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Part I: Introduction and Acknowledgements

Introduction

On May 2, 2013, President Eli Capilouto announced the creation of the Workgroup on Student Health and Safety (the Workgroup). Within his announcement, he cited national trends and issues that should be addressed by the university to improve the health and safety of today's students.

President Capilouto charged the Workgroup with the following:

- Assess individual and environmental factors that contribute to the misuse of alcohol by University of Kentucky students on- and off-campus;
- Assess current campus practices and policies designed to promote responsible use of alcohol and prevention of alcohol abuse with reduction of associated harms;
- Review and evaluate new evidence and best practices available to the University and community to prevent alcohol abuse and reduce its associated harm on- and off-campus; and
- Provide summary evaluations about alternative strategies at the individual, campus, and community level designed to prevent alcohol abuse and its associated harms on- and off-campus and mechanisms for assessing the effectiveness of such strategies for the purpose of continuous quality improvement.

The Workgroup met for the first time on June 4, 2013 to set plans and topics of discussion/presentation for future meetings. The topics agreed upon included:

- The history of the alcohol policy and an overview of university police enforcement;
- University of Kentucky students’ perceptions and behaviors pertaining to substance use;
- Information from national experts on research, effective practices, and trends;
- Lexington-Fayette County Urban Government (LFUCG) presentation on off-campus enforcement, planning, and development;
- Detail on the current student conduct process, both on- and off-campus;
- A student panel representing diverse perspectives and points of view; and
- The UK Master Plan for development and property acquisition.

Since its creation, the Workgroup has met eight separate times for one-and-a-half (1.5) hour meetings. The purpose of these meetings was to gather information on prevalent student safety issues, their causes, methods of prevention, and methods of responding to the issues at hand. The information gathered from the meetings as well as the research performed by the supporting staff has been synthesized in this document.

The final meeting consisted of a 3-hour long discussion on the gathered information and the feasibility of each recommendation. Part II of this document, entitled Recommendations of the Workgroup on Student Health and Safety, reflect the general consensus of the Workgroup stemming from the final meeting.
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Part II: Recommendations of the Workgroup on Student Health and Safety

On Campus

1. Establish the Work Group for Student Health and Safety as a permanent committee tasked with the charge for the following:
   a. Serve as the centralized hub for health and safety-related concerns from university and community stakeholders;
   b. Assess the impact of those issues through data collection; and
   c. Develop potential methods of effectively addressing those concerns, if necessary.

2. Revise the institutional alcohol policy to permit alcohol to be served and consumed on campus under predetermined guidelines and conditions. Such guidelines and conditions should address the following issues:
   a. Rules and procedures determining when and how alcohol can be consumed.
   b. Locations and designated areas whereby students of legal age will be allowed to responsibly consume alcoholic beverages.
   c. Determine how a medical amnesty or Good Samaritan policy for substance overdose or dangerous situations (on-campus or off-campus) could be developed and implemented.
   d. Best practices found at other higher education institutions.

3. Evaluate existing University efforts in the prevention-based areas of substance abuse, sexual health, general wellness, and financial wellness. Determine how these efforts are coordinated and how such coordination could be improved, adjusted, structured, and implemented.

Off-Campus Living Space

1. Work in greater collaboration with off-campus apartments, landlords, and rental agencies to incentivize responsible student behavior.

2. Rehabilitate and lease University owned houses/apartments in adjacent neighborhoods to faculty and staff.

3. Encourage landlords who rent to students (including UK) to use standardized leases.

4. Work proactively to develop positive neighbor relationships in near-campus neighborhoods (wealllivehere.org).
5. Expand the Code of Student Conduct beyond campus boundaries. (e.g. UK Athletic Department’s Code of Behavior)

6. Designate a conduct officer within UK’s Division of Student Affairs to serve as ombudsman to hear and act upon Code violation complaints from neighbors and students.

**Police/Legal Intervention**

1. Establish stronger enforcement protocols for the alcohol policy and alcohol laws through improved use of the Student Code of Conduct, as well as law enforcement (specifically UKPD) when dealing with statutory violations.

