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Overview

• Two parts:
  • Introduction to the Maryland Collaborative
  • Case study of how we work to bring about environmental change
Why Establish a Collaborative?

Source: NSDUH
Why Establish a Collaborative?

In the past 30 days (2014):

- 5.2 million (59.8%) full-time college students 18-22 drink alcohol
- 3.3 million (37.9%) engage in binge drinking (5+)
- 1.1 million (12.2%) engage in heavy drinking (5+ in 5+ days)

Consequences:

- 1825 deaths per year among 18-24 year-old college students
- 696,000 students assaulted by another student who had been drinking
- 97,000 students report experiencing alcohol-related sexual assault or date rape
- 1 in 4 college students reporting academic consequences – missing or falling behind in class, doing poorly on exams or papers, receiving lower grades overall

Source: NSDUH, NIAAA
Maryland Data
Binged in past 30 days, 2012

Source: NSDUH
Excessive drinking is associated with short- and long-term academic difficulties during college.

**Alcohol Use**
- Skipping Class
- Less Studying Hours
- Decreased Motivation
- Poor Quality/Less Sleep
- Cognitive Problems

**Drug Use**

**Mental Health**

**Intermediary Processes**
- Declining GPA
- Dropping Classes
- Lost Opportunities (internships, work, special studies)

**Short-term Manifestations**
- Delayed Graduation
- Failure to Graduate
- Attenuation of Goals
- Lack of Readiness for Employment
- Underemployment
Impact on Educational Achievement of Maryland College Students

• High-frequency drinkers skip, on average, 17% of their classes compared to low-risk drinkers (9%)

• Excessive drinking is associated with fewer study hours/week.

• 38% of students report that they overslept and missed class due to drinking

• Marijuana use has an independent and even stronger impact on academic progress in college
Skipping Class, by Binge Drinking and Marijuana Use

Percent who skipped class sometimes or often

- **Binge drinking during past month**
  - No: 14% (n=1824)
  - Yes: 28% (n=1378)

- **Marijuana use during past year**
  - No: 15% (n=2021)
  - Yes: 31% (n=1044)
Skipping Class, by Past-month Binge Drinking and School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Did not binge drink</th>
<th>Binge drank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent who skipped class sometimes or often

School

Did not binge drink
Binge drank

Skipping Class,
by Past-month Binge Drinking and School
Skipping Class, by Past-year Marijuana Use and School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Did not use marijuana</th>
<th>Used marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am satisfied with just getting by in my classwork. 19% (n=1824) 19% (n=1378)

I strive to be in the top 10% of my class. 63% (Did not binge drink) 57% (Binge drank)

I am motivated to excel in my classwork. 92% (Did not binge drink) 90% (Binge drank)

Academic Motivations, by Past-month Binge Drinking
I am satisfied with just getting by in my classwork. Did not use marijuana (n=2020) 19%, Used marijuana (n=1044) 18%

I strive to be in the top 10% of my class. Did not use marijuana (n=2020) 64%, Used marijuana (n=1044) 53%

I am motivated to excel in my classwork. Did not use marijuana (n=2020) 92%, Used marijuana (n=1044) 89%
Attended events or seminars on campus related to academic interests in the past year

- Did not binge drink (n=1824): 66%
- Binge drank (n=1378): 64%

Sought out off-campus opportunities for professional development in the past year

- Did not binge drink (n=1824): 59%
- Binge drank (n=1378): 64%
Attended events or seminars on campus related to academic interests in the past year

- Did not use marijuana: 66%
- Used marijuana: 67%

Sought out off-campus opportunities for professional development in the past year

- Did not use marijuana: 61%
- Used marijuana: 61%
Alcohol Drinking Patterns of Maryland College Students, 2016 (N=3,426 students)

**LOW RISK**
Students who *did not drink* during the past year (including lifetime abstainers)

**MODERATE RISK**
Drank during past year, but *did not binge drink* during the past month

**HIGH RISK**
Engaged in *binge drinking one to four times* during the past month

**VERY HIGH RISK**
Engaged in *binge drinking five or more times* during the past month

“Binge” Drinking:

Females and transgender student: *Four or more drinks in a row (or within a couple of hours) during the past month*

Males: *Five or more drinks in a row (or within a couple of hours) during the past month*
Marijuana Use Frequency, by Drinking Risk Group (Used in the Past Year)
Marylanders Consider College Drinking To Be a Serious Problem

Excessive Alcohol Use on College Campuses
The View of Maryland Registered Voters Statewide

Not sure, 10%
Very serious problem, 28%
Not a serious problem, 21%
Serious problem, 41%

69% Serious + Very serious

“How serious a problem do you consider excessive alcohol use on college campuses to be”? (Read list; rotate low to high and high to low.): “A very serious problem, a serious problem, not a serious problem.”

