

**Alcohol Policy Implementation Committee  
Meeting Notes  
January 24, 2003**

**Attendance:** Lea Stewart, Brian Rose, Joan Carbone, Lee Schneider, JoAnn Arnholt, Lisa Laitman, Linda Lederman, Elizabeth O'Connell Ganges, Adrienne Coleman, Daniel Perkins, Cheron Rountree

**Handouts:** Chart summarizing residence life policies regarding alcohol at the four (4) undergraduate residential colleges in New Brunswick (untitled), December Meeting Notes, Updated Committee Roster, Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs Social Policy, List of Appendices from 1999 Committee Report

The Committee began its discussion by reviewing the policy chart that had been prepared by the Rutgers College Alcohol Committee. Discussion points included:

Use of Fines - Cook / Livingston assess fines. Cook fines go back into residential life programming including cash incentives paid out to students who host alcohol free parties. Students may substitute community service for fines in cases of hardship. No one was present from Livingston to confirm their use of fine monies.

Decoratives – Cook bans decoratives (e.g., displays of empty beer cans / bottles), though some alcohol related decorations such as shot-glasses and posters are probably permitted. RC has no policy because of privacy concern.

Process – Rutgers College resolves most violations without need for a college-level hearing (i.e. administrative resolution). Students don't want college hearings -- sanction would be on permanent record whereas a residence life penalty is not. The "probation" described in the chart is only a residence hall probation. There is a concern over how to promote consistency across all staff in the residence halls and a recognition that alcohol enforcement is a difficult role for student staff. Comments from the committee noted that hall staff that begin the year by setting a clear tone that they will enforce the rules usually have fewer problems. It was also noted that strong "Hall Directors" (RC) can establish a "team" mentality among staff in the residence hall and their willingness to do so is a strong indicator of the potential of a particular residence hall to either avoid or have significant behavioral problems.

The Committee had a lengthy discussion concerning how the various units respond to intoxicated students. Key discussion points included the following:

There was an "Intoxicated Student Procedure" developed under Leslie Fehrenbach. Joan Carbone agreed to provide copies of the procedure for the next meeting.

The general understanding of the procedure is that there are certain indicators (e.g. vomiting, slurred speech) that determine whether staff will call EMT. EMT arrives together with police. EMT makes a determination as to whether or not the student should be transported to the hospital. If the student resists a hospital transport, Rutgers College advises the student that their parents will be contacted which typically results in student assent to the transport.

The Committee raised the question as to whether we can / should mandate that all hospital transports are referred to ADAPS. There are approximately 150 ambulance calls per year in New Brunswick. The Committee agreed that we should undertake writing up a clear procedure to supplement or amend the existing one. Joan Carbone indicated that she would write a first draft for committee consideration. Issues include:

- (a) what if the student is intoxicated but did not merit a hospital transport – should this student also be referred to ADAPS? Mandatory?
- (b) Is there any reason to treat differently an intoxicated student who did not drink in the residence hall itself?

- (c) How should we handle intoxicated students “on the street” who do not live in residence? There is apparently an agreement with New Brunswick and Piscataway Municipal Courts that Rutgers students who are charged with violations of municipal ordinances in connection with drinking or behaviors caused by drinking will be referred to ADAPS as part of the case disposition. How do we handle in situations where there is no municipal violation? Referral could be made through a judicial process, but would require a hearing and it is not always clear that the student can be charged successfully with an offense.

The Committee discussed the concern that students will be reluctant to call university staff when a friend / hall-mate / roommate is engaging in dangerous behavior for fear of creating a disciplinary problem for the student when s/he might just “sleep it off” without any significant consequence. Issues discussed that relate to this concern were the following:

- (a) disciplinary sanctions that go beyond just residence hall sanctions become part of the student’s permanent record and can therefore have a lasting impact. The question was raised whether there should be a process to expunge certain student disciplinary records after some period of time. Colleges currently do so in their discretion as to college level offenses, though in doing so, they are probably acting outside the scope of existing policy.
- (b) Parental Involvement – the trend in higher education generally is toward more active engagement with parents, though Rutgers currently will only involve parents in an emergency.
- (c) Police – The presence of police on an EMT call has led to police arresting students for other issues (e.g. stolen property such as a street sign, drug paraphernalia). This is seen as a disincentive to calling staff for help. The Committee consensus was that we should work with Public Safety to try and develop a protocol that would generally keep the police officer role limited to insuring safety during the EMT call (i.e. no entry into room unless necessary to protect someone’s safety such as in the case of a student who becomes violent). The Committee discussed the same issue in the context of police response to an EMT call at a fraternity house. The Committee recognizes that there are additional complexities when dealing with a privately owned fraternity house, probable cause and so forth; however, we would also like to explore with Public Safety what procedures could be developed that would create less of a disincentive to contact university staff for help with a student who appears to need assistance.
- (d) Special Programs – There was mention of a “call-a-cab” program that is financed through membership fees such that there is no payment required when the cab is needed (as opposed to driving drunk). Elizabeth O’Connell Ganges agreed to bring more information to the next meeting.

The Committee briefly discussed the existence of procedures to respond to suspected marijuana use in the residence halls. Rutgers College has a procedure where staff will request residents to open their door and will then address the concern. If no drugs are visible, police are not contacted, but the room is placed on a hall-specific watch list. It is not clear at this point if this Committee will undertake a review of drug policies as well or limit itself to alcohol.

**Next Meeting: Friday, February 21, 2003, 11:30 AM- 1:30 PM, SCILS Faculty Lounge, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor.**

**Summary of Follow-up for Next Meeting:**

- 1. Intoxicated Student Procedure --- Joan Carbone to furnish copies.**
- 2. Police – Lea Stewart / Brian Rose to coordinate Jay Kohl and police officer attendance**
- 3. First Draft – ADAPS Referrals – Joan Carbone**
- 4. Info on Cab Program – Elizabeth O’Connell-Ganges**
- 5. Brochures on Criminal Penalties for Alcohol / Drug Offenses – Adrienne**

**Coleman**