

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Purpose.....	1
Representation on the President’s Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention.....	2
Alcohol and Other Drug Policy and Distribution	2
Effectiveness of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs	3
θ AOD Program Elements	
θ AOD Program Goals and Goal Achievement	
Consistency of AOD Enforcement in Student Discipline	6
AOD Program Successes and Challenges.....	9
President’s Certification.....	14

Appendices

Appendix A

President’s Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention Minutes of Meetings 2002-2004.

Appendix B

President’s Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention - Mission and Goals

Appendix C

2002 CORE Institute Executive Summary of Alcohol and Drug Survey

Appendix D

Residence Life AOD Programming Initiatives

Appendix E

Alcohol/Drug Counseling and Programs associated with/offered by MTU Counseling Services staff and P.O.W.E.R.

Appendix F

Sponsored/Supported AOD Programs Office of Student Affairs (First Year Programs and Student Activities)

Appendix G

Public Safety Department AOD Programming Initiatives

Appendix H
Athletic Department AOD Programming Initiatives

Appendix I
Human Resources AOD Initiatives

Appendix J
Student Organization AOD Initiatives

Appendix K
Policy and Procedure Concerning Drugs and Alcohol at Michigan Technological University

Appendix L
Crisis Protocol for Residence Life Staff: Critical and Non-Critical Mental Health, Substance Abuse and Behavioral Issues

Appendix M
Sanctioning Protocols for Judicial Hearing Officers Related to Alcohol Behaviors/Alcohol and Drug Law Infractions

Executive Summary

The Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations require Institutions of Higher Education to review their Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) programs and policies every two years. This report explores the issues that arose out of Michigan Tech's biennial review of its AOD programs and policies from August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2004.

The President's Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention (PCSAP) conducted the biennial review. The Standing Members of PCSAP consist of Athletics, Human Resources, Public Safety, Student Affairs (including Residence Life, Counseling Services, First Year Programs, Judicial Affairs, and Student Activities), Board of Student Media, Graduate Student Council, Inter Fraternity Council, Inter Residence Hall Council, and Undergraduate Student Government.

PCSAP representatives examined, updated and revised the PCSAP Goals. They also reviewed the campus AOD policies and procedures, the prevention programs offered, the CORE survey results, and issues related to annual distribution of the AOD policy, as well as evaluated the consistency in enforcement related to student discipline.

The representatives made four recommendations for areas of improvement that are beyond the scope of current changes made to the institution's AOD policy:

1. Hire a professional staff member with an adequate budget whose objectives are to develop ongoing AOD educational programs, including a comprehensive peer-education program.
2. Continue to expand outreach efforts to law enforcement agencies to include the Houghton County Sheriff's Department and Hancock City Police in respect to prompt reporting of student conduct violations.
3. Provide an adequate budget to ensure that Public Safety can always schedule two officers on duty to provide full staff coverage.
4. Provide a budget to PCSAP for grants to student groups and other departments for AOD programming.

The representatives found this review to be a useful exercise that was helpful in identifying the AOD programs that have taken place over the last two years. It became evident that even with the low number of staff and dollars in this area, staff and students continued to develop and maintain high quality programs and new initiatives during this review period. This will be enhanced in the future because PCSAP has instituted a procedure to coordinate programming across departments to avoid duplication of effort and/or poor use of limited financial resources.

Michigan Technological University's Biennial Review of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs and Policies

The Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations require Institutions of Higher Education to review their Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) programs and policies every two years. This report describes Michigan Tech's biennial review of its AOD programs and policies from August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2004. The review has three objectives: to determine the effectiveness of the AOD program, to implement any needed changes to the AOD program, and to ensure that the disciplinary sanctions for violating standards of conduct are enforced consistently. The report includes:

1. Representation on the President's Commission for Substance Abuse Prevention.
2. AOD Policy and Distribution.
3. Effectiveness of University's AOD Programs, Policies & Procedures.
 - a. AOD Program Elements.
 - b. AOD Program Goals and Goal Achievement.
4. Consistency of AOD Enforcement in Student Discipline.
5. AOD Successes and Challenges.
6. President's Certification.

Copies of this report are available in the President's Office, the Provost's Office, and the Division of Student Affairs.