Poll conducted by OpinionWorks January 2014
Why Establish a Collaborative?

The Collaborative:

• Raises the profile of the problem and provides the momentum and leadership in bringing other partners to the table to be part of the solution;

• Provides public health expertise and support to implement effective interventions, change alcohol policies, and reduce alcohol problems;

• Provides a forum for sharing information and support among colleges statewide working to reduce college drinking;

• Expands funding opportunities for sustainability;

• Creates a standard measurement system for measuring progress
Long-term Goals

• Measurably reduce the current level of excessive alcohol use and alcohol-related harm among all colleges in Maryland

• Mobilize and sustain the commitment of campus and community leaders toward this goal
Maryland Collaborative

Structure

Participating Schools:
- Garrett College
- McDaniel College
- College of Southern Maryland
- Towson University
- Goucher College
- Frostburg State University
- UMES
- St. Mary’s College of Maryland
- United States Naval Academy
- Allegany College of Maryland
- Notre Dame of Maryland University
- Hood College
- UMBC
- Johns Hopkins University
- Loyola University Maryland

Governance Council (College Presidents):

Advisory Board

Public Health Faculty:
- Amelia M. Arria, Ph.D. (UMCP)
- David H. Jernigan, Ph.D. (Johns Hopkins)

Funding Acknowledgment:
The Behavioral Health Administration (BHA)
Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Major Barriers Identified by Colleges to Address Excessive Drinking

- Lack of information about effective strategies
- Budget limitations for alcohol prevention and intervention
- Inconsistent enforcement and judicial response
- Low visibility of the problem at non-residential colleges
- Proliferation of high-quality false IDs
- Limited understanding of how to broker community partnerships
- Limited capacity to measure alcohol use and related problems
College alcohol problems are systems problems, and require a multi-level, multi-component response. Educational approaches alone will be ineffective.
MD Collaborative TA Support

Individual Level
- College Park Team
- Dr. Amelia Arria

Environmental Level
- JHSPH Team
- Dr. David Jernigan
Maryland College Alcohol Survey
MD-CAS
Goals of Measurement System

1) To track the **level** of college student drinking in Maryland

2) To measure the **impact** of interventions aimed at reducing the problem
Alcohol Use
Quantity/Frequency/Type
AUDIT

Expectations & Attitudes
- Perceived Benefits
- Perceived Norms

Early Exposure
Age at First Use and Intoxication

Access & Availability
- Location
- Source
- Beverage Type
- Ease of Access
- False ID use

Parental Permissiveness
- Parent Attitudes
- Parent Limits

Harms
- Health
- Legal
- Academic

SELF

OTHERS
- Violence
- Social
- Academic
Alcohol Drinking Patterns of Maryland College Students, 2014 aggregate data

(\(n=4,209\) students)

**LOW RISK**
Students who did not drink during the past year (including lifetime abstainers)

**MODERATE RISK**
Drank during past year, but did not binge drink during the past month

**HIGH RISK**
Engaged in binge drinking one to four times during the past month

**VERY HIGH RISK**
Engaged in binge drinking five or more times during the past month

“Binge” Drinking:

**Females:** Four or more drinks in a row (or within a couple of hours) during the past month

**Males:** Five or more drinks in a row (or within a couple of hours) during the past month
Alcohol-related Consequences

- Had a hangover 64.3%
- Blacked out (forgot where you were or what you did) 33.6%
- Performed poorly on a test/project and/or missed a class* 23.9%
- Rode in a car driven by someone who had been drinking... 20.3%
- Had unprotected sex 15.2%
- Got hurt or injured 13.9%
- Drove a car when you had been drinking alcohol 13.1%
- Physically injured yourself 9.4%
- Damaged property 8.3%
- Got in trouble with residence hall staff or other campus... 7.9%
- Got taken advantage of sexually 6.9%
- Drove a car or other vehicle while drunk 5.8%
- Got in trouble with campus police 3.8%
- Physically injured someone else 3.1%
- Got in trouble with off-campus police 2.9%
- Had sex with someone without their consent 0.8%
- Arrested for DWI/DUI 0.7%

