking to the same extent, and the environment at [name of institution] on the weekends would be much different.

Consistency and fairness. In addition to other comments regarding consistency cited elsewhere in this section of the report, some students expressed concerns about fairness related to their race, sex, class, disciplinary history, academic achievement, age, and other factors. One said, “Be more fair to students of color. [Name of institution] is racist.” One said, “the girl in our group, who had just as much blame as each other member, got away with no penalty.” Three students did not believe it was fair that they received various discipline sanctions because they were “a freshman,” “a first-time offender,” and “a good student.” Other examples of unfairness include:

• Violations that people get caught for are generally for people who don’t have a problem. Students who have a problem are just really good at hiding it.
• I know people that drink every weekend and get away with it. I only did that one night because I was upset and I was the one that got into trouble.
• They should have the same punishment for everyone. Some people get off easy with just a ticket and alcohol classes while others like me actually got arrested and had to spend the night in jail.

“ They should have the same punishment for everyone. Some people get off easy with just a ticket and alcohol classes while others like me actually got arrested and had to spend the night in jail. ”
One student said, “Students of legal drinking age should not be disciplined as though they are underage drinkers.” Some students who are 21 or older said that policies that prohibit their possession of “hard alcohol” or alcohol in excess of specified quantities in residence halls are unfair or even in violation of their “legal rights.” One of these students commented as follows:

- In my case, possession of the container confiscated by the administration was legal anywhere but on campus. This makes the students question the rationality of on-campus policies because they are in conflict with federal law. Obviously the college would be very reluctant to amend their policies in favor of more freedom for of-age students, and in this case I think it would be beneficial to include a thorough explanation of why the more questionable policies are in place. For example, I appreciate the limitations on the amount of alcohol we are allowed to possess now that I know the school simply wants to prevent rampant alcohol poisoning.

Although they did not use the term “unfair,” some underage students were similarly unhappy that their institutions had not discussed various laws and policies with them before incidents occurred. Four examples are provided here. One student said she would not have had to face disciplinary consequences if she had been informed of her “legal rights” and continued by saying, “She did not have a warrant, and I was unaware that I could remain silent.” Another student said, “I had unopened alcohol in my car and I am underage. I know I am not supposed to drink, but I truly did not know it was unlawful to even have it in my possession.” A third student said:

- If it had been explained to me beforehand that participating in activities against [name of institution] policy off campus or even outside of the state would still get me in trouble, I would not have participated, or at least would have been more cautious.

And a fourth underage student, who described his incident as “drinking and loss of physical control that led to hospitalization,” said, “I didn’t know that it was university policy to send violators to the hospital regardless of their level of intoxication.”
On-campus housing. Many comments pertaining to on-campus housing, residence halls, “dorms,” RAs, and area coordinators are scattered throughout this section of the report. Twenty additional comments related to on-campus housing are discussed here. Four of these comments recommended having “stricter policies about what goes on in the dorms,” being “as strict as possible about having alcohol in dorm rooms,” having “a closer watch for parties on Friday and Saturday nights,” and enacting “housing suspensions” for students who violate policies. Three other students recommended, “advance notification of room searches, without suspicion” and said:

- A more lenient alcohol policy focused around drinking responsibly would be much more effective in deterring excessive consumption of alcohol than simply kicking students out of dorms after a violation or two.

- The major problem with the policy is that almost everyone leaves as a result because there is nothing else to do around here. There’s nowhere to go and a very sparse social life, so people drink on the weekends in the dorms. This shouldn’t be surprising.

Comments regarding RAs focused on their relationships with students and their consistency in enforcing alcohol policies. One student called for “Better trained RAs,” and one suggested that RAs talk with students about alcohol “when they first move in.” One student said, “I think it really comes down to kids having respect for their RAs,” and one said:

- I feel like universities should choose more devoted Residential Advisers (RAs) to watch over the residential halls. Many RAs simply don’t try hard enough to get to know their residents, so the residents have no respect for the RAs and are willing to break the rules in their dorms.

Three students said, “if RAs would just confront their residents if they believe they were drinking,” “RAs should be more consistent with who and what they decide to write up,” and “Some RAs are very lenient when it comes to alcohol.” A fourth student said that whether a student is reported for violating the alcohol policy “is really just based on luck and timing” and continued by saying, “I could have been just as sick, but in another dorm, and I would have gotten away with it.” One indicated “Instead of residence advisers being out to get kids, they should just make sure they are safe so that the kids don’t get screwed over by the university.”
Another consistency issue is addressed in the following comments:

- The university should stick with the rules they have issued and not change them. Three warnings and a student is not to live on campus anymore is the rule. The university should not change this for some students and kick them off campus for only two warnings.

- Follow through with your own policies. For example, the 3-strike rule is ridiculous. I lived in the apartments and knew multiple people who were not evicted from campus housing after their 3rd write up.

Finally, the following two recommendations express different perspectives regarding the role of housing staff in enforcing alcohol policies.

- Don’t walk around in the dorms looking for people who are going to drink because more than 75% of students, especially in [name of city], drink because there is nothing to do here.

- Dorm check. A supervisor of some sort would not allow any student to leave a dorm without an alcohol check, to see if they are carrying anything that contains alcohol. If the staffing of such a policy is too difficult, then at least have someone check students when they’re attending going to campus events.

