

**A CAMPUS DRUG COURT:  
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**By Cheryl L. Asmus, Ph.D.  
Family & Youth Institute,  
Colorado State University**

*There is a certain core of students on university campuses involved in high-risk drinking and illegal drug use for which even the most comprehensive prevention efforts are not making a difference. The serious and/or negative consequences of their alcohol or drug use commonly and repeatedly place them in the campus offices of judicial affairs, resulting in a high rate of disciplinary dismissals for this group. It is for this particular group that Colorado State University (CSU) has adapted, implemented, and currently evaluates the nation's first campus drug court.*

*Applying the drug court model to CSU's campus, the goals are (1) to reduce the number of serious incidents resulting from high-risk drinking and/or drug use at CSU; (2) through rehabilitation, to reduce the number of dismissals of students who reach that level of discipline due to their problematic behavior resulting from alcohol and/or drug (AOD) use; (3) by combining consequences for delinquent behavior and treatment in a therapeutic approach, to involve and coordinate the various offices and programs on campus involved in AOD prevention; and, (4) to adapt, implement, evaluate, and report on the feasibility of, and steps to, developing a campus drug court model for other campuses across the nation. This article outlines the need for campus drug courts, program design, program personnel, involved departments and agencies, the evaluation process, and future directions. After two years, CSU's dismissal rate for this population went from 100 percent to nine percent—a 91 percent success rate.*

*Cheryl L. Asmus, Ph.D., Coordinator of the Family and Youth Institute and Assistant Professor of Psychology at Colorado State University (CSU), is the evaluator of the Eighth Judicial District Juvenile Drug Court in Colorado. Dr. Asmus teaches Social Psychology, Introductory Psychology, and Drugs and Behavior at CSU. For several years she was a research associate and field director at the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research at CSU on a project funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) that surveyed high school students in 260 rural communities across the United States regarding drug and alcohol issues, HIV, and economic impacts and opportunities for youth. Dr. Asmus is currently the project director and author of the nation's first campus drug court. In addition to contracting and working with communities on community issues, assisting agencies and CSU Cooperative Extension in evaluations, Dr. Asmus has authored and co-authored articles and book chapters, and has presented at numerous conferences both nationally and internationally.*

Direct all correspondence to Cheryl L. Asmus, Ph.D., Coordinator, Family and Youth Institute, 201 Gibbons Building, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, 80523-1501; E-mail: [asmus@cahs.colostate.edu](mailto:asmus@cahs.colostate.edu).

## ARTICLE SUMMARIES

### **CRIME AND CAMPUS DRUG COURTS**

[1] College campuses are seeing increases in alcohol and drug-related crime.

### **“HARD CORE”**

### **DRINKERS ON CAMPUS**

[2] To address the increases in drug and alcohol incidents on campuses, alternatives must be found to engage the hard-core alcohol and drug-using students.

### **INCREASE IN SERIOUS STUDENT OFFENSES AT CSU**

[3] Dramatic increases in campus hearings at CSU, many involving alcohol, also signal increases in associated negative behavior.

### **DRUG COURT AT CSU**

[4] As an alternative to expulsion, CSU implements a campus drug court, based on the proven drug court model, for those students most seriously involved with alcohol and drugs.

### **CSU CAMPUS DRUG COURT PILOT SUCCESSFUL**

[5] Seven students at dismissal level were taken into the CSU drug court, graduated, and remained crime free two years later.

### **CAMPUS DRUG COURT PROCESS AND DESIGN**

[6] The campus drug court team assesses eligibility; following that the student participant is given an individualized treatment plan, intensive case management, regular judicial supervision with sanctions and incentives, and alcohol and/or other drug testing.

### **CAMPUS DRUG COURT TEAM (CDCT)**

[7] The CDCT consists of the coordinator and evaluator, program director and hearing officers, case manager and clinicians, law enforcement, student representatives, and project advisors.

**CAMPUS DEPARTMENTS  
INVOLVED**

[8] The campus departments involved in drug court are the Family and Youth Institute, the Office of Judicial Affairs, the Center for Drug and Alcohol Education, the University Counseling Center, the CSU Police Department, and the Associated Students of Colorado State University.

**CAMPUS DRUG COURT  
EVALUATION**

[9] The campus drug court has a thorough MIS, which stores the basic information for the process, outcome, and impact evaluations.

**FUTURE OF CAMPUS  
DRUG COURTS**

[10] The CSU Drug Court has shown success. Legislation is pending to fund pilot campus drug courts, at \$15 million.

## INTRODUCTION

There is a certain CORE of students on university campuses involved in high-risk drinking and illegal drug use for which even the most comprehensive campus prevention efforts are not making a difference. The serious and/or negative consequences of their alcohol or drug use commonly and repeatedly place them in campus or community offices of judicial affairs, resulting in an almost 100 percent expulsion rate for this group. It is for this particular group that a pilot project has been successfully implemented on the Colorado State University (CSU) campus by adapting the drug court model used by over 1,200 courts nationwide.

The author predicts that the application of a drug court model on campuses would reduce the recidivism rates of this difficult targeted population, making the campus and surrounding community a safer and more civil environment by reducing the negative behaviors and incidents caused by this population. The author also believes that it would be easily adapted to most campus settings. The findings of this application, to address the students involved in alcohol and drug use that results in serious consequences will benefit both the university campus and the students themselves.

## NEED FOR A CAMPUS DRUG COURT

### **High-Risk Drinking and its Negative Consequences on Campus**

[1] As most program directors for alcohol and other drug prevention programs on campuses know only too well, the number of students participating in high-risk drinking is a serious and increasingly complex problem. Campus offices of student and judicial affairs recognize that the situations that are bringing many students under their auspices are often

closely linked with alcohol and substance abuse. In addition, the nature of both the delinquent (e.g., criminal) acts and the dependency matters resulting from alcohol and other substance abuse (AOD) on campuses is frequently associated with more serious and/or violent criminal activity. A recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (2001, February 2) reported that arrests due to liquor-law violations at 6,300 campuses increased 0.4 percent from 1998-1999. *The Chronicle*, using a somewhat different sample of campuses, has been reporting on crime on campuses since 1993 with the trend indicating that this number increases every year. A recent federal law, the Clery Act (1989), requires the U.S. Department of Education to collect data pertaining to crimes occurring on campuses starting in 2000 and to begin reporting this information not only to students but also to Congress. The recent *Chronicle* report clearly indicates the number one cause of crime on campuses involves alcohol, either through referrals or arrests. The combination of these findings and the new reporting requirement (Clery Act) indicate the need to specifically address the serious incidences (e.g., crime) resulting from alcohol use on campuses.

The Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act, codified as Part 86 of the United States Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR, 34 CFR) requires that every institution of higher education conduct a review of its alcohol and other drug prevention program every two years to determine its effectiveness. The CORE survey instrument consists of 39 items that can be broken down into the following categories: attitudes, perceptions and opinions about alcohol and other drugs, patterns of alcohol and drug use and consequences of use, and perceptions of campus climate and policy issues. The CORE survey was developed with funding from the U.S. Department of Education and is used widely nationwide, allowing a campus to use a large national comparison group as a reference to its own findings.

**Current Prevention Efforts and “Hard-CORE”  
High-Risk Drinkers**

[2] The core of high-risk drinkers and drug users on campuses are the students who have been involved in repeated serious incidences while using alcohol or other substances, which caused them to be brought to the attention of the campus offices of judicial affairs, the surrounding community offices of judicial affairs, or both. Not only do the typical prevention and intervention programs not work for this group, but also very few attempts have been made to target this group beyond arrest and/or expulsion. It is for this particular group that prevention or intervention efforts must be developed, implemented, and evaluated to make campuses more civil communities conducive to learning and excellence. However, any prevention or intervention effort aimed at this group must also address the associated problems surrounding these students (both internal and external) if the escalating pattern of high-risk drinking on college campuses is to be arrested.

In the 1999-2000 school year at CSU, approximately 340 students were seen for the first time by the Center for Drug and Alcohol Education (CDAE) on campus due to an incident with alcohol and/or drug involvement. In addition, approximately 400 students, many of whom had already been sent at least once to the CDAE, were put in an extended program due to the seriousness or frequency of the incidents involving their AOD use. Even more alarming, 76 students were brought before the Office of Judicial Affairs (OJA) and faced at the least, suspension; and at the worst, expulsion from school because of their repeated involvement in problematic or serious incidents due to their AOD use. Students face consequences with the OJA, as well as other negative consequences. Table 1 shows results from the most recent CSU CORE survey. This table reflects self-reported negative consequences that a student has experienced in the

previous 30 days as a direct effect of alcohol or drug involvement.

**Table 1**  
**Negative Consequences, Public and Personal,**  
**from Alcohol Use One or More Times in Last 30 Days**  
**at Colorado State University, 1999**

High-Risk Drinking Measures from CORE	Percent of those who Drank
Public	
Trouble with police	2.5
Trouble with college authorities	0.6
Physical fighting	4.4
Verbal argument	28.5
Drove a car while under the influence	29.1
Damaged property	1.9
Personal	
Medical treatment for alcohol overdose	0.6
Did something later regretted	44.2
Had unprotected sex	15.2
Had a memory loss	32.2
Passed out	20.5
Been hurt or injured	6.4
Had a hangover	60.3
Missed a class	28.0
Got behind in schoolwork	25.5
Performed poorly on a test/project	5.7

[3] The University's OJA also keeps detailed records of students who have been charged with infractions that require hearings. In the 1999-2000 school year, CSU saw a 70 percent increase in total number of hearings compared to the previous year; almost a third of those involved direct alcohol or drug charges (Colorado State University, Office of Judicial Affairs). These charges represent only repeat offenders or an underage charge in conjunction with a more



serious offense. The vast majority of underage drinking reports are handled by residence hall staff and do not appear in these statistics. They also do not include violations of stadium rules, typically involving students who have consumed alcohol for long periods of time before attending games. Almost 15 percent of the students at CSU that year were charged with under-aged drinking, and 18 were actually hospitalized due to an alcohol overdose (Colorado State University, Office of Judicial Affairs).

Students engaging in high-risk drinking, and the all too often resulting delinquent incidents, arrests, or referrals, not only affect the campus environment but also the larger community in which the campus exists. At minimum, the associated behaviors of students engaging in high-risk drinking and drug use include missed classes and poor grades; at worst, associated behaviors include expulsion from school or arrests by either campus or community police. Unfortunately, though expulsion of a particular student may make that campus a safer and more civil place, often the expelled student's alcohol-related problem and behavior simply will become the problem of either another university or college or the community at large.

Campuses across the nation typically have some type of programs, task forces, and other resources in place that individually deal with high-risk drinking. Almost every campus with an alcohol or drug (AOD) program implements general education as an intervention. Other common practices include: comprehensive approaches; environmental approaches/social norms campaigns; targeted approaches (specific groups [e.g., fraternities]); academic curriculum programs (e.g., courses dealing with alcohol and drug-related issues); peer-based initiatives; training for students, staff, and other campus leaders on dealing with intoxicated students; support services that include identification of students with alcohol problems, screening, interventions, support and

counseling services; university-wide drug and alcohol task forces; campus policies and university mission; enforcement; and evaluation of current efforts.

Many campuses across the nation are employing one or more of the above types of programs; still other campuses are combining their programs and using cross-college initiatives to address the problem: a systems approach (Weschler *et al.*, 1999). CSU is one of the many universities across the nation that is using a systems or comprehensive approach to address AOD use on the campus and in the nearby community.

### **SIGNIFICANCE OF ADAPTING A DRUG COURT TO A CAMPUS**

[4] CSU and many other campuses employ systems approaches to address their AOD issues. One approach never implemented on a campus in the United States is the widely accepted drug court model. Drug courts take on the responsibility of handling cases involving drug-using offenders through comprehensive supervision, drug testing, treatment services, and immediate sanctions and incentives. Drug court programs bring together all intervenors (judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, substance abuse treatment specialists, probation officers, law enforcement and correctional personnel, educational and vocational experts, community leaders, and others) in coordination, forcing the offender to deal with his or her substance abuse problem (The Facts: Facts on Drug Court, 2002 November).