Top three consequences
- Hangovers
- Blacking out
- Academic performance problems

Important Institutional Risk Management Issues
- Physical injury
- Driving impaired
- Sexual assault
Alcohol-related “Harms to Others”

- Had to “babysit” or take care of another student who drank too much: 54.2%
- Had your sleep interrupted: 53.8%
- Had your studying interrupted: 41.9%
- Had to clean up after a student who had been drinking: 35.0%
- Been insulted or humiliated: 21.8%
- Had a serious argument or quarrel: 21.6%
- Experienced an unwanted sexual advance: 15.1%
- Had your property damaged: 12.3%
- Been assaulted, pushed, or hit: 7.1%
- Had to call emergency medical services about a student who had been drinking too much: 7.1%
- Been a victim of sexual assault or "date rape": 2.3%

2.3% translates into approximately 5,750 college students in Maryland per year.
Is there School-level Variation in Past-month Binge Drinking?

- School A: 68.6%
- School B: 57.0%
- School C: 54.0%
- School D: 46.5%
- School E: 44.2%
- School F: 34.7%
- School G: 29.7%
- School H: 24.5%
- School I: 18.4%
Risk Factor: Overestimating Peer Norms

Perceived Norms Regarding Alcohol Quantity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk group</th>
<th>Percent of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate risk</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high risk</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protective Factor: Injunctive Norms

Percent of Students Who Said Peers Should Drink Two Drinks or Less Per Occasion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Factor: Greek membership and athletic team involvement

Note: Students were categorized into one of four risk groups (low, moderate, high, very high), based on their responses to questions about their alcohol consumption patterns during the past month, past year, and lifetime. See page 18 for a definition of each risk group.
Risk Factor: Early Exposure to Alcohol

Percent of Students who were First Intoxicated Before Age 18

- **Moderate risk**
  - 17.8%
  - 6.7%

- **High risk**
  - 37.1%
  - 11.7%

- **Very high risk**
  - 50.5%
  - 23.0%
Protective Factor: Parent Limit-Setting

Percent of students with parents that did not permit any alcohol consumption during high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Percent of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate risk</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high risk</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Factor: Early Exposure to Alcohol

Percent of Students who were First Intoxicated Before Age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Very High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>15 or younger</td>
<td>16-17 years-old</td>
<td>15 or younger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protective Factor: Parent Limit-Setting

Percent of students with parents that did not permit any alcohol consumption during high school

- Low risk: 83.0%
- Moderate risk: 59.2%
- High risk: 46.8%
- Very high risk: 38.2%
Prevalence of Parent Limit Setting Reported by Students, by Risk Group

Risk group

Low risk
Moderate risk
High risk
Very high risk

Percent of students

No limit set
2 to 12 drinks permitted
1 drink permitted

83.0%
59.2%
46.8%
38.2%

5.3%
15.8%
31.6%
48.2%

4.0%
17.0%
6.8%

7.7%

19.7%

6.8%

4.6%

6.8%
Risk Factor: Where Students Drank during the Past Month, by Age

- Off-campus residence (someone else's): 47% (18 to 20), 60% (21 to 25)
- Residence hall or dorm room (someone else's): 27% (18 to 20), 49% (21 to 25)
- Residence hall or dorm room (yours): 35% (18 to 20), 40% (21 to 25)
- Off-campus private party (larger than five...): 37% (18 to 20), 32% (21 to 25)
- Bar, restaurant or club: 24% (18 to 20), 74% (21 to 25)
- Off-campus residence (yours): 20% (18 to 20), 42% (21 to 25)
- Fraternity or sorority sponsored event: 6% (18 to 20), 16% (21 to 25)
- In a car: 4% (18 to 20), 5% (21 to 25)
- Off-campus musical event: 3% (18 to 20), 5% (21 to 25)
- Off-campus sporting event: 3% (18 to 20), 4% (21 to 25)
- Intercollegiate sporting event: 3% (18 to 20), 2% (21 to 25)
- Intramural sporting event: 1% (18 to 20), 1% (21 to 25)
- Casino in Maryland: 1% (18 to 20), 4% (21 to 25)
Rsick Factor: Where Students Drank for Free, among Students Who Reported Typically Getting Their Drinks for Free, by Age
Risk Factor: Typically Get Drinks for Free, by Age and Gender

