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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

“Gordie Bailey Jr. had been in college only one month before he overdosed on alcohol. Urged on by members of a fraternity he was intent on joining, the 18-year-old drank until he passed out, was dumped onto a couch and was found dead the next morning. The 2004 incident at the University of Colorado was one of the approximately 1,700 alcohol-related deaths that occur among college students each year in the United States. They include traffic accidents, falls, suffocation, drowning and alcohol poisoning.”

This article from Shari Roan (2008) of the Los Angeles Times illustrates how alcohol consumption on college campuses has become something that is a part of the culture on some campuses and an activity that some students are spending the majority of their time doing. A recent article in USA Today by Mary Beth Marklein (2009) reported that a recent survey of 30,000 students on 76 campuses found 70% of the respondents drank and that nearly half of the 70% spent more time drinking than studying. That is almost 1/3 of the students who took the survey (Marklein, 2009). Why are College bound students so likely to engage in dangerous binge drinking behaviors? Are they unaware of the dangers?

College administrators are trying to discover what factors are encouraging students to drink underage (specifically binge drinking) and what sort of prevention methods work best to protect and educate their student body. Wechsler and company reported that “approximately 1,400 alcohol-related deaths, 500,000 alcohol-related unintentional injuries, and 70,000 alcohol-related sexual assaults or date rapes occur each year among college students aged 18 to 24 years” (Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, Wechsler, 2002, p. 139). That is enough to make anyone within the field of Higher Education take notice of such a serious situation. It’s not just the students who are drinking that are affected. Hingson et al. (2002) reported that 600,000 students between
18 and 24 are assaulted by a student who has engaged in drinking. The second hand effects of college drinking can affect the entire community of a college or university.

Why is drinking at college so dangerous? It is often you see a movie such as “Animal House” where drinking is fun and often humorous. These movies and media images can create a false image of binge drinking that people may try to emulate. Many movies and television shows such as Accepted, Greek, and American Pie attribute college social life to binge drinking or drinking mass quantities in a limited time. Binge drinking is what is dangerous and is why many colleges and universities are concerned with the increased trends of alcohol consumption on campus.

While alcohol abuse can easily be identified as one of the most commonly occurring preventable contributors to morbidity and mortality in America, it also tends to be one of the most difficult problems to solve (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, Castillo, 1995). In fact Wechsler conducted a multi-college study using over 17,500 students and found that 44% were identified as binge drinkers (Wechsler et. al, 1995). Binge drinking is a dangerous habit that seems to be on a rise in many colleges and universities around the nation.

Without proper intervention and prevention programs many colleges and universities would be facing an uphill battle against college binge drinking and all of its inherent dangers. The lack of specific guidelines, policies and education; administrators would be at an extreme disadvantage dealing with an all too common public health hazard, not to mention the adverse affect it would have on a college’s mission to create a safe and enhancing environment for academic achievement and personal growth.

This study will evaluate the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy (Fall 2006) to the previous Marietta College alcohol policy. By gathering data about the number of
alcohol related judicial cases before and after the current alcohol policy was put in place, the study will be able to determine if the Marietta College’s new alcohol policy has led to a decrease in alcohol related judicial cases. The study will also be able to discover trends related to the new alcohol policy regarding judicial violations. An efficient alcohol policy will lead to prevention in alcohol judicial action and a overall alcohol consumption rather than having an increase in judicial cases and more exacerbated incidents of alcohol use.

Statement of Problem

Prevention of alcohol-related incidents on college campuses start with a clear, outlined, and strict alcohol policy. In order to erase existing social norms related to alcohol with in a college community the college must educate, enforce, and clarify its policy on alcohol. A strict policy will eventually lead to a more realistic perception of the drinking norms and a decrease in judicial actions related to alcohol. Without proper development and enforcement of an alcohol policy, colleges and universities will be unable to address the issues related to college drinking. This research hopes to discover whether or not the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy has had an effect on the number of alcohol related incidents on campus.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to inform administrators of the importance of a substantial alcohol policy, specifically, to inform Marietta College of the current successes of its new alcohol policy by comparing judicial records with and without the current alcohol policy. The study hopes to discover if the current Marietta College alcohol policy is effective in reducing the number of alcohol related incidents and if a more structured alcohol policy could help to change or limit dangerous college drinking behaviors and perceptions.
Research Hypothesis

The research hypothesis below will be tested using various inferential statistics. An independent samples t-test, a one way ANOVA, and a Pearson’s Chi-Square was used to investigate any relationship of correlation between the number of alcohol incidents and the implementation of the current Marietta College alcohol policy. The researcher proposed that the current Marietta College alcohol policy has led to a decrease in alcohol-related judicial actions.

Null Hypothesis

There will be no significant difference in Marietta College’s judicial records before and after the new alcohol policy was put into effect.

Alternative Hypothesis

There will be a significant difference in Marietta College’s judicial records before and after the new alcohol policy was put into effect.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Minimum Legal Drinking Age

It’s easy to see why alcohol is such a major part of American culture since it played such a large role in American history. The most well known “alcohol policy” is known as the Prohibition Era. From 1920 to 1933 all sales, production, and transportation of alcohol for consumption was banned due to the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. During the Prohibition era many individuals rebelled against the law and drank anyway, often engaging in dangerous drinking habits (Miron & Zwiebel, 1991). Individuals would engage in binge drinking while they drank dangerous and often poisonous homebrews. According to Miron and Zwiebel the drinkers during the Prohibition era often drank in order to get drunk rather than enjoy a social drink or two with others. Prohibitions outlawing alcohol even brought organized crime into the mix as sellers and rum runners to produce and distribute the now illegal substances (Miron & Zwiebel, 1991).

