

SCAPE—March 2, 2012

Present: Morgan Levy, Alicia Lewis, Melissa Kelley, Dana Perrin, Laurel Contomanolis, John DiSarro, Andrea Golden, Tess Petersen, Ben Swanson, Evalyn Chiu, Clay Monson, Jared Hilton

Dean Levy: I want to check in with everyone to see if we feel that we'll be able to accomplish all of our goals by the end of the semester. Most of what we have discussed over the past 2 meetings is how we will document our effectiveness of our responses to the President's report. We've discussed pre-gaming, security checks, food and soft drinks at parties, and off-campus event risk management. I want to make sure we have a clear plan for how to accomplish these things by the end of the semester because we have a lot of tasks. Can we get an update on the biennial review?

Melissa Kelley: I sent emails out to all of the departments that submitted information for the Biennial report. It is supposed to be done every 2 years so the deadline I set is March 13. We need departments to read the report over and edit and change it if need be in relation to alcohol and other drugs. We produce this report so that if the Department of Education were to want to know what we are doing, they would be able to see the programs and services and departments that are working together on the issue. Also, social host training is no longer going to take place but we are going to have bystander training. If anyone knows students that would be interested in being alcohol educators those students should get in touch with me.

Dean Levy: Have you gone to the event registration committee to discuss the role of social hosts? Right now there is a required number of social hosts at an event.

Melissa Kelley: We're not looking to change that part of it. Mostly, we're changing the name "social host."

John DiSarro: Would people that are already social hosts have to go through the new training or would they be grandfathered in?

Melissa Kelley: They would be grandfathered in; if they want to do the new training they can but they won't be required to. Any student on campus will be able to go through the training, even if they are not a "social host."

Dean Levy: What are the goals for changing the system?

Melissa Kelley: Bystander interventions are about getting individuals to see that their behavior affects greater than their immediate circle. That we can intervene and take action when we see something concerning or risky. Social host training is mostly telling students about policy but this new training will add a piece on student responsibility. We changed the name of social host.

Dean Levy: We asked one of the IFC organization to give some feedback on the changes.

Melissa Kelley: A lot of it is event management—more of what the University is requiring for an event and what to do if things go wrong at an event. We can't possibly present every scenario and provide a solution but the new training gives students the opportunity to think about what their words or actions would be in difficult situations and motivate students to get involved in a difficult situation when they usually might not.

Dean Levy: It might be helpful for students to be the ones stepping in and recognizing there is a situation.

Melissa Kelley: I might be able to do a short presentation at the end of April or beginning of May with more details about the program.

Dean Levy: Great. I want to make sure I am capturing the information correctly on the pre-gaming issue. We talked about ways we might be able to measure effectiveness of increasing RA presence/ response in Res Halls. We could look back at past reports of alcohol-related incidents.

Melissa Kelley: We have that data but it hasn't changed much in the past couple of years and we haven't publicized it yet because it's going to be part of the new program we're working on.

Dean Levy: I think this summer will be a good time for me to work on counting all the alcohol related incidents because then we'll have a whole year of data. Are there other ways we could measure the effectiveness of increased RA presence? We could possibly send out a survey to RA's.

Melissa Kelley: We could also survey the students about their RAs' presence.

Dean Levy: How reasonable do you think it would be to make and distribute a survey like this?

Clay Monson: I think it would be reasonable but I'm not sure what the participation rate would be. I know at this time of the year students don't really want to deal with their RA's.

Dean Levy: I was thinking we could 'Survey Monkey' it and send out an email.

Laurel Contomanolis: Do we want that kind of data or is it something that we ask the GHRs to have a conversation about at their staff meeting?

Dean Levy: I think that would be a good idea to have GHRs ask the RAs what their experience was like with their increased participation.

Clay Monson: A meeting at the end of March might be possible.

Dean Levy: Clay and Laurel volunteered to compose questions for GHRs to ask of RAs. I think it would be helpful for us to benchmark against other schools to see how they do things in terms of alcohol education. We have also talked about more frequent security checks and registration of parties. We'll change the 25+ policy for the Fall 2013 semester. The way we can assess the effectiveness of that would be to see if the number of event registrations increases.

Melissa Kelley: Why are we waiting a whole year and a half to do that?

Dean Levy: The alcohol policy lives in so many different places; I would rather just do it once when we reprint all of our documents. In terms of the increased security checks we talked about maybe doing focus groups with group event managers and security officers. I volunteered John to do that, if he is willing. We can look at the number of high-risk incidents. Looking at those numbers in combination with the focus groups will probably be helpful. It could even be sending out an email rather than having a focus group. Are there other groups that have had events with alcohol on campus other than fraternities and sororities?

Dana Perrin: What about events that are registered at the Meliora? They might be worth looking at, number-wise, whether there is alcohol served or not.

Dean Levy: We can look at spreadsheets about that and we can look at the number of high-risk incidents. We have implemented the food requirement for Spring 2012. It sounds like we do have a plan for assessing everything we've talked about. For the recent additions I don't know how much we will be able to get going but I definitely want feedback. A new addition is having conversations with people who host off-campus events.

