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Presentation Objectives

Participants will:

◦ Examine an evidence-based group alcohol education class.

◦ Learn how two universities tailored their program to their campus and were provided evidence of its effectiveness for each.

◦ Gain skills to evaluate their own campus environment and how this program could be uniquely implemented.
Our Roadmap

- Timeline of UNCW interventions
  - Class changes
  - Current iteration
  - Evaluation development

- USC Adaption
  - Evolution
  - Adapted version
  - Evaluation

- Conclusions & Discussion
NIAAA Recommendations for Reducing Problem Drinking in College Students

1. Increasing individual motivation to change
2. Changing knowledge and beliefs
3. Provide behavioral skills to limit consumption
4. Changing students’ perceptions about fellow students’ drinking behavior and attitude.

(Larimer & Cronce, 2002)
Literature Review on Interventions for Adjudicated Students

- Effective individual interventions: Alcohol Skills Training Program & BASICS
  (Fromme, Marlatt, Baer, & Kivlahan, 1994; Dimeff, Baef, Kivlahan, & Marlatt, 1999)

- Group motivation enhancement - mixed findings
  (Fromme & Corbin, 2004; Walters, Bennett, & Miller, 2000)

- Adaption of Motivational Interviewing (AMI) effective with heavy drinkers and men
  (LaBrie, Lamb, Pederson, & Quinlan, 1006)
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA WILMINGTON
University of North Carolina Wilmington

- Mid-sized 4-year public university on coast of North Carolina
- Student body: 58% female, 89% white.
- Began alcohol prevention & intervention programs in 1988 (FIPSE Recipient)
- Comprehensive substance abuse prevention program
  - Environmental management
  - Evaluation focus
Additional Logistics

1st Sanction: $50 fee, Challenging Decisions

2nd Sanction: $75 fee, BASICS (two sessions), Disciplinary Probation, Parent Notification (first year students)

Marijuana Sanction: $75 fee, individual Motivational Interviewing with e-TOKE session, Disciplinary Probation, Parent Notification (first year students)
Early Days

- Current version began in 1996-1997
- Named Challenging Decisions (play on words)- previously called Connections.
- “A primary initiative of CROSSROADS will be to directly challenge our students thinking about their decisions to use drugs and the consequences associated with different levels of use. Behavioral changes can be initiated in response to an individual’s problematic behavior associated with drug use.”
  - CBT background- change thinking and change behavior
Early Version (the Green Bean days)

- Didactic information sharing
  - “Facts about alcohol”
  - Warnings about consequences
  - Drinking and driving video

- “College Binge Drinking & Sober Reflections” video
  - Video of student drinking up to 16 shots, followed by interviews the next day
Evolution - 2002

Content
- Learned about ASTP and BASICS
- Added self-assessments (Audit, CEOA, APRA)
- Added social norms information (student reflects on recent use and receives campus norms information)

Evaluation
- Began to collect personal use surveys from participants
  - Allowed us to compare the participants against campus sample.
- Began to mail follow-up surveys after 30 days
  - Offered cash incentives
  - Response rate under 10%
Fall 2003

- Added Good, Bad, and Ugly
  - Student input illustrates BiPhasic Response/Drug of Diminishing Return concepts

- Increased focus on protective strategies
  - Teaching strategies
  - Data about which are most effective

- Instructors start to have significant MI training.
Fall 2005

- Added e-CHUG personalized feedback program
  - Completed at start of class
  - Group review integrated into program outline

Example: Teach BAC and then point out their highest BAC on chart.
Fall 2008- Enhanced Focus on Behavior Change

- Decisional balance

- Added behavioral goal setting
  Ask students to consider making one change in their drinking & challenge them to try this change for 30 days.
Gender-focused

- Received Dept. of Ed. Grant focusing on gender with other target areas
  - Were reading articles on gender

- Wrote grant to broaden gender efforts including judicial class
  - Initially unfunded
  - Moved on evaluation commitment from Dean of Students office
  - Carved out split into single gender sections
Evaluation Evolution