2. Institute a medical amnesty or Good Samaritan policy for substance overdose or dangerous situations (on campus or off campus).

3. Develop an active enforcement task force that includes representatives from LFUCG Police Department, UK Police Department, UK Office of Student Conduct, and BCTC Student Affairs.

**Data Collection**

1. Develop or establish uniform and valid methods of assessment of student behaviors and perceptions (including those related to safety and health) for both on-campus and off-campus students. This assessment should focus upon areas such as:
   a. Knowledge of campus resources;
   b. Frequency in use of campus resources;
   c. Use and perception of substance use among the student body;
   d. Student expectations of the college experience;
   e. The change (if any) in student perceptions and behaviors as students matriculate through the University; and
   f. The effectiveness of any intervention methods attempted by the university.

2. Require students to confirm and/or update their addresses at the beginning of each semester. Keep this database available to LFUCG police so that they can pass on the information to UK when there are criminal complaints.

**Education Intervention**
1. Collaborate with the LFUCG to establish and promote an optional, incentivized off-campus or civility workshop for students considering off campus living options.

2. Encourage students moving/living off-campus to proactively establish positive neighbor relationships, and long-term residents living near campus to be the first point of contact. Also consider a “restorative justice” approach to first offenses or minor violations of community standards for off-campus living.

3. Provide formal opportunities – e.g. town hall forums – for both UK and community representatives to discuss the overall experience of students and long-term residents living in near-campus neighborhoods.

4. Develop a UK Community and community identity. Consider models such as Penn State PRIDE – [www.pride.psu.edu](http://www.pride.psu.edu) – a campaign established by students to promote positive fan behavior.

5. Develop a more formalized, year-round community service program based in near-campus neighborhoods through which UK students and long-term residents living in those neighborhoods can interact (e.g. neighborhood cleanups).

6. Adopt a policy that mirrors the philosophy of the Facilitator Model, which according to Bickel and Lake, *combines safety and risk management with an educational strategy*. The model seeks to inform and empower students as choosing agents within the specific environment and culture of UK and Lexington. The strategy is for the UK administration to create an environment where students can make responsible decisions for themselves, but they are given formalized guidance, tools, and structure in doing so.
Appendix A: Outline of Research and Information from Presentations

UK Alcohol Policy Change of 1997

- The current policy does not dictate a “dry” campus.
- The only change in policy that occurred in 1997 was to remove alcohol from all fraternity and sorority (Greek) houses.
  - This action was spearheaded by the Student Government Association and five fraternities.
  - No on-campus incident inspired this move; it was primarily done so as a preventative measure.

UK Police Department

- The pre-1997 student alcohol culture included:
  - Wild on-campus fraternity parties;
  - Underage drinking;
  - Sexual assaults and fights;
  - Assaults on police officers;
  - Crowd-control issues;
  - Alcohol overdoses and injuries.
- After 1997, student alcohol culture included:
  - An increase in off-campus parties;
  - Reduction of reported sexual assaults and fights;
  - Fewer assaults on police officers;
  - Years of student alcohol-related deaths until UKPD/LPD/ABC Task Force established;
  - The intensity of drinking habits (quantity and frequency) of those who drink increased.
- In the past, UK relied on housing corporations for chapters to “self-enforce” the laws and regulations. This policy was unsuccessful.
- Spanning 2001 to 2008, UK reported 10 confirmed alcohol-related deaths of students or visitors to campus.
- From 2004 to 2011, UKPD crime statistics report a decrease in on-campus Alcohol Intoxication incidents as well as DUIs.
  - There has been an increase in “Minor in Possession” offenses.
  - Longitudinally, these statistics seem to live on a “Boom-Bust” cycle due to factors such as UKPD personnel, funding (e.g. grants), and focus on specific violations.
- The perception of an increase in off-campus drinking and parties can neither be substantiated nor disproved due to the lack of records and statistics before 1997.
The State of Substance Use at UK (AlcoholEdu survey representing 95% of UK Freshmen)

