

Data Report:
2001 New Hampshire Higher Education
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Survey

*Presented by the New Hampshire
Higher Education
Alcohol and Other Drug
Committee*



C/o Wellness Center
Southern New Hampshire University
2500 North River Road
Manchester, NH 03106-1045
603-645-9679
603-645-9711 (fax)

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

PURPOSE AND CONTEXT

- Sample
 - Table 1: Institution's Sample Size
 - Table 2: Demographic Proportions
- Method

SELECTED DATA RESULTS

- Graph 1: Attitudes – Personal vs. Perceived Attitude
- Graph 2: Number of Drinks Consumed in a Typical Week
- Graph 3: Number of Drinks Consumed when “Partying” – Actual vs. Perceived Norm
- Graph 4: Number of Nights when “Partying” – Actual vs. Perceived Norm
- Graph 5: Binge Drinking – Rate of Incidence in a Two-Week Period
- Graph 6: Protective Behaviors
- Graph 7: Consequences
- Table 3: Consequences by Category and Code
- Graph 8: Drug Use – No Use
- Table 4: Drug Use – Non Use and Actual vs. Perceived Use
- Graph 9: Drug Use – Actual vs. Perceived Use

EFFORTS TO ADDRESS USE OF ALCOHOL BY STUDENTS

- Environmental Management
- Educational Efforts
- Counseling and Support Services

OBSERVATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FUTURE

CONTACT INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The New Hampshire Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drug (NHHEAOD) Committee is comprised of representatives from higher education institutions across the state of New Hampshire. Members meet monthly to discuss important issues and develop action plans related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use on college campuses in the state. In the fall of 2000, the NHHEAOD committee collaborated to develop a survey that could be administered at the various membership schools (*see Appendix A for a copy of the survey instrument*). The purpose of this survey was to assess the attitudes, behaviors and perception of use regarding alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use of its students. Furthermore, this statewide survey would allow individual schools and the NHHEAOD Committee to track and evaluate data consistently, to monitor trends, and to provide assistance in the development of alcohol, tobacco and other drug programs and services.

The survey was administered at nine higher education institutions in the state during the spring of 2001. This report provides a summary of key aggregate data from this survey, with an emphasis on data results that illustrate the gap that exists between actual and perceived norms among New Hampshire college youth. Social norms theory, a concept receiving a lot of national attention, is based on the premise that students over-perceive harmful behaviors and under-perceive protective behaviors among their peers and that those misperceptions have an impact on decisions to use substances. As such, the aim of a social norms approach is to reduce misperceptions of substance use with a resulting decrease in use and consequences.

A copy of the 2001 survey questions can be accessed at <http://www.unh.edu/student-life/assessment/pdf/nhalcohol.pdf>

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Attitudes (see Graph 1)

- The majority (89.3%) of students' personal attitudes about drinking and getting drunk are conservative ("Drinking is never a good thing to do" or "Drinking is all right but a person should not get drunk") to moderate ("Occasionally getting drunk is okay as long as it doesn't interfere with academics or other responsibilities")
- The majority (63.5%) of students believe that getting drunk, even occasionally, is not okay if it interferes with academics or other responsibilities.
- Students believe that more than half (51.1%) of their peers think getting drunk is okay even if it does interfere with academics or responsibilities and that frequently getting drunk is okay if that's what the individual wants to do. Actual responses indicate that only 10.7% of students share one of those two attitudes about drinking.

Average Weekly Consumption (see Graph 2)

- The majority of students (63%) of students consume six or fewer alcoholic drinks in a week.
- Thirty-one percent (31%) or roughly one-third of students report that they don't typically consume alcohol weekly.

Quantity & Frequency of Alcohol when "Partying" (see Graphs 3 and 4)

- The majority (61.2%) of students report that they party without alcohol or when they party their quantity is limited to six drinks or fewer.
- Students believe that the majority (68.4%) of their peers consume 7 or more drinks when they "party". Students are severely overestimating the amount their peers are consuming in party situations.
- The majority (54%) of students who do report partying with alcohol indicate that they limit this activity to one or two nights a week. Additionally, 26% of students report that they don't "party" leading one to believe that they either abstain from alcohol completely or limit their consumption to other types of settings (e.g. with a meal, among a small group of friends).
- Students believe that the majority (68.3%) of their peers "party" 3 or more nights a week. Students are severely overestimating the frequency with which their peers are "partying."