**Police and security guards.** Twelve students mentioned police and two mentioned security guards in their responses. Both of the comments regarding security guards called for greater consistency in enforcing alcohol policies. For example, one student claimed that, “Some of the officers have been known to drink with the students or to completely pass by the fact that students are violating the alcohol policy.” Comments regarding police vary greatly. Three students recommended “Law enforcement action,” “Calling the police,” and “Cutting down on drinking on campus by involving the police more often.” A fourth student said, “I think you should just report students to the police and let the police do the disciplining.”

In contrast, one student said, “Only the most serious violations should receive police involvement,” and one recommended that institutions “Hang up flyers warning students about cops.” One claimed that “Part of the reason this campus will never be a booming university is because the alcohol policy and police are so eager to get people in trouble.” Two additional comments regarding police are as follows:
• My roommate was suspended, and the police were very rude! They need to take in account that they were in college once and drinking happens. One party shouldn’t ruin the rest of your life, but that is what they did.
• I now realize how much stricter our school is than most because we are a public school. I realize all the benefits from going to a better school that will work with the students and not allow actual police on campus and how you do really get what you pay for in schools. Just keep police off campus and try not to ruin a student’s future for one mistake they made as a teen.

**Warnings as discipline sanctions.** Twenty students mentioned warnings as discipline sanctions. Two simply said, “give a warning”; one said, “give people more warnings”; and five recommended giving warnings “if it’s just one beer,” “if the situation was unfair,” if there are “extenuating circumstances,” if the student also has to “deal with the legal consequences,” and if the student “was not aware of the policy at the time.” Two students said, “They should always give a warning first” and “I think they could do a better job giving warnings and not being so strict the first time,” while two others said, “First time should be a warning and second time have harsher consequences” and “To begin with just give a warning and slowly make consequences worse.”

One student recommended a “Warning that a fine will be cited and suspension/eviction from on-campus living will be put in place after 2 or 3 times of violating,” while another said, “A warning, but I DO NOT think you should be kicked out of your dorm after your second violation. Mistakes will repeat, moving the student will not solve the problem.” One student recommended “Warnings or community service, depending on how severe the incident was,” and another made the following comment.

• A meeting with the area coordinator to talk over the incident. The consequences would be a warning stating that next time this happens it would result in further and actual disciplinary action. You would also have to participate in an alcohol education class and in community service. In my opinion, you’re still learning a lot and doing good for not only yourself but the community. It’s positive reinforcement because you wouldn’t receive any real disciplinary sanctions other than a warning. This would not make students as put down by sanctions and would be encouragement to actually stop and not underage drink.
Two students indicated that warnings have no effect on the drinking behaviors of students, one recommended, “no second chances,” and one made the following comment.

Students need a harsher punishment for the first time around, so they can learn their lesson. Just giving them a warning basically tells them you don’t consider the violation to be all that serious.

“Serious” discipline sanctions. At or near what many may consider to be the other end of the sanctioning scale that ranges from warnings to dismissal from the institution lie the comments of ten students that are quoted here. Six of these students asserted that, in order to deter students from underage or excessive drinking, there need to be “heavier policies,” “more sanctions after an incident,” “more serious disciplinary actions,” “more extreme punishments,” “worse punishments,” and “harsher punishments in regards to suspending and expelling students.” Two additional students said, “EXPULSION” and “[the threat of] dismissal from the university would scare students from wanting to do it again, or at least cut down.” And two others responded as follows:

- Nothing more could have helped. I would have made the same decisions regardless – unless there was an immediate removal from the university.
- You would have to seriously kick people out of school to make them stop drinking.

Comments and Recommendations Pertaining to Other Discipline Sanctions, Policies, Programs, and Services

Monetary fines. Monetary fines as disciplinary sanctions were mentioned by 16 students. Half of them recommended fines as deterrents because, for example, “people don’t like paying money for anything,” “college students are mostly broke,” or “money is a huge deal in college.” Two said, “a second offense should result in a fine” and “the second offense should involve more money.” One said, “Just keep fining students who keep on repeating the violation,” and another said:

- Alcohol, for how shameful this may sound, has become a part of a college experience. Like [those who do] anything else that is illegal, but is a victim-less crime, students should just be fined and sent on their way. The amount of energy to teach and undergo reviews of the perps does not add up to successful interventions, in my opinion.
Some students are not in favor of fines and/or do not believe fines are effective deterrents. One said fines do not “punish” him because his “parents have to pay them,” and another said, “Not a [expletive] fine for my [expletive] family.” One recommended “Not being as strict when a student blows a .01 and receives a fine when we are going to be 30k in debt by the end of the college education.” And two others made the following comments:

• I do not know what would stop college students from drinking. I don’t think you really can. My fine and alcohol class honestly just pissed me off.

• I understand that not all college students are broke. For me, the fine I had to pay was the biggest deterrent, as well as the tarnished record. Putting too much on a full-time student could hurt his academic success. I would like to see the university take into consideration time and place of the incident and instead of punishing, reward improvement. If alcoholism is a disease, should we reward good or improved behavior or should we punish every instance? I haven’t had a drink in a long time because I am trying to be healthy, and the one occasion when I decide to celebrate with some friends I get arrested and charged. With all this I get even more fines and “duties” from my university that makes it harder when I am struggling.

Parental notification. Five students commented on parental notification. Three simply said, “call parents,” “tell parents,” or “notify parents”. The other two offered the following comments:

• No matter what the consequences, college kids are going to drink alcohol. With that being said, they could make a policy that if you are caught you must call your parents and tell them in front of a school official because telling the parents is usually the part that everyone hates the most.

• The most effective sanction for me and for every student I know who has had trouble with alcohol violations is notification of parents. Students don’t seem to care about a college warning, a fine, or even probation, but when their parents find out it becomes a much more serious matter. The notification of my parents is what has deterred me from violating the alcohol policy.