Finally in 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt signed an act that allowed the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, due to the overwhelming unpopularity of the prohibition act. The Eighteenth Amendment was repealed with the Twenty-First Amendment (Miron & Zwiebel, 1991).

Following prohibition, many states developed a minimum legal drinking age (MLDA) of 21 years of age. Towards the 1970’s many states started to set their MLDA around 18, 19, and 20 years of age (Wagenaar & Toomey, 2002). During this time researchers saw evidence of a substantial increase in youth car crashes (Wagenaar & Toomey, 2002). According to King and Dudar (1987) the federal government enacted the
Uniform Drinking Age Act in 1984. This act allowed the federal government to withhold highway funds from states that did not have a MLDA of at least 21 in order to potentially help curb the recent increases in youth car crashes. “By 1988, all states had established an age-21 MLDA.” (Wagenaar & Toomey, 2002).

Call to Revisit the MLDA

The debate over the current MLDA still continues to date. Some feel that the MLDA of 21 is not an effective way to reduce alcohol related problems (Wagenaar & Toomey, 2002). Recently, many college administrators have expressed interest in investigating the Uniform Drinking Age Act and looking more closely at the research surrounding the current 21 MLDA. A recent article by the Associated Press on MSNBC shows how quickly this call to revisit the MLDA is gaining support:

“The college presidents from about 100 of the best-known U.S. universities, including Duke, Dartmouth and Ohio State, are calling on lawmakers to consider lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18, saying current laws actually encourage dangerous binge drinking on campus. The movement called the Amethyst Initiative began quietly recruiting presidents more than a year ago to provoke national debate on the U.S. drinking age, which is among the highest in the world.” (MSNBC.com, 2008).

The debate is of particular interest to colleges because the majority of the students on most college campuses are under the age of 21 and many college administrators argue that environmental factors and societal norms are causing the current MLDA to have an adverse affect on underage consumption, specifically, an increase in dangerous drinking behaviors such as binge drinking (Lonnstrom, 1985).

Culture of Drinking/Social Norms

In order to make any lasting change in a community you must also seek to try and affect the culture. The alcohol industry spends over $4.5 billion per year in advertising and marketing, much of which is targeted to underage drinkers with youthful images and
funny advertising (Mitchell, Toomey, Erickson, 2005). The media is saturated with advertisements for alcohol and Hollywood has become obsessed with glorifying the college party scene in movies with outrageous behavior and excessive drinking as “just another day at college.” Movies like Van Wilder, American Pie series, and Accepted make behaviors such as underage consumption and binge drinking seem like a social norm once a student goes to college.

The research gathered for this study showed that Freshmen College students seem to be more greatly affected by the perceived social norms related to drinking than their upperclassmen peers. According to a study done by Taylor, Johnson, and Voas (2006) which looks at drinking trends, “Freshmen reported the most drinking on average for measures of drinks on Friday, drinks on Saturday, and binge drinking frequency in the last two weeks” (p.43). It seems that the drinking culture is much more focused on fast paced binge drinking and drinking to get drunk than on casual social drinking (one to two drinks per outing). Much of the research centered around the drinking culture on college campuses discusses the binge drinking behavior as the current dominant norm (Wechsler & Nelson, 2008).

Previous research also seems to indicate that many students develop drinking rituals or habits because it develops a sense of community and therefore the sense of community becomes a motivation for the drinking behavior (Driver, 1991; Cronin, 1997). Drinking behaviors become highly ritualized and sought after as a support group and social tool to students. That means students who go out with friends will increase in alcohol consumption rates, regardless if those among the group did not want to drink in order to be a part of the group and a part of the perceived social norm (Brannon & Pilling, 2005).
Binge Drinking

There has been a significant amount of research done on binge drinking, especially when related to college campuses. There are three specific areas in which data was gathered that related binge drinking to the culture of college drinking as well as to why there is a need to have strong alcohol policies and preventative measures at a college or university.

First, it is important to understand the operational definition of binge drinking and the limitations the label “binge drinking/er” has. According to Weschler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, (1994) binge drinking refers to drinking to or exceeding a certain threshold of drinks per night, such as four or more drinks for females (4+) and five or more drinks for males (5+). Weschler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, Lee, (2002) research suggest that 45% of students nationwide meet or exceed the 4+/5+ definition of binge drinking at least once every two weeks. This type of drinking behavior could potentially produce blood alcohol concentrations (BACs) of 0.08% or higher if consumed in rapid succession (White, Kraus, and Swartzwelder, 2006).

It is also worth noting that college students labeled as a binge drinker may be consuming far more than the 4+/5+ definition. In fact USA Today (2004) reported than three students at Colorado schools died from alcohol overdoses within the first semester in 2004. One of these students, Samantha Spady, is thought to have consumed more that 40 drinks on the night she died (USA Today, 2004). This is 10 times the binge threshold for females (White et al, 2006). Aaron White et al. (2006) investigated these labeling issues and discovered that a significant portion of binge drinkers are consuming two or more times the defined drinking threshold. Almost 20% of binge drinkers are consuming
more than twice the established threshold with males being slightly more frequent than females (White et al, 2006).

Another area of importance pertaining to binge drinking is the established correlates for college students. There are many different correlates that previous research has uncovered that pertain to college binge drinkers. One of the strongest correlates was a measure of a student’s commitment to different college lifestyle choices. Students who chose parties as “very important” had a high correlation to binge drinking. Students who did not value religion as important also had a high binge drinking correlation and self classified themselves as risk takers (Wechsler et al, 1995).

