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Roadmap of This Report

I. A profile of University of Michigan Students’ Drinking Behavior
   » What are the drinking behaviors of students before they arrive on campus?
   » How often, where, when and why do your first-year students drink?
   » How do your students compare to students nationally?
   » What is the impact of high-risk drinking on your students?

II. Mitigating Risk and Impacting Culture
   » What did your students gain from taking AlcoholEdu?
   » How can your campus engage students to change the drinking culture?

III. Implications for Your Institution's Prevention Strategy
   » How can these data inform your prevention efforts moving forward?
Highlights from Your Data

This Executive Summary contains data from your institution's 2012 implementation of AlcoholEdu for College. Findings are based on self-report data obtained from 4956 first-year Michigan students who completed all three AlcoholEdu for College Surveys.

Note: An additional 652 students completed Part 1 of the course, but did not complete all three surveys so were not included in the final data set.

» When measured prior to their arrival on campus, your students' drinking rates are slightly above the national average.

» When measured midway through the fall semester, 32% of Michigan students reported drinking in a high risk way.

» Michigan students are most commonly drinking at a Fraternity/sorority house or an Off-campus residence.

» The most common drinking-related risk behaviors that your students engage in are doing shots and pregaming.

» Drinking rates are similar for men and women. Women are drinking in a high-risk way slightly less frequently than men.
Understanding "The College Effect"

Student drinking rates nationally follow a typical pattern: alcohol use generally rises the summer before a student enters college, and then increases substantially after arriving on campus. This phenomenon, known as the "College Effect," is represented by the conceptual graphic below.

*Drinking rate is the proportion of students who have had more than a taste or sip of alcohol in the two weeks prior to the survey.*
A Profile of Your Incoming Students

In looking at the drinking rates of students prior to their arrival on campus (Survey 1), your institution is slightly above the national average for high-risk drinkers. Understanding these pre-college drinking behaviors can help your campus establish appropriate messaging that sets clear behavioral expectations early in the semester.

- High-risk drinkers:
  - Michigan: 22%
  - National Average: 19%

- Light/Moderate drinkers:
  - Michigan: 14%
  - National Average: 13%

- Non-drinkers:
  - Michigan: 64%
  - National Average: 68%

(Includes 3% Problematic)
(Includes 5% Problematic)

- Non-drinkers: 0 drinks in the past two weeks
- Light/Moderate drinkers: 1-3 drinks for women; 1-4 drinks for men on at least one occasion in the past two weeks
- High-risk drinkers: 4 or more drinks for women; 5 or more drinks for men on at least one occasion in the past two weeks (includes Problematic drinkers - 8 or more drinks for women; 10 or more drinks for men)
Benchmarking Your Drinking Rate Data

The data below shows your first-year student drinking rates measured midway through the fall semester (Survey 3) as compared to the national aggregate for all students taking AlcoholEdu during the same time period.

Note: As drinking rates vary from campus to campus, it may be helpful to also compare your rates to those of a peer group (by region, athletic conference, Carnegie classification, etc.). If you are interested in a peer benchmark report, please contact your Partner Service Director.

![Bar chart showing drinking rates for Michigan and National Average for High-risk drinkers, Light/Moderate drinkers, and Non-drinkers.](chart.png)

(Includes 6% Problematic)
(Includes 7% Problematic)

- High-risk drinkers: 32% (Michigan) vs. 25% (National Average)
- Light/Moderate drinkers: 16% (Michigan) vs. 15% (National Average)
- Non-drinkers: 52% (Michigan) vs. 59% (National Average)
Examining Gender Differences

Midway through the fall semester (Survey 3), the drinking rates are similar for men and women. Additionally, women report drinking in a high-risk way* slightly less frequently than men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of high risk drinking in the past two weeks (Drinkers only)</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more times</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In response to the question: During the past two weeks, how many times have you had five or more drinks (for men)/four or more drinks (for women) in a row within a 2 hour period?
Drinking rates have remained steady over the last four years. It is important to consider the multiple factors that influence drinking rates and how these factors may vary from year to year on your campus.

Typical factors impacting college students' drinking rates from year to year:
- Alcohol policy changes
- Changes in enforcement of alcohol policy
- Shifts in composition of first year class
- Consistency in the timing of data collection

Data represents student responses collected in Survey 3, 30-45 days after completing AlcoholEdu for College.
Identifying Peak Drinking Days

Understanding drinking behaviors across time may be useful for identifying weekly patterns or targeting highest-risk days/events for prevention and enforcement efforts.

Average number of drinks per day

Note: This is a snapshot of a 3-week period of time during the fall semester. As drinking rates are impacted by academic calendars, campus-wide events, holidays, etc., these rates may not be reflective of drinking patterns across the entire semester.
Where Students Drink

Michigan students are most commonly drinking at a fraternity/sorority house or an off-campus residence. Every effort should be made to target these particular locations with increased prevention and enforcement initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority house</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus residence</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus residence</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic event</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other location(s)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data represents student responses collected in Survey 3, 30-45 days after completing AlcoholEdu for College.
In Survey 3, Michigan students indicated their top 5 most important reasons for choosing to drink (drinkers only) or not drink (all students) on a particular occasion.