Binge Drinking (see Graph 5)

- The overall rate of binge drinking among college students in New Hampshire is reported at 55.4%. However, upon examining the frequency of binge drinking episodes among respondents, one finds that 25.1% of that 55.4% reported limiting this type of high-risk drinking to 1 or 2 times in a 14-day period.
- The minority of students (30.3%) is engaging in the majority of the frequent binge drinking episodes. Frequent is defined as 3 or more episodes in a 14-day period.

Protective Behaviors (see Graph 6)

- Students are engaging in a number of protective behaviors when it comes to taking care of themselves or others in situations involving substance use.
- Listed below are some examples of protective behaviors that the majority of students attending New Hampshire institutions report employing either sometimes, usually or always: 97.2% report that they party with friends and people they know and 92.4% report that they watch over their friends who are consuming; thus, reducing the risk of crime or other consequences involving strangers. Additionally, 88% report eating before “partying” or going out, 87.3% report using designated drivers, 76% report consciously tracking the number of drinks consumed, 56.7% report choosing not to drink and 50.3% report determining in advance and staying within a set number of drinks.

Consequences (see Graph 7 and Table 3)

- The majority of students do not experience consequences from their substance use.
- For 14 of 23 consequences students were asked about on the survey, the percentage of students reporting they had never experienced that consequence in the last six months exceeded 70%.
- For 21 of the 23 consequences students were asked about on the survey, greater than 50% of students reported that they had never experienced that particular consequence in the last six months due to their substance use.

Abstinence from Substance Use (see Graph 8 and Table 4)

- The majority of students attending colleges in New Hampshire do not engage in tobacco or other drug use, with the exception of alcohol.
- More than 8 out of 10 respondents (88% or higher in each drug type category) reported that in the last six months they had not used smokeless tobacco, amphetamines, designer drugs, sedatives, cocaine, hallucinogens, steroids, inhalants, opiates or other illicit substances.
- Approximately 6 out of 10 respondents reported that in the last six months they had not smoked tobacco products (59.3%) or marijuana (63.9%).

Substance Use – Actual vs. Perceived (see Table 4 and Graph 9)

- Students consistently over-perceive drug use among peers attending their own institutions. In some drug categories, the discrepancy between actual and perceived responses was tenfold.
- Students estimate that their peers use alcohol more than twice as often as that which is reported.
- Students perceive that their peers are smoking tobacco products and marijuana approximately three times more often than actual use reported.
- For most drug categories respondents were asked about, the mean number of days of actual use reported in a six-month period was relatively small. Relatively small is defined as four days or fewer. Exceptions to this definition were in the areas of tobacco products that are smoked (excludes smokeless tobacco products), alcohol, and marijuana.

PURPOSE AND CONTEXT

Since the early 1990's the *Core Survey - Short Form*, a national survey coordinated by the University of Southern Illinois, had been the instrument used by many of the schools in the state to gather data on alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use behaviors. Early in the summer of 2000, the Core Institute made the decision that it would no longer support the short version of its survey and it would only scan and report on the long version of the survey. The longer version took approximately 45 minutes to complete versus 20 minutes for the short form.

Concerned about the time needed to administer the Core Survey – Long Version, members of the NHHEAOD Committee made a decision in August 2000 to create their own survey. Their goal was to have an instrument that could be completed in approximately 20-25 minutes. In addition, the committee wanted a survey that higher education institutions in New Hampshire would use so that institutional data could be compared to a statewide reference group. In the past, comparisons such as these were not always possible. A statewide survey would also allow for consistent tracking of data and monitoring of trends. The Student Affairs Research and Assessment Center at the University of New Hampshire was asked to assist in this process. This center has staff with experience conducting this type of project, the ability to create and scan the survey, and the means to report the results.