A similar study looked at more serious data. Ralph Hingson et al. (2002) looked at the magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S college students. They estimate that 1,400 unintentional, alcohol-related fatal injuries occurred in 1998 among college students ages 18-24 (Hingson et al, 2002). Out of 1,400 incidents 1,100 were traffic related and the other 300 were non-traffic, alcohol-related fatal injuries (Hingson et al, 2002). Even more frightening is the fact that students that are involved with nonfatal injuries while under the influence may exceed 500,000, and over 600,000 others will be hit or assaulted by a drinking college student who is under the influence (Hingson et al, 2002). So even if a student is not engaging in a drinking behavior, their safety is still at risk through no fault of their own. This is why the college drinking dilemma is so important to administrators, staff, and faculty at colleges and universities all over the nation.

The last important area dealing with binge drinking is the adverse effects it may have on the student. Obviously there is a serious risk of fatality as described earlier but
there is also a surprising amount of data that suggest students may be developing serious
drinking problems which may be negatively affecting their academic achievement.

Taylor et al. (2006) performed a chi-square test to reveal a significant association
between Grade Point Average (GPA) and binge drinking at least once in the last two
weeks. Students who have a GPA less than 2.00 consistently reported significantly high
rates of drinks or drinking occasions while students with a GPA of 3.51 and above
reported an adverse relation (Taylor et al, 2006). Taylor’s study also noticed the GPA has
a significant effect on alcohol-related problems. Specifically, students with low GPAs
reported high rates of alcohol related problems while students with high GPAs reported
low rates of alcohol-related problems (Taylor et al, 2006). These data help show that
alcohol-related problems are correlated to GPA which helps to show the importance of
the current research to develop a way to lower alcohol-related problems on college
campuses; a strong college alcohol policy would be one such method.

**Previous Marietta College Alcohol Policy**

The previous Marietta College Alcohol Policy in the Student Handbook did not
spell out direct consequences or sanctions for violations and also failed to address many
rules that were in the Residence Life Handbook. While the previous policy had some nice
language that made of age students aware that they were only to consume alcohol in their
residence hall room or at a College and student sponsored event (so long as they were
following the guidelines listed in the policy), it never directly addressed underage
students or what would happen if they violated the alcohol policy (Marietta College,
2004). See appendix A.

The only items that the previous alcohol policy addressed were the limit of the
number of students allowed in a room and the guidelines for group consumption (campus
parties). The lack of structure and identifiable consequences made the previous alcohol policy something of a mystery that may have been ignored by some students. This lack of identity and structure also made judicial hearings involving alcohol incidents very inconsistent.

Whenever a college policy is broken an incident report is filled out by the staff member who dealt with the event and the incident report is then forwarded to the Residence Hall Director who is in charge of the building that the student(s) reside in. The Residence Hall Director schedules a judicial hearing that the student must attend and at this hearing the Residence Hall Director or Judicial Hearing Officer decides on the appropriate sanctions if the student is found in violation. This process allows the Residence Hall Directors to become very creative with their sanctioning but can also create some major inconsistencies with the way alcohol violations are sanctioned. Two very similar cases may have two very different sanctions because there was no sort of codified sanction.

A good comparison would be if someone parked in a no parking zone and received a 20 dollar fine and then another person parked illegally in the same spot the next day but received a 55 dollar fine by a different officer. This would more than likely be upsetting to the person who received a larger fine. The same type of inconsistency existed within the old alcohol policy because violation of the alcohol policy did not have any defined consequences. According to Bruce Peterson, the Director of Residence Life, many students were unhappy with how different sanctions were from building to building and these students felt they were being treated unfairly. The student body soon got together and addressed the issue by creating a new alcohol policy in the Fall of 2006.
Current Marietta College Alcohol Policy

In the Fall of 2006 the student government proposed a new alcohol policy with help from the student life department. This new alcohol policy had codified sanctions for various violations of the alcohol policy. The current policy also clearly defined underage consumption and sought to discourage binge drinking behaviors by adding an allowed quantity of alcohol per of age resident. The student government and Student Life staff hoped that these new amendments would help to discourage underage consumption and dangerous binge drinking behavior (Marietta College, 2008).

The edition of a codified alcohol sanctioning system also helped Judicial Hearing Officers to be consistent with their sanctioning. By having a structured and itemized table for violations and sanctions, the Judicial Officers could better justify why they were imposing their sanctions and could treat students equally. Below is a chart of the current alcohol policy sanctions.
### Marietta College Alcohol Policy Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
<th>3rd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverages and paraphernalia in substance free areas</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Warning, 10 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$150 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$250 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item h.</strong></td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting alcohol for a College sponsored event.</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Warning, 10 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$150 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$250 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item k.</strong></td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal age individual possessing or consuming liquor or consuming alcohol outside of his/her room</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item b, d</strong></td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An underage individual in the presence of, possessing or consuming alcohol</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item b, c</strong></td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any individual in possession of drinking game paraphernalia</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item b, i</strong></td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age who is in possession of more alcohol than allowed by policy</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive, Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td>1st Offense</td>
<td>2nd Offense</td>
<td>3rd Offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being under the influence of alcohol (Item d)</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age who is in possession of bulk quantities of alcohol (Item g)</td>
<td>$200 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 20 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment, 30 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$400 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 50 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age providing alcohol to underage individuals (Item c)</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 50 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$400 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, Removal from College Housing, 100 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$500 fine, Suspension from College, 150 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the current Marietta College alcohol policy sanction chart. The Judicial Hearing Officer would look up the violation and then apply the sanction based on the number of prior alcohol policy violations. A full description of the current alcohol policy can be viewed in appendix B.