“ You would have to seriously kick people out of school to make them stop drinking. ”
Community service and counseling. Five students recommended community service as a discipline sanction, and three mentioned counseling. Examples of comments within the category are as follows:

- Community service instead of a monetary fine. Most college students do not want to wake up early on a Saturday morning to pick up trash at the park, work at a soup kitchen, etc.
- BETTER COUNSELING. [Name of institution] needs to get more creative counselors. Their counselors need to come up with their own ideas to try to help kids instead of just referring them to other programs. We don’t want to go to those and we need one-on-one guidance.

Transportation. Three students commented on transportation. One simply said, “Safe Ride” and one said, “My incident happened on the way home from a party. A clear, safe transportation system such as public busses would prevent alcohol policy violations such as my own.” The third student said, “Set up a sober driver program, and everyone would be fine.”

Amnesty. Two students recommended amnesty policies. One emphasized that this policy should be “clearly explained to the students” and the other said “it would be EXTREMELY beneficial, since if a student is sick they will be able to get their friend to safety instead of guessing what to do.”

“\nThe most effective sanction for me and for every student I know who has had trouble with alcohol violations is notification of parents. Students don’t seem to care about a college warning, a fine, or even probation, but when their parents find out it becomes a much more serious matter. The notification of my parents is what has deterred me from violating the alcohol policy.”
Other Recommendations from Students

One student recommended each of the following: “DUI checkpoints,” “AODA meetings and therapy,” “Restorative justice programs,” “An honor system,” “Saturday detention,” “Giving students more privacy,” having “a place on campus where students can drink,” “Not making empty containers a cause for disciplinary action,” “Not harassing students,” having “definite concrete evidence before convicting a student,” following-up with students on probation “to make sure their incidents don’t happen again,” “Not telling parents one thing and doing another,” and letting students “see the calorie counts in different popular drinks and the combined total calories of drinking an average of about 10 drinks per weekend.”

Finally, one student (each) said that institutions should “make it more difficult for underage students to acquire alcohol,” “tell us where we CAN drink when we turn 21,” “make it known that at school functions there will be area coordinators walking the campus,” “make students in violation spend their nights with an RA or someone so they won’t have the night to go party or what have you,” and “say that an offense will harm your GPA. If you go to a serious school, no one will risk that.”

No changes are needed. Positive comments regarding policies and programs that are already in place were made by 23 students. Eleven of them indicated that current policies, programs and programs at their institutions “are fine,” “are all fine,” “work,” “do their job,” “do a good job,” “are effective” “are sufficient,” “make the school rules clear and the repercussions understandable,” “are well-enforced,” “are suitable,” and “are fair and for the most part seems like they hit all of the key points (education, counseling, etc.).” Five other students essentially recommended “same as are already in place” or “same as they do now.” Three said, “no other policies or programs seem necessary,” “our system does not need to change” or “I would not recommend that any aspect of the system be altered.” And yet another four students made the following comments:

• I think my institution has a great program and policy in place, but there will also be the few who heed no warnings.

• I think what they did was effective. I have not repeated the behavior, and I have learned more about the effects of alcohol.

• There already are many policies, programs, and actions in place. I just made the mistake of ignoring them on the night of interest.

• I think the University does more than enough to deter violations. I knowingly made my poor choice.
The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of discipline sanctions for alcohol-related policy violations. Effective sanctions were defined as those that students reported as deterring them from repeating the behavior in the future. The study also sought to determine the extent to which the results from this larger sample (N = 777) were consistent with those of our previous research (N = 154).

It should be noted that these data are not based on a random sample of today’s college students, but rather limited to students who had been found responsible by institutional disciplinary systems for violating alcohol policies. Consequently, their behaviors and opinions should NOT be generalized to the larger student population. In selecting only students who had been sanctioned for violating institutional alcohol policies we wanted to capture the attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of those who had actually gone through the campus disciplinary process, had been found responsible for violating alcohol policies, and been sanctioned. Given the primary purpose of the study, we sought students who had first-hand knowledge of the effects of disciplinary sanctions on their subsequent behavior.
As in last years study, a large majority of students said that before the incident they were aware of the negative effects of alcohol on their health and safety. However, in spite of the large number of those who say that they knew the policies, the negative effects of alcohol and that their behavior would violate those policies, they persisted in that behavior. In the open-ended comments section there were some students who stated, that there was a need for more educational programs to explain and clarify the rule and consequences for violating them as well as information on the effects of alcohol on their health and safety, were familiar with their institutional alcohol policies, and knew that their behavior would violate those policies. Nevertheless, in spite of this knowledge, they chose to engage in this behavior.

Some students recommended more educational programs, particularly those that clarify alcohol policies and the consequences for violating them. Obviously, institutional efforts to inform students about their policies, disciplinary consequences and negative effects of alcohol are not reaching every student, and many of those who are reached either don’t care, or believe they will never be caught violating the community standards, or the policies hasn’t been made sufficiently weighty to them. In the words of one student “Nothing can deter college students from drinking”. While many students told us this and we believe many administrators also think it’s true, the results of this study show that there are several sanctions that can have a deterrent effect on students repeating their alcohol-related behavior.

The data from this year’s study and those from last year’s study, reveal that institutions may be focused on less effective sanctions and are less likely to use sanctions that students believe are more effective in deterring them from repeating their behavior. Institutions need to conduct their own research to learn what sanctions their particular students believe are effective in deterring them from violating alcohol policies, and based upon that data, rethink their sanctions. Administrators are free to use the survey in Appendix D if proper attribution is given.