The NHHEAOD survey items were derived from three national surveys: the *Core Survey* (short form), the *Campus Survey of Alcohol and Other Drug Norms*, and the *1999 Annual Student Health Behavior Assessment*. There were a few reasons for this decision. First, the higher education institutions wanted to use questions that they had used from surveys in the past so that they could maintain trend data. Secondly, NHHEAOD members thought that questions from these national surveys solicited the type of information they wanted. Thirdly, since the questions from these instruments had been used on national surveys, committee members were confident that they were reliable and valid. Where possible, all response categories were constructed to solicit interval data for easier analysis and significance testing. In January of 2001, the instrument was drafted, pre-tested, and finalized. Due to time constraints reliability and validity was not determined for the instrument.

■ Sample

Nine higher education institutions in New Hampshire participated in the study. These institutions varied in affiliation (e.g., private/public, religious/secular, two/four year), mission, and size. Each school chose its own sampling method. A total of 2493 students participated in the survey. Weights were not assigned to compensate for disproportionate representation of each college in the sample analyses (see Table 1).

TABLE 1: SAMPLE AND SIZE FOR EACH INSTITUTION

	Sample Size	Percent of Sample
Colby-Sawyer College	311	13%
Daniel Webster College	86	4%
Hesser College	242	10%
New Hampshire College (now Southern New Hampshire University)	257	10%
New Hampshire Technical Institute	190	8%
Notre Dame College	144	6%
Plymouth State College	457	18%
Rivier College	326	13%
University of New Hampshire	479	19%

TABLE 2: DEMOGRAPHIC PROPORTIONS

	Sample
GENDER	
Men	960
Women	1477
Transgender	18
CLASS	
Freshman	861
Sophomore	570
Junior	474
Senior	543
Grad	15
Other	24
STATUS	
Full-time	2360
Part-time	126
PERMANENT RESIDENCE	
In-State	1334
USA, but out- of -state	1079
Country other than USA	73
RACIAL/ETHNICITY	
African American/Black	74
American Indian/Native American	23
Asian American/Pacific Islander	41
Caucasian	2182
Hispanic/Latino	50
International (non-immigrant)	54
Multiracial/biracial	47

■ Method

Prior to administration of the survey each institution received approval from their Institutional Research Board (where applicable). All schools implemented an administration method to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of participants.

The Student Affairs Research and Assessment Center at the University of New Hampshire recommended (1) that the survey be administered in academic classrooms by identifying classes that would allow each school to achieve a representative sample and (2) that the survey be administered beginning mid-February until two weeks prior to spring break on each of the campuses. Beginning to survey mid-February would allow time for the surveying to be scheduled in classes. Choosing to end the survey prior to spring break would help ensure a uniform experience that was generally typical of usual use and not colored by spring break activities. Each campus decided its own administration method with most institutions choosing the classroom method.


The following schools distributed surveys in academic classes: Daniel Webster College, New Hampshire College (now Southern New Hampshire University), New Hampshire Technical Institute, Notre Dame College, Plymouth State College, Rivier College, and the University of New Hampshire. Colby-Sawyer College distributed surveys in the residence halls and Hesser College distributed the survey in both academic classes and residence halls.

Note: Two institutions did administer some of their surveys after spring break because a serious snowstorm canceled classes on days in which it was to be administered. For these schools data from students surveyed before the storm were compared to data from those surveyed after it to determine if the responses were relatively similar and were not influenced by the different administration times.

After the data was collected it was cleaned to remove outliers. Outliers are data responses that fall outside the range of possible responses. For example, questions with a time frame of 6 months (e.g., in the past 6 months how many days did you use alcohol?) any answer greater than 180 was changed to a missing response so that it was not calculated in the analysis. Thus that piece of data was dropped from the aggregate data for that question only. For questions based on two weeks and 30 days, responses greater than 14 or 30, respectively, were changed to missing responses. For the questions regarding negative consequences (e.g., in the past 6 months how many times did you have a hangover?) and protective behaviors (e.g., during the past school year, when you went out/socialized/"partied" how many times did you choose not to drink?) histograms were run to determine the existence of outliers. Outlying responses were analyzed to determine if they were possible answers to the question. If it seemed clear that these responses were erroneous or fraudulent they were changed to missing responses.