The current Marietta College alcohol policy has been in place for almost three full years. Alcohol related judicial cases have fluctuated from semester to semester but there appears to be a downward trend. This trend is even more interesting because enrollment at Marietta College has consistently been on the rise. Probability and basic statistics would suggest that as the enrollment increases so would the number of alcohol related incidents. That is what this study will be investigating.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Study Design

The evaluation of the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy compared the Fall and Spring semesters alcohol-related judicial cases during 2001-2008. This allows a substantial number of semesters before and after the alcohol policy. The researcher used a t-test, one way ANOVA, and a Pearson Chi-Square to determine a possible relationship between the alcohol related judicial cases and the semester (pre alcohol policy and post alcohol policy). Judicial records were gathered for the Fall and Spring semesters of 2001-2007. Documentation of the previous alcohol policy and current alcohol policy was gathered and compared.

The researcher believes this to be the most efficient way to evaluate the quality of the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy without comparing many policies with a large unbiased population in a multivariate study.

Procedures

The researcher only utilized alcohol violations that went to a judicial hearing and were proven to be in violation. Alcohol violations were also compared to enrollment numbers in order to account for varying populations between each academic semester.

Instruments

The researcher used total alcohol violations and alcohol-related incidents from the Marietta College Judicial Records System as well as the enrollment numbers from each semester to show approximate percentages of students who commit an alcohol violation. Permission was granted from both the Director of Residence Life and the Dean of Students. Data was analyzed using the SPSS program version 16.0.
Reliability

To guarantee internal reliability, the researcher performed the following:

1. The researcher used both the yearly totals of alcohol-related judicial cases as well as investigated the entire semester’s individual judicial cases in order to confirm totals.

2. The researcher found the approximated percentages of students who were violating the alcohol policy in order to account for the rises in enrollment.

3. The researcher processed and analyzed the data from the SPSS program with Dr. Alicia Doerflinger to increase accuracy and reliability.

4. The researcher set the alpha level at .05 on SPSS.

Validity

To guarantee internal validity, the researcher performed the following:

1. The researcher looked only at alcohol related cases for this study.

2. Homogeneity of the mean was also processed in order to confirm the validity of the study.

3. Content validity was analyzed by asking the Director of Residence Life if the number of alcohol violations seemed representative of the student body and if the percentages of alcohol violations seemed accurate.

Data Analyses procedures

All data are categorized and organized chronologically. All judicial cases were reviewed only by the researcher who already had full access to these files. All identities of the individuals involved in any of the cases were kept confidential. Some data obtained had total number of alcohol cases and not individual cases. The data were only available
to the researcher and the Director of Residence Life in order to maintain confidentiality. All quantitative data was analyzed through SPSS.

**Preliminary Results**

The researcher was not able to disprove the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis states: there will be no significant difference in Marietta College’s judicial records before and after the new alcohol policy was put into effect. The data showed that the differences in alcohol related incidents prior to the new alcohol policy and after the implementation of the current alcohol policy were not significant. The data do show a developing trend in the reduction of alcohol related incidents that suggests further investigation.

**Potential Ethical Issues**

Prior to gathering data the researcher obtained the proper approval from the Marietta College Human Subjects Review Board. All data were obtained with the permission from the Director of the Residence Life. All information gathered was accessible due to the Cleary Act. The individual judicial records will be kept confidential. The information obtained from every individual college Residence Life department will be destroyed or returned once it has been used for this study. The data will be stored at the researcher’s office in the Residence Life Department.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Interpretation of Findings

The researcher obtained judicial records from 2001-2008 that indicated the number of alcohol violations from the Director of Residence Life. The records were gathered from the Residence Life Office and from existing Microsoft Excel data via personal pick up. The statistics were tabulated using the SPSS 16.0 statistical software program. Table 2.1 shows the number of alcohol violations throughout 2001-2008 semesters. Table 2.2 shows the total enrollment numbers throughout the 2001-2008 semesters and the percentage of those students that were involved in an alcohol related incident. Figure 1 shows an emerging trend in the decline of alcohol related incidents but the data from computing a Pearson Chi-Squared test (2-sided) was .307 which is not significant at the alpha level of .05. A one way ANOVA was also calculated for the percentages of alcohol violation before and after the new alcohol policy was written and enacted but was also not significant (.111) at the .05 alpha level.

Table 2.1 shows a breakdown of the number of alcohol violations in each of the investigated semester.
Table 2.1

2001-2008 Alcohol Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Alcohol Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is fairly consistent until the Fall 2004 where there is a large rise in alcohol policy violations and then a large decline the following semester. A larger than normal enrollment may have been a factor in this spike. This can be seen in Table 2.2 below.
Table 2.2

*Total enrollment and Percentages of Students involved in Alcohol Policy Violations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Alcohol Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fall 2006</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 shows the enrollment for each semester and the percentage of students involved in alcohol policy violations. * is when the 2006 alcohol policy went into effect.
Table 2.2 shows that after the 2006 alcohol policy was established there was a steady decline in alcohol violation percentages even while enrollments still remained higher than previous years. Figures 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 show a slight decline in alcohol violations after the new alcohol policy was written and put into action.

Figure 2.2

*Alcohol violations per Semester*

Figure 2.2 illustrates that alcohol violations were on a rise even as enrollment was increasing and that after Spring of 2007 there was a steady decline in the total number of alcohol violations.

Figure 2.3 shows a visual representation of the enrollment increase from 2001-2008. Figure 2.3 coupled with Figure 2.2 helps to provide evidence that there may be a relationship to lower alcohol policy violations between the previous alcohol policy and
the current alcohol policy even when enrollment is increasing at an average rate. Figure 2.4 further supports this possibility with a visual representation of the percentages of students who are violating the alcohol policy in the Spring and Fall semesters.