Most students in the sample were under 21 lived in residence halls on campus, and their alcohol violation took place on campus The most common types of violations were underage drinking and underage possession of alcohol. A considerable number of these violations were in connection with loud, rude, disorderly or disruptive behavior; damaged property; placing self and others at risk; or actually injuring someone. There were 23 students who were driving under the influence (DWI) and 20 who had to be hospitalized for alcohol poisoning. Although those may seem like small numbers, that’s way too many! This year we were able to break down data on the basis of age and sex and found that the DWI violators were more often men over 21 years of age. Men were also more likely than women to have been found in violation of policies related to possession while women were more often found responsible for actually drinking alcohol in violation of campus rules or civil laws.
This year the top three sanctions issued were the same as they were last year, possibly suggesting that they are uniformly used. Each of the three sanctions — participation in an alcohol education program, disciplinary probation with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences, and a warning not to repeat the behavior — represented over 50% of all sanctions issued. No other sanction was issued that was even close to 50%. While students generally believe that the disciplinary sanctions they received were “somewhat”, “effective” or “extremely effective”, a closer look at the three most often used sanctions tells a different story. A larger majority of students said sanctions “simply make students more cautious so they don’t get caught.”

Alcohol education programs are generally offered in person or on line and students are required to pay for them as part of the sanction. Students had differing views of the effectiveness of alcohol education programs with many students recommending them and others trumpeting the need for programs to “bring students’ attention to the hazards of drinking.” However, another student pointed out that “almost on a daily basis since middle school... [students] have been informed of the dangers of drinking... by the time they reach college... any additional activities just waste time and cause a slight disruption in academic work.”

Disciplinary probation, with a warning that future violations would result in more serious consequences, was the second most often used sanction. The third most often issued sanction was a warning. While several students though that warnings were an appropriate sanction, especially for a first or not too serious infraction, two others said warnings had no effect and a warning “…basically tells them you don’t consider the violation to be all that serious.” Indeed, warnings were issued to 37 of the students who had been found responsible for violated institutional alcohol policies THREE or MORE TIMES! — obviously not a very effective deterrent.

Fines were a frequently issued sanction, but they too don’t seem to be effective deterrents. As one student said fines do not “punish” him because his “parents have to pay them.” In 1761 the Board of Overseers at Harvard came to the same conclusion when they decided “…the use of fines was not a sufficiently effective deterrent to crime, being primarily a tax on parents rather than students. They, therefore, decided to reduce the use of fines and to return to … notifications to parents.” (Moore, 1976). We haven’t learned much in 250 years!

Students said the three most effective sanctions were among the least used by institutions. Parental notification was used about one-third of the time, and the majority of the students whose parents were notified said this would deter them from repeating their behavior. It was
also suggested by about one-third of the students recommended parental notification as a way to prevent other students from violating alcohol policies. One student put the sanction in context saying, “The most effective sanction for me and for every student I know… is notification of parents. Students don’t seem to care about a college warning, a fine or even probation, but when their parents find out it becomes a much more serious matter. The notification of my parents is what has deterred me from violating the alcohol policy.”

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232(g) (Regulations appear at 34 CFR 99) permits parental notification for alcohol violations if the student is less than 21 at the time of the notice. The vast majority of the students in this study were under 21 years of age, so it is puzzling why so many institutions fail to notify parents when it has such a deterrent effect. Some administrators argue that they don’t inform parents because they want to treat students like adults. However those same administrators fail to contact police when students violate the law by drinking underage or are otherwise in violation of the law.

Three of the least used sanctions were an alcohol assessment, notification of police (if, the violation involved unlawful behavior), and participation in an alcohol treatment program. Students, however, said alcohol assessment is highly effective as a deterrent. The majority of the students who had alcohol assessments said they were “somewhat,” “very,” or “extremely” effective. Similarly, the majority of those who had participated in alcohol treatment programs said their participation in an alcohol treatment program was “somewhat,” “very,” or “extremely,” effective. Yet, institutions used these effective sanctions only 10% of the time or less.

The police were notified in less than half of the incidents when the violation involved unlawful behavior, yet for the 327 students who were involved with the criminal justice system the majority said that was a deterrent. Students want to be treated as adults, which they are, so it is difficult to understand why having police notified of unlawful behavior is not something institutions do when it is such a powerful deterrent to repeating the behavior.

One final deterrent is simply going through the process. When asked if the incident and its consequences made them more aware of the effects of alcohol on their behavior, health and safety, the majority of these students said their increased awareness did. In addition, of those who said it made them more aware, two-thirds said it deterred them from repeating their behavior.
Binge drinking on college campuses is a serious problem recognized by college presidents (Center for Science in the Public Interest, 2006), and the results of this study confirm that binge drinking is a serious problem. What is alarming is that at the time of the incident almost half of the students said they were binge drinkers and almost 40% said they were binge drinkers at the time of the survey.

Last year women’s binge drinking rates decreased substantially more than men’s between the time of the incident and when the survey was completed. Those results were not replicated this year. While the binge drinking rate for women again decreased slightly more than the rate for men, the gender difference was not as dramatic as last year. However, it does suggest that women may, as a result of the experience and its consequences, be more inclined to stop binge drinking.