### Reasons for Drinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have a good time with friends</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To celebrate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be more outgoing</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel happy</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get drunk</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reasons for Not Drinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm going to drive</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have other things to do</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have to drink to have a good time</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't want to lose control</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking interferes with my school work</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritizing Student Engagement

Effective prevention includes actively engaging students to reinforce positive behavioral intentions of drinkers and non-drinkers alike. The data below can inform decisions around investments in planning and prioritizing alcohol-free activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This year, your students are most interested in the following activities:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Movie Nights</td>
<td>2093 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Live Music</td>
<td>2011 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Fitness Classes (pilates, yoga, spinning)</td>
<td>1851 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Intramural Sports Tournaments</td>
<td>1833 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Community Service</td>
<td>1659 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Nothing Specific - just a cool place to hang out</td>
<td>1648 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, this year 773 students indicated an interest in planning alcohol-free events and activities.

To download the names and contact information of students interested in these activities and others, or to view data on any custom activities you may have added to this exercise, please visit the Student Engagement section of the Hub.
Drinking-Related Risk Behaviors

The most common drinking-related risk behaviors that your students engage in are doing shots and pregaming. Michigan may consider dedicating educational efforts that highlight the risks associated with these specific behaviors.

Choosing a drink containing more alcohol
- Michigan: 21%
- National Average: 20%

Chugging alcohol
- Michigan: 22%
- National Average: 21%

Doing shots
- Michigan: 57%
- National Average: 47%

Pregaming
- Michigan: 53%
- National Average: 48%

Note: Graph represents grouped responses of 5, 6, and 7 on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all; 7 = always) for drinkers only.
Negative Consequences of Drinking

While a majority of students did not experience negative consequences as a result of their drinking, certain behaviors worth noting are detailed below.

Percentages represent the number of students who reported experiencing a particular consequence at any time in the past two weeks.

- Missed class, performed poorly on an assignment, and/or got behind in school:
  - Michigan: 33%
  - National: 29%

- Had a hangover:
  - Michigan: 51%
  - National: 44%

- Blacked out:
  - Michigan: 38%
  - National: 34%

- Drove after 4 or more/5 or more drinks:
  - Michigan: 6%
  - National: 8%

- Rode with a driver who had been drinking:
  - Michigan: 7%
  - National: 11%

- Was taken advantage of sexually:
  - Michigan: 12%
  - National: 12%

- Took advantage of someone sexually:
  - Michigan: 8%
  - National: 8%
Gains from AlcoholEdu

AlcoholEdu has enabled Michigan to provide students with a baseline of knowledge and decision-making strategies around alcohol use.

Exam Scores, Fall 2012

In Fall 2012, students reported that AlcoholEdu...

- Helped me establish a plan for responsible decisions around alcohol: 86%
- Prepared me to identify and/or help someone who has alcohol poisoning: 87%
- Stimulated me to reflect on my personal attitudes and behaviors: 65%
- Changed my perceptions of others' drinking-related behaviors: 65%

Data represents student responses collected in Survey 2, immediately following completion of Part 1 of AlcoholEdu.
Course Impact on Those at Greatest Risk

Among the 58% of high risk drinkers (736 students) who saw "no need to change the way they drink" before taking AlcoholEdu, 36% (265 students) indicated their readiness to change after completing the course.

High Risk Drinkers Pre-Course

- 58%
- I see no need to change the way I drink alcohol

High Risk Drinkers Post-Course

- 65%
- I am currently trying to drink in a healthier/safer way
- 16%
- I am thinking about drinking in a healthier/safer way
- 10%
- I am ready to try drinking in a healthier/safer way

Data represents student responses collected just before (Survey 1) and immediately following (Survey 2) Part 1 of AlcoholEdu for College.
Positive Behavioral Intentions

After completing AlcoholEdu, Michigan students reported an increase in several positive behavioral intentions. Programming efforts aimed at further promoting these behaviors can reinforce the messages students received through AlcoholEdu.

Intention has been shown to be the most important variable in predicting behavior change (Ajzen, 1991).
Guiding Principles for Success

Beyond what the data reveals, there are a number of guiding principles that drive successful prevention efforts.

1. Be intentional with efforts and gather data on whether they succeed.

2. Don't try to do it all - a few targeted interventions can be very effective.

3. Stay attuned to new research to inform your efforts.

4. Implement programs strategically to mitigate costs.

5. Test your messages and strategies against the research base, behavior theory, and your instincts.

6. Develop a comprehensive prevention program that includes complementary efforts.

7. Ground all strategies in data.

8. Make decisions based upon your unique culture, allies, and resources.
Haven: Michigan's Learning Outcomes

Recognizing Alcohol as the Most Popular Date Rape Drug
Percentage of students responding "alcohol" when asked to identify the number one date rape drug.

- Pre-Course: 37%
- Post-Course: 89%

Demonstrating an Understanding of Consent
Percentage of students who "strongly agree" with the following:

Regardless of whether or not a person has been drinking or is sober, if he or she did not consent to have sex, then it is rape.

- Pre-Course: 72%
- Post-Course: 89%

Developing Self-Awareness
Have you ever been the victim of sexual violence (sexually assaulted or raped)?

- Pre-Course:
  - 93% of students responded "No"
- Post-Course:
  - 99% remained No
  - 66% remained Yes
  - 70% remained Unsure
  - 25% moved to No
Additional Resources

You may also request reports that allow you to benchmark your data against that of specific peer groups such as athletic conferences, national affiliations, regional groups and others.

For assistance accessing your online reports, or to request peer benchmark reports, please contact your Partner Service Director.

Lexie Yang  
lexie@everfi.com

Katie Wood  
kwood@everfi.com

Abby Rogers  
abby@everfi.com

Linda Gernes  
linda@everfi.com

Lisa Haubenstock  
lisa@everfi.com