

## **Task Force on Illegal Drugs**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**October 22, 2015**

#### Attendance:

Isabelle Bartholomew '18, Vincent Benevento '05 (by phone), Meg Chaplin P'17, Rick Culliton, Captain Rich Davis, Eddie Gehman Kohan P '17, Chando Mapoma '16, Emily Pagano, Tanya Purdy, Nila Ravi '18, Scott Rhode, Prof. Michael Robinson, Mike Whaley

#### Unable to Attend:

Jill Bertolini, Remy Hatfield-Gardner'17, Joe Greenfield, Harry Rafferty '17,

The committee had a very productive meeting discussing using the Ecological framework to develop strategies to reduce illegal use of drugs, reviewing existing policy and enforcement, talking through messages that students receive and hear about alcohol and drug use and beginning to discuss effective practices for prevention.

There was an observation that some students don't engage in the online course (alcohol.edu) or take seriously the content being delivered. The suggestion was made that we need to do more in-person education for new students. It was also mentioned that students see lots of messages, some conflicting, about alcohol and getting drunk through student authored publications. So even if the policy is clearly articulated there seems to be some disconnect between the message of the university and peer messaging/ student experience.

The task force had a discussion of the policy/enforcement/consequences of policy violations from illegal drinking to illegal drug use and sale/distribution of drugs. Residential Life and Public Safety staff document any alcohol/drug violations and send the reports to the Dean of Students office. All reports are reviewed and referred to the Student Judicial Board (SJB). Cases are heard by the SJB or via an administrative judicial conference. Outcomes range from a warning to probation up to suspension/dismissal. There was a discussion about whether the sanctions are calibrated correctly at this point and /or if students understand clearly enough what the stakes are before they choose to use or distribute drugs?

(Attached to the end of these minutes is page 14 of the student handbook which outlines the point system currently in use by the judicial boards)

There was discussion about whether underage alcohol use should be sanctioned differently than marijuana use or other drug use.

Distribution or sale of drugs has led to suspension/dismissal depending upon the drug and the circumstances. Does this need to be made even clearer? Should we instead say, "Distribution or sale of drugs usually results in suspension/dismissal." Qualifying it as above may send a mixed message???

The judicial board is looking not just at whether a student is using a substance or is intoxicated but their behavior can also be an aggravating factor if they are violent/assaultive.

What are the bright lines in terms of consequences?

It was suggested that we should conduct an audit of all of the messages that students receive about alcohol and drug use (both official and unofficial) throughout the year so we can better understand where the inconsistencies might be and how they can be corrected.

It was observed that there seems to be a focus on getting information out to first year students but there is less of an emphasis on education and even intervention after the first year.

What are the strategies for intervening with upper class students? Social Norms messaging?

Is a one-person health education office able to do any more than is already occurring? The office at one point had 2.5 staff and now has only one. If we are going to expect more in person alcohol and drug education we will need additional FTEs to do that work.

A question was raised as to whether we can get testimonials from students who have been impacted negatively by their drug use and would they speak out to other students from a personal perspective.

There was agreement that we need to tighten up the messaging about policy and enforcement and address any disconnects between what we are saying and what how we are responding. Students report that the likelihood of getting caught is low. Do we have the right level of enforcement to adequately address violations? Are the consequences calibrated to deter use?

The committee shifted conversation to the November 13 illegal drug symposium (see attached) which will be facilitated by Tom Workman and Beth DeRicco. The symposium will be held from noon-5 followed by a working dinner by the task force members to further develop a list of recommendations for Wesleyan to consider moving forward.