Figure 2.3

*Enrollment Totals for the 2001-2008 Semesters*

Figure 2.3 shows the enrollment rates for each semester during 2001-2008.
Figure 2.4 depicts the percentage increases and decreases throughout the 2001-2008 semesters.

Fall and Spring semesters were separated in order to show differences in the seasons and to see if there was any seasonal trends with alcohol violation percentages. The percentages were calculated with the total enrollment for the semester as well as the total number of alcohol violations of the same semester. More data are needed in order to identify any sort of seasonal trends. A declining trend is visible in both the Fall and Spring graphs after the Fall of 2006.
Table 2.3

*Mean and Standard Deviation for Total Alcohol Violations and Percentages of Alcohol Violations Before the 2006 Alcohol Policy and After the 2006 Alcohol Policy (N=15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Violations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>28.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Alcohol Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Violations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4

*Independent Samples t-test With Equal Variances Assumed and Not Assumed (N=15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Violations</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variances Assumed</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variances Not Assumed</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>12.840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 shows the Independent Samples t-test with equal variances assumed and not assumed in order to account for the difference in the number of samples gathered from before Fall 2006 and after Fall 2006 (pre test and post test using the current alcohol policy as the treatment). As shown in the figure, no results were significant at the .05 alpha level.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy in order to see if it has decreased the number of alcohol related incidents. While the data did not show any significant results there were some visible trends. These trends were visible in figures 1 and 3. By obtaining the records from the 2001-2008 judicial cases and calculating the data the researcher was able to show a possible relationship with the current Marietta College Alcohol Policy and a decline in alcohol related incidents. While the results from this study were not significant they did show that a trend is emerging. The data showed a significant outlier in the Fall 2004 semester. In an attempt to further show this trend the research isolated the Fall 2004 outlier and recalculated the data.

Discussion

The researcher calculated the data without the Fall 2004 semester but the independent samples T-test still showed no significant results at the .05 alpha level with the number of alcohol violations but it did show significance with the percentage of violations with equal variances not assumed (.022). The data indicated a trend in a decreased percentage of alcohol related incidents when comparing the two alcohol policies. This can be seen in Table 2.5. The researcher believes that the current alcohol policy is reducing the number of alcohol related incidents but more data (additional semesters) are needed to gather significant results.
Table 2.5 shows an independent samples t-test looking at data before the Fall 2006 alcohol policy and after the 2006 alcohol policy. This test looked at both the total number of alcohol violations and the percentages of alcohol violations. The test was also run with equal variances not assumed to account for the difference in semester before the current alcohol policy.

**Limitations of the Study**

During the course of this study a few limitations were noted. The first limitation being that there is no way to completely isolate the difference in alcohol policies and how they affected each student. The changes in alcohol violations could be attributed to national programs or public service announcements that could be helping (or hindering)
the amount of alcohol violations to decrease. It is also impossible to tell if students are
drinking less or just getting caught less. The students could be learning new ways to
avoid getting caught while still continuing or even increasing the frequency of the
behavior.

Another major limitation to the study is that the current alcohol policy is still
fairly new and there is limited data prior to the implementation of the current alcohol
policy to test. The researcher was able to find 10 semesters worth of judicial records prior
to the current alcohol policy but only has 5 semesters of judicial records after the current
alcohol policy. The researcher believes that in two years there will be more than enough
data to show a significant change in the number of alcohol violations due to the current
Marietta College Alcohol Policy.

Future Research

One of the goals of this research was to develop an interest in the evaluation of
alcohol policies. This study showed that alcohol policies could have an effect on alcohol
violations which could help to eliminate the dangerous stigmas associated with college
drinking. Miller and Rollnick (1991) reported that many social norms marketing theorists
are in favor of making students aware of the real drinking norms which would lead
students to tailor their behavior to be more in line with the real norms in order to fit in
and not stand out in the crowd. Conversely, this means that any false perceptions about
drinking behaviors (specifically a positive increase) would lead to students increasing
their alcohol use and abuse in order to fit into the perceived norm. A decrease in drinking
behaviors would hopefully lead to a new perception about college drinking and help to
curb this growing problem.
College drinking is not a problem that can be solved with one solution. It is a multifaceted problem which requires a multifaceted solution. More research is needed into why college students drink, the culture surrounding college drinking, and how to change that culture. There are numerous ways in which colleges and universities try to do this whether it’s trying to educate students to real drinking norms, teaching or role modeling responsible drinking habits, and even public service announcements. What is needed now is the evaluation and testing of these recent attempts to help curb dangerous college drinking behaviors to see what is most effective and what sort of multifaceted program can be implemented to protect the next generation of college students from college drinking and the unsafe behaviors that emerge.
APPENDIX A

MARIETTA ALCOHOL POLICY PRIOR TO FALL 2006
Alcoholic Beverage Use Policy

The Alcoholic Beverage Use Policy is part of the Marietta College Student Creed.

Marietta College recognizes that alcohol and other drug abuse are problems on the nation's campuses. In an attempt to deal with the prevention and treatment of these problems as they arise on the Marietta College campus, the following policy has been developed. As an institution for higher learning, Marietta College believes that alcohol abuse and misuse conflict with the goals and purposes of liberal education, and therefore supports a policy of responsible alcohol use.

Illegal use of other drugs is incompatible with the basic purposes of an institution of higher learning, and those who indulge in it or encourage others to do so are jeopardizing both the mission of Marietta College and their own responsible role in that mission.