Not only are institutions focused on less effective sanctions, but they are failing to use measures that would be helpful in deterring students from repeating their behavior in the future. Alcohol assessment and treatment are effective sanctions, and measuring a student’s blood alcohol level (BAL) or the blood alcohol concentration (BAC) could be used to justify such sanctions. It could also be used to help students become aware of how much alcohol they have consumed. However, a large majority of students reported that the institution did not measure their BAL at the time of the incident. The need to support students who face the challenge of not repeating their behavior seems obvious but most students reported no follow-up or minimal follow-up after their sanction. The majority did not answer the question concerning follow-up possibly indicating that there was “no” follow-up, and an additional third said “none” or described a minimal effort by administrators to follow-up. One student pointed out how important follow-up really is. He said “None, however maybe it would make their job more effective if they did.”
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

- **Institutions must survey their own students to learn what sanctions they believe would deter them from repeating the behavior.** Institutions are using sanctions that have little deterrent value and they are not using sanctions students believe would deter them from repeating their behavior. Institutions may, with proper attribution, use the instrument in Appendix D to survey their students to determine their particular opinions of sanctions that have a deterrent value.

- **Institutions must follow-up with students who have been sanctioned to provide them with support in the challenge of not repeating the behavior.** It is recognized that there are limited staff to do this, but others can be enlisted to assist in this effort. Graduate students, practicum students or interns in appropriate disciplines might be available to assist. If the institution has no graduate programs, graduate students from nearby institutions or faculty and staff may be sought as volunteers to follow-up with students.

- **Institutions must comply in a meaningful way with the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (20 USC 3224a with regulations at 34 CFR 86).** The law requires that students be told of the laws, college rules, sanctions, effect on their health, and counseling services available. Based on our extensive experience in student affairs, we know student do not read student handbooks and the other materials we provide them, so the information must be provided verbally as well at orientation, during hall meetings, and in first year seminars and should be posted on campus in places students frequent (not on bulletin boards with a thousand other materials –try the back of bathroom stall doors at eye level when seated). They can’t be told often enough. Institutions may also consider enlisting students who have had negative experiences as a result of using alcohol to speak at orientation. Students tell us they listen to each other more than to administrators.

- **Housing staff needs to enforce the alcohol policies consistently and fairly.** Many students who live in the residence halls do not drink and should not be subjected to others who are loud, rude and disruptive. Students commented “if RAs would just confront their residents if they believe they were drinking,” “RAs should be more consistent with who and what they decide to write up,” and “some RAs are very lenient when it comes to alcohol.”
If permitted by state law, parental notification should be used for all alcohol violations for students under 21 years of age. This is one of the most important deterrells, yet it is not used by almost two-thirds of the institutions. Institutions miss out on enlisting parents as an important allies in the struggle to limit the use of alcohol on campus.

If educational programs are used as a sanction, be sure that they are not used in isolation, but in combination with other actions (not just a fine either!) (See, DeJong, W., Vince-Whitman, C., Colthurst, T., Cretella, M., Gilbreath, M. Rosati, M. & Zweig, K., 1998).

If students are involved with unlawful behavior notify police. Involvement in the criminal justice system is a powerful deterrent. Students want to be treated like adults and should be. Others of the same age who are not in college and engage in unlawful behavior are subjected to the criminal justice system. Why should college students be insulated from the law?

Students who are cited for excessive drinking or underage drinking need to have their BAL/BAC measured. This will assist in determining if they need to have an alcohol assessment or be assigned to an alcohol treatment program. Measuring students' BAL/BAC also provides them with an objective measurement of their level of intoxication.

Institutions should consider an amnesty program if they do not have one. This program would allow students or others seeking medical assistance to do so without disciplinary consequences if the student has become ill because of their alcohol or drug use. Better to have students seek medical assistance than die in their rooms because they were afraid of getting into trouble [see Oster-Aaland, L., Thompson, K., & Eighmy, M. (2011)].
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APPENDIX A

Earlier this year, you expressed interest in assisting our research team, Dr. Don Gehring, Dr. Carolyn Palmer, and myself, with the next phase of our research on relationship of disciplinary sanctions to subsequent underage or excessive drinking on the part of students found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies. I am writing today to confirm your continued willingness to participate in this study and share additional information with you.

Our research, which is funded by the Century Council, is sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration in partnership with The National Judicial College. The ultimate goal of the study is to improve the effectiveness of campus disciplinary systems in deterring students found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies from repeating their behavior in the future. This research project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. You can view the IUP IRB’s approval letter on-line.

We will be asking that you identify at least 10 students found responsible in the past 6 months of violating institutional alcohol policies at your institution. You can either randomly select 10 students or simply send survey to each student who has been found responsible in the last 6 months of violating institutional alcohol policies. Approximately one week after sending the initial message, please send a reminder to all of the students requesting again that they complete the survey. After two weeks, we would ask that you send a final reminder to each of the students you originally contacted requesting that they complete the survey. We will provide you with the text of messages to be sent to your students.

If you remain willing to participate in our research study, no further action is needed on your part at this time. We will send you another message in approximately one week with additional instructions as well as the text of the email messages to be sent to students. If you are unable or unwilling to participate in our research study, please email me by Friday, March 30, 2012.

Thank you very much for your continued support of our research. Please contact me if you have any questions or need more information.

Sincerely,

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
dlowery@iup.edu

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
APPENDIX B

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in the next phase of our study of the relationship of disciplinary sanctions to subsequent underage or excessive drinking on the part of students found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies!

This research, which is funded by the Century Council, is sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration in partnership with The National Judicial College. The ultimate goal of the study is to improve the effectiveness of campus disciplinary systems in deterring students found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies from repeating their behavior in the future.