- UK is above the national average for all substance-related issues covered in this survey, including:
  - Quantity and frequency of drinking;
  - Driving under the influence;
  - Alcohol-related sexual assault;
  - Alcohol-related sexual assault perpetration;
  - “Blackout drinking” (drinking to the point of not remembering events).
- UK students represent a “work hard/play hard” mentality, indicating a higher-than-average importance on academic success.
- When compared to Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions that use AlcoholEdu, UK is well below the average, indicating relatively safer behavior.
- 67% of UK students do the majority of their drinking at off-campus residences, compared to 42.5% nationally and 39% in the SEC.
- Conversely, 7% of UK students do the majority of their drinking in residence halls, compared to 21% nationally and 14% in the SEC.
- After arriving on campus, alcohol use increases while drug use decreases. This is true with all drugs except for ADHD medications.
- When filtered from the data set, students involved in Greek organizations drink at a much greater risk.
- The majority of our students who drink choose to drink hard liquor over beer.

Dr. Christopher Correia Recommendations – Professor of Psychology, Auburn University

- College student alcohol consumption is not a “black or white” matter when discussing “wet” versus “dry” policies.
- If a student truly wishes to drink, a dry campus policy will not necessarily dictate if it occurs, but where and when.
- Drinking can be a detrimental behavior, but it can also be a skill that is taught to help students engage in more protective behaviors when drinking.
- The Workgroup (or something similar to it) must remain intact and active for the future. Committees like this one must serve a consistent role with the university and policy formation.
  - The higher-ranking the members of the committee, the better. It indicates a true investment from the university and increases the potential for institutional change.
- We can change our alcohol policy to be more lenient with regard to alcohol use, but we have to be cognizant of what type of message we are sending.
Peter F. Lake, J.D. Recommendations – *Director, Center for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy, Stetson University*

- President Capilouto is a huge resource for this particular endeavor due to his academic background in health policy and public health.
  - A "Message from the President" regarding alcohol and safety should be placed on a highly visible place on UK's website.
- The persisting drinking behaviors seen in freshmen and undergraduates regarding the off-campus "house party culture" are unusually large when compared to other institutions he has observed.
- Issues to be addressed by UK and LFUCG in the future in order to help prevent a "catastrophic event" from occurring:
  - Off-campus regulations/enforcement/education;
  - Transporting mass quantities of hard liquor to distribute to those underage;
  - Knowledge of the alcohol policy and acting on its enforcement are not universal nor consistent throughout campus.
  - There needs to be more comprehensive and longitudinal data collection (such as the CORE Survey) to accurately articulate alcohol policy.
  - Simultaneously address Title IX-related issues while addressing substance abuse prevention.
  - Use student-driven data to become more aware of safety-related issues in the neighborhoods surrounding campus. Upon interviewing a focus group of students, he found that they possess more in-depth understanding of these issues.
  - Students have a discrepancy in policy versus reality; they see off-campus drinking as a "free for all" not regulated by the institution, despite the fact that the wording of the policy states otherwise.
  - Some apartment complexes around campus may attract certain populations that would view students as potential victims of crime or clientele for drug sales.
  - Current policy under the Code of Student Conduct is "outdated, as if it were written in another era."
    - More schools have been making policy for a broader jurisdiction.
  - Develop community advocacy among students in order to combat challenges seen within the off-campus environment.
    - Utilize environmental management strategies and campus-community coalitions.
  - There is a small group of students that create risk, connecting with symbiotic, underworld groups selling hard drugs, possibly weapons and other criminal activity.
    - Identify the target populations where this occurs and address through a coordinated strategy of environmental management.
  - Students perceive tailgating as a general lack of campus enforcement of alcohol policy. Relate this behavior to all on-campus events.
  - UK must articulate not just the rules, but purposes behind the rules so students don’t construct their own version of the intent.
Right now, students who live off-campus are “willing the battle of self-learning and having the behavior they want.”

UK has real opportunity for further growth; a platform is currently in place due to the Office of Substance Education and Responsibility and the leadership of President Capilouto.

UK is experiencing problems that are due to being successful, and success has its own challenges.