• Class now began with a pre-test
  ◦ Initially tried to require pre-test before class but were unsuccessful

• 45-day post-test was required
  ◦ Included divisional learning outcomes for hearing process
  ◦ Use, consequences, and protective strategies
  ◦ Readiness to Change scales
Fall 2008 Gender Split

- Single Gender
  - Normative feedback
  - Alcohol and sex
  - Sexual assault risk reduction
    - Bystander intervention material
    - Red flags for women
    - Consent for men
  - Alcohol risk reduction
    - Which works best for each gender
  - Recognizing a problem
    - “That Guy” or “That Girl” gender-specific symptoms
    - How to help a friend
Full Gendered Split

- Funding received from U.S. Department of Education Model Programs grant

- Classes now taught by same gender pair
  - Team meets regularly and adjusts order and content to maximize effectiveness
  - Pre and post-test design, data now linked by student identification code
  - Much of the change is in the order; felt in the discussion.

  **Women Specific Section:** Reasons for Drinking Discussion: Why do women drink? Share information about what men think about women’s drinking.
Content (2009)

- E-Chug (Feedback integrated throughout class)
- Good, Bad, & Ugly
- Reasons for Drinking (Women)
- Social Norms Feedback
- Alcohol Expectancies
- Didactic Information about Alcohol (B.A.C., Individual differences), Consequences, and Problem Drinking
- BASICS BiPhasic Response Handout
- Protective Strategy Training
- Decisional Balance
- Behavioral Goals
- Evaluation / Personal Use Survey
## Evaluation Evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rate</td>
<td>Proves that most don’t return to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Evaluation</td>
<td>Feedback on content and presenters, allow for participant suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Use Survey (in class)</td>
<td>Data on what these students use and their consequences, compare against campus sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Mailed Survey</td>
<td>Collect some post-test data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Pre and Post Tests</td>
<td>Most complete data set, unique identifiers strengthen statistical case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Data Example

High risk drinking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judicial (Last Month)</th>
<th>Judicial (Last Week)</th>
<th>Campus-wide Survey (2 Weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence experienced in the Last Year</th>
<th>Judicial</th>
<th>Campus Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performed poorly on test or project</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove under the influence</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a memory loss</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Outcome

- Example: As a result of attending the Student Conduct experience, I better understand the effects of my behavior on (agree or strongly agree):

- Myself: 77.9%
- Other Students: 74.5%
- Campus Community: 73.2%
2008-2009: How many drinks do you have on average when you go out?

Significant changes jointly and for each gender.
Significant changes also occurred in number of days drinking in last 30 days
In the last two weeks, on how many occasions did you have:

- 0.00%
- 10.00%
- 20.00%
- 30.00%
- 40.00%
- 50.00%
- 60.00%
- 70.00%
- 80.00%

3 drinks in a row?
- Pre-Test: 85.30%
- Post-Test: 60.69%
- Basic Studies sample-Sp. 08: 72%

4 drinks in a row?
- Pre-Test: 78.40%
- Post-Test: 53.79%
- Basic Studies sample-Sp. 08: 63%

5 drinks in a row?
- Pre-Test: 71.60%
- Post-Test: 52%
- Basic Studies sample-Sp. 08: 72.41%

Reductions are significant for 3 and 4 in a row, but miss for 5 in a row.
Consequences: In the last 30 days, have you?

- Played drinking games? 67.81% (Post-Test) 84.50% (Pre-Test)
- Attended class hungover? 18.49% (Post-Test) 26.70% (Pre-Test)
- Had a memory loss? 35.62% (Post-Test) 45.20% (Pre-Test)
- Drove under the influence? 10.27% (Post-Test) 14.70% (Pre-Test)
- Got nauseated or vomited? 26.03% (Post-Test) 35.30% (Pre-Test)
- Had a hangover? 54.11% (Post-Test) 66.40% (Pre-Test)
Protective Behaviors: In the past 30 days, have you?