We are asking that you identify at least 10 students found responsible in the past 6 months of violating institutional alcohol policies at Research Team member. You can either randomly select 10 students to send the email messages to below or simply send the message to each student who has been found responsible in the last 6 months of violating institutional alcohol policies. Approximately one week after sending the initial message, please send a reminder to all of the students requesting again that they complete the survey. After two weeks, please send a final reminder to each of the students you originally contacted requesting that they complete the survey. We have included the text of each of the messages below.

Once you have sent the initial email message to your students, please email John Wesley Lowery [jlowery@iup.edu] and let him know how many students were sent the invitation to complete the survey. This email will also serve as your entry into the drawing for 1 of 5 free Kindle Fires or Nook Color e-readers.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact us. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University of Pennsylvania by telephone at 724-357-7730.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
jlowery@iup.edu

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
APPENDIX C

Student Message 1

Dear Student:

We wish to invite you to participate in an important study of the extent to which various disciplinary sanctions deter college students from repeating behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies. To identify research participants, we have asked student conduct administrators to send this message to students who, within the past six months, were found responsible for violating institutional alcohol policies.

Please note that all survey responses are anonymous. We will not know who the respondents are or what institutions they attend. We assure you that there is no way for anyone at Research Team member to see your responses.

This research is funded by the Century Council and is sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration in partnership with The National Judicial College. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. By completing the web-based survey you will be indicating your consent to participate. As an incentive, we will are offering students completing the survey a chance to win 1 of 20 free Kindle Fires or Nook Color e-readers. Your contact information for this drawing will not be linked to your survey responses.

To complete the survey which should take less than 10 minutes, please click on the link below or copy and paste link into your Internet browser:

https://iup.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=6F51gXNe3L95uKg_d54Qzoc3u0bR4oc&_=1

The ultimate goal of the study is to improve the effectiveness of campus disciplinary systems. Student opinions on all of the issues addressed in the survey are of critical importance, so we hope that you will assist us by completing the survey.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact us. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University of Pennsylvania by telephone at 724-357-7730.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
jlowery@iup.edu

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
Student Message 2

Dear Student:

Approximately a week ago we wrote to invite you to participate in an important study of the extent to which various disciplinary sanctions deter college students from repeating behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies. If you have not already done so, we sincerely hope that you will take the time to complete our brief survey.

To complete the survey which should take less than 10 minutes, please click on the link below or copy and paste link into your Internet browser:

https://iup.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=6F51gXNe3L95uKg_d54Qzoc3u0bR4oc8_=1

Please note that all survey responses are anonymous. We will not know who the respondents are or what institutions they attend. We assure you that there is no way for anyone at Research Team member to see your responses.

This research is funded by the Century Council and is sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration in partnership with The National Judicial College. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. By completing the web-based survey you will be indicating your consent to participate. As an incentive, we will are offering students completing the survey a chance to win 1 of 20 free Kindle Fires or Nook Color e-readers. Your contact information for this drawing will not be linked to your survey responses in any way.

The ultimate goal of the study is to improve the effectiveness of campus disciplinary systems. Student opinions on all of the issues addressed in the survey are of critical importance, so we hope that you will assist us by completing the survey.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact us. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University of Pennsylvania by telephone at 724-357-7730.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
jlowery@iup.edu

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
Student Message 3

Dear Student:

It is still not too late for you to participate in an important study of the extent to which various disciplinary sanctions deter college students from repeating behaviors that violate institutional alcohol policies. As an incentive, we will be offering students completing the survey a chance to win one of 20 free Kindle Fires or Nook Color e-readers. Your contact information for this drawing will not be linked to your survey responses. If you have not already done so, we sincerely hope that you will take the time to complete our brief survey.

To complete the survey which should take less than 10 minutes, please click on the link below or copy and paste link into your Internet browser:

https://iup.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=6F51gXNe3L95uKg_d54Qzoc3u0bR4oc&_=1

Please note that all survey responses are anonymous. We will not know who the respondents are or what institutions they attend. We assure you that there is no way for anyone at Research Team member to see your individual responses.

This research is funded by the Century Council and is sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration in partnership with The National Judicial College. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. By completing the web-based survey you will be indicating your consent to participate.

The ultimate goal of the study is to improve the effectiveness of campus disciplinary systems. Student opinions on all of the issues addressed in the survey are of critical importance, so we hope that you will assist us by completing the survey.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact us. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University of Pennsylvania by telephone at 724-357-7730.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
jlowery@iup.edu

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
Informed Consent: The Effects of Sanctioning on Underage and Excessive Drinking on College Campuses

You are invited to participate in a study of the effects of sanctioning on underage and excessive drinking on college campuses. The following information is provided in order to help you to make an informed decision about whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of sanctioning on underage and excessive drinking on college campuses. Participation in this study will require approximately 10 minutes of your time. You will answer survey questions concerning your institution, its policies, and statistics. There is no personal risk involved in participating in this study.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adverse effect. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by closing your web browser.

If you choose to participate, your survey responses will be held in strict confidence. Your responses will be presented in aggregate form with those of other participants or all information identifying you or your institution will be removed. The information obtained in the study may be published in journals or presented at professional meetings but your identity will be kept strictly confidential. If you include information in your responses which identifies you or your institution, that information will only be available to the research team. If you elected to enter the drawing for a free Kindle Fire or Nook Color, your contact information will be stored completely separately from your survey responses. The research team will not be able to connect your contact information with your responses.

