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"THE DELAWARE PLAN"

A COMPILATION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE’S EFFORTS TO CURB BINGE AND ABUSIVE DRINKING AMONG STUDENTS

BACKGROUND

In 1992 the University of Delaware conducted a CORE Survey on campus. The alcohol consumption rates among University students were startling. Over 60% of the students who answered the survey indicated that they were binge drinkers. The Harvard University School of Public Health conducted a national survey of binge drinking in 1993 – 1994. The survey was conducted at 140 institutions and involved over 17,000 students. The University of Delaware was included in that survey and once again very high binge drinking rates were reported. In response to the growing concern over student alcohol use, the University increased educational programs in the residence halls, enhanced mandated alcohol education programs assigned as a result of disciplinary action and initiated a grant proposal designed to seek support from more aggressive efforts to curb alcohol abuse among students.

In 1996 the University of Delaware received a grant of $700,000 from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to develop a variety of unique and collaborative approaches to reduce binge drinking on campus. One such approach based on recommendations from both Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the American Medical Association included the enhancement of the present judicial system to better address abusive drinking. Subsequently, two of the major policy changes implemented in the 1997 – 1998 Academic Year included the publication and enforcement of consistent stronger penalties for the illegal use of alcohol and revision of the judicial process through the use of computer technology to expedite the disciplinary referral and adjudication process.
In essence, the University adopted a “three strikes and you are out rule.” Attachment A describes the penalties for freshman students and upper class individuals. You will note that the penalties include parental notification. The University used the “dependency” loophole in FERPA to notify parents and guardians of judicial action. The University believes that this had a dramatic impact on changing student behavior and reducing recidivism.

In addition to strengthening disciplinary enforcement, the University worked toward the implementation of twenty-nine new objectives (See Appendix B). These included everything from a very strict evaluation system for fraternities and sororities to proposing legislative changes in the area of social host and dram shop laws to working with the University’s feeder high schools to change their alcohol culture. Clearly, some of these efforts have been more successful than others. For instance, so far the University has had no impact on legislation. The State of Delaware has no dram shop legislation and has no social host legislation or case law.

ALCOHOL IN HIGH SCHOOLS

The University is convinced that it inherits its alcohol problems to some extent from its feeder high schools. Therefore, the University has embarked on developing programs dealing with alcohol abuse in its feeder schools. Appendix C indicates the consumption rates and other problems associated with alcohol in Delaware high schools.

In the attached material you can see that 77% of Delaware high schools’ eleventh graders have used alcohol in their lifetime and 28% are binge drinkers. In addition, almost 50% of eighth graders have consumed alcohol at least once within the past year. Approximately 10% of the fifth graders have consumed alcohol within the past year. These rates of alcohol consumption have stayed consistently high for the past decade and there is no question that students bring their alcohol consumption habits right into higher education.
RESULTS

Since the new policies were put in place in September of 1997, there have been a number of positive indicators. The following is a list of areas in which the University has seen improvement.

- Vandalism went down in the residence halls by 32%
- Alcohol overdoses, which led to hospitalization, went down 20%
- More than 300 extra upper-class students wanted to remain in the residence halls after the first year of the changes
- The recidivism rate for alcohol offenses is relatively low. In the first year of the new penalties, there were 630 first offenses, 143 second offenses and only 51 third offenses
- Greek disciplinary cases were reduced by 50%
- Resident assistants in the residence halls were very supportive of the “three strikes and you are out policy” and they are convinced that it improved the residence hall environment
- Residence hall students reported at the end of the first year a much better living and studying environment
- Parents were overwhelmingly positive about being contacted concerning their sons and daughters Code of Conduct violations
- Levels of binge drinking were reduced from 61.9% prior to the new policies to 56.7% after their implementation
- The use of marijuana also dropped from 24.6% prior to the new sanctions to 21.5% this year
- The number of abstainers went from 6% to 15.7%.
CONCLUSION