Representation

Representatives of Standing Members of the President's Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention (PCSAP) conducted the 2002-2004 biennial review. The representatives consisted of:

Patricia Gotschalk, Chair, Student Judicial Affairs
Suzanne Sanregret, Athletics
Human Resources*
Jon Ahola, Public Safety
Beth Smock, Residence Life
Nancy Taglione, Counseling Services
Beth Wagner, First Year Programs
Rob Bishop, Student Activities
Mike Ftaclas, Board of Student Media
Graduate Student Council *
Mark Garver, Inter Fraternity Council
Carl Jarema, Inter Residence Hall Council
Brian Gieger, Undergraduate Student Government

Minutes for the PCSAP committee meetings from September 17, 2002, to May 18, 2004, can be found in Appendix A.

Alcohol and Other Drug Policy and Distribution

During this biennial review period, PCSAP reviewed and updated the AOD policy. One goal was to make the policy more student-friendly (as it is distributed to both employees and students). The policy was reorganized in a more logical fashion and unnecessary material was removed. The University's Internal Audit requested additional language related to student/employee and employee disclosure of criminal drug convictions, which was included. The AOD policy includes the information required under the following minimum criteria:

1. Standards of conduct that "prohibit the unlawful possession, use or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol by students and employees on its properties or as part of any of its activities."
2. A discussion of applicable legal sanctions under federal, state, or local laws for unlawful possession or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol;
3. A description of health risks associated with the abuse of alcohol or use of illicit drugs;

* Representative unable to attend.

4. A list of AOD programs and resources (counseling, treatment, rehabilitation and re-entry) that are available to employees or students; and
5. A clear statement of disciplinary sanctions on students and employees for violations of the standards conduct and a description of those sanctions, up to and including expulsion or termination of employment and referral for prosecution.

Michigan Tech's current AOD policy is in Appendix K.

In compliance with federal mandates, the University AOD policy is printed and distributed annually to students, faculty, and staff. Students' copies are mailed to their University address upon their arrival for fall semester classes (within the first three weeks of classes). Faculty and staff receive the policy through campus mail.

PCSAP is investigating whether the University should distribute the AOD policy in printed form only to those members of the campus community without email addresses. Federal regulations allow electronic distribution of AOD policies if certain delivery verification criteria are met. The AOD policy is currently posted on a webpage.* It may be preferable to distribute the policy via email because (1) it provides the information to our students in their preferred medium, and (2) it is more cost-efficient. It would also allow for a more interactive and creative presentation which appeals to students. This matter is on PCSAP's agenda for discussion in fall 2004.

Effectiveness of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs, Policies and Procedures

1. AOD Program Elements

A. Prevention Programs Offered

Seven departments and two student organizations have served as the primary delivery of prevention programs for the campus community during this review period. A report of programs offered can be found in the following appendices:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------|
| 1. Residence Life | Appendix D |
| 2. Counseling Services | Appendix E |
| 3. First Year Programs | Appendix F |
| 4. Student Activities | Appendix F |
| 5. Public Safety | Appendix G |
| 6. Athletics | Appendix H |

* The AOD policy may be accessed at <http://www.sa.mtu.edu/judicial/policies/drugandalcohol/>

- 7. Human Resources
- 8. Student Organizations

- Appendix I
- Appendix J

A review of these appendices shows that, despite ongoing budget limitations faced by the entire campus community, the University provides a wide array of AOD programs and resources. These initiatives reflect Michigan Tech's commitment to curb problems associated with alcohol abuse and illegal drug use, which can distract community members from fully engaging in the University experience.

B. CORE Survey

The CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey is a nationally-administered survey that collects data on students' self-reported behaviors and perceptions related to use of alcohol and illegal drugs, as well as their involvement and perceptions of campus life. The survey (long form) was most recently administered in March 2002 via the web. 1,500 students were selected using a representative sampling technique. 437 students completed the survey. An executive summary of the survey can be reviewed in Appendix C. PCSAP will implement the next CORE survey in spring 2005.

One finding from the CORE survey that continues to concern University community members is that 47% of the students reported "binge drinking." Binge drinking is defined as consuming five or more drinks in one evening. This percentage is a slight drop from the 49% reported by MTU students in 1991 and in 1999. The national average for "binge drinking" is 40%. The University's interventions with students have been more successful when they have focused on how many drinks a person consumes in a specified period of time, factors that affects BAC levels and those environmental and family history issues that ultimately lead students into difficulty and problems associated with irresponsible drinking.