Systems approaches offer a campus the opportunity to deal comprehensively and systematically with high-risk drinking. A systems approach is based on the assumption that to change a behavior, both the individual and his or her environment must be addressed (Sallis, *et al.*, 1996). Research suggests that using a systems approach involving

the entire campus would have much promise (Upcraft and Welty, 1990). For the group of students involved in repeated serious incidences resulting from their AOD use, nothing but a systematic approach inclusive of both the campus and the surrounding community will be effective. Unfortunately, the “hard-core,” high-risk drinkers and drug users seem to be addressed heretofore only by either law enforcement or expulsion. Very often the result has been similar to what the U.S. Judicial system experienced in the mid 1980’s when the drug court model was first implemented: repeated incidences of referrals and arrests.

With the substantial success rate of drug courts, regardless of the context or the population it is surprising that, to the author’s knowledge, no university or college has adapted the U.S. Department of Justice-supported systems approach, the drug court model, to address either substance abuse or high-risk drinking. As did many judges and courts across the country in the past two decades, the author decided to test the generalizability and success of drug courts by adapting, implementing, and evaluating a drug court model on the campus of CSU.

One of the most powerful functions of a drug court is the ability of the judge to use the power of the court to mandate treatment and to provide a format for graduated sanctions and incentives to reduce AOD use. Even though many AOD treatment providers are suspicious of mandatory treatment, several research studies have shown that, compared to voluntary treatment, court-ordered treatment outcomes are as good or better (Anglin and Hser, 1990; Collins and Allison, 1983; DeLeon, 1988; Hubbard, et al., 1989; Leukefeld and Timms, 1988). When a student is facing suspension or dismissal from college he or she is typically facing a judicial branch of the university. Like a drug court, the combination of the power of the OJA in mandating

treatment along with graduated sanctions and incentives is expected to be powerful in the campus setting.

**Table 2**

<b>Goals and Objectives of the Colorado State University Campus Drug Court Project</b>
<u>Goal 1.</u> Reduce the number of serious incidents resulting from alcohol and/or other drug (AOD) use at CSU, as measured by the CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey.
<u>Goal 2.</u> Through the rehabilitation process, reduce the number of expulsions of students who reach the level of dismissal due to their problematic behavior resulting from AOD use.
<u>Goal 3.</u> By combining consequences for delinquent behavior and treatment in a therapeutic approach, involve and coordinate the various offices and programs at CSU involved in AOD prevention.
<u>Goal 4.</u> Adapt, implement, evaluate, and report on the feasibility of, and steps to, developing a campus drug court model for university and college campuses across the nation.

## **PROJECT DESIGN**

### **Beginnings**

Colorado State University is located in northern Colorado on the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains in the City of Fort Collins. Fort Collins is a rapidly growing community of approximately 120,000 people, located in Larimer County. Colorado State University has a population of approximately 24,000 students, making up roughly one-quarter of the population of the City of Fort Collins. In 1998, a district judge started the State of Colorado's first juvenile drug court: the Eighth Judicial District of Colorado Juvenile Drug Court. The Eighth Judicial District's Justice Center is located in Larimer County. That district judge suggested to

the coordinator of the Family and Youth Institute (FYI) at CSU that the coordinator and the campus chief of police start the nation's first campus drug court. The coordinator of FYI then met with the newly formed CSU Drug Task Force Team and proposed the idea. The CSU Drug Task Force Team is comprised of the Chief of Police, staff from the Center for Drug and Alcohol Education (CDAE), the Director of the University Counseling Center (UCC), the Director of Housing, and the Director and Assistant Director of the Office of Judicial Affairs (OJA) at CSU. The team was given a presentation of the components and philosophy of a drug court on the campus by the district court drug court judge, the coordinator of FYI, and the juvenile drug court coordinator. Next, the CSU Drug Task Force Team attended, as observers, a staffing and a session of juvenile drug court at the Eighth Judicial District Justice Center. The team decided they would be interested and willing to pilot the idea. The coordinator of FYI began to look for funding to support the project.

### **Pilot**

[5] The CDAE, in collaboration with the UCC and the OJA, piloted the campus drug court with seven students at the *dismissal* level in the fall semester of 2000. Students were referred to the program through the OJA and received an initial AOD assessment at the CDAE. The OJA, working with the student, set up individualized treatment plans which often included individual and group therapeutic sessions, random urinalysis (UA) or breath analysis (BA), and referral to receive additional testing and/or psychiatric evaluations either at the UCC or off-campus. Medical, learning disabilities, and academic support was provided in a case management-like approach. Two years later, of the original seven students, all have graduated from the campus drug court program, are still in school, and remain law-abiding. In comparison, in the previous five years, *all* similar students were dismissed from school. The first campus drug court

proved to be a great success. For the first time, campuses had an option at or prior to the point of dismissal for the AOD abusing student.

In the meantime, the coordinator of FYI was writing and sending proposals requesting support for funding to pilot the campus drug court idea on a larger scale at CSU. The coordinator of FYI designed the campus drug court to simulate a judicial drug court: assigning analogous campus staff to the roles of a typical drug court team. The coordinator also designed the process of the campus drug court, student and data monitoring, and the evaluation process to simulate a drug court that might be found in any courthouse across the country. In the fall of 2001, funding was received through the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools' competition to Prevent High-Risk Drinking on College Campuses.

In January 2002, the coordinator and FYI held several day-long trainings with the campus drug court team to set up policies and procedures and to begin the project full scale. Because a campus is not a judicial court, many terminology changes and adjustments were made. The campus drug court was named DAY IV, or Drugs, Alcohol and You IV. CSU already had in place DAY I, II, and III to address AOD use on the campus. DAY I is an educational program, DAY II is AOD assessment and limited individual counseling, and DAY III is group counseling. The remainder of this article will describe the implementation of DAY IV. "DAY IV" will be used analogously with campus drug court.