The College will actively pursue a program of education on alcohol use. Marietta College also recognizes that whether to drink or not is an individual decision, and the College supports that decision, consistent with the laws of the State of Ohio and with College policies.

Marietta College takes the official position that a student who seeks counseling or treatment for an alcohol or other drug use problem will not be subject to any disciplinary action because of said counseling or treatment. Further, no record of such treatment or counseling will be made or used in any way to place the student in jeopardy at a future time.

The College recognizes alcoholism and drug addiction as diseases that can be treated. For the purpose of this policy, alcoholism and drug addiction are defined as diseases in which the student's consumption of alcohol or any other drug interferes with behavior, academic performance, and/or personal health. Alcohol and drug abuse are defined as the student's consumption of alcohol or any other drug to an extent where such consumption creates problems for the student or others.

Marietta College assures that any student having a problem with alcohol or other drug abuse will receive the same careful consideration and offer of treatment that is now extended to students with any other illness.

The reason for the social stigma often attached to alcoholism and drug addiction have no basis in fact. The College expects that a campus-wide enlightened attitude and realistic acceptance of alcoholism and drug addiction as diseases will encourage students to take advantage of available treatment whenever it is needed.

1. Preamble

The campus alcohol policy proceeds from the premise that all campus policy must support the Marietta College mission and its inherent values, which are articulated in the College Mission Statement and the Campus Creed. As an educational institution, Marietta College is committed to fostering the intellectual and personal development of its members. The abuse of alcohol or other substances (and the behaviors that often follow such abuse) is inimical to the mission and purposes of the institution and is therefore prohibited.

The campus alcohol policy is also based upon the recognition that:
a. The majority of Marietta College students cannot legally consume alcohol;
b. A number of students who are of legal age to consume alcohol choose not to do so;
c. Alcohol abuse on college campuses across the nation (including Marietta College) is rampant and widespread.

Given these facts, the College bears a dual responsibility: acknowledging the desire of those students who are of legal age to consume alcohol and ensuring that the social life of the campus does not revolve around an activity in which a majority of the students cannot participate. Furthermore, the College bears a responsibility for insuring that College-sanctioned events do not infringe upon students' intellectual and personal lives. Thus, the policy permits students who are of legal age to consume alcohol in their residence hall rooms and, under the guidelines outlined, at College and student-sponsored events. Exceptions to the policy outlined may be granted by the Dean for Students.

2. Personal Consumption
   a. Students who are of legal age may consume alcohol in the privacy of their rooms (in residence halls/small group houses) or in the rooms of other students of legal drinking age, except in freshman residence halls.
   b. No more that 15 students are permitted in a room in which open containers of alcohol are present. No more than 36 students will be permitted in a suite in Parsons Hall in the presence of open containers of alcohol.
   c. Open containers of alcohol are not permitted in lounges, hallways (except suite hallways in Parsons Hall), stairwells, balconies, on campus grounds, or in the public or semipublic areas of the campus.

3. Group Consumption
   a. All group consumption (campus parties of 16 or more) will take place in designated party spaces (e.g. Andrews, Gilman, Hermann, The Gathering Place etc.). Members of a small group may hold two small parties per semester in their houses. The maximum number of people attending these parties (including the hosts) shall be based on the formula: three multiplied by the number of members in the group (e.g., 3 x 40 = 120). Although suites in Parsons Hall may be designated as small group housing, parties at which alcohol is present are not permitted in large residence halls. These regulations refer to parties at which alcohol will be served and for which party permits are required. Groups may have an unlimited number of non-alcohol parties. In addition, groups may sponsor an unlimited number of parties in Andrews Hall or other specified party areas.

   Groups hosting small parties will follow the same procedures in procuring party permits as for all other parties. Violations of alcohol policies that occur during these parties could...
result in sanctions by the Marietta College Student Conduct Board or through an Administrative Hearing including, but not limited to, the loss of party privileges for up to 12 months after the violation. In the case of subsequent violations occurring within 12 months of the previous violation and sanction, students will lose the privilege of such parties for an additional year.

Groups may reduce the period of suspension of party permits by providing an alcohol education program approved by the Dean of Students office for the group. This may result in a six-month reduction of the suspension.

b. A party permit must be obtained from the Office of Campus Police and must be signed by the advisor of the organization seeking the permit. A completed form must be returned at least 48 hours in advance of the event. Permits will be issued only for parties organized around themes. Guest lists must be submitted along with the request for party permits. Guest lists will include specific names and birthdays of all those invited to the event. An identification card with photograph will be required for admittance to the event (College ID for Marietta College students).

c. A third-party vendor will be the sole purveyor of alcohol at campus events. (This depends on the ability of the College or of a third-party vendor to secure an appropriate liquor license).

d. Security for events will be arranged and approved by the Chief of Campus Police. These arrangements will include the use of campus police officers, wrist bands, and other risk management items. In addition, sponsoring groups will provide a “sober patrol” according to practices outlined in party guidelines. Campus Police will provide escort service to and from events as requested.

e. Appropriate high protein foods must be served throughout group events. Breads, meats, cheeses, vegetables, brownies, cookies, subs, pizzas, fruits, and dips are considered appropriate.

f. Alternative nonalcoholic beverages served from closed containers (cans, plastic bottles, or fountain-dispensing machines) must be available throughout group events. Water and coin-operated soda machines are not considered appropriate. The amount of non-alcoholic beverages should be sufficient for the number of guests at the event.

g. Alcohol will be limited to beer and/or wine. (The nature of alcohol served will depend on the type of liquor license the College or third party vendor is able to obtain).

h. During the last 45 minutes of an event, alcohol service must stop. A new, non-alcoholic beverage and new food items will be served.
APPENDIX B

CURRENT MARIETTA COLLEGE ALCOHOL POLICY
two (2) business days.