- Calculate your BAC: 6.90% Post Usually / Always, 3.50% Pre Usually / Always
- Avoid drinking games: 16.55% Post Usually / Always, 9.50% Pre Usually / Always
- Pace to 1 or fewer per hour: 22.10% Post Usually / Always, 15.50% Pre Usually / Always
- Watch out for friends: 75.20% Post Usually / Always, 57.80% Pre Usually / Always
- Determine a limit on number: 39.30% Post Usually / Always, 27.60% Pre Usually / Always
- Alternative alcohol/non alcoholic: 20% Post Usually / Always, 18.90% Pre Usually / Always
University of South Carolina

- State’s flagship institution; Large, public, 4-year research university centrally located in state’s capital, Columbia, SC

- Student body (2008): 55% female, 73% white

- 27,488 students as of Fall 2008
Typical Alcohol Sanctions

- **1st alcohol sanction**: $50 University fine, CAAPS, 2 post-CAAPS assessments

- **2nd alcohol sanction**: $100 University fine, Alcohol Use Disorders Identity Test (AUDIT - through Substance Abuse Prevention Education – SAPE office), community service, possible group counseling (through Counseling and Human Development Center)

- **3rd alcohol sanction**: $150 University fine, group counseling, community service, possible suspension
What is the Carolina Awareness on Alcohol Policies and Safety (CAAPS) course?

- Educational sanction for underage, first-time alcohol policy violators

- Focuses mainly on USC’s alcohol policy and SC alcohol laws

- Heavily interactive and discussion based

- Students are challenged to hold themselves accountable, reflect, and attain knowledge to make positive future decisions regarding alcohol use
CAAPS Learning Outcomes

1. To create an open and honest environment conducive for student interaction, discussion, and learning,
2. To inform and educate students about USC policies and SC state laws pertaining to alcohol,
3. To enhance and improve behavioral skills and motivation towards lessening the consumption of alcohol,
4. To recognize and understand future consequences of using and abusing alcohol,
5. To identify future personal benefits of consuming less or no alcohol,
6. To improve the alcohol culture at USC.
CAAPS Background

- Administered by the Office of Student Judicial Programs (OSJP) as part of the Division of Student Affairs
- Began in 2001, taught by two graduate assistants
- 20-25 students per class
- Class held bi-weekly, approximately 1.5 hours in length, 8-10 classes per semester
Evolution of CAAPS through Spring 2007

- Started as a collaborative effort between OSJP, Residence Life, and the Office of Alcohol and Other Drugs (now SAPE)
- Consistently been an interactive/activity-based class
- One-week post-CAAPS anonymous questionnaire about facilitators and activity relevance to students’ learning
  - Originally done by hand
  - In 2006, done online through Flashlight
What is CAAPS today?

- CAAPS has two prongs:
  - The first is that the program is conceptualized and adapted through the lens of student development theory,
  - The second is the incorporation of additional interactive activities, such as a social barometer and “The Good, The Bad, The Ugly,” aimed to enhance the class within that theoretical perspective.

- Intertwines interactive activities with education and group discussion to create an environment where the students are learning from one another just as much as they are from the facilitators.

- Assessed for both facilitator and activity/discussion effectiveness and to track behavioral changes with alcohol consumption.
Theory Behind CAAPS

• Delivery of class activities and the two assessments are rooted in various student development theories

• King and Kitchener’s (1994) Reflective Judgment Model
  ◦ Two prongs: assumptions about the nature of the development of reflective judgment and promotes reflective thinking through observations and suggestions.
  ◦ Aspects of both prongs are used within the course and assessment tools of CAAPS.
  ◦ Examples: assessments create multiple opportunities for student reflection of the activities such as incident discussion, and Decisional Balance Sheet.
Theory continued