- Under-age:
  - Men: 46%
  - Women: 58%

- Legal-age:
  - Men: 8%
  - Women: 9%

P<.05
Interventions

Trainings
• Environmental strategies
• Media advocacy
• Screening and Brief Intervention
• Athletic Departments
• Law enforcement and fake IDs
• Building coalitions
• Doing environmental scans

Other resources
• Webinars
• Fact sheets
• Individualized CAS reports and recommendations
• On-site TA
• Model legislation
Guide to Best Practices

REDUCING ALCOHOL USE AND RELATED PROBLEMS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS:
A GUIDE TO BEST PRACTICES

THE MARYLAND COLLABORATIVE
College AIM  
**NIAAA’s Alcohol Intervention Matrix**

- New resource for schools to reduce excessive college drinking
- Extensive review of scientific literature
- Nearly 60 individual and environmental interventions rated for effectiveness
Individual-level Interventions
Key Findings of the Assessment

Individual Level Strategies

- Universal screening is very rare.
- 42% screen based on apparent need.
- Evidence-based interventions are offered at most 4-year schools (67% of public, 58% of private) and two 2-year schools (14%).
- 54% offer services on campus, such as counseling, 12-step meetings, and other support groups.
- Educational programs are commonly utilized. (79% of 4-year schools and 57% of 2-year schools)
- There is a highly expressed need for more training.
A model for screening, identifying and intervening with college students with different levels of alcohol involvement

Initial Screening (to identify students with possible alcohol problems)

General student population

Students who violate alcohol policies

Comprehensive Assessment to Determine Level of Risk for Serious Alcohol Problem

Assignment to Appropriate Intervention based on Risk Level

Low-risk
  e.g., Brief Intervention

Medium-risk
  e.g., Intensive Intervention

High-risk
  e.g., Refer to Treatment

Clinical Decision:
Involving Academic Assistance Centers
EXPAND ROLE OF ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE CENTERS

• Research shows a clear and compelling connection between AOD involvement and skipping class, and GPA

• Academic assistance centers might be an additional touchpoint to identify students at “dual risk” – for AOD problems and academic difficulties.

• Inquire about concentration problems, missed classes due to AOD use, and attenuation of personal academic goals.

• UMCP has developed a protocol and a screening tool for use in academic assistance centers.
Expand Role of Academic Assistance Center professionals

- Screen
- Identify
- Intervene
- Monitor
Parent-focused Website
www.CollegeParentsMatter.org

- Focus on parent-child communication
- Tips, tools, and scripts
- Alcohol-related topics
- Website is updated frequently

Topics Include:
- Spring break
- 21st birthday
- Off-campus parties
- Impaired driving

Upcoming:
- Sexual assault prevention
- Marijuana
www.CollegeParentsMatter.org
Environmental-Level Interventions
Key Findings of the Assessment

On Campus

• While most schools provide information about campus alcohol policies in student handbooks, few (18%) integrate this information into classes.
• 23 schools allow alcohol use on campus; 80% of these report they prohibit it at intercollegiate sporting events and residence hall events.
• 57% limit the amount of alcohol available at events.

Off Campus

• Schools vary widely with respect to how involved they are with community partners to address local drinking problems and environments.
• At least four schools have worked with local authorities to address problematic service and/or pricing practices at local outlets.
• 13 of 38 schools work with a local law enforcement agency to enforce existing state and local alcohol laws.

There is a clear need to harmonize on- and off-campus policies and enforcement.
Ideally, reducing high levels of alcohol availability and easy access will decrease opportunities for high-risk drinking.
School-level Variation in the Proportion of Underage Students who Report that Obtaining Alcohol is “Very Easy” or “Easy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percent of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>