Survey results showed some slight positive changes between the 1999 and the 2002 results. Awareness of campus polices related to AOD increased from 86% to 94%. Students who believe the campus has an AOD intervention program increased from 34% to 48%. The percentage of students who cared about alcohol issues increased from 28% to 40%. In addition, students reported a higher awareness with issues related to diversity in the 2002 survey. The percentage of students who care about harassment because of (a) race or ethnicity (up 5%), (b) sexual orientation (up 8%) and (c) religion (up 8%) increased in 2002.

2. AOD Program Goals and Goal Achievement

A. Historical Overview

In April 1998, the Vice Provost and Dean for Student Affairs established a campus Substance Abuse Advisory Committee. Three goals were established for the committee:

- Conduct the biennial review of the MTU Policy on Drugs and Alcohol to assure compliance with the provisions of the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act.
- Conduct the CORE survey to assess the behaviors and attitudes of MTU students concerning drug and alcohol use.
- Recommend policies and/or strategies to address the negative effects of drug and alcohol use on the Michigan Tech campus.

In April 2000, the President upgraded the Substance Abuse Advisory Committee to the President's Commission on Substance Abuse Prevention. The new commission established a mission and goals. During the 2002-2004 biennial review period, these goals were reviewed, updated and revised. (Appendix B) A review of the goals achieved during this biennial review period is discussed below:

B. Goal Achievement for Biennial Review Period 2002-2004

i. Academic Year 2002-2003

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the University was faced with challenges due to the departure of a key administrator in Student Affairs who had been deeply involved in PCSAP goal achievement oversight. A budget crisis and hiring freeze slowed down the recruitment and hiring process, and his duties were divided among many administrators for a period of time.

It is a credit to the University staff that, despite these challenges, numerous goals were achieved during this period. The AOD policy was reviewed and updated. The Chemical Free Living spaces in Residence Life were continued, and specialized living and learning communities (the Healthy Living House and First Year Experience) also remained chemical-free. PCSAP representatives continued to implement AOD initiatives such as TIPS and the N.I.T.E. program. N.I.T.E. has been active since the 2001-02 academic year providing late night, alcohol-free programming. A substance abuse speaker, Will Kiem, appeared at campus in April 2003 and one of his talks focused on Alcohol, Drugs & Date Rape. Also in April, during Spring Fling, N.I.T.E. sponsored a Drunk Driving Simulator.

ii. Academic Year 2003-2004

PCSAP representatives met regularly during the 2003-2004 academic year. The PCSAP goals were reviewed and updated. A “wellness” element was included, and a goal was added to coordinate the scheduling, funding and advertising of programming on substance abuse and wellness issues. (See Appendix B) Communication among PCSAP representatives was enhanced through a majordomo email list, PCSAP-I. Assessment goal deadlines were established or clarified. Preparation of the 2002-2004 biennial review was planned.

Passive alcohol abuse programming during Winter Carnival, recommended by student members of PCSAP, was sponsored by PCSAP and will be continued on an annual basis. TIPS Training for University Trainers was held April 8, 2004. Three students and three staff from Michigan Tech, as well as community member and staff from two other colleges completed the certification training.

In furtherance of the goal to coordinate substance abuse programming across departments, in spring 2004 PCSAP contracted with a substance abuse speaker/comedian who will make a campus-wide presentation in fall 2004, jointly funded by several of the Standing Members of PCSAP.

State funding for the Campus Connections social norming program was eliminated by the state during this review period, but the Peer Mentor Program in First Year Programs was instituted to help first year students adjust to University life.

A committee met during the academic year to work on upgrading the education program assigned to students who violate Michigan Tech’s AOD policy. Starting in fall 2004, this education program will include a substance abuse component and a \$40 education fee will be charged to insure adequate funding for a quality education program.

Another committee, including representatives from Student Judicial Affairs, Residence Life and Counseling Services, evaluated and revised the AOD sanctioning protocols for students who violate the AOD policy, to ensure that AOD rules were being consistently and fairly enforced. (See Appendix M). This is discussed in more detail in the following section.

Consistency of AOD Enforcement in Student Discipline

The Drug Free School Act requires schools to report how consistently they enforce their student AOD policy. In order to discuss how consistency is established in student discipline, we need to describe how the University coordinates enforcement of its policy through the offices of Student Judicial Affairs, Residence Life, Public Safety, and Counseling Services.

