



**Testing the Social Norms Model to Reduce
High Risk College Drinking
1999 – 2002
Final Report**

Part III - Replication Manual

Prepared by the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division,
Colorado Department of Human Services, BACCHUS & GAMMA
Peer Education Network, and the University of Denver
January 2003

Community Initiated Prevention Intervention Studies Research Grant #8604, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA)

A. Abstract

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division (ADAD), Colorado Department of Human Services conducted a three-year generalization study, “Testing the Social Norms Model to Reduce High Risk College Drinking,” in collaboration with the University of Denver (DU) and the BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network. The study targeted all undergraduate students at DU, a private, co-educational, urban liberal arts university with an undergraduate enrollment of 4,300. The Colorado College in Colorado Springs (CC) served as the comparison site for this evaluation.

Binge drinking has been labeled the number one public health hazard and a primary source of preventable morbidity and mortality among college students (Wechsler et al., 1995). A significant number of college students report binge drinking, defined as having at least five drinks in one sitting for males and four for females. College students drink more when they perceive that their peers are drinking more (Goodwin, 1989). At the same time, many students have distorted perceptions of campus alcohol use.

ADAD initiated this project to increase resources to address the high-risk drinking problem on Colorado’s college campuses. The University of Denver administration agreed to be the study site due to concerns about the high-risk drinking behaviors of DU undergraduate students (identified in 1997 by Core Survey data), with a goal of creating a more positive and healthy campus climate. The Colorado College, a similar liberal arts college in Colorado Springs, volunteered as a comparison site due to interest in obtaining resources to develop future social norms programming.

The selected prevention model, social norms marketing, is a research-based environmental approach that involves using a mass media campaign to correct students’ misperceptions of the campus norms for alcohol use. The implementation steps are based on Linkenbach and D’Atrie’s *7-Step Montana Model on Social Norms Marketing* (1999): Planning and Environmental Advocacy; Baseline Data; Message Development; Market Plan; Pilot Test & Refine Materials; Implement the Campaign; and Evaluation.

The core components of our program implementation included: 1) the survey; 2) use of a Stakeholders’ advisory group consisting of university faculty, students and staff; and 3) promotional materials. Because this is a science-based, data-driven model, all of the developed materials must be based on the collected data. A truly effective social norms campaign cannot be developed and implemented without this information.

Once the data were gleaned for positive norms, the Stakeholders were key in ensuring a successful campaign. This group’s input on the materials and their ability to convey the message and reliability of the data was critical. They acted as messengers throughout the campus.

The last core component was the promotional materials. The greater number of materials and greater variety of media used, the better. It is absolutely necessary to saturate the target population, in this case, DU undergraduates, with the messages, to achieve the goal of changing students’ misperceptions of their peers’ alcohol use. If the population sees the message only once or twice, they are unlikely to learn and remember it. However, if they see it multiple times, in multiple formats, they become more likely to discuss it, learn it, and eventually, truly believe it.

The project used a quasi-experimental design outcome study to: 1) determine the social norms model's effectiveness in preventing, delaying, and/or reducing binge drinking among DU undergraduate students as compared with students at the Colorado College; and to 2) measure and document reductions in alcohol abuse and associated problems at DU as compared with CC.

The evaluation plan included the ongoing collection of quantitative data through administration of the *Core Alcohol and Drug Survey*. Subsequently these data were used to develop specific campaign messages. During the first year of the project the outcome study focused on collection of baseline data at both the intervention and comparison site. In addition to the Core Survey, in Years 02 and 03 intervention students received a supplemental questionnaire that measured student perception of drinking by various groups on campus, an estimate of the percentage of students consuming five or more drinks at one sitting, the frequency that students saw the social norms message on campus, and the degree to which students believed the messages disseminated throughout the campaign.

The target sample was 1000 (500 students pre-test and 500 students post-test at each site). Data were collected over the three-year period from DU and CC. At DU the evaluator used a cluster sampling process in 25 classrooms to collect first-year baseline data and follow-up data in Years 02 and 03. At CC, questionnaires were collected using a similar sampling procedure over the three years.