LFUCG – Off-Campus Enforcement, Planning, and Development

- Historically, off-campus student conduct incidents can and have been reported to the UK Office of Student Conduct.
- The key to lowering student-related nuisances is to work with landlords.
- Student education on city laws and policies need to occur, leading to the recommendation for some type of educational program to help students transition from on- to off-campus.
- The Community Law Enforcement Action Response (CLEAR) Unit focuses on prevention, education, enforcement and treatment in specific areas of Lexington, including those surrounding UK.
- The CLEAR Unit consists of 6-8 officers to make contact with students in the areas that have high rates of reporting.
- The CLEAR Unit’s primary objective is to make connections, not to make arrests. However, this may occur due to the increased police presence.

UK Student Panel

- All students – even those who do not drink – hear and see issues regarding house parties and heavy drinking episodes.
- Most students do not believe that their drinking behaviors will carry over past graduation.
- Students are initiated early into the alcohol culture, learning certain practices that will decrease the likelihood of getting into trouble even if questioned by police.
  - Assigning “fall guys” to inform police that they are the residents of a party even when they are not;
  - Not bringing ID with them to parties in case they are stopped by police;
  - Pre-gaming before going out.
- Older students tend to drink at bars while younger students tend to drink at house parties.
  - This may not change even if the policy changes.
- Students do not have a clear understanding of the alcohol policy, but they do understand that if they are found in violation on campus, the punishment will be more severe than if they were found in violation off campus.
- Students do not typically think they can get into trouble at house parties, stating that police usually cite the owners for noise violations, but rarely alcohol-related infractions.
• The dry campus policy does not inhibit access to alcohol. Drinking on campus still occurs frequently.
• Those who choose not to drink generally do so because of their own personal values or out of fear of being caught.
• The panelists liked the idea of extending the Code of Student Conduct off-campus, but felt some students would be upset because they left campus in order to not be held accountable for University policies.
• Allowing for legal consumption of alcohol on campus has pros and cons.
  o Pros
    ▪ Giving older students a place to practice responsible drinking.
    ▪ Creates an atmosphere to encourage student involvement on campus and potentially give older students incentive to live on campus.
  o Cons
    ▪ It will not stop underage drinking.
    ▪ It will not stop drinking at off-campus house parties.
• Allowing alcohol in Greek houses would be a bad idea due to potential destruction of property at the houses, but it may make it safer for students to come and go.
  o This would still not stop the unofficial off-campus parties where underage drinking can go unchecked.
• Students don’t tend to care about how their drinking affects others. They are more interested in how it can negatively impact them personally.
• None of the panelists want to live in a “party district” of the community, citing vandalism, noise, and suspicious individuals who walk the area looking for potential victims.
• Some agreed that a citizenship course could be something useful to students after college.

UK Office of Student Conduct

• As of early November, the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) saw 132 of the roughly 1200 overall Residence Life (on-campus) cases.
• The Code of Student Conduct does allow and has been practiced for off-campus student conduct.
  o These acts are typically considered “prejudicial to the character and welfare of the university.”
• As for off-campus conduct cases, the OSC adjudicates the following:
  o The CLEAR Unit reported 40 cases to her office during the first three weeks of the 2013 fall semester;
  o Keeneland Fall and Spring meets;
  o Game day citations that come from LFUCG PD, UKPD, and ABC Officers.
• Nuisance violations can be brought to the OCS, but historically have not been for the lack of the names of the violators.
  o Times when there has been a follow-up from OSC, names have been provided by neighbors or police.
  o Historically, anonymous complaints have not been adjudicated due to students’ rights concerns.
Community reports of student behavior is easier if done through the LFUCG police, but they can also contact the OSC.

