

**Alcohol Policy Implementation Committee
Meeting Notes
February 21, 2003**

Attendance: Lea Stewart, Joan Carbone, Brian Rose, Laura Kull, JoAnn Arnholt, Daniel Perkins, Cheron Rountree, George Jones, Elizabeth O'Connell-Ganges, Lisa Laitman, Lee Schneider

Handouts:

- Protocol for care of Acutely Intoxicated
- Draft proposal for Amendment to Protocol / Housing Booklet
- Alcohol and Drug Related Laws in NJ (Brochure)
- Student Lifeline Website (cab program)

Discussion:

See Proposal for reference.

Part 1 (“To address student living on-campus”)

The Committee discussed the possibility of the student who refuses treatment. It was agreed that ADAPS and Residence Life would have to address on a case basis. Lisa Laitman observed that most students don't outright refuse treatment. The more common problem is non-compliance. For students that continue to engage in very risky behavior, the options are to (a) involve family either with cooperation of student or pursuant to Parental Notification Policy; and/or (b) refuse to provide housing upon non-compliance per the suggested revision. The Committee acknowledges that there will be the occasional student who is not otherwise a behavioral problem for whom we will run out of options (i.e. students simply do not respond to treatment / intervention and also do not violate rules).

Motion: The Committee moved that the Housing Booklet should be amended to add the following provision upon the next printing:

“Any student found to be acutely intoxicated will be evaluated by Emergency Services for possible hospital treatment. Any student requiring hospital treatment will be subsequently evaluated by the Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program and must comply with any mandated education or treatment to remain eligible for housing.”

Moved: Joan Carbone

Seconded: Elizabeth O'Connell Ganges

Approved: unanimously

Part 2 (“To address student living off-campus”)

Proposal would add language to the “Protocol for the Care of Acutely Intoxicated Individuals” to the effect that students “treated” under the protocol would be deemed disorderly under the University Code of Student Conduct with sole sanction to be assigned being evaluation by the Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program and compliance with mandated education or treatment.

Issues discussed by the Committee relative to the proposal were as follows:

Reward Voluntary Compliance. The Committee endorsed generally the notion that any judicial charges should be deferred and ultimately dismissed for any student who voluntarily agreed to undergo assessment and followed through with education / treatment.

Disorderly Conduct. There was discussion concerning whether the charge of “disorderly conduct” could be applied in any and all circumstances where a student required EMT response under the Acutely Intoxicated Protocol and then refused to undergo an assessment. The Committee could not reach a consensus with regard to whether this charge would be appropriate, though there was a general consensus to the effect that the University should attempt to establish some leverage to require reluctant students to undergo an assessment.

Resident versus Non-Resident. There was discussion about whether to treat resident students the same whether the response from EMT was required within the residence hall in which they live or somewhere else on campus such as a campus bus (i.e. in either instance to use their continued eligibility to live in residence as leverage to require assessment). Some Committee members felt it was inequitable to tie housing eligibility to conduct that occurred outside of the student’s residence hall and that all students (resident or non-resident) should be handled in the same manner when the behavior occurs in some place other than the student’s residence hall (if any). Accordingly, the Committee agreed to pursue a unitary approach for both resident and non-resident students in such circumstances.

Violation of Other University Policy. The Committee discussed the possibility of using the charge “violations of other university policies” under the Code of Conduct as a means of leverage to require assessments for students treated under the Acutely Intoxicated Protocol who are otherwise reluctant to go for an assessment. The Committee noted that the existing Alcohol Policy allows for “regulations” to be adopted by approval of the campus “provost” to implement the intent of the alcohol policy. The Committee first needs clarification as to the administrative office to which that responsibility devolved upon the dissolution of the Office of the New Brunswick Provost. Upon such clarification, the Committee would propose to that office that the Acutely Intoxicated Protocol (a) be amended to require students treated under it to undergo an assessment and (b) be accepted as a regulation under the Alcohol Policy. This would then facilitate the use of the judicial charge (failure to comply with university policies) as leverage to require assessments of

those students who do not voluntarily comply.

Broadening of Protocol to Other Activities / Organizations. The Committee notes that Residence Life staff at the colleges are trained with respect to the Acutely Intoxicated Protocol and therefore know to summon EMS per the criteria set forth therein. The Committee believes that other student leaders (e.g. fraternity members, band, athletic team members) should similarly summon EMS under the protocol by applying the same criteria at events / activities involving their members / guests. The Committee raised the following issues in connection with such an approach:

- The need to provide training for such student leaders
- The concern such students may have with calling EMS in terms of the presence of University Police and the possibility that police will use the opportunity to “search” for other university or criminal misconduct (e.g., enter the premises and observe a “bong” in plain view)
- Whether such students could be held accountable for failing to apply the Protocol as would a residence life staff person

The Committee re-emphasized the need to begin a dialogue with both RUPD and EMS in terms of response under the Protocol and also reporting procedures when there is a response. In addition to the concern with the activities of police on an EMS call, there were also questions raised about the circumstances under which EMS will / will not report a call to a student’s Dean (e.g. is there notice when student is treated at a football game?). We will attempt to have both Police and emergency services administrators present at the next Committee meeting.

Next Meeting: Friday, March 14, 2003 , 11:30 AM- 1:30 PM, SCILS Dean’s Conference Room, 3rd Floor.

Summary of Follow-up for Next Meeting:

1. Committee will request clarification on successor to Provost (BTR)
2. Committee will attempt to secure attendance of Jay Kohl / John Kovacs (BTR, LS)
3. Committee members to consider what can we do to get more student input. Initial examples mentioned were Joint Advisory Board, Student Health Advisory Board, Student Athlete Advisory Council - Kate Hickey.