### **Goals and Objectives**

The overarching goal of the campus drug court is to decrease AOD involvement in a group of students not normally reached by the traditional interventions, through a collaborative systems model designed to encourage the

student to make the necessary lifestyle changes which will contribute to their success not only as a student, but also in their lives after they graduate. Four other goals were included in the project, and will be monitored continuously as indicators of the success of the project.

Goal 1: Reduce the number of serious incidents resulting from AOD use at CSU as measured by the CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey. Information from the CORE survey will measure student reports of negative consequences that the students caused or they knew happened as a result of drinking alcohol. In addition, a report normally kept by the OJA will sum the students arrested for AOD related crimes.

Goal 2: Through the rehabilitation process of DAY IV, reduce the number of expulsions of students who reach the level of dismissal due to their problematic behavior resulting from AOD use. The total number of students dismissed due to their AOD use for the two years preceding the implementation of DAY IV will be compared to the total number dismissed following DAY IV implementation. In addition, students in the DAY IV program will be tracked for graduation success in order to document which variables of the campus drug court are most effective such as the individual, social, cultural, and situational variables.

Goal 3: Involve and coordinate the various offices and programs on campus involved in the alcohol and drug programs into the creation of a campus drug court by combining consequences for delinquent behavior and treatment in a therapeutic approach. The identification of these offices and programs, extent of their involvement, and specific responsibilities of the OJA, CDAE, UCC, Ombudsmen, the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU), and the Family and Youth Institute (FYI) will be documented for evaluation and replication.

Goal 4: Adapt, implement, evaluate, and report on the feasibility of, and steps to develop, a campus drug court model for other campuses across the nation. A detailed record of each step in the adaptation, implementation, and evaluation of the first campus drug court will be kept. The steps replicate and adapt the steps taken by hundreds of drug courts across the country.

### **Target Population**

At CSU, when an incident occurs that involves a student who either violates the law or CSU's written students' "rights and responsibilities," either on or off-campus, a range of interventions occur. At the lowest level, a resident hall staff or police officer talks to the student and a first level educational referral to the CDAE is made (DAY I). When this doesn't work, or if the incident was serious, the University OJA is brought into the picture. If the incident is determined to be AOD related, the CDAE becomes more involved providing an individual assessment (DAY II). Once the OJA becomes involved, the student must go through a series of steps. At the initial step of OJA involvement, if the incident is not serious, the student will be *warned*. If the student continues with the behavior, a *general discipline* (a lower level of probation and a letter to the student's parent(s)) would follow. If neither of these minor interventions has an effect, or if the incident was quite serious, the student is placed on *disciplinary probation*. The student is told that if there is one more complaint—"you're gone." The next step calls upon CSU's OJA is to *suspend* the student. Typically, this is in time increments. In other words, the student is sent away for a specified time and then allowed to return. This level is typically not used for AOD-related incidents because time alone will not rectify the student's issues. *Dismissal* is most commonly used, because it requires specific tasks, such as the completion of treatment, in order for a student to be eligible for readmission. *Expulsion* is reserved for the most



serious offenses involving crimes of violence or sex offenses with less evident opportunities for successful treatment. Separation from the university occurs for approximately 15 to 40 students in a given year. In light of the OJA's disciplinary levels, the first criterion for inclusion in the campus drug court project was established: students would be admitted when facing disciplinary probation or above. On average, 121 students per year met this criterion in the last five years at CSU (with a range of 68 to 188).

When a student is involved in any AOD-related incident, through the DAY II assessment, the CDAE screens the student to place him or her at one of three levels. The first level is typically a developmentally normal student who is likely experimenting without any chronic problems. The second level involves students who may be beyond experimental; yet, with minor counseling and awareness programs, AOD use is diminished. The third level involves a student who is probably chemically dependent, all possible services at the CDAE have been exhausted and no progress is occurring. These are the students that are considered eligible for DAY IV. The second criterion for inclusion in the campus drug court project was established: the student has been through some combination of AOD education and assessment without success. Both criteria must be met for inclusion in the program.

### **Campus Drug Court Process and Design**

[6] The following narrative adapts the drug court language to be relevant and conducive to a university setting. When necessary, the corresponding language of drug court follows in parentheses for clarification. The process of the project is illustrated by the steps and stages a student goes through as a participant in CSU's DAY IV.

**The Campus Drug Court Team (CDCT)**

The CDCT's responsibilities are described in detail in the "Project Personnel" section.

**Screening and Eligibility**

The team meets on a weekly basis to staff the students. At the staffing, the potential participants are discussed along with the students already in DAY IV (the drug court). Once a student is identified as fitting both criteria, the student is considered eligible for review by the CDCT. Students found guilty of the following infractions are not eligible for inclusion in DAY IV: violent or sexual offenses, child abuse, or any Class 3 felonies. Eligibility for DAY IV includes the following underlying types of infractions: alcohol overdose; possession of alcohol (if underage); possession of illegal drugs; possession of drug paraphernalia; cases in which the student is under the influence of AOD at the time of the offense; cases in which the student is known to have a significant involvement with AOD; and, cases in which AOD is known to be a causative factor in the offense.

At this time, a screening (if not already completed) will define and record the types of problems or characteristics that may occur in and around the student. The screening consists of a Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) at the UCC; an individual session with a clinician at the CDAE; a baseline urinalysis drug screen; a meeting with the case manager to get a thorough family, physical, psychological, and social history; and a criminal records search (Chief of Police).