UK Master Plan

- The residential focus is to increase the number of on-campus beds from 5,200 to over 6,500.
- Part of this is through an attempt to create a more vibrant Greek community, being bordered primarily by Rose Street, Rose Lane, Woodland Avenue, and Euclid Avenue
- Seven principles of the Master Plan:
  - Academic environment – 21st century learning environment);
  - Campus life – Enhance student life experience and reinforce campus community in strong residential districts;
  - Community – Forge partnerships to strengthen the neighborhoods surrounding the campus and downtown;
  - Growth – Establish long-term plan for growth management that is consistent with the university’s mission;
  - Mobility – Facilitate safer and more efficient mobility;
  - Landscape structure – Establish a legible open space and landscape structure that improves campus quality;
  - Sustainability – Energy conservation, landscape and ecology, mobility, etc.
Appendix B: Notes from Interviews with Benchmark Institutions

**UGA – Office of Student Conduct, (706) 542-1131**

Spoke with Doug Bell, Senior Coordinator of Assessment in the Office of Student Conduct. The Office of Student Conduct comprises of a Director, Assistant Director, 3 Senior Coordinators (Housing, Assessment, and Outreach & Student Conduct Board), a full-time administrative assistant, and one Graduate Assistant. There is also a Student Conduct Board, which is a student panel that hears conduct case appeals. When an off-campus incident occurs, the Athens-Clark County police have a protocol that includes contacting UGA police as well as sending all their student-related reports to the Office of Student Conduct. The Assistant Director receives all reports and then assigns them to their conduct officers to do student follow-up. While UGA has a working relationship with Athens-Clark County police, they seem to have the same type of set-up at University of Kentucky. Some of the biggest difficulties and challenges the office currently has is getting students to understand that they can pursue charges off-campus. UGA has no honor code but has what they call the “Pillars of the Arch,” which is similar to the University of Kentucky Creed. Mr. Bell also said another challenge was communicating to students that they’re not out investigating for wrongdoing (such as reading the local papers and checking social media accounts), but just reacting to any reports given to them by the police and by the community.

As for off-campus reports: Summer ’13 – 37 reports; Spring ’13 – 74 reports; Fall ’12 – 80 reports.

**South Carolina – Office of Student Conduct, (803) 777-4333**

Spoke with Maureen Grewe with the Office of Student Conduct. Since USC is located in South Carolina’s capitol city, they get reports from USC police, county police, and state police. About 75% of their students live off-campus, with 50% of received incident reports are off-campus. Ms. Grewe said that their office recently hired new staff over the summer; they currently have a Director, Assistant Director, 3 coordinators, 4 Graduate Assistants, and 5 professional conduct officers. Ms. Grewe reported a “super positive” relationship with local law enforcement; the Office of Student Conduct attends weekly meetings with local police, go to police trainings at least once a semester, and does outreach initiatives for law enforcement. From the law enforcement, they also do outreach programs to USC students. As for incident reporting, local law enforcement have access to USC’s Banner database to look up whether individuals they arrest or cite are USC students; this also includes any students that are in the local jail databases. The Office of Student Conduct receives reports every night.

When it comes to difficulties and challenges, USC used to have issues with game day and tailgating, but now they have a Game Day Task Force that comprises of police, Office of Student Conduct staff, Athletics Department staff, Office of Student Life staff, Student Ticketing Office, and their Substance Abuse Education Coordinator. Whenever students are ejected from a game or
arrested on game day, they lose their season ticket privileges and have a conduct hearing. Along with this, the Substance Abuse Education Coordinator’s office holds a sober tailgate.

Currently, the big challenge cited by Ms. Grewe is that some apartment complexes are more willing to help with conduct issues than others. When asked about communicating Code of Conduct enforcement with off-campus students, USC has their own off-campus student services office with its own coordinator and assistant director. At the beginning of each school year, this office provides newsletters and magnets to off-campus students that clarifies that their Code of Conduct is enforced off-campus.

Ohio State – Office of Student Conduct, (614) 292-2098

Spoke with Assistant Director Kelly Smith; Office of Student Conduct includes a director, a newly hired associate director, an assistant director, a program coordinator, and a Graduate Assistant, all of which also function as conduct officers and have the ability to dismiss students.

As far as off-campus Code of Conduct enforcement goes at OSU, there is partial jurisdiction. The Code of Conduct applies to students for credit-bearing and student organizations. There is jurisdiction for students living off campus, but only for crimes of violence, behavior that endangers the community (such as assault against student or faculty), or riotous behavior (such as a riot after an athletics win); unless the incident falls under one of those three categories, the OSU Office of Student Conduct does not review student infractions of what they see as minor violations (such as public urination, drug possession, or underage alcohol consumption).