If you have any questions regarding this study or would like a summary of the findings, please contact Dr. John Lowery at jlowery@iup.edu. The Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724-357-7730) has approved this research.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please click the “Agree” button below and you will be automatically directed to the survey.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Gehring, Ed.D.
Donald D. Gehring & Associates, Inc.
Professor Emeritus, Bowling Green State University
908-433-4912
dgehrin1@earthlink.net

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-4535
jlowery@iup.edu

Carolyn J. Palmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Bowling Green State University
419-372-7383
cpalmer@bgsu.edu
STUDENT SURVEY

☐ I agree
☐ I disagree

Which of the following characteristics best describe your institution?

☐ Public
☐ Private, Religious-Affiliated
☐ Private, Independent

Which of the following characteristics best describe your institution?

☐ Four-year Undergraduate Only
☐ Four-year undergraduate and Graduate/Professional
☐ Graduate/Professional Only

How many students enrolled on your campus?

☐ Fewer than 2,000
☐ 2,000-9,999
☐ 10,000-19,999
☐ 20,000-29,999
☐ 30,000 or more

How many students who live on your campus?

☐ 1-999
☐ 1,000-4,999
☐ 5,000-9,999
☐ 10,000 or more

Are you male or female?

☐ Male
☐ Female
At the time of the most recent incident for which you were found responsible for violating your institution’s alcohol policy, how old were you?

- Under 21
- 21 or older

Did the incident occur on campus or off campus?

- On campus
- Off campus

Were you living on campus or off campus at the time the incident occurred?

- On Campus
- Off campus

Did the institution measure your Blood Alcohol Level at the time of your violation?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following best describes the violation for which you were found responsible? (Please choose only one)

- Under age possession (only; that is not in combination with other behaviors that violated institutional policies)
- Possession (regardless of age) on a campus or in a specific location where alcohol is prohibited (only)
- Underage drinking (only)
- Drinking (regardless of age) on a campus or in a specific location where alcohol is prohibited (only)
- Providing alcohol to one or more underage individuals
- Driving while intoxicated
- Drinking in combination with loud, rude, disorderly, or disruptive behavior that remained at the verbal level
☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that damaged personal or institutional property

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that endangered your own safety

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that endangered the safety of one or more other people

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that endangered the safety of one or more other people and yourself

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that actually injured you

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that actually injured one or more other people not including yourself

☐ Drinking in combination with behavior that actually injured one or more other people and yourself

☐ Alcohol poisoning requiring hospitalization or medical treatment

☐ Other (please specify below) [ ]

Do you believe you were in fact responsible for the violation for which the discipline system found you responsible?

☐ Yes

☐ No

How many times, including the most recent incident, have you been found responsible for violating your institution’s alcohol policy?

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4 or more
Before the most recent incident occurred, how knowledgeable were you of your institution's alcohol policy?

- Not at all knowledgeable
- Not Very knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Before the incident occurred, how knowledgeable were you that your behavior would violate your institution’s alcohol policy?

- Not at all knowledgeable
- Not very knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Before the incident occurred, how aware were you of the negative effects alcohol could have on your behaviors, health, and safety?

- Not at all aware
- Not very aware
- Somewhat aware
- Very aware
- Extremely aware

Were you found responsible by a student conduct administrator, a disciplinary panel, or both?

- Student conduct administrator
- Disciplinary panel
- Both
Were the disciplinary sanctions determined by a student conduct administrator, a disciplinary panel, or both?

- Student conduct administrator
- Disciplinary panel
- Both

Which of the following disciplinary sanctions were issued? (Please check all that apply.)

- A warning not to repeat the behavior
- Disciplinary probation (which usually comes with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences)
- Participation in an alcohol education program
- Completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol
- Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol
- A monetary fine
- Community service
- Eviction from on-campus housing
- Suspension from the institution
- Participation in an alcohol treatment program
- Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions
- Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment as a sanction itself
- Notification of parents
- Notification of police (if the violation involves unlawful behavior)
- Other (please specify ___________)
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How effective were the disciplinary sanctions you received in deterring you from repeating the behavior?

- Not at all effective
- Slightly effective
- Somewhat effective
- Effective
- Extremely Effective

Do you believe disciplinary sanctions deter most students from violating institution alcohol policies in the future?

- Yes
- No

Do you believe disciplinary sanctions simply make most students more cautious so they do not get caught in the future?

- Yes
- No

Are there other disciplinary sanctions that you believe may be more effective in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe them briefly:

Did you ever tell your parents about this incident and/or its disciplinary consequences?

- Yes
- No
Did the student conduct administrator or other institutional official ever tell your parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Did your parents’ knowing about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Would the student conduct administrator or other institutional official notifying your parents about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Were police notified of or involved in the incident?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Were you arrested?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Did your case ever go to court?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Did you have to spend any time in jail?

☐ Yes
☐ No
Did your involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Yes
- No

Would involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Yes
- No

Whether or not it was required, did you receive an alcohol assessment as a result of this incident?

- Yes
- No

Did the assessment deter you from subsequent underage or excessive drinking?

- Yes
- No

How effective was the assessment in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Not at all Effective
- Not very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Very effective
- Extremely effective

Whether or not it was required, did you participate in an alcohol treatment program as a result of this incident?

- Yes
- No
How effective was the treatment program in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Not at all effective
- Not very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Very effective
- Extremely effective

How has that awareness deterred you from repeating the behavior in the future?

Do you believe being in an alcohol treatment would make you more aware of the negative effects that alcohol can have on your behavior, health and safety?

- Yes
- No

As a result of the incident and its consequences, did you become more aware of the negative effects that alcohol can have on your behavior, health, and safety?

- Yes
- No

Did that awareness deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?