3. In either case the accuser will be notified in writing by the SCO, RD, or Chairperson of the SCB of the outcome resulting from his/her complaint.

4. The SCB secretary shall report the results of SCB cases to be forwarded monthly to the Marcolian without names.

5. The SCO shall report to SCB the results of Administrative Hearings monthly. The SCB secretary shall report the results of the Administrative Hearings cases to be forwarded monthly to the Marcolian without names.

6. The DOS office must maintain records for the safety and protection of the College community as a whole. Disciplinary records will be maintained, including those that do not result in a finding of "in violation".

7. Disciplinary records are expunged one year after the student's graduation from Marietta College.

Appeals
A student found "in violation" of the Marietta College Student Creed by either the SCB or the AHO may appeal the decision. The student must file a written appeal directly to the Provost for academic violations and to the Dean of Students for social violations within five (5) business days of the decision. The basis of appeal must meet one of the following criteria: procedural violation, new evidence or lack of evidence.

Amendment
Amendment to the Creed may be proposed by the Campus Life and Athletic Committee, Faculty Council, Student Senate or President of the College. No amendment or revision shall be effective until it has been approved by a two-thirds vote of Faculty Council, a two-thirds vote of the Student Senate and President of the College.

Alcohol Policy
Marietta College recognizes that abuse of alcohol and other drugs is a problem on the nation's campuses. In an attempt to deal with the prevention and treatment of these problems as they arise on the Marietta College campus, the following policy has been developed.

Illegal use of drugs is incompatible with the basic purposes of an institution of higher learning, and those who indulge in it or encourage others to do so are jeopardizing both the mission of Marietta College and their own responsible role in that mission.

Marietta College takes the official position that a student who seeks counseling or treatment for an alcohol or other drug use problem will not be subject to any disciplinary action because of said counseling or treatment. Further, no record of such treatment or counseling will be made or used in any way to place the student in jeopardy at a future time.

The College recognizes alcoholism and drug addiction as diseases that can be treated. For the purpose of this policy, alcoholism and drug dependence are defined as diseases. A student is considered to have an alcohol or drug abuse problem when the use of such drugs interferes with the student's behavior, academic performance and/ or personal health. Alcohol and drug abuse are defined as the student's consumption of alcohol or any other drug abuse to an extent where such consumption creates problem for the student or others.

Marietta College assures that any student having a problem with alcohol or other drug abuse will receive the same careful consideration and offer of treatment that is now extended to students with any other illnesses.

Philosophy
The campus alcohol policy proceeds from the premise that all campus policy must support the Marietta College Mission Statement and the College Creed. As an educational institution Marietta College is committed to fostering the intellectual and personal development of its members. The abuse of alcohol or other substances and behaviors associated with such abuse is incompatible to the mission and purposes of the institution and is therefore prohibited.

The alcohol policy is also based upon the recognition that:
1. The majority of Marietta College students cannot legally consume alcohol;
2. A number of students that are of legal age to consume or possess alcohol choose not to do so; and
3. Alcohol abuse on college campuses across the nation (including Marietta College) is rampant and widespread.

Given these facts, the College bears a dual responsibility: acknowledge the desire of those students who are of legal age to consume alcohol and ensure that the social life of the campus does not revolve around an activity in which the majority of students cannot participate and ensure that College-sanctioned events do not fringe upon students’ intellectual and personal lives.

Marietta College condemns excessive consumption of alcohol as an unacceptable and irresponsible act. Also, the College considers the decision to consume alcohol or not, to be a value judgment on the part of each individual of legal age. If alcoholic beverages are consumed, the consumption must take place in accordance with the laws of the State of Ohio and the City of Marietta, as well as the policy of Marietta College.

Each member of the Marietta College community is responsible for upholding to the College Creed. The college reserves the right to deal with inappropriate alcohol related behavior by an individual or organization on- or off- campus through the campus judicial structure.

General Policies

a. An individual must be of legal age (21 years of age or older) to consume or possess alcohol on campus.
b. An underage (under 21 years of age) individual is not permitted to be in the presence of alcohol except when within the confines a living space (room or apartment), one resident of the living space is of legal age (21 years of age or older), and there are no more than 4 guests present and the door is left open.
c. Under no circumstance is an individual of legal age permitted to purchase and/or provide alcoholic beverages to an underage individual.
d. Alcohol consumption to the point of severe intoxication as manifested by destruction of property or harm to oneself or others is a violation of the College Creed. When severe intoxication is an accompaniment to other CREED violations under no circumstances may it be regarded as a mitigating factor and may result in additional disciplinary sanctions.
e. Wine and malt beverages are the only alcohol permitted for possession and/or consumption by an individual of legal age on the Marietta College campus. No hard liquor is permitted on campus.
f. An individual of legal age is allowed to possess a maximum of 12(twelve)-12 oz. containers of malt beverage or up to one 750ml bottle of wine in their control for personal consumption in a living space.
g. The purchase, possession and/or use of bulk quantities of alcoholic beverages (i.e., kegs of alcohol, beer balls, and other common containers) are not permitted on Marietta College campus.
h. Alcoholic beverages and paraphernalia (i.e., shot glasses, empty wine, malt beverages, champagne bottles, and other common containers) are not permitted within residence hall floors and programmatic units that are designated as alcohol and/or substance free housing.
i. Alcoholic beverage drinking games of any kind are not permitted on Marietta College campus.
j. Registered student organizations, departments and offices shall follow all Social Function Policies and Procedures. If the registered student organization is affiliated with a national organization, it is the responsibility of the local chapter to comply with the rules and regulations of their national policies (the local chapter is expected to abide by College policy).
k. No alcohol promotions or advertisement for College-sponsored events of kind are permitted on Marietta College campus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
<th>3rd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverages and paraphernalia in substance-free areas Item h.</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Warning, 10 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$150 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$250 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting alcohol for a College sponsored event. Item k.</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Warning, 10 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$150 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$250 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal age individual possessing or consuming liquor or consuming alcohol outside of his/her room Item h, i</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An underage individual in the presence of, possessing or consuming alcohol Item h, c</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any individual in possession of drainage game paraphernalia Item h, i</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age who is in possession of more alcohol than allowed by policy Item f.</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being under the influence of alcohol Item d.</td>
<td>$100 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$200 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol screening and follow recommendation, 25 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 35 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age who is in possession of bulk quantities of alcohol Item g.</td>
<td>$300 fine, Conduct Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 20 hrs work penalty</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 20 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol assessment and treatment as deemed necessary by counselor, 30 hrs work penalty, notify parents, removal from College Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual of age providing alcohol to underage individuals Item c.</td>
<td>$300 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$400 fine, Restrictive Probation, mandatory alcohol education program, 15 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
<td>$500 fine, Suspension from College, 150 hrs work penalty, notify parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these sanctions are minimums and the actual sanctions imposed upon an individual would depend on the circumstances of the violation and the prior judicial record of the individual documented.