When the University of Delaware first started using the CORE survey in 1992, it knew that there was an alcohol issue on campus. Without question a culture of alcohol abuse was present. After the University received the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant, it put in place a number of changes including an enhanced judicial system and spending significantly more money on alcohol free student activities. All of the efforts appear to be making some positive changes in the University environment. However, the University recognizes that it will take at least five to ten years to truly change an alcohol-based culture. The results seem to indicate that the University is clearly headed in the right direction.
APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE ALCOHOL SANCTIONS
Effective September 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESHMAN INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR(S)</th>
<th>FIRST OFFENSE</th>
<th>SECOND OFFENSE</th>
<th>THIRD OFFENSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under age 21 possession and/or consumption.</td>
<td>Disciplinary probation for one year.</td>
<td>Deferred suspension from Hall for one year.</td>
<td>Suspension from Halls for one year. The student will be held responsible for the full cost of the residence hall room for the remainder of the academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open container of alcohol in public.</td>
<td>Alcohol Education</td>
<td>Substance abuse referral.</td>
<td>Deferred suspension from University for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting a party involving the illegal use of alcohol.</td>
<td>$50.00 fine.</td>
<td>$100.00 fine.</td>
<td>Parental notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS' INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR(S)</th>
<th>FIRST OFFENSE</th>
<th>SECOND OFFENSE</th>
<th>THIRD OFFENSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under age 21 possession and/or consumption.</td>
<td>Disciplinary probation for one year.</td>
<td>Deferred suspension from University for one year.</td>
<td>Suspension from University for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting a party involving the illegal use of alcohol.</td>
<td>$50.00 fine.</td>
<td>$100.00 fine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sanctions are cumulative. Consequently, upper-division students who already have code of conduct violations may receive more severe sanctions. Sanctions may also be enhanced based on the severity of the behavior and the impact on the community.
Goal 1: Reduce the frequency and amount of student binge drinking to below the norm (44%) of other four-year institutions of higher education, as reported by the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study, by the year 2000-01

**STRENGTHENING ENFORCEMENT**

**Objective 1.A:** Increase the severity of University judicial system sanctions for alcohol code violations  
Target: Violators of the alcohol code  
Desired Outcome: Increase the negative consequences for students who violate the alcohol code  
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

**Objective 1.B:** Increase the efficiency with which alcohol code violations are adjudicated  
Target: Violators of the alcohol code  
Desired Outcome: Imose more immediate consequences for students who violate the alcohol code  
Status: Implemented, September, 1997, on-going

**Objective 1.C.:** Coordinate alcohol code enforcement operations that target underage drinking and/or alcohol abuse  
Target: Alcohol sellers and consumers  
Desired Outcome: Increased enforcement of existing laws governing the selling and use of alcohol  
Status: On-going

**Objective 1.D.:** Increase the number of officers available for alcohol control efforts within the Delaware Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission  
Target: Sellers and buyers of alcohol  
Desired Outcome: Increased enforcement of existing laws governing the selling and use of alcohol  
Status: September, 1999
CHANGING POLICY

Objective 1.E.: Educate the public policy-makers about the advantages of strengthening policies affecting the price, access to and availability of alcohol
Target: City Council
Desired Outcome: Eliminate discount prices for alcohol
Status: Target start date, December, 1998

Objective 1.F: Educate the public policy-makers about the advantages of establishing dram shop and social host responsibility policies as well as raising the cost of an alcohol license
Target: Alcohol sellers
Desired outcome: Establish criminal liabilities and increase risks for sellers of alcohol who contribute directly to the abuse of their products
Status: Target start date, September, 1999

Objective 1.G.: Develop a plan to educate stakeholders about any proposed legislative changes
Target: City Council and State Legislature
Desired Outcome: Demonstrate public support for the proposed legislation
Status: Implemented, summer, 1998; on-going

Objective 1.H. Change the social hosting policies of the Greek system for special events that are open to members of the non-Greek community
Target: Greek organizations
Desired Outcome: Eliminate open fraternity parties where alcohol is served and institute F.I.P.G. standards for the management risks associated with alcohol
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

Goal 2: Change the knowledge base, perceptions, and environment of students pertaining to alcohol use and abuse