The Resident Assistant (RA) staff and the officers in Public Safety are first to confront most incidents when students violate University AOD regulations or state laws. RAs are trained annually on how to appropriately intervene in such incidents. (Appendix L) When an incident is documented, a senior Residence Life staff person initiates a judicial proceeding, or, in some cases, refers the incident to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. The Office of Public Safety forwards all alcohol and drug-related incident reports to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs for disciplinary action.

During this review period, all incidents submitted by an RA or Public Safety officer to a judicial hearing officer have been reviewed and adjudicated by the hearing officer or a disciplinary panel, unless a student withdrew from Michigan Tech before the process could be completed. In these cases, a “disciplinary hold” is typically placed upon the student’s record so if the student attempts to re-register at Michigan Tech, the disciplinary process must first be concluded.

As discussed above, sanctioning protocols for AOD cases have been established to help promote consistency in how hearing officers/judicial committees sanction students found responsible for policy violations. (Appendix M)

The tables below evaluate whether a hearing officer correctly imposed the sanction of:

- 1) Disciplinary probation for one calendar year, the recommended sanction for first-offense marijuana possession and first-offense alcohol possession/intoxication/open container and minor in possession; or
- 2) Additional disciplinary probation for a cumulative maximum of 18 months for second alcohol offenses; or
- 3) Suspension for alcohol or drug offenses which are chronic or particularly detrimental to the health or safety of the respondent or the University community, in the judgment of the hearing officer. †

**Table 1: Total AOD Incidents
August 1, 2002 – July 31, 2004**

Type of Incident Reported	Number of Incident Reports	Procedures Followed	Procedures Followed (%)
Narcotics/Dangerous Drugs	19	17	89%
Alcohol	352	300	85%

Source: Judicial Database

† Note: Effective May 8, 2004, the AOD sanctions were revised, as set forth in Appendix M. For simplicity of evaluation, post – May 8th incidents are included in Tables 1 and 2. The sanctions imposed in all post-May 8th incidents are consistent with the revised sanctioning protocols.

Explanation of AOD Incident Data

During this review period, all reported “narcotics and dangerous drug” incidents involved marijuana possession. In the two cases where the probation period was shorter than recommended, the respondents were international exchange students who were scheduled to leave the University at the end of one academic year. The hearing officer could have imposed a one-year sanction, but as a practical matter the students were not scheduled to be at the University beyond the end of the term. In future situations, hearing officers will be instructed to follow the protocols for all students, including international exchange students, graduating seniors and other students who are scheduled to leave the University before the end of the recommended sanction period.

The alcohol-related incidents require some additional discussion. One important piece of information (as discussed earlier) is that the senior administrator responsible for oversight of sanctions for student AOD offenses resigned from Michigan Tech effective August 4, 2002, and, due to budget issues, the newly-created position of Director of Student Judicial Affairs was not filled until mid-June 2003. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the absence of day to day oversight in student judicial affairs became apparent, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

The primary cause of inconsistent application of the sanctioning procedures in 2002-2003 was a fraternity house incident where 62 students were charged with “minor in possession of alcohol.” Those 62 cases were heard by several hearing officers over a course of several months. In 32 of the 62 incidents, the recommended AOD sanction was not assigned. In some cases, there was a misinterpretation of “calendar” year and “academic year.” In other cases, the hearing officer imposed a one-semester probation period rather than one calendar year. There were 11 other incidents in 2002-2003 where the appropriate disciplinary probation periods were not applied.

As shown in Table 2, this situation dramatically improved in academic year 2003-2004.

**Table 2: Evaluation of Inconsistent Sanctions
August 1, 2002 – July 31, 2004**

Inconsistent Sanction Incidents	Number of Inconsistent Sanctions	Percentage of Total Inconsistent Sanctions
Sanctions in Fraternity MIP Incident 2002-2003	32	62%
Other Sanctions in 2002-2003	11	21%
Total 2002-2003	43	83%
Sanctions in 2003-2004	9	17%
Total 2002-2004	52	100%

Source: Judicial Database

The numbers in Tables 1 and 2 include all reported incidents, including incidents where a student was ultimately held to be not responsible or where the incident was reported during the biennial review period but the case remains pending because a student withdrew from the University.