SELECTED DATA RESULTS

■ Graph 1: Attitudes - Personal vs. Perceived Attitude




Results:

In general, the majority of students own attitudes were conservative to moderate in nature with the majority of students believing that getting drunk is not okay if it interferes with academics or other responsibilities.

Consistent with social norms theory, students perceive the attitudes of their peer group to be more liberal than their personal attitudes about drinking. This misperception, according to the theory, has an influence on one's personal choice to use alcohol and can lead to more drunken behavior than the majority of students personally believe is acceptable.


■ Graph 2: Number of Drinks Consumed in a Typical Week



Results:

When asked to report on the amount of alcohol typically consumed in a week, 31% (slightly less than a third) reported they had no alcohol and 32% (approximately an additional third) reported that their intake was limited to 1-6 drinks. Consequently, one can conclude that the minority of students is consuming the majority of the alcohol in a typical week.

■ Graph 3: Number of Drinks Consumed when “Partying” – Actual vs. Perceived Norm




Results:

The majority (61.2%) of students at New Hampshire schools either don’t use alcohol when they party or consume a six-pack or less. While that may appear to some to be a large quantity of alcohol, as compared to students’ perceptions of others use, it is quite low.

As social norms theory and the data suggests, students overestimate the quantity of alcohol their peers are consuming. The concern is that this overestimation can drive up use in “party” situations, a decision that often can result in negative experiences.


■ Graph 4: Number of Nights when “Partying” – Actual vs. Perceived Norm



Results:

In addition to overestimating peers’ consumption when “partying”, respondents also overestimate the frequency of “partying” on campus. Twenty six percent (26%) of students or more than ¼ report not “partying” at all and an additional 29% report their “partying” is usually limited to one night a week. However, when asked about their peer group, they believe that more than 9 out of 10 students (93.2%) party two or more nights a week with the greatest percentage partying three times a week.

■ Graph 5: Binge Drinking – Rate of Incidence in Two Week Period



Results:


Binge drinking, defined nationally as five or more drinks in a single sitting, is a concern on college campuses across the country. In general, the Northeast has a rate of binge drinking higher than other regions of the country and if left to examine only the overall rate of binge drinking (55.4%) in New Hampshire, one would be left with a distorted view of the data and a suggestion that the majority of students are engaging in frequent, high-risk behavior. Instead, it is important to look more closely at the number of episodes as reported.

In reviewing this data, the following categories of binge drinking were defined:

Frequent binge drinkers answered “3” or more to the question, “how many times have you consumed five or more drinks in one sitting?”, infrequent binge drinkers answered “1” or “2”, and non-binge drinkers answered “0” and also had the number of abstainers subtracted from this. Abstainers were defined as people who answered “0” to the question, “in the past 6 months, how many times have you used alcohol?”. The breakdown of respondents was as follows: Abstainers 24.6%; Non-binge drinkers 20.0%; Infrequent binge drinkers 25.1%; Frequent binge drinkers 30.3%

As indicated on the chart, the data suggests that a minority of students (30.3%) is doing the majority of the frequent binge drinking.

■ Graph 6: Protective Behaviors




Results:

Students were asked 9 questions pertaining to behaviors that would be considered “protective” when drinking including a decision not to use alcohol. For each question students were asked to respond whether they always, usually, sometimes, rarely or never engaged in the behavior.

Responses above are for questions in which the cumulative percentage of students who responded that in the last school year they had engaged in the protective behavior sometimes, usually or always equaled or exceeded 50%. In other words, the majority of students in New Hampshire regularly make decisions that involve choosing not to drink alcohol, to determine in advance a set number of drinks, “party” with people they know, watch out for friends who may have had too much to alcohol, use a designated driver, eat a full meal before drinking and track how many drinks they are having. In addition, though not the majority of students, 41.3% reported having sometimes, usually or always alternated non-alcoholic beverages with alcoholic beverages and 46.9% reported the same with regards to pacing drinking to one or fewer per hour.