**Acceptance to DAY IV**

At the first review of a potential DAY IV student, the CDCT will make one of three decisions: accept, reject, or pending more information. Often, the team does not have enough information to accept or reject the student. After discussion, the team will decide what additional information they may need. This information may include AOD screening (see above), information from the student's previous school, information from parents, or a criminal records screen. If the team decides to accept the student, the student is now offered participation in DAY IV. The CDCT then goes over, as a group, the terms and conditions of each student's participation in DAY IV. Conditions may include: number of random breathalyzers, times per week to meet with case manager, type and frequency of treatment, possibly moving from current living area, attendance in class, increasing GPA, etc. Participation is completely voluntary. The student must understand and agree to the conditions and terms of the DAY IV, as explained both verbally and in writing by the hearing officer. A signed copy is given to the student. If the student decides to accept, two release forms are collected from the student at that time, in addition to the terms and conditions form. One of the release forms is an informed consent form. This form is in compliance with Federal Regulations CFR 42, or informed and voluntary consent to do research with the information collected in regard to the student, in other words: evaluation. The second release form is a release of information that specifies the various people their information can be shared with. Both forms are explained verbally and in writing with one copy given to the student upon obtaining their signature. If the student is under 18, a parent must also sign the consent forms.

Once accepted, the student is advised of his or her rights according to the regulations of the University's disciplinary guidelines, and again admits the elements of the

offense. According to Prochaska, et al., (1982), this is important for an individual to openly acknowledge his or her problem. If the student successfully completes DAY IV, the probationary status is terminated and the student is allowed to continue at the University without sanction. If unsuccessful, the student will be processed according to University discipline systems depending on what level of discipline he or she was at before participation in DAY IV. The students who either self-select out of the program or are dropped from the program are followed for a period of one year to compare recidivism rates to program graduates.

### **Treatment Plan**

Based upon the assessment and advisement of the screening by CDAE (treatment provider), the CDCT develops an individual strengths-based treatment and case management intervention plan for the student. A student or staff member from either the UCC or the CDAE is assigned to the student along with a case manager. DAY IV uses the term “clinician” in lieu of treatment provider. DAY IV has two clinician roles: Primary Clinician and Secondary Clinician. The primary clinician meets on a routine basis with the student providing individual counseling at the CDAE. The secondary clinician performs the psychological assessments when required at the UCC and serves on the DAY IV team as advisor regarding clinical decisions. Often students in the psychology counseling masters or doctoral program, or the social work department at CSU, will do their internships at the UCC. With the supervision of faculty, these graduate students provide treatment and case management for the students.

The treatment plans are individualized; therefore the number and type of treatment sessions vary. Interventions may include: an eight-week assessment, education, and treatment program; individual therapy; family therapy; stress

management; anger management; peer or group therapy; intensive outpatient treatment; or, inpatient treatment or detoxification (the last two would be referred off campus). The clinicians keep track of specified information to monitor and evaluate the student's treatment plan both to assist the decision-making process at the CDCT's staffing and for evaluation purposes.

### **Case Management**

The Director of the CDAE is responsible for the overall case management of the student. Individual case managers (typically supervised students) are responsible for providing timely and consistent information to the Director of the CDAE about the student for both team decision-making at staffing and evaluation. The case manager monitors the intervention plans, coordinates information and resources between the drug court team and other University departments or programs, regularly meets with the student, requests and monitors drug screens, and reports information to the CDCT to ensure the student is complying with all DAY IV requirements.

### **Judicial Supervision**

Upon acceptance into DAY IV, the student meets with the hearing officer (Director of Judicial Affairs, or "Judge"). At this time in DAY IV's testing of a model campus drug court, the student never appears in "court." The student meets in private with the hearing officer, case manager, treatment provider, etc. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), commonly known as the Buckley Amendment, severely restricts access to a student's records of any kind without consent. An appearance in a court, discussing the student's information in the presence of other students would violate FERPA. It would be possible to have a "hearing" with other students in DAY IV present with

specific signed consent. DAY IV is not doing this currently, but it is being considered for the near future.

At the meeting with the hearing officer, the student will again be made aware of the criteria for success in the program, the incentives of program compliance, and the conditions and procedure for expulsion from the program. The student meets in private with the hearing officer every two weeks. The DAY IV individual team members, such as the case managers or clinicians (treatment providers) report information specific to each student on a weekly basis to the hearing officer at the staffings. This information typically includes, but is not to be limited to: attendance at clinician appointments, compliance with sanctions, breathalyzer or urinalysis results, school performance, and other current issues impacting the student's life.

### **Alcohol and/or Drug Testing**

Depending on the individual plan developed by the DAY IV team, students may be required to submit to random breath or urine AOD analyses several times a week for the first several weeks of participation in the program. If the student is found to be sober or drug-free consistently, collection will be reduced gradually. Students are placed on a collection schedule involving randomly selected days on which the student must appear at a local drug analysis agency for assessment. Students are responsible for the expenses associated with the tests.

### **Interventions (Sanctions and Incentives)**

Current research states that the most successful intervention programs use graduated sanctions as part of the intervention process (Lipsey and Wilson, 1998). The campus drug court imposes graduated interventions for both non-compliance and compliance with program guidelines. The

interventions employed are meaningful to the individual with the intent to have the best chance of impacting his or her behavior. Sanctions include: AOD education, ethics workshop, additional counseling, letters of apology, restitution, restorative justice, community service, relocation in residence halls, no-trespass orders, anger management classes, the writing of papers, and conflict workshops. These interventions are imposed by the hearing officer in a graduated fashion and recorded by the case manager, upon DAY IV team recommendations.

One new program, “Weekend Nights at CSU,” was deemed important enough by the DAY IV team to be partially supported by the campus drug court. The campus drug court pays the stipend and tuition of a graduate student charged with running the program. “Weekend Nights at CSU” is a cross-campus effort involving, faculty, students, administration, and staff members for late-night programming designed to provide innovative and safe alternative weekend activities on the CSU campus. Using the “Weekend Nights at CSU” program, both incentives and sanctions are implemented in a graduated fashion. A student may have to work at an event (sanction) or take charge of running a program (incentive). This program’s existence as a “place” to send students where they are not with the typical partying crowd allows the students to learn that there are other ways to spend their nights and other things to do that do not involve drinking or drug use. Students in DAY IV have provided feedback regarding the importance of these programs and that feedback has been very positive and very powerful. One student said, “I had no idea that there were so many things I could do if I wasn’t drunk all the time! I have been wasting my life.” “Weekend Nights at CSU” provides an alternative environment for students trying to terminate AOD use.