Social Functions
In an attempt to promote responsible use of alcohol and practice sound risk management the Office of Student Life has developed procedures for use by faculty, staff, departments, recognized groups and registered student organization for hosting events where alcohol will be present. Please contact the Dean of Students Office for copies of the procedures and approval of events.

Good Samaritan Policy
In those instances in which a student contacts Campus Police or a Resident Hall Director seeking assistance with another intoxicated student, neither the student making the contact nor the student in need of assistance will be charged with violations of the Alcohol Policy. The students however will be asked to meet with the Director of Residence Life to discuss the incident. The Director may refer the student(s) to Counseling Services for possible alcohol intervention. No formal judicial action will be taken unless the student(s) involved demonstrate a repeated lack of care for their well being and that of the college community or fail to follow the recommendations of the Director of Residence Life or Counseling Services.

Controlled Substance Policy
As an institution within the State of Ohio, Marietta College is committed to encouraging compliance with all state and local laws. Marietta College is opposed to the unlawful possession and use of controlled substances. It is only in an environment free of substance abuse that Marietta College can fulfill its mission. For these reasons, it is the policy of Marietta College that all activities on College property shall be free of the unlawful use of controlled substances.

In accordance with the Drug-Free School and Communities Act, Marietta College has determined that the following behaviors violate this policy:
1. The use of non-prescribed controlled substances.
2. Possession and trafficking (manufacturing, dispensing, or selling) of controlled substances.
3. Improper use of prescription medications.
4. Possession of drug-related paraphernalia (i.e., water-bongs, bongs, bowls and other common containers) is not permitted on the Marietta College campus.

Health Risks
The use of alcohol and other controlled substance, even on an infrequent basis, may seriously damage or impair one’s health. The College Health Center or your individual health care provider can offer information on the effects of specific substances to one’s health. Some of the risks include, but are not limited to the following:
• Excessive use of alcohol is associated with the liver damage, hypertension, brain damage and weaken immune system. Use of alcohol by pregnant women has been associated with fetal alcohol syndrome, premature birth and low birth weight.
• Cocaine or crack use may be fatal, depending on the cardiovascular response of the user. The drug is highly addictive.
• Tranquilizers and sedatives are also addictive, even in low doses. Use of these drugs in conjunction with alcohol is extremely dangerous and may result in the user becoming comatose.
• The intravenous use of drugs carries the additional risk of infection due to shared needles. HIV and hepatitis are both transmitted this way.
• Marijuana has properties of both depressants and stimulants and is considered a psychoactive drug. Marijuana contains more tar than tobacco and cause lung and bronchial disease, a chronic dry cough and respiratory irritation. Continuous use has also been connected with memory loss and motivational syndrome.
• Tobacco smoke contains carbon monoxide and may cause cancer and bronchial disease, a chronic cough and respiratory irritation. Smoking by pregnant women may result in fetal injury, premature birth and low birth weight. Chewing of tobacco may cause cancer.
Prevention and Awareness Programs

Assistance concerning alcohol and other controlled substance related problems are available from several sources at the College. Individuals needing personal assistance, individuals who know of someone who needs help, or individuals with questions concerning alcohol and other controlled substance problems may contact in confidence any of the following:

- Office of Student Life, Andrews Hall
- Counseling Services, Andrews Hall
- Student Health Center, Broughton Center Suite 200

Training on issues regarding alcohol and other controlled substance use and abuse is provided to the Residence Life staff, including student staff (RA's) in the residence halls. Additionally other members of the Student Life staff and Campus Police periodically receive appropriate training. Counseling Services members are available to residence hall personnel as needed for consultation concerning individual students with alcohol and other controlled substance problems. In addition, the Athletic Department provides educational workshops focusing on alcohol and other controlled substance abuse and all first-year students must attend a mandatory educational program.

Revisions and Amendments

As part of the Marietta College Student CREED revisions or amendments may be proposed by the Campus Life and Athletic Committee, Faculty Council, Student Senate or President of the College. No revision or amendment shall be effective until it has been approved by a two-thirds vote of Faculty Council, two-thirds vote of the Student Senate and President of the College.
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