

SCAPE—April 13th 2012

Present: Morgan Levy, Jessica Ecock, Ashley Chiu, Ben Swanson, Laurel Contomanolis, Andrea Golden, Tess Petersen, John DiSarro, Melissa Kelley, and Jared Hilton

Dean Levy: Do we want to adopt some of the other medical amnesty policies that other schools are using? Do we need to expand the process so one can be given amnesty multiple times for an alcohol violation?

Andrea Golden: There has to be something that holds the students accountable.

Ashley Chiu: I agree, I think if there is no repercussion then students will be abusing that. Are there different levels of being written up? For example, is there a difference between writing up a freshman for having alcohol in their room and writing up a junior?

Melissa Kelley: Do you think that other people would be aware at that point? We already said that the caller gets amnesty. If someone got in trouble their freshman year and then again in their junior year, the caller for that person may not necessarily be the same person and therefore may not know that the person has already gotten in trouble in their freshman year. Thus the incentive is still there for the caller to make the call. I think if someone got in trouble and went through an educational program in their freshman year, having an educational program again in their junior year could be helpful.

Ashley Chiu: Do you think it would be wise to say if a student doesn't get in trouble a second time within a certain amount of time then they can get amnesty again? Of course if a student gets medical amnesty and then 2 months later is transported, the student would be in trouble again.

Dean Levy: I see what you're saying but I wonder about the culture and how we advertise it. It would be easy for students if we say that every time they call we are concerned about their health and well-being and they'll get connected to some resource to make a better decision in the future. I'm worried about how we talk about it with students if we start adding asterisks and conditions.

Melissa Kelley: What is the amnesty from? Is it from the reporting out? I think we all agree that we have to do something when students are transported but if students are getting repeat amnesty, what are they getting amnesty from?

Dean Levy: It's from having probation or deferred suspension on record. I think we can get to the same ends through different means. If there is a student who has been transported to the hospital multiple times but have not violated other policies, we would want to make sure they were connected to resources to help them make better decisions in the future; we might be concerned about the student living in the residence halls; we could go through the care system and still achieve the same goals—we could have the student assessed and the assessment may be that it's worrisome to have the student living in residence halls. We could create a behavioral contract that says the student needs to engage in these treatment opportunities so that the student can make better decisions in the future and that the residence halls are not supportive of the student's needs so he/she needs to move somewhere else. I think if we can achieve the same goals without the threat of punishment being the motivating factor in whether or not to get help, I'd rather do that.

Tess Petersen: I think we need to figure out what our goal is. I see the goal as creating a system in which there is no deterrence in calling for help if someone needs medical attention. I think that eliminating punitive sanctions and using the care system is a good way to do this. I think that having Security there

when MERT is called can be intimidating for the student calling a person in, especially if the caller has been drinking. This is not to say that I don't think Security should not be present.

Ashley Chiu: I think giving amnesty to the caller solves a lot of problems.

Tess Petersen: Yes and no; typically the caller is a close friend of the person in need of medical attention.

Jared Hilton: I think students that are considering calling for help are also concerned about getting their friend in trouble.

Dean Levy: Let's think about the reasons that we wouldn't want to give amnesty multiple times.

Jessica Ecock: I always think about the other students who do not get in trouble. If I was applying to law school along with a person who had 6 alcohol violations, I would be mad if the law school didn't know that.

Laurel Contomanolis: Some of my thoughts are about whether or not we would want a lawyer or a doctor that has an alcohol problem that was never identified.

Dean Levy: There won't be 6 violations; it could be someone with 1 or 2 violations. I agree that it wouldn't be fair to view students who do and do not have any violations on the same level. However, I also look at it from the perspective of competing with other schools, not just within the Rochester community, and other schools are already giving amnesty multiple times.

Laurel Contomanolis: We do want students to learn from their mistakes but we have to decide how many violations it takes them to learn.

Jessica Ecock: I'm ok with more than one allowance of medical amnesty but I do think it should be limited at some point.

Dean Levy: We know of students with substance abuse issues because they are often also reported for other policy violations and those other policy violations are often reportable.

Tess Petersen: I think it's a good distinction to make—I think amnesty is important for transportation to the hospital more than for being caught drinking by an RA or CA. I think it's a way to prevent dangerous situations from happening. I think SCAPE should focus on deciding how to do our best to start a cultural change such that students feel alright about calling for help.

Dean Levy: I think unless we are clear about what we mean by medical amnesty, we are not going to start a culture change. We need to get to a place where we can think about how to implement a culture change. I sense hesitancy with the idea of getting medical amnesty all the time and that's because we feel there should be a line at some point where students are held accountable through the disciplinary process. I want to point out that this is not my position. I think it would be easier to communicate with students if there was no limit for how many times they could get amnesty.

Tess Petersen: How often is it that students are hospitalized more than once?

Dean Levy: Not often.

Tess Petersen: That's why I think there should be a limit.

Ashley Chiu: I see people that should be hospitalized but they think they are fine so they don't call.

Dean Levy: That's why we should try to get rid of the fear for calling. They would still have to meet with Melissa.

Ashley Chiu: I think talking to Melissa would help but there are some people that if they don't get it the first time it's not going to make a difference.

Ben Swanson: With people like that the best thing you can do is have a conversation about it.

Melissa Kelley: It is more than a conversation on my end. I normally do not see students more than once. A good number of students act with limited information so once they have more information it helps fill the gap in their thinking.

Ashley Chiu: If that's the way it is now, do we need to even change the policy?