The intervention application of drug courts is extremely important to the success of the participant because

it is fundamentally based on a seminal theory of behavioral psychology: instrumental conditioning. According to the psychological principles of instrumental conditioning, a behavior can be expected to occur when it is reinforced, and not occur when it is not. This is one of the strengths of drug court and the relevance behind the interventions, or sanctions and incentives. An additional principle of instrumental conditioning that drug court applies very well is the immediacy of actions to a behavior. That is, if a student goes out and gets drunk and causes some type of incident, the DAY IV program will immediately apply a reinforcer (sanction) within one week at the latest. Another principle of instrumental conditioning used by drug courts is the use of graduated reinforcers. A behavior consistently rewarded with a reinforcer can be gradually “trained” to still occur as the reinforcers are less consistently offered. For example, a student who is sanctioned to attend and work at “Weekend Nights at CSU” one night a week could eventually be required to simply attend the program and not work at it. The student would be gradually reinforced less and less with the positive behavior still expected to occur. Incentives include donated tickets to athletic events, food or clothing coupons, etc. A list of incentives is generated by the team on an individual basis.

### **Graduation Requirements**

Graduates of the DAY IV program receive certificates signed by the whole team. The Director of Judicial Affairs will announce students’ graduation in front of the entire team and any others present. The adult drug court judge often comes to campus and “robes up” to congratulate the students. Students who meet the following criteria are eligible to graduate from the program: achieve intervention plan goals; participate in the program no less than four months; remain law-abiding; remain alcohol or drug-free continuously while in the program; complete AOD education



program; participate in an exit interview; and perform according to their abilities in school (measured by grades and letters sent to instructors).

### **Expulsion Criteria**

Students who fail to comply with the program goals are terminated from the program. This criterion includes failure to comply with treatment requirements; refusal to attend case management, clinician, or drug testing appointments; unsuccessful discharge by any treatment provider; and/or failure to remain law-abiding. If the student is out of compliance with the DAY IV requirements, the CDCT will meet to determine whether the student will be allowed to remain in the program. If allowed to remain in the program, the CDCT will impose immediate consequences. If removed from the program, the student's case will be transferred to the regular adjudication process in the OJA.

### **PROJECT PERSONNEL AND CAMPUS DEPARTMENTS**

[7] One of drug court's ten key components states: "A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance." The campus of Colorado State University, as well as most campuses across the country, is ideally positioned to meet this criterion. The components of a drug court already exist at Colorado State University and at many of the colleges and universities across the nation.

The following description identifies key team members and involved departments of the CSU campus drug court, DAY IV. Team members are identified by campus drug court roles, with the typical analogous drug court team role found in the parentheses.

**Personnel**

***Project Director and Evaluator (Coordinator and Evaluator).*** The project director is responsible for the day-to-day supervision and coordination of all aspects and activities of DAY IV in close collaboration with the Assistant Director of OJA. The project director's responsibilities include: organizing, coordinating and monitoring campus drug court; evaluating DAY IV and supervising the evaluation; arranging training and conferences; staff development; public relations; monitoring budgets; approving expenditures; preparing yearly and final reports; maintaining administrative and technical responsibility for establishing and meeting goals and objectives of the drug court and the project; organizing and coordinating training for the clinicians and case managers; maintaining cooperative relationships with treatment, community, probation, and other campus and non-campus agencies that may be involved in a student's case; attending conferences, meetings and other training; and working toward sustainability.

***Program Director and Hearing Officers (Judge).*** In the first months of the project, it was clear that the director of judicial affairs would need assistance in order to take on the extra duties of the drug court. To meet this need, the assistant director of judicial affairs was hired by the OJA and the campus drug court to take over as the main hearing officer of DAY IV. The assistant director of judicial affairs has taken on the role of developing the campus drug court terminology and data collection forms to fit the specific campus of CSU, and has the official responsibility of chairing each DAY IV staffing. In hearings the assistant director advises the student and the student's family (if applicable) of their rights and responsibilities. The hearing officer's responsibilities include: day-to-day supervision and coordination of all aspects and activities of DAY IV in close collaboration with the project director; chairing each DAY IV staffing; working

closely on policy issues with the project director and other DAY IV team members; meeting with students; retention decisions involving the student; review of compliance issues; imposition of interventions; implementation of policies and procedures; and listening to recommendations of the DAY IV team members.

***Case Manager and Primary Clinician.*** As the director of case management for DAY IV, the CDAE director's responsibilities include: monitoring intervention plans; monitoring student progress and compliance; coordinating information between the DAY IV staffings, students, and other resources on campus; input at staffing as to creative and appropriate sanctions and incentives, including weekend programming options for the students; and supervision of the primary clinician, who is also the assistant director of CDAE.

***Clinicians (Treatment Providers).*** The primary clinician is responsible for initial AOD screens; one-on-one individual counseling; development of a treatment plan for each student; alcohol and drug evaluations; and family, mental, and medical histories. The primary clinician works very closely with both the secondary clinician and the case manager to insure or provide strengths-based treatment and rehabilitation to the DAY IV students.

The director of the UCC serves as the secondary clinician of DAY IV. The director of the UCC oversees the operation of a comprehensive mental health center that provides direct services to approximately 4,000 students each year. The responsibilities of the secondary clinician include: psychological testing of potential or ongoing DAY IV students; supervision of psychology students at the UCC in any treatment intervention; and DAY IV team "treatment" consultation. The secondary clinician works very closely with the primary clinician in the development of the students'

treatment plan and progress. Both clinicians are members of the DAY IV team and attend all staffings or report directly to the case manager with information prior to each staffing.