Melissa Kelley: I think one piece will be that those students can participate in the newer programming that we'll have so going forward, even though it wouldn't be a requirement, they can attend and would probably find it beneficial.

Dean Levy: Will it be a requirement for groups who need the newer "social hosts."

Melissa Kelley: Yes.

Dean Levy: Would it be useful to try to reach out to our community and have people come to some sort of a structured program to talk about issues with having off-campus events and about where the University could help?

Alicia Lewis: I think it's a good idea but I don't know if now is the time to do that.

Dean Levy: We could have small groups talk about it instead of having a big presentation.

Laurel Contomanolis: I would love to have Keisha come in and talk about this. We're getting information from City Hall but many neighborhoods have concerns with student houses.

Clay Monson: I think that if we did have something like a focus group we could hand out a survey card asking what people see as risks and how likely they would be to call for help, that way if we were to repeat this down the road we would have a benchmark.

Dean Levy: That's a good idea. Who wants to work on this?

Melissa Kelley: I would be willing to work with Keisha on this.

John DiSarro: I can also help out with it.

Dean Levy: The last part to talk about is looking into our medical amnesty policy with our Second Chance option. It seems that over the past couple of years medical amnesty doesn't change people's likelihood to call for help. It would be useful to get that information and I think Tess has already gathered some of that information.

Tess Petersen: We did a lot over June and July. I can come prepared with more information next time on that.

Melissa Kelley: There is a second chance work group and one of my suggestions is that it's marketed differently. I don't think students perceive it as a good thing. Part of the new programming will be to make sure students understand how the second chance works.

Dean Levy: I think students perceive it as punishment and not amnesty. I don't want to work in contrast to the second change work group.

Melissa Kelley: What if the second chance work group was invited to the next SCAPE meeting?

Tess Petersen: I think that's a good idea if our group decides that they are related enough to the issue—if we decide there are significant overlaps between medical amnesty and second chance. Many students don't see second chance as medical amnesty.

Dean Levy: Tess, would you be ok with sending the information you have to SCAPE?

Tess Petersen: Yes, I can send what I have. ACJC had a program that was a question answer session and some students perceived the function to be like a Town Hall setting in which they could express concerns. That prompted a lot of students to bring up the second chance issue.

Dean Levy: A lot of students are worried about their permanent record this year. It doesn't make sense to me that noise complaints and things like that go on one's permanent record but going to the hospital for drinking too much does not. I think the idea of the second chance work group could be looking at different ways to look at those policy violations that are maybe better suited for more strict education rather than something on your permanent record. A lot of other schools don't report things like noise violation so maybe we are doing our students a disservice in that respect.

John DiSarro: So would there be a number limit for how many times something can happen before there are consequences?

Tess Petersen: We would have to come up with standards for that.

Speaker: At this point, what do we do and why do we do it?

Dean Levy: There was an email train on the conduct list on medical amnesty. Some schools don't have medical amnesty at all and all incidents are reportable; some schools do what we do; some school have absolute amnesty, no matter what; some schools have semi-amnesty in which the Dean of Students strongly encourages the student to go to an alcohol education program but it's not on their permanent record. I think these are difficult things to think through. I think it speaks to what our perspective of education is.

Melissa Kelley: Speaking from experience, all the students that I meet with don't generally come back through; they get what they need to make their decision-making better.

Tess Petersen: I think the education piece is extremely important. I think it is primarily health related and many students feel that the second chance policy doesn't persuade them to call MERT if their friend is in trouble but an amnesty policy would.

Dean Levy: What if we referred to it as amnesty rather than second chance?

Alicia Lewis: They are two different things; second chance is for the person that was intoxicated and amnesty is for the person who called them in, though they might also be intoxicated.

Melissa Kelley: It is scary to think that students might not call in very intoxicated friends for fear of getting in trouble, themselves.

Tess Petersen: Unfortunately that is ubiquitous and I think we need to think about educational initiatives so we can change the logic of the student body. I think that should be the focus.

Melissa Kelley: That's why I think the bystander program will help.

Dean Levy: I don't think students are necessarily making the decision between saving someone's life and getting themselves in trouble. I think students more are thinking that they could take care of an intoxicated person just as well as if they were taken by MERT so they would rather do that and not risk getting in trouble. That could be a very important educational piece—how to know how drunk someone really is. My question is there is also about this idea of 3rd party vendors for events with alcohol and what would it be like if we were to encourage the use or require the use of these vendors for serving alcohol? It seems like it would be beneficial to pass of that responsibility to a company rather than to our students. Is it reasonable that we are going to be able to tackle all these things this semester?

Melissa Kelley: I think the 3rd party vendor idea can wait until the summer or fall.

Dean Levy: Once it gets closer to the end of the year we can discuss whether or not we will have SCAPE over the summer. Please look at the minutes and bring any questions or concerns to me.