■ Graph 7: Consequences



Results:

Students were asked 23 questions pertaining to consequences experienced during the last 6 months as a result of their own drinking or other drug use. Responses were in terms of the number of times occurring. The categories are contained in the following table along with the percentage for each category reporting “0” to the question, and the corresponding codes used in the graph above (where applicable).


For 14 of 23 categories, the response rate was greater than 70% as indicated in Graph 7. For 21 of 23 categories, a majority of students (greater than 50%) responded that they had NEVER experienced that particular consequence in the last 6 months due to substance use.

This information is important to review in the context of those who are experiencing consequences and realizing that such incidents are not “normal” and therefore should be treated seriously. Too often, consequences are just seen as a normal college experience and are generalized when; in fact, survey data from students indicates that these behaviors are far from normal for many types of incidents.

**TABLE 3:
Consequences by Category and Code**

Consequence In the past 6 months, how many times have you ... due to YOUR drinking or other drug use?	Percentage reporting "0"	Graph Code
Hangover	23.3	
Performed poorly on a test or important project	73.5	Poortest
Been in trouble with police, residence hall staff, or other college authorities	87.1	Trouble
Damage property, pulled a fire alarm, etc.	89.7	Damage
Got into an argument or fight	62.2	
Got nauseated or vomited	44.1	
Driven a car while under the influence	68.4	
Missed a class	59.3	
Been criticized by someone you knew	68.9	
Thought you might have a drinking or drug problem	88.6	AOD Problem
Had a memory loss	59.1	
Done something you later regretted	56.8	
Been arrested for DWI/DUI	99.1	DWI/DUI
Ridden with someone who was drunk or used drugs	58.5	
Been taken advantage of sexually (unwanted touching, intercourse, etc.)	92.7	SA Victim
Taken advantage of another person sexually (unwanted touching, intercourse, etc.)	98.5	SA Perpetrator
Had unprotected sex with someone	78.9	Unprotected Sex
Tried unsuccessfully to stop using	95.3	Failed to stop
Seriously thought about suicide	96.9	Thought suicide
Seriously tried to commit suicide	98.7	Tried suicide
Initiated threats of physical violence	90.4	Violence threat
Hurt or injured another person	94.7	Hurt another
Been hurt or injured	87.1	Ben hurt

■ **Graph 8: Drug Use – No Use**



Results:


Table 4 (see below) provides specific data figures for Graph 8 and 9. This data is presented in descending order from most used to least used (actual use – column 2).

As the data shows, the majority of students in New Hampshire do not engage in tobacco or other drug use, with the exception of alcohol use. And while it is of concern that we have students engaging in use of illicit substances and we need to address those matters, it is critical not to lose sight of the fact that it is far from the majority of students who are making those choices. And as the data points out for alcohol, even though the majority of students use alcohol; overall, it is a minority of students who are engaging in the types of high-risk, frequent use that may result in academic and social consequences.

TABLE 4: DRUG USE
Non-Use and Actual vs. Perceived Use

	Actual Use: % reporting no use	Actual Use: Mean # of days of actual use	Perceived Use: Mean # of days of perceived use by the average student on campus
...alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)?	24.6%	27.78	59.71
...tobacco (cigarettes, cigars, pipes)?	59.3%	26.49	74.96
...marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)?	63.9%	14.57	44.26
...smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, dip)?	89.8%	3.26	37.00
...amphetamines (diet pills, speed)?	88.6%	3.09	20.97
...designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)?	88.1%	2.59	20.06
...sedatives (downers, ludes)?	92.9%	1.93	15.46
...cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)?	91.8%	1.86	14.99
...hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)?	92.3%	1.59	15.14
...other illicit drugs?	94.3%	1.59	13.69
...steroids?	96.3%	1.42	15.29
...inhalants (glue, solvent, gas)?	95.2%	1.33	11.38
...opiates (heroin, smack, horse)?	95.2%	1.24	11.53

■ Graph 9: Drug Use – Actual vs. Perceived



Results:

Students were asked to respond to questions regarding their own use of substances over a six-month period and their perception of others use in the following categories: alcohol, tobacco – smoking, marijuana, smokeless tobacco products, amphetamines (speed, diet pills), designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA), sedatives (downers, ludes), cocaine (coke, crack, rock, freebase), hallucinogens (LSD, PCP), steroids, inhalants (glue, solvents, gas), opiates (heroin, smack, horse) and other illicit drugs.