***Law Enforcement (District Attorney).*** The Chief of Campus Police serves as the law enforcement entity for the DAY IV project. The chief of police's responsibilities include: attending all staffings or sending a police liaison; providing criminal background checks on all potential DAY IV participants; and providing campus safety advice in regards to particular students to the team. The chief of police also provides a crucial link to law enforcement representatives in the community and the State of Colorado.

***Student Representation (Public Defender).*** Either or both the University Ombudsman's Office and the Associated Students of CSU may serve to represent some of the DAY IV students who may request representation. At the staffings, they will advocate for the legal rights of the students, monitor interventions imposed by the CDCT, and act as consultants to the student.

***Project Advisors.*** The Larimer County drug court judge, district attorney, and assistant deputy district attorney have served as key advisors of the first campus drug court: DAY IV at CSU.

### **Campus Departments**

[8] The ***Family and Youth Institute (FYI)*** is a collaborative undertaking between CSU, CSU Cooperative Extension, and the College of Applied Human Sciences. One purpose of the FYI is to provide links between departments, colleges, and faculty on campus in issues facing families and youth. As such, the FYI is the administrative center of DAY IV providing leadership, coordination, research, and evaluation.

Student hearings are held in the ***Office of Judicial Affairs (OJA)***. CSU expects students to maintain standards of personal conduct in harmony with the University's educational goals; to observe national, state, and local laws; and to respect the rights, privileges, and property of others. The OJA is charged with education, consultation, and support to the campus community regarding due process protections. They also respond to alleged violations of behavioral standards of conduct established for CSU students.

The ***Center for Drug and Alcohol Education (CDAE)*** provides campus-wide education for prevention of AOD misuse with strong emphasis on promoting alternative activities. Some of their responsibilities include: assessments and evaluations for chemical dependency; referrals for treatment and support groups; programs for residence halls and Greek houses; class presentations; weekly AOD education classes; screenings and assessments; and resource materials.

The ***University Counseling Center (UCC)***, as a comprehensive mental health agency, assists students in acquiring the skills, attitudes, and resources necessary to succeed in college and pursue satisfying and productive lives. The UCC staff is comprised of psychologists, social workers, consulting psychiatrists, counselors, psychology and social work interns, graduate students, and paraprofessionals. Some of the services the UCC provides include: individual and group counseling; 24-hour emergency services; daytime walk-in services; stress management programs; study skills training; learning disabilities evaluation; and psychological testing.

The ***CSU Police Department*** is a full-service law enforcement and human resource agency. All members of the department share as equal partners in their efforts to serve the university community and work cooperatively with

others. Their mission—to respond to the public safety and law enforcement needs of the CSU community—grows out of the department’s concern for people and the CSU environment.

The *Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU)* envisions a campus united. They work to ensure that residence halls, Greek life, campus programming, advocacy offices, and individual students are all equally and effectively represented by the union and voice of ASCSU.

The *University Ombudsman* at CSU ensures that students, staff, and faculty receive fair and equitable treatment within the University system.

## **PROJECT EVALUATION**

[9] The evaluation was developed by the project director (and evaluator) at the FYI. Because drug courts are information-driven, a thorough and efficient management information system must be in place from the very beginning. DAY IV has developed an ACCESS data base used by the entire team to both drive decisions at staffings and to record information for evaluation purposes. The case managers, judicial affairs officers, law enforcement, and clinicians have specific data entry forms available that automatically inserts information into the main database. Within 24 hours prior to each staffing, an FYI graduate student accesses the main database and prepares a report for the staffings. This timely report is used for decision making in individual cases, overall management of the caseload, and evaluation record-keeping.

### **Logic Model**

This evaluation applies the logic model as the framework to develop and achieve a *process, outcome*, and

*impact* evaluation (see Table 3).

**Table 3**  
**DAY IV Logic Model/Linking Program Design and Evaluation**

Inputs	Outputs		Outcome-Impact		
	Activities	Participation	Immediate	Short Term	Long Term
What is needed to achieve DAY IV's goals?	What has to be done to ensure DAY IV's goals are met?	Who needs to: - participate? - be involved? - be reached?	What immediate changes are expected?	What short term changes are desired?	What impact is hoped for?
Staff Volunteers Time Money Materials Equipment Technology Partners	Meetings Publications Programs Media Outreach	Number Characteristics Reactions	<u>Learning</u> Awareness Knowledge Attitudes Skills Aspirations	<u>Action</u> Behavior Practice Decisions Policies Social Action	<u>Impact</u> Social Economic Civic Environmental

**Process Evaluation**

For the process evaluation, the focus is on Goals 3 and 4. Goal 3 involves coordinating the various offices and programs on campus that already address AOD use and its consequences to form a campus drug court. The identification of, extent of involvement, and specific responsibilities of the OJA, ASCSU, CDAE, UCC, and the FYI will be documented for evaluation and replication. Evaluating the success of Goal 4 will record, in detail, the process the team used to adapt and implement the drug court model in a campus setting. A detailed record of each step in the adaptation, implementation, and evaluation of the first campus drug court will be kept.

Applying the Logic Model, the typical information recorded for the process evaluation includes, but is not limited to: number and demographics of staff members and volunteers; amount of time spent on programs, resource development, trainings, etc.; sources of money to support the program, staff, equipment, buildings; materials needed to sustain programs and sources for this material; equipment needed to sustain programs and sources for the equipment; use of technology and technology needs; partners and collaborators on campus and in the community; workshops and trainings attended by program staff and costs of workshops; meetings among staff and community; media work; and how participants are admitted into the program.

Additional information to be recorded for the process evaluation includes the following: demographic characteristics of the participants; frequency and type of drug testing and treatment provided; number found eligible for the program, admitted, accepted, rejected, declined, graduated and failed, along with the characteristics around each; current charges; educational status; criminal/problem history; AOD history; mental health history; medical history; family



history; severity of drug abuse problem; sanctions and incentives imposed on each participant and the conditions around which those occurred; record of attendance; and a record of social, academic, personal, and treatment progress throughout the program.