Ms. Smith reports a “very positive” relationship with local law enforcement. OSU police has a joint patrol set up with Columbus city police; an OSUPD officer patrols alongside a CPD officer in off-campus student neighborhoods and CPD will send student reports to the Office of Student Conduct to review. If the Office of Student Conduct receives information, they feel comfortable in calling the OSUPD officer that will be engaging in the joint patrol so they can further investigate.

CPD faxes all reports directly to the Office of Student Conduct. Serious reports go directly to the director, while the rest are divided amongst the other staff; there are times where the director will just take all reports and assign reports to staff by himself. The assigned staff member will then look at the student’s prior history and decide whether they need to schedule a hearing.

The student will either be sent what the office calls a “Disappointment Letter” to their campus address to notify them that the University is aware of the incident and expects better behavior or have a meeting scheduled to have an informational meeting (no charges, but instead are given on-campus resources and outside help such as counseling or rehab services). For example: if a student is cited for a public intoxication off campus but has no priors, a letter or informational meeting will be the end result; However, if that same student has prior reports, a conduct meeting will be held. Last year, Ms. Smith said that her office received approximately 800 off-campus reports, while OSU’s Housing Office received around 2000 (Housing Office handles their own cases).
As for difficulties and challenges, Ms. Smith only reported issues with OSU’s Code of Conduct wording. Because there is the catchall clause of behavior that endangers members of the community, the clause is open to interpretation and her office wished that they had more clarity. They would like to make clearer definitions to that part of their Code of Conduct in the near future. Ms. Smith also made a point in saying that their office has no intention of global jurisdiction and plans on keeping the off-campus Code of Conduct jurisdiction as is.

Wake Forest – Office of Judicial Affairs (within Office of the Dean of Students)

Spoke with Charlene Buckley, Associate Dean of Judicial Affairs. The Office of Judicial Affairs includes Ms. Buckley, an Office Manager, and a Judicial Administrator; they previously had the Dean of Students as well, but he recently retired and the position hasn’t been filled yet. Wake Forest recently instated a residency requirement that students must live on-campus for their first 3 years, so the current off-campus student population includes seniors and graduate students. Ms. Buckley emphasized that Wake Forest has created a culture on their campus where alcohol irresponsibility is not as major of an issue as it has been in the past.

When students first come to Wake Forest for new student orientation, they have multiple presentations and small group sessions with different WFU offices (Judicial Affairs, Residence Life, Health Education, etc.) that discuss the alcohol policy; Ms. Buckley said that WFU has been accused of talking about alcohol policies too much. Along with orientation, WFU’s Office of Residence Life holds a required session for all students that live off-campus in single-family homes that covers citizenship issues like parties, parking, noise, and general concepts of being responsible and respectable in the off-campus neighborhood. This session also covers WFU’s Code of Conduct and emphasizes that it is enforced off-campus.

Ms. Buckley said that her office has an excellent relationship with campus police, local police, and state police. If there is a police response off-campus, the officer will ask for a student ID (Ms. Buckley said that culture has engrained into students to carry their student ID at all times) as well as outright ask if the individual is a student at Wake Forest. Local and state law enforcement forward all student related reports to WFUPD, which forwards the reports to the Office of Judicial Affairs. For alcohol citations, if a student lives on-campus, the Office of Residence Life gives a lower level first offense warning; all other conduct issues (on or off campus) are handled by the Office of Judicial Affairs. As for challenges and issues her office may face, she mentioned that due to the culture shift at Wake Forest, her office doesn’t have very many major issues to address at this time.

University of Missouri – Office of Student Conduct

Via email from Rony Die of the Office of Student Conduct:

- What is the Office of Student Conduct’s working relationship with local law enforcement (How are off-campus student incidents reported to your office? How is the relationship/communication between your office and local law enforcement?)
“I would say we have good relationship with local law enforcement. When needed we are able to reach each other. We have talked about having monthly meetings but that has never occurred consistently. So, there is room for improvement. The Columbia PD Lieutenant has met with the Office when needed to discuss behaviors and possible issues that he has. We also have an officer that we can contact directly to get more information on a case.”