From Table 4 and this graph, it is apparent that the mean number of days of actual use for most substances is very small; however, perception of others’ use remains consistently higher. With regards to alcohol use, students estimate that students use alcohol more than twice as often than what is reported. In addition, students perceive that their peers are smoking tobacco products and marijuana approximately three times more often than actual use reported. With the remaining substances, the gap between actual use and perceived use is even more exaggerated. In some cases the discrepancy is tenfold or more.

EFFORTS TO ADDRESS USE OF ALCOHOL BY STUDENTS

The Higher Education Center has identified the use of multiple prevention strategies as a best practice in impacting the campus community. Best practices have to be implemented as appropriate to the uniqueness of institutions as well as available resources. Though not every school implements every program, the colleges and universities of the New Hampshire Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drug Committee implement prevention efforts in the following areas.

■ Environmental Management

Social Norms Strategy: The use of the social norms approach to education is based on theory and research showing that students misperceive their peers' attitudes and behaviors regarding alcohol, and that students tend to drink according to these misperceptions. The social norms approach provides information on these misperceptions by challenging the perception that high-risk use is the norm and by supporting lower-risk use of alcohol. By informing students of the accurate norms about alcohol use on campus, it is anticipated that students will change their drinking behaviors to be consistent with the true campus norm.

Policies and Enforcement: Post-violation prevention efforts on the college and university campuses include individual sessions/assessments by counseling staff for students who are admitted to the hospital or taken into protective custody due to alcohol or other drug use, parental notification, stiffer sanctioning for repeat violations of alcohol or other drug policies, and/or sanctioning that includes mandatory alcohol or other drug counseling.

Campus and Community Alcohol or Other Drug Task Force: The work of these teams is to make changes on the campus and in some cases the community as well.

Substance Free Events: The campuses sponsor many activities with an intentional substance-free theme; these events may take place in an area specifically designated for substance-free programming.

Substance Free Housing: Campuses provide housing for students who choose to live free of substances and to students who are in recovery for alcohol or other drug addiction.

■ Educational Efforts

Campus-wide programs: The colleges and universities offer a number of large group programs on alcohol, tobacco and other drugs.

Orientation programs: The colleges and universities offer sessions during first year and transfer student orientation of alcohol, tobacco and other drug issues, policies regarding use as well as efforts to address high-risk use.

Curriculum infusion: The colleges and universities present information on alcohol, tobacco and other drugs through a variety of in-class curricula: first year courses, courses specific to alcohol

and other drug use from a psychological or sociological perspective, courses designed to teach low-risk alcohol use, etc.

Targeted (or Across the College) programs: The colleges and universities offer programs targeted to specific smaller audiences such as class visits or residence hall programs.

Prevention programs specifically for athletes: These programs provide information about the effects of alcohol, tobacco and other drug use on athletic performance.

Prevention programs specifically for fraternities and sororities: Fraternities and sororities are required to present a number of educational programs to their members. One of the requirements calls for an educational program on alcohol, tobacco and other drug use.

Information training for faculty and staff: The colleges and universities provide information for faculty and staff on recognition and referral for alcohol and other drug issues.

■ **Counseling and Support Services**

Counseling: The campuses provide short-term alcohol and/or other drug counseling. Students in need of long term or in-patient care are referred to off-campus agencies.

Support Groups: The colleges and universities offer support groups for students who are currently questioning their alcohol and other drug use as well as a group for students early in their recovery process. Alcoholics Anonymous meetings are held either on the campuses or locally and are available for students.