- **Sanford (1962) Challenge and Support**
  - Students are challenged internally and externally to force them to consider developing new responses
  - **Examples:**
    - Social Barometer – presents them with moral and personal challenges
    - Stages of Impairment – challenges their current knowledge and decisions regarding their consumption
Outline of CAAPS Course

- Quiz
- Introduction
- Social Barometer
- Lecture on SC state laws and USC policies
- The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly
- Five Stages of Impairment
- Drinking Your Dollars
- Decisional Balance Sheet
- Review Quiz
- Discuss assessments (as part of sanctions)
Assessment Process

• OSJP Administration of Assessments – graduate assistant
  • 1 week post-CAAPS assessment
    • Survey link distributed at CAAPS course – link on OSJP website
    • Monitored through exported real-time results
  • 4 week post-CAAPS assessment
    • Survey link is e-mailed 3 days before due date
    • Monitored through exported real-time results

• Administered via Studentvoice
  ◦ University has purchased contract and given regional representative for USC – each office given separate access
  ◦ Draft and create survey with representative guidance
  ◦ Access to real-time data and survey results from student responses, ability to filter and export specific data

• Free alternative is Survey Monkey or Flashlight
Development of Behavioral Assessment

- Based on UNCW’s behavioral assessment
- Partnered with USC’s SAPE office to work from the nationally validated assessment tool, AUDIT
- Created a online assessment with Student Voice
- Began use in October 2008
Future Evolution of CAAPS

- Validate our 4-week behavioral assessment
- Create a pre-CAAPS assessment for stronger validity of data results
- Validate the pre-CAAPS assessment
CAAPS Demographics
Out of 698 students between October 2008 – December 2009

- 429 Men vs. 269 Women
- 18 & under – 284 students
- 19 or 20 – 400 students
- 21-23 – 14 students
- On-campus living – 574; Off-campus living - 124
- Greek Life – 254 students
Behavioral Assessment Data Results

- Themes to represent data:
  - Drinking behavior
  - Protective behaviors
  - Consequential behaviors

- Filtered results
  - 3 sub-populations
    - Greek vs. Non Greek
    - Men vs. Women
    - Freshmen vs. Sophomores
Behavioral:
Since your incident, hearing, and CAAPS past 30 days, on how many days have you used each of the following? - Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)

The data represented in this graph was collected from October 2008 – December 2009 and is representative of approximately 698 respondents.
Protective:
Since your incident, hearing, and CAAPS

The data represented in this graph was collected from October 2008 – December 2009 and is representative of approximately 698 respondents.
Consequential:
Since your incident, hearing, and CAAPS

The data represented in this graph was collected from October 2008-December 2009 and is representative of approximately 698 respondents.
Common Effectiveness Data

- Reduction in days drinking per month
- Reduction in number of drinks per occasion
- Increased protective strategy use
- Decreased consequences
Major Differences/Issues to Consider

- Graduate versus Professional Staff Facilitation
- Class Size and Frequency
- AOD Office versus OSJP Facilitation
- Length, Volume of Content, Discussion versus Information Dissemination balance
**Good, Bad, Ugly Facilitation**

- **Directions**
  - Make 3 columns on the board
  - Write “Good” at the top left. Ask students to name everything that is good/that they like about drinking. Write down their answers verbatim(ish).
  - Label the middle column “Bad” and the right column “Ugly.” These can be differentiated by severity or by short and long-term consequences. Again, ask students what could be bad or ugly.
  - After they can completed their lists, ask them what they notice.
  - Most will start with more negative than positive, then lead to discussion on how most good things happen at low doses. The higher the dose, the more likely a bad or ugly consequence can happen.
Decisional Balance Worksheet
Facilitation

• Directions:
  ◦ Make a list of both the pros/advantages and cons/disadvantages of drinking less than you currently drink. Please complete this exercise however it is the most meaningful for you.
  ◦ Please create a goal that ties into one of your advantages

Tailoring to Your Campus

- Analyze capacity
- Unique high-risk factors (community, behavioral, attitude, etc.)
- Integrate evaluation
QUESTIONS
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