### **Outcome and Impact Evaluation**

For the outcome and impact evaluation, the focus is on Goals 1 and 2. Goal 1, reducing the number of serious incidents resulting from high-risk drinking or other substance use, was measured by the use of CORE survey results in the fall of 2002 and the yearly OJA report. The CORE survey will provide student reports of negative consequences that either they caused or negative consequences they knew happened as a result of drinking alcohol, while the OJA report will count the number of students arrested for AOD related crimes and the number of expulsions of students who reach the level of dismissal due to their problematic behavior resulting from AOD use (Goal 2). Additionally, for Goal 2 a count of students over the past two years pre-existence of the campus drug court getting expelled due to AOD use will be compared to post-existence of the campus drug court.

Since the overarching goal of this project is to reduce high-risk drinking and other substance abuse through a systems-based approach using rehabilitation of the student through treatment and mandated sanctioning, it is important to measure *which* parts of the drug court model had the most impact on the individual. Typical information to be recorded for the outcome and impact evaluation includes, but is not limited to: number of persons accepted, graduated, active in program, length of time in program, and terminated from or dropped out of the program; impact of DAY IV on short-term outcomes such as: awareness, knowledge, attitudes, skills, opinions, aspirations, and motivations, evidenced by increases in these noted by the use of pre-tests/post-tests;

impact of DAY IV on intermediate outcomes such as: behavior, practice, decision-making, policy changes, and possible social action taken as evidenced by real measurements in any changes in the same from the participants, community, and state; impact of DAY IV on long-term impacts such as any changes in the social and economic status of the participant, the community and the state; and the impact of DAY IV on long term impacts such as the participant's life circumstances as evidenced by the ability of the participant to function in the community (remain in college), and successfully advance in goals set by the staff member(s) and the participant.

Additional information to be recorded for the outcome evaluation will include the following: impact of DAY IV on criminal behavior, as evidenced by involvement of participants in new negative behaviors due to AOD while in the program and after graduation from the program; and the impact of the program on high-risk drinking and substance abusing behavior as evidenced by drug tests and successful graduation and maintenance.

#### **FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

[10] To date, the CSU campus drug court has had 32 participants. Nine have graduated, one has withdrawn, and four were expelled from the program for DAY IV non-compliance. There have been three females and 29 males; one graduate student, three juniors, seven sophomores, and 21 freshmen. The academic standing of all but four of the DAY IV students was dismissal. In other words, 28 students would have been dismissed from CSU if not for the mechanism of a campus drug court. Almost 40 percent of the freshmen were out-of-state tuition paying students. The cost-benefit of retaining a first-year, out-of-state tuition paying student is approximately \$10,000 per year, per student. In one year,

CSU has gone from a 100 percent dismissal rate for this population to a nine percent dismissal rate.

On September 17, 2002, Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado introduced Congressional bill S. 2941 to establish resources for pilot campus drug courts modeled after state drug court programs and CSU's program in the amount of \$15 million. This funding would allow CSU's National Center for Campus Drug Courts, to collaborate with the National Association of Drug Court Professionals/ National Drug Court Institute (NADCP/NDCI) and the National Judicial College (NJC). This funding would also provide resources to support four to five pilot campus drug court programs for four years.

Through this bill, the U.S. Department of Justice would launch a pilot project to continue the successful operation and evaluation of the CSU drug court and to provide training and technical assistance to the other four to five pilot campus drug court programs. The Center for Campus Drug Courts would provide, with NADCP/NDCI and NJC, training and technical assistance modeled on the established and effective NADCP/NDCI training workshops that train federal government grantees to effectively plan, implement, and operate a drug court. The CSU trainings would be tailored to meet the special needs of a program on a particular campus. The participants would include teams of people comprised of, but not limited to, the university office of judicial affairs, local law enforcement and campus police, local treatment providers, the office of student affairs, an evaluator, the university counsel, the local district attorney and public defender, and a student representative. Once cross-trained on issues ranging from the basics of treatment to team building to incentives and sanctions, the participants would return to their campuses with an action plan and the Center would conduct follow-up technical assistance. The Center for Campus Drug Courts at CSU would provide

evaluation for the pilots and a clearing house for campus drug court technical assistance and resources.

## REFERENCES

- Anglin, M.D. & Hser, Y. (1990). The treatment of drug abuse. In M. Terry & J.Q. Wilson (Eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. 393-460.
- Chronicle of Higher Education*. (2001, February 2). Arrest rates on campus. Vol. XLVII(no. 21).
- Clery Act 20 U.S.C § 1092 (f) et seq. (1990, 1998, 2000) (34 CFR § 668).
- Collins, J.J. & Allison, M. (1983). Legal coercion and retention in drug abuse treatment. *Hospital community psychiatry*, 34, 1145-1149.
- DeLeon, G. (1988). Legal pressure in therapeutic communities. *Journal of drug issues*, 18, 625-640.
- Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act (34 CFR Part 86) (1989).
- Hubbard, R.L., Marsden, M.E., Rachal, J.V., Harwood, H.J. Cavanaugh, E.R., & Ginsburg, H.M. (1989). *Drug abuse treatment: A national study of effectiveness*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Luekefeld, C.G., & Timms, F.M. (Eds.). (1988). *Compulsory treatment of drug abuse: Research and clinical practice*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health.
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (2002, November). *The facts: Facts on drug courts*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

- Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1982). Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a more integrative model of change. *Psychotherapy, 20*, 161-173.
- Sallis, J.J., & Owen, N. (1996). Ecological models. In K. Glanz, F.M. Lewis, & B.K. Rimer (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 403-424.
- Taylor-Powell, E. (2000, June). *The logic model/linking program design and evaluation*. Paper presented at the 1999 UWEX Evaluation Conference, Vail, CO.
- Upcraft, M., & Welty, J. (1990). *A guide for college presidents and governing boards: Strategies for eliminating alcohol and other drug abuse on campuses*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Weschler, H., Kelley, K., Weitzman, E.R., San Giovanni, J.P., & Seibring, M. (1999). *What colleges are doing about student binge drinking: A survey of college administrators* [on-line]. Available: <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/cas/alcohol/surveyrpt2.html>