Information adapted from The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Education. Environmental management: A comprehensive strategy for reducing alcohol and other drug use on college campuses. Retrieved January 7, 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.edc.org/hec/framework/>

OBSERVATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FUTURE

This study has provided the NHHEAOD Committee with comparative data to utilize in developing institutional-specific and statewide prevention efforts. In general, the data clearly shows that students in New Hampshire consistently over-perceive their peer group's substance use and the ensuing consequences and under-perceive protective behaviors, such as choosing not to drink or alternating between alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages. In addition, the data suggests that while New Hampshire students do engage in substance use, it is a minority of students engaging in the majority of high-risk use (e.g. binge drinking, illicit substance use).

Based on these findings and their consistency with social norms theory, the New Hampshire Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drug Committee is committed to (1) reducing misperceptions that exist about students at New Hampshire colleges and universities, (2) educating key state leaders on social norms theory, and (3) continuing to develop and refine prevention efforts that support a social norms campaign and a comprehensive approach to substance abuse prevention

Specific activities to reach the above goals include the following:

- Attend public forums sponsored by the Governor's Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment and Intervention and speak to these requests: (1) to appoint a representative from higher education in New Hampshire to be a member of the Commission and (2) to consider higher education as a constituency deserving support given its history of action and its current broad-reaching efforts to reduce high-risk drinking and other drug use in New Hampshire by (a) funding a position dedicated to assisting New Hampshire-based colleges and universities in combating the illegal use and abuse of alcohol and (b) supporting a prevention-focused statewide social norms campaign in order to change the culture around the illegal use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs.
- Implement a statewide social norms campaign aimed at reducing high-risk alcohol use, tobacco use and illicit drug use on our campuses. This campaign will promote positive behaviors that the majority of New Hampshire college students are engaging in and celebrate the decisions our students are making about substance use that are low-risk and consistent with strong academic performance.
- Investigate the feasibility of creating a New Hampshire listserv to facilitate the discussion of social norms theory and implementation on our campuses.
- Facilitate workshops on social norms theory and approach at the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery's annual conference in October 2002. These workshops will include background on social norms theory and highlight ways to implement a social norms campaign at the secondary and post-secondary level and statewide based on currently held data.
- Sponsor workshops periodically to further discussions about social norms theory and its implementation within New Hampshire.

- Initiate contact with the Partnership for a Drug-free New Hampshire about developing a social norms campaign designed to reach the parents of middle and high school students. This campaign would center on dispelling myths that “other parents” permit their high school children to consume alcohol.
- Develop an evaluation plan to measure outcomes of the aforementioned activities.
- Continue to work with the New Hampshire College & University Council, the Higher Education Center, and the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery to provide effective prevention programs to our students.

CONTACT INFORMATION

The production and dissemination of this report is a project of the New Hampshire Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drug Committee. Committee members are available to individuals wishing to arrange for a presentation of the findings of the study. Please direct requests for presentations, comments about the report, or specific questions about the report to one of the following committee members:

Ann Backus
 Consultant & Non-institutionally Affiliated
 Member
 167 North Adams Street
 Manchester NH 03104
 603/623-8072
 603/623-5271 (fax)
abackus@grolen.com

Gyme Hardy
 Student Development
 New Hampshire Technical Institute
 31 College Drive
 Earl Little Hall
 Concord, NH 03301-7412
 603/271-6983
 603/271-6958 (fax)
ghardy@tec.nh.us

Robin Burroughs-Davis
 Director of Citizenship Education
 Colby-Sawyer College
 New London, NH 03257
 603/526-3752
 603/526-2135 (fax)
rdavis@Colby-Sawyer.edu

Sara Wilson
 Wellness Center
 Southern New Hampshire University
 2500 North River Road
 Manchester NH 03106-1045
 603/645-9679
 603/645-9711 (fax)
s.wilson@snhu.edu

Kathleen Grace-Bishop
 OHEP – Health Services Center
 12 Ballard St.
 University of New Hampshire
 Durham, NH 03824
 603/862-3823
 603/862-2947 (fax)
kgbishop@christa.unh.edu