AOD Program Successes and Challenges

There are a number of success stories related to the University’s approach to AOD policies and programs, as well as challenges to be addressed. We highlight the following examples:

1. Program Successes

One: *Maintaining an Integrated, Collaborative AOD Intervention Program for Students*

For many years, staff in Student Affairs, Counseling Services, Residence Life, and Public Safety have followed an integrated, collaborative intervention program for students experiencing difficulties as a result of alcohol abuse or illegal drug use. The frequency and quality of contact with students occurs at various points. Under the program currently used, a student in difficulty generally has his/her first contact with a Resident Assistant or a Public Safety officer (or sometimes off-campus law enforcement authorities). This is promptly followed by a student conduct hearing with a senior staff member in Residence Life or the Director of Student Judicial Affairs. The student is then sanctioned under the AOD sanctioning protocols. This generally requires alcohol (or drug) education on a

first offense and a more in-depth assessment on a second offense. Depending on the severity and danger of the inappropriate conduct, we also require some students to obtain off-campus comprehensive substance abuse evaluations and maintain follow-up contact with the Director of Student Judicial Affairs to confirm that the student is following through on requirements. We also require parental notification on second alcohol offenses and first drug offenses for students under the age of 21, in order to advise the parents of potentially dangerous behavior and to enlist the parent's support in reinforcing our AOD policy.

Of 371 student AOD incidents during this review period, only 32 involved two or more offenses, or 8.6% of total reported AOD incidents. This is compared to a 7-11% rate for first offenses for the review periods from 1997 to 2002.

Two: *Enforcing AOD Protocols to Insure Consistency in Rendering Disciplinary Decisions*

In the vast majority of cases (as described above in Tables 1 and 2), Residence Life and Student Judicial Affairs staff followed minimum standards for disciplinary charges, and the minimum sanction, length of sanction, and special conditions for alcohol and drug violations will continue to be enforced in the future. (Appendix M). The most significant changes in the 2002-2004 review period was the institution of a \$40 education fee for first time alcohol and marijuana offenders. This fee is used to support a quality AOD education program administered by Counseling Services and may also act as a deterrent to underage drinking. We also expanded the parental notification policy for second alcohol offenses to include all alcohol-related offenses, not just "intoxication" as was the case under the prior policy.

We are also experimenting with eliminating the \$400 marijuana possession fine to determine if students will be more likely to accept responsibility for marijuana offenses (which are often difficult to prove even under the "more probable than not" evidentiary standard used in conduct hearings), and also to avoid the disproportionate impact of a heavy fine upon students of lesser economic means. All students found responsible for marijuana possession will pay a \$40 education fee and attend substance abuse education. More serious drug offenses will result in substantial fines and/or suspension from the University.

As a result of following consistent sanctioning protocols, as well as emphasizing safety issues and making appropriate choices, community standards are maintained and students understand that administrative staff is here to help students get assistance and make better and healthier choices in the future.

Three: Prevention Programs Maintained

In this two-year period, a number of AOD prevention programs were conducted on campus. They are as follows:

Late Night Programming Students' excessive consumption of alcohol is sometimes linked to their frustration that there is nothing to do that will bring them together in the late evening to socialize and interact with each other. Late night programming (as funded by the Student Activity Fee increase of May 2002) allows student leaders to plan creative social interaction events. During the 2002-2004 period, the group, New Innovations in Tech Entertainment (or NITE) conducted late night programming including "Fright NITE," "Hip Hop NITE," "Casino NITE," "NITE Club" and "Comedy NITE Club." (Appendices F and J). As these socially driven activities continue, students will always have attractive alternatives to excessive drinking and they can find healthy ways in which to meet and interact with others.

TIPS Training TIPS is a nationally recognized server-social host program that looks at how students can minimize risks associated with conducting events where alcohol is served. It also trains hosts in how to intervene with guests before guests get to a point where they have over-consumed. Since spring 1999, over 320 members of Greek-lettered organizations have attended these training seminars. It is also important to note that peers in the Greek community lead these training programs.

New Student Orientation AOD Initiatives During this review period, Student Life, First-Year Programs has sponsored two major programs required for all first year students at new student orientation in August. The first program is an education skit which emphasizes responsible and safe practices that revolve around alcohol and other substance use. The second is a series of case studies which are discussed in small groups. Topics include alcohol use and abuse. Orientation is a substance free event and we strive to provide a wide variety of alcohol free social events throughout the week, proving that you can have fun without a drink in your hand.