- Yes
- No

Before responding to the following questions, please note that the generally-accepted definition of a “binge drinker” is someone who consumes four or more drinks at one sitting (for women) or five or more drinks at one sitting (for men) at least once in a two-week period.

Given this definition, were you a “binge drinker” at the time the incident occurred?

- Yes
- No
Given this definition, are you a “binge drinker” now?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

To your knowledge, has the student conduct administrator or other institutional official ever referred to you as a “binge drinker”?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

What disciplinary sanctions do you believe would be most effective in deterring other students from violating your institution’s alcohol policies? (Please select up to 5)

- [ ] A warning not to repeat the behavior
- [ ] Disciplinary probation (which usually comes with a warning that repeated behavior will result in more serious consequences)
- [ ] Participation in an alcohol education program
- [ ] Completion of a research paper pertaining to alcohol
- [ ] Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to educate other students about alcohol
- [ ] A monetary fine
- [ ] Community service
- [ ] Eviction from on-campus housing
- [ ] Suspension from the institution
- [ ] Participation in an alcohol treatment program
- [ ] Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment prior to the determination of sanctions
- [ ] Receiving a post-incident alcohol assessment as a sanction itself
- [ ] Notification of parents
- [ ] Notification of police (if the violation involves unlawful behavior)
- [ ] None of these sanctions would be effective
- [ ] Other (please specify below)
What, if any, follow-up has your institution had with you after you completed the disciplinary sanction(s) for your alcohol violation?

In your opinion, what programs, policies, or actions could your institution have in place to deter alcohol policy violations such as the one you were cited for before they happen? (please explain)

Do you want to be entered into a drawing to win a Kindle Fire or Nook Color e-reader?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Please enter the following information to be included into the drawing. This information will not be connected to your responses to the survey in any way.

First name
Last name
E-mail address
Mailing address
City, State and Zip Code
RESEARCH TEAM BIOGRAPHIES

DONALD D. GEHRING, Ed.D.

Don Gehring is Professor Emeritus of Higher Education at Bowling Green State University. He earned his bachelor’s degree in Industrial Management at Georgia Institute of Technology (1960) then served two years in the U.S. Navy in the Western Pacific. He earned an M.Ed. in Mathematics Education at Emory University (1966). While at Emory, Don served in several student affairs positions. After earning his Master’s, he assumed the position as the first Director of Housing at West Georgia College. He received his doctorate in Higher Education at the University of Georgia (1971), and was then appointed the Dean of Student Development at Mars Hill College before becoming Associate Professor at the University of Louisville.

Don has earned distinction as a teacher at both the University of Louisville and Bowling Green State University. His publications are found in a variety of student affairs journals as well as in The Dental Educator; and Surgery. He Co-Edited of The College Student and the Courts, Co-Aauthored Alcohol on Campus and has contributed chapters to a number of other books. He is the founder and first President of The Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). He has been sought as an expert witness in 30 cases including Shinn v. MIT, Lisa Simpson v. The University of Colorado, and The Texas A&M Bonfire cases.

He is the recipient of numerous awards for his contributions to literature, student affairs administration and service to the profession. ACPA elected Don to Senior Scholar status and NASPA recognized him as a Pillar of the Profession.

JOHN WESLEY LOWERY, PH.D.

Dr. John Wesley Lowery is department chair, graduate coordinator, and associate professor in the Student Affairs in Higher Education Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. In August 2009, John joined the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM) as an affiliated consultant. He previously served on the faculty at Oklahoma State University and the University of South Carolina. In addition to teaching, he coordinated graduate preparation programs at both those universities. He earned his doctorate at Bowling Green State University in Higher Education Administration. He previously held administrative positions at Adrian College and Washington University in St. Louis.

John is actively involved in numerous professional associations including ACPA, ASCA, and NASPA. John holds a Masters degree in student personnel services from the University of South Carolina and an undergraduate degree from the University of Virginia in Religious Studies. He is a frequent speaker and author on topics related to student affairs and higher education, particularly legislative issues (including Clery, FERPA, & Title IX) and student conduct on which he is widely regarding as a leading expert. Over his career, John has been honored by several professional organizations. At the 2007 Association for Student Judicial Affairs Conference, he received the D. Parker Young Award for “outstanding ongoing scholarly research contributions to the fields of higher education and student judicial affairs.” In 2007, he was recognized by the Higher Education Administration doctoral program at Bowling Green State University as the alumnus of year in “recognition of outstanding contributions to the profession through teaching, research, and service.” At the American College Personnel Association’s 2005 meeting, he received the Tracy R. Teele Memorial Award from the Commission on Campus Judicial Affairs and Legal Issues for “outstanding contributions to the area of judicial affairs and legal issues.”
CAROLYN J. PALMER

Carolyn Palmer received her bachelor’s degree in human development from the University of Massachusetts, her master’s degree in counseling from the University of Connecticut, and her Ph.D. in education (quantitative and evaluative research methodologies) from the University of Illinois. After serving as a student housing administrator at the University of Illinois for 15 years, she moved to Bowling Green State University, where she served for 21 years as a faculty member in the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs.

Carolyn has received numerous awards from professional organizations at the state, regional, national, and international level for her service, research, and writing. Among her publications are books focusing on topics as varied as computer applications in statistics, violence in residence halls, and adult learners in higher education. She co-edited A Handbook for Complying with the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act with Don Gehring and co-authored journal articles regarding parental notification policies with both Don Gehring and John Lowery.

She retired from her full-time position at BGSU in 2011, but continues her research and writing as an associate professor emerita.