INCREASING KNOWLEDGE

Objective 2.A.: Amend the materials and procedures used to recruit and to orient new students to the institution
Target: New students
Desired Outcome: Communicate expectations of the institution about the use of alcohol to new students and parents
Status: Implemented, September, 1997; on-going

Objective 2.B.: Develop a partnership between the University, feeder schools, and other community agencies/groups to communicate an intolerance of high-risk drinking
Target: High school students and families
Desired Outcome: Combat the perception that the University is a "party school"
Status: Target start date, September, 1998
Objective 2.C.: Establish a course which focuses on research about alcohol use and the negative consequences of it
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Educate students about direct and second-hand consequences of alcohol use and encourage them to do research projects which will enhance coalition activities
Status: Implemented, September, 1997; on-going

Objective 2.D.: Inform faculty members how class requirements, examinations, and schedules can inadvertently enable students to sustain an unhealthy involvement with alcohol
Target: Faculty members
Desired Outcome: Enlist faculty leaders (Faculty Senate, Center for Teaching Effectiveness) in recognizing the legitimacy of the concerns about binge drinking and encourage them to actively oppose such behaviors
Status: Implemented, Fall, 1997; on-going

Objective 2.E.: Expand orientation programs for students who move from University housing into the community
Target: Commuter students
Desired Outcome: Encourage students to be knowledgeable about and sensitive to community standards of conduct, resulting in fewer disorderly house violations in the City of Newark
Status: Implemented, January, 1998; on-going

CHANGING PERCEPTIONS

Objective 2.F.: Develop a media campaign degrading high-risk drinking, including student-created PSA’s, posters, and public relations events
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Change in attitude of students about the desirability of high-risk drinking
Status: Target start date, September, 1998

Objective 2.G.: Assess and/or improve current efforts to continue to educate students and community members about the problems associated with high-risk drinking
Target: Campus and community
Desired Outcome: Take full advantage of opportunities to educate/influence individuals about high-risk drinking
Status: Implemented, summer, 1998

Objective 2.H. Focus attention on the second-hand negative effects of high-risk drinking, through the use of media and the framing of high-risk drinking as a public health issue
Target: Campus and community
Desired Outcome: Decrease the incidence of disorderly conduct charges, sexual assaults and vandalism related to alcohol use
Status: Implemented, September, 1997; on-going
Objective 2.1.: Establish a "Student-Athletes Against Irresponsible Drinking" program
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Use highly-visible student-athletes to encourage other students to use alcohol legally and responsibly
Status: Target start date, December, 1998

CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

Objective 2.J.: Increase the number and type of non-alcoholic social activities on the campus and in the community
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Initiate new alternative social activities for students to attract them away from parties where binge drinking may be normative
Status: Implemented, September, 1997; on-going

Objective 2.K.: Develop an internet Web site for communicating information to students about alternative social activities
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Increase attendance of students at non-alcoholic activities
Status: Implemented, January, 1998

Objective 2.L.: Establish an accreditation system for Greek organizations that will emphasize a return to the traditional values of scholarship and service and de-emphasize the "animal house" syndrome
Target: Greek organizations
Desired Outcome: Require organizations to meet high standards in order to continue their role on campus
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

Objective 2.M.: Implement a "Designated Driver" program in cooperation with local bars and restaurants
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Discourage students from traveling with those whose driving abilities are impaired by the use of alcohol
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

Objective 2.N: Promote the University's mortgage assistance program to encourage employees to purchase houses in areas of Newark that are heavily populated by students
Target: University employees
Desired Outcome: Counter the trend to convert certain neighborhoods in Newark into student rental units where off-campus parties proliferate, so that the density of student off-campus housing is lowered
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

Objective 2.O.: Initiate a "Get to Know Your Neighbor" program for off-campus students
Target: Students who live in Newark neighborhoods
Desired Outcome: Fewer complaints to City administrators and police concerning disrespectful student behavior.
Status: Implemented, September, 1997