	Regulation	POINT RANGE		Regulation	POINT RANGE
1	Disturbance of the Peace	1–3	12	Disruptions	1–10
2	Harassment and Abuse	2–10	13a	Drugs	1–5**
3	Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Assault	5–10	13b	Underage Possession or Use of Alcohol	1–3
4	Property	1–8*	13c	Distribution of Alcohol to Minors	1–4
5	False Information	1–4	13d	Possession of False Identification	1–2
6	Misuse of Documents	2–10	13e	Open Container	1–2
7	Locks and Keys	1–4	13f	Sale or Dispensing without a Permit	1–3
8	Fire Protection Systems	2–5	13g	Operating Under the Influence	5–10
9a	Starting a Fire	1–4	14	Failure to Comply	1–4
9b	Storing Flammable Material	1–3	15	Social Event Registration	1–3
9c	Restricted Items	1–3	15	Unregistered Guest	1–2
9d	Explosives, Ammunition, Incendiary Devices	2–10	15	Smoking in Residence Hall	1–2
9e	Weapons	4–10	15	Quiet Street Noise Violation	1–3
10	Reckless Endangerment	2–10	15	Hazing	5–10
11	Pets	1–3			
#	The point ranges outlined above will be followed except in mitigating and aggravating circumstances where the impact of student behavior indicates a judicial response outside of the published range.				
*	Restitution for property damage may be included in the sanction up to 2 times the cost of repair or replacement.				
**	Distribution/sale of drugs on or off campus will result in 4–10 points.				

**IN ADDITION TO ANY OTHER SANCTIONS:**

- 1–4 total accumulated points will result in a student receiving a “disciplinary warning”.
- 5–10 total accumulated points at any time will result in a student being on “disciplinary probation”
- 10 or more accumulated points will result in a separation of the student from the University through either suspension or dismissal.

A student who has been found responsible for violating the Code of Non-Academic Conduct and assigned points as a result, will lose one point after 6 months (180 days) without being found responsible for any additional infractions. (A student with 6 points who is placed on probation will return to disciplinary warning status after one year without any additional infractions.)

2. The board will consider a range of sanctions including but not limited to community service, fines, restitution, educational assignments, and referrals to deans and directors of student affairs’ departments. Based on the number of points assigned, the board will normally recommend the imposition of one of the following sanctions:
  - a. **DISCIPLINARY WARNING**—An official written reprimand that includes a warning that further violations of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct will result in more serious sanctions.
  - b. **DISCIPLINARY PROBATION**—A temporary status for a period to be established by the board, during which the student’s standing within the University is in question. Additional violations during the probationary period may result in suspension or dismissal. The dean of students will typically notify parent(s) or guardian(s) of students placed on disciplinary probation by letter.
  - c. **DEFERRED SUSPENSION**—A status imposed by the board, indicating the student’s standing within the University is in jeopardy. Additional violations during the probationary period will result in suspension or dismissal.
  - d. **SUSPENSION**—A student’s removal from the institution for a period to be determined by the judiciary, but in no event less than the remaining portion of the semester during which the case is adjudicated. Students must comply with the terms of their suspension in order to be eligible to return to the University.
  - e. **DISMISSAL**—A student’s permanent removal from the institution.
3. In cases of damage to university property, the board, as a part of its recommendation to the dean of students, should normally require full restitution and/or any reasonable expenses for repair. The board may recommend restitution for damages suffered by a third party, but cannot collect damages on behalf of a third party.
4. The board may recommend restriction of individual access to specific university facilities, limitation of individual participation in specific university activities, or curtailment of privileges that are enjoyed by a student, so long as these restrictions are directly relevant to the violation.
5. **REPEAT VIOLATIONS**—In the case of repeated violations or violation in deliberate disregard of a specific warning, a student will be subject to more serious sanctions than would otherwise be the case. A prior disciplinary record is never relevant in determining the facts of an incident, but once the facts have been established, it is relevant in determining appropriate sanctions.
6. **SANCTIONS RELATED TO GROUP BEHAVIOR**—In addition to recommending other sanctions such as community service, fines, educational assignments, restitution, etc., the board may recommend the imposition of the following sanctions:
  - a. A written disciplinary warning with a copy maintained in the judicial file. The warning may specify corrective measures that can help the group avoid similar complaints in the future.
  - b. Disciplinary probation for a period to be established by the board, implying that the group’s standing within the University is in jeopardy and that further negligent or willful violations will normally result in suspension of university