Dean Levy: Yes because 14% of our students say they would not call for help in fear of getting in trouble. We can't talk about the policy unless we change it because I think the way we talk about it now implies one chance for medical amnesty.

Tess Petersen: I see a very clear difference between second chance and medical amnesty. If someone is playing beer pong that is a policy violation but they might not be anywhere near needing medical attention. Thus the second chance deals with disciplinary situations like that.

Laurel Contomanolis: So you're advocating both a second chance policy and a medical amnesty policy?

Tess Petersen: I'm just trying to draw a distinction between a medical emergency and safety and a policy violation. I'm not saying that punitive actions are not useful but if someone is in danger I think other avenues are better.

Melissa Kelley: I think that helps to not replace what the second chance policy committee has been working on.

Jessica Ecock: I think using the care system gets parents involved. We haven't really talked about other drugs.

Laurel Contomanolis: We've had a couple situations with repeated pot use. People on the hall might get frustrated if nothing is done.

Dean Levy: So does everyone agree that both a second chance policy and a medical amnesty policy should be in place?

Tess Petersen: I think if we make a change we need to reassess it next fall and look at statistics.

Dean Levy: So we all agree that there should be medical amnesty no matter how many times someone calls for help for someone. This is for the caller and the patient. At Cornell, the organization does not get amnesty but it's considered a mitigating circumstance, which is what we do now. We've never held an organization accountable because they called for help.

John DiSarro: I can see the same arguments being made for the caller and individual being applied to organizations in that if there are other policy violations they'll be caught for that. From the fraternity and sorority perspective I know there are issues with freshman in the houses and if there is a greater expectation for the organizations that they're going to be calling, there's a sense of accountability and I think there could be a strong benefit to having peers being the ones to call in.

Ashley Chiu: If we make a distinction between housing violations and calling for help because a lot of people still have the perception that they will get in trouble for calling.

Dean Levy: Would we hold them accountable if the only policy violation was them providing alcohol?

Ashley Chiu: I'm not sure how well you can hold them accountable for that; I don't know how well that's going to get through.

Ben Swanson: Another thing to consider is it's easy for a student to say a house served them ten beers as opposed to admitting to taking shots before going to the house.

Dean Levy: We don't usually see that. We aren't going to know how the person got as drunk as they are.

John DiSarro: If we were going to apply amnesty to an individual who may have provided alcohol we would want to be consistent with organizations.

Dean Levy: We are talking about medical emergencies and I want to break down barriers for calling in. Serving alcohol to underage individuals is against NYS law and our policies but what if someone not calling leads to a student death.

Jessica Ecock: An individual is different than an organization. An organization will host another party and what is to stop them from serving another minor who gets intoxicated and goes to the hospital?

Jared Hilton: I think with those fraternities, there will be repeated violations. If they call for help because someone needs it that's fine. If freshmen go back to their room and get sick, people are going to find out and might know what house they were at so they're going to get into the system through another route.

Jessica Ecock: Giving amnesty won't stop the serving of minors.

Dean Levy: We want people to feel comfortable calling for help—that's our goal.

Tess Petersen: Just like with an individual, this is for emergency situations and I think organizations should have the same privileges as individuals calling.

Dean Levy: There are security officers doing ID checks and documenting if underage students are served.

Ashley Chiu: If organizations are getting in trouble it would be through security finding them serving alcohol to underage students.

John DiSarro: If I'm registering an event for a fraternity that has been caught serving underage students, I can have them come up with a strong risk management plan so it's not punitive in that there is still a productive conversation happening.

Dean Levy: We have data about students whether or not students will call for help. We only have anecdotal information about organizations.

Ashley Chiu: Maybe we should start with the leadership of organizations so that they can inform their members and hold them accountable.

Dean Levy: To review: we are going to advertise a medical amnesty policy that applies to emergency situations and it will apply to the individual student caller and the student who is ill with no punitive responses. The students will still need to do some sort of educational program. This will apply every time a student calls for help.

Tess Petersen: I think this fits in perfectly with the goal of harm reduction.

Jessica Ecock: I thought that even if an RA calls the student would get medical amnesty.

Melissa Kelley: I think that would fall under second chance.

Jessica Ecock: I'm concerned about a student being passed out in the bathroom without a friend with them.

Melissa Kelley: You want your friends to call for you where as an RA calling would be late in the situation. Also, as the friend calling they might tell the friend that they're calling for that they need to act more responsibly.

Jessica Ecock: It doesn't sit well with me because what if someone does not have good friends that will call for them and the RA ends up calling?

Melissa Kelley: It would go over to second chance with which the student still gets education.

Jessica Ecock: But what if it's the second or third time it's happening?

John DiSarro: It's going to be very important to be clear about what we mean by student caller. Does that include RAs? Or MERT responders? RA's and MERT responders are students.

Melissa Kelley: Maybe we can use the word friend. If an RA is on duty they are not a friend. If an RA is a friend and is off duty then they're acting as a friend.

Ben Swanson: What about "friends" from RIT?

Jared Hilton: We could say "a student without a job responsibility"

Dean Levy: I want this policy to be simple—every time there is a call about a medical emergency, the ill individual and the friend will not get in trouble.

Dean Levy: We need to continue thinking about how to apply this to organizations, how we are going to market the policy, and how we are going to evaluate the success of the efforts. I would like to put something in place to get feedback within one year.

Melissa Kelley: I could look at doing something within the scope of my conversations with students. I would need to get students' permission.

Dean Levy: That would capture the perception of the students that benefit from the policy. We might be even more interested in the perception of the students in general and of the friends calling. I will have to send all recommendations to Dean Feldman before we can move forward with them.