- **What is the personnel structure for your office (e.g. number of staff- conduct officers, directors, GAs, administrative staff) and how are reports processed and assigned?**

  “We have a Director, Coordinator, Graduate Assistant, and Administrative Assistant. We also have 6 student workers and student judicial board. Police reports are emailed directly to us by CPD. The Administrative assistant gives the CPD reports to the GA to pull out DUls, assault, and theft. We only pull these cases out because we don’t have the personnel to handle the amount of Public Nuisance (Parties, noise, public urination, and etc.) and Minor in Possession charges sent over. The Coordinator hears the majority of the cases in the office. The Director also oversees two other functional areas (Black Cultural Center and Multicultural Center) and hears cases as needed. The GA advises the student judicial board and hears mostly alcohol, drugs, and parking violations that occurred on campus.”

- **Are there any difficulties and challenges you have with enforcing the Code of Conduct off-campus? What are some successes you have had or programs in place that aid with off-campus enforcement?**

  “CPD only sends us probable cause statements. We don’t get full police reports like we do from MUPD. So, during the meetings we really only have what the student shares with us to make a decision. They aren’t aware that we don’t have the full details and very few actually choose to not tell us what happened.

  “We have on campus an Office for Off Campus Housing and the Coordinator focuses on educating students on being good neighbors. We have talked about creating a workshop to address off campus misbehavior. The goal would be that we assign all students charged with Public Nuisance to this workshop.”
1. UK should increase data collection efforts, using an instrument such as the CORE Survey, to better inform programming and utilize programming that is evidence-based (i.e. social norms approaches, targeted population-level interventions, etc.).

2. The Office of Substance Education and Responsibility (SEAR) should a) revisit the name of the office and change it if it does not adequately represent what the office addresses and the functions it serves, b) go through a mission/vision exercise to draft vision and mission statements that better reflect the purpose of the office and tie its efforts to the core mission of the university, c) articulate specific goals and objectives for prevention efforts and prioritize them, and d) seek to memorialize a philosophical approach regarding alcohol use that is separate from the mission statement. The SEAR Office should be the central repository for all substance abuse programming at UK.

3. UK should seek to implement environmental management strategies both on and off campus, especially ones targeted at high-risk, underage drinking at house parties and tailgating.

4. The new Office of Student Conduct should undergo a mission/vision exercise to draft vision and mission statements that better reflect the purpose of the office and tie its efforts to the core mission of the university.

5. The Student Code of Conduct should be updated to reflect state-of-the-art approaches to student discipline – including an improved focus on educational outcomes and risk management. The Code should ensure recent regulatory mandates regarding Title IX and Title II are respected.

6. UK should extend its power to enforce policies off-campus.

7. UK should seek to continuously improve Title IX compliance efforts across a broad spectrum including: a) enforcement efforts (specifically updating Title IX policies and ensuring staff are properly trained), b) culture and climate checks, c) accessibility of victim services, and d) organizational structure.

8. To ensure compliance with EDGAR Part 86 guidelines, the SEAR Office should begin compiling comprehensive biennial reviews that include, at a minimum: a) information on how alcohol and other drug policies are disseminated on campus, b) a complete description of UK’s alcohol and other drug prevention and intervention programming, and c) data describing alcohol and other drug-related policy violation, incidents, and sanctions.

9. UK should consider adopting an overarching vision of student engagement, such as the Facilitator University philosophy.

10. UK should adopt a comprehensive Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) philosophy and create a Chief Compliance Officer position, which reports to both the UK Risk Management Department and General Counsel.

These recommendations are part of a larger report submitted on 10/31/13.
Appendix D: Individual Opinions of Workgroup Members

- “The only thing I would add is that the on-going ask force, which I am glad to see as part of the recommendations, specifically include the 3rd District Council Member. I would also encourage a neighborhood representative to be included.”
  
  - Diane Lawless
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