Objective 2.P.: Establish model lease agreements between community landlords and renters that will provide stronger restrictions about the use of alcohol.
Target: Renters
Desired Outcome: Provide landlords with more assurances that renters will be responsible for respecting property and following good neighbor practices, resulting in fewer City code violations.
Status: Target start date, September, 1998

Objective 2.Q.: Support the growth of non-alcoholic activities and businesses which offer late-night hours.
Target: Students and local businesses
Desired Outcome: Decrease the number of alcohol-related offenses after 10:00 p.m.
Status: Implemented, January, 1998; on-going

Objective 2.R.: Through the partnership between the University, feeder schools, and other community agencies/groups, strengthen existing alcohol prevention programs in the secondary schools.
Target: High school students and families
Desired Outcome: Enhance health education curricula, encourage socially responsible behavior, and engage parents in alcohol-related topics.
Status: Target start date, September, 1998

Goal 3: Conduct on-going assessments that will describe the attitudes and behaviors of students in regard to high-risk drinking.

COLLECTING DATA

Objective 3.A.: Compile a data base that will document the consequences of high-risk drinking, such as alcohol-related arrests, injuries, fatalities, and property damage.
Target: Campus and community
Desired Outcome: Provide data to stakeholders about the consequences to the campus and community of high-risk drinking.
Status: June, 1998

Objective 3.B.: Administer the CORE Survey on a bi-annual basis to a stratified random sample of students.
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Measure longitudinal changes in students’ attitudes and behaviors, such as drinks/week and binge episodes/week.
Status: Fall, 1998
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Objective 3.C.: Use focus groups to obtain input from students about Coalition activities
Target: Students
Desired Outcome: Assess student reaction to Coalition efforts and encourage input from them
Status: Implemented, spring, 1998; on-going

8. How do you see the foundation's role?

As was true a year ago, the strongest needs we have for the involvement of the foundation are to supplement the local efforts to develop a media campaign. In the absence of a national media campaign, additional funding seems vitally important to strengthen our capabilities in this area and to respond to external events in a more timely fashion.
Delaware Kids and Alcohol

Facts You Should Know

- Almost three-quarters of 11th graders have drunk alcohol at least once within the past year, almost half within the past month. Only 29% feel there is great harm in daily drinking, and less than half perceive great harm in binge-drinking (more than five drinks at a time for a male, four for a female). 30% of 11th graders binge drink.

- Almost half of all 8th graders have drunk alcohol at least once within the past year, 28% within the past month. Less than one quarter feel there is great harm in daily drinking and less than half perceive great harm in binge drinking. 15% of 8th graders binge drink.

- 10% of 5th graders have drunk alcohol within the past year, and only one-third feel there is great harm in daily drinking.

- 28% of 11th graders have driven a car at least once after drinking, 20% within the past year, 9% within the past month.

- Half of 11th graders report ever riding in a car with a driver who has been drinking alcohol, one-third within the past year, and 14% at least once within the past month. Forty percent of 8th graders report riding in a car with a driver who has been drinking alcohol, one quarter within the past year, and 12% within the past month.

- 8th graders who argue almost daily with their parents are more than twice as likely to use alcohol as those who rarely argue. 11th graders are 50% more likely.

- 8th graders who drink alcohol are more than twice as likely to steal, fight, commit illegal entry and three times as likely to skip school and be in trouble with the police as students who do not drink alcohol. 11th graders who drink are approximately 50% more likely to steal, fight, and commit illegal entry, and approximately two-thirds more likely to skip school and be in trouble with the police as students who do not.

- 15% of 5th graders say it is easy to get alcohol.

- There has been no great change in the level of regular alcohol consumption by 8th graders or by 11th graders since 1989. The rates are consistently high.

Source: Database/diagnostics plus "1989 - 1993 Department of Public Instruction 1994 and the University of Delaware's surveys 1995 - 1996"
## Alcohol Use Among Delaware Eleventh Graders 1996 (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lifetime Use</th>
<th>Past Year Use</th>
<th>Past Month Use</th>
<th>Binge Use</th>
<th>Great Risk of Harm From:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Castle</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kent</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sussex</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Delaware Survey 1996