Residence Life Alcohol-Free Programming In academic year 2002-2003, Residence Life offered 268 alcohol-free social programs attended by 5,071 residents. In 2003-2004, 469 alcohol-free social programs were attended by 7,097 students. (See Appendix D)

Residence Hall Chemical Free Living Spaces Chemical Free houses or floor sections are defined as housing areas where students live, where the residents choose not to use alcohol, tobacco, and illegal substances. During this review period, Chemical Free living spaces accounted for 23-25% of the halls.

Public Service Announcements on WMTU The student-run campus radio station has run numerous PSAs on alcohol and substance abuse prevention including “10 Ways to Turn Down a Drink” and “Binge Drinking.” (Appendix J)

These initiatives reflect a common theme of student peer-designed or peer-led activities -- educational approaches which are most appealing to the student population.

2. Challenges to be Addressed

The committee has identified four major challenges to be addressed during the upcoming 2004-2006 review period, outlined below:

A. Hire a professional staff member with an adequate budget whose objectives are to develop ongoing AOD educational programs, including a comprehensive peer-education program.

As highlighted in prior biennial review periods, for several years there has been no position funded at the University for a staff member dedicated to coordinate and develop alcohol and drug programs with students, and to enhance the “wellness” component of AOD programs. Various Standing Members of PCSAP have maintained initiatives in this two-year period and PCSAP as a group has established a goal of coordinating resources to provide AOD and some “wellness” programming. However, PCSAP does not believe it can increase or enhance these initiatives into the future. We believe that PCSAP should serve as an advisory group to a staff member who is directly responsible for coordination of events between departments and community groups. Best practices on college campuses show that comprehensive peer-education programs have the most impact in modifying student behaviors and perceptions with alcohol and drug use, and as such, a dedicated staff member would need the resources to develop and administer future peer-led programs and initiatives.

B. Continue to expand outreach efforts to all local law enforcement agencies, including Houghton City Police, the Houghton County Sheriff’s Department, and Hancock City Police in respect to prompt reporting of student conduct violations.

We are pleased to see frequent reporting to the University of student AOD violations in the local community from Houghton City Police and the Houghton County Sheriff’s Department. We know, however, that there are more AOD incidents involving Michigan Tech students than those currently reported to the University. In spring semester 2004, Student Affairs administrators met with the Houghton City Police to continue to maintain the lines of communication. We recommend that these formal discussions between the University and local law enforcement agencies continue and expand in order to establish and enhance reporting of AOD offenses to the Division of Student Affairs for disciplinary action.

These types of discussions may also raise issues concerning how hospitals and local taverns interface with police agencies on these matters.

C. Provide an adequate budget to ensure that Public Safety can always schedule two officers on duty to provide full staff coverage.

The majority of AOD incidents on campus occur between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday evenings, although we have experience with marijuana incidents and alcohol incidents occurring at any time, weekday or weekend. Particularly with marijuana incidents in the residence halls, response time is crucial to intervene and secure evidence of the violation. Whenever the Public Safety department is reduced to one officer, both the safety of the officer and the effectiveness of the intervention program are compromised. We propose that Public Safety be provided with an adequate budget so that two officers on duty can always be scheduled to provide full staff coverage.

D. Provide a budget to PCSAP for grants to student groups and other departments for AOD programming.

PCSAP currently has no budget, so its effectiveness and visibility on campus is limited. In 2001-2002, the President's Office began to subsidize this Commission's work but budget issues have resulted in a zero budget during the last review period. We would like to be able to provide grants for AOD programming to student groups and departments. Currently such programming is funded by figuratively "passing the hat" around various departments or seeking outside grants. This is often ineffective; and, having no budget makes it difficult for PCSAP to engage in long-term planning. We feel it is essential to provide quality AOD programming on a regularly-scheduled basis in order to meaningfully reinforce substance abuse prevention/student safety messages (particularly in the absence of a staff member with responsibility for AOD programming, as noted above).

Respectfully Submitted:

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION

By _____
Patricia A. Gotschalk, Chair

Date: _____

Final report prepared by: Patricia A. Gotschalk
Director of Student Judicial Affairs

Elizabeth A. Smock
Assistant Director of Student Life, Residence Life

PRESIDENT'S CERTIFICATION

I have read the foregoing 2002-2004 Biennial Review.

By _____
Glenn D. Mroz, President
Michigan Technological University

Date: _____