Outcome data showed moderate changes in drinking at the intervention site after implementation of the campaign. While the general DU population showed little change, women reported a reduction in the frequency of alcohol use. There were consistent differences in frequency and quantity of alcohol consumption between the intervention and comparison sites. Students at CC significantly increased their alcohol use over three years compared to DU students, and experienced a higher rate of problems associated with alcohol use. In addition, DU students reported statistically significant reductions in their perceptions of campus alcohol use. In measuring dosage and believability, there was a significant increase in message believability between Years 02 and 03. The intervention's fidelity was found to achieve a high compliance rate with the social norms model.

B. Program Philosophy and Overview

1. Original Conceptual Design

Our project was designed to test a promising new science-based model, social norms marketing, on undergraduate students at a private liberal arts college in Denver, Colorado to address the problem of high-risk college drinking and associated problem behaviors by correcting student misperceptions of the college norms related to alcohol use. Social norms marketing campaigns, directed at all students through widely disseminated campus media, are categorized as universal prevention interventions and are considered an environmental prevention approach (Berkowitz 2000).

Social norms theory provides the underpinning for the social norms approach, which includes social norms marketing. Perkins and Berkowitz (1986) were the first to utilize the social norms approach to analyze student drinking behavior. They found that college students generally overestimate the permissive drinking behaviors of their peers and this misperception predicted how much individuals drank. Berkowitz and Perkins (1987) then recommended that students be given accurate information on their peers' drinking attitudes and behaviors as an intervention to reduce high risk drinking.

An increasing body of research confirms the early work of Perkins and Berkowitz establishing the relationship between perceptions of the campus norm and students' drinking behaviors. College students drink more when they perceive that their peers are drinking more (Goodwin, 1989). Actual campus norms are usually less liberal than most students' perceptions (Baer & Carney, 1993; Baer et al., 1991; Haines, 1996; Presley et al. 1995; Prentice & Miller, 1993).

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division (ADAD) of the Colorado Department of Human Services initiated this project to bring additional resources to our state to address the high risk-drinking problem in Colorado's higher education arena. The University of Denver (DU), an urban liberal arts college with an enrollment of more than 8,700 students in its undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, agreed to be the study site for two reasons: 1) the University wanted to confront the high-risk drinking issue (identified in 1997 by Core Survey data) and make the necessary changes to create a positive and healthy campus climate; and 2) the University had insufficient resources to address such behaviors and welcomed the opportunity to work with ADAD on the project. Colorado College, a similar school in Colorado Springs, volunteered to be the comparison site for this study.

Key project staffs assigned to the project included an ADAD Project Director, a DU evaluator, and two project coordinators, one a DU Wellness Center project director and one a higher education and social norms specialist from BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network.

Our project based its implementation plan on the seven steps detailed in the training manual, *Social Norms Marketing (The Montana Model)* by Linkenbach and D'Atrie (1998). The steps are: 1) Planning and Environmental Advocacy; 2) Baseline Data; 3) Message Development; 4) Marketing Plan; 5) Pilot Test and Refine Materials; 6) Implementation; and 7) Evaluation.

The implementation plan involves collecting data from undergraduate students using the *Core Alcohol and Drug Survey* and using that information to design a marketing campaign that challenges students' misperceptions about alcohol use and other destructive behaviors. A supplemental survey

to capture dosage and believability information also can be used. The first year, a baseline survey is conducted on campus and the data is used to identify healthy campus behavioral norms. These healthy norms are then used to create positive messages using a variety of appealing marketing materials that are distributed throughout the campus. The second year data is collected again, messages are revised, and new marketing materials are developed and distributed. The third year the same process is followed again. Research indicates that by the end of the third year, high-risk drinking behaviors should drop as students correct their behaviors to replicate the true, and healthier, campus norms.

A detailed chronology of our activities in Year 01 is as follows:

2. Year One Chronology Of Activities

August 99:

- ✓ Pre approval of evaluation plan by Department of Human Services IRB

September 99:

- ✓ CSAP Notification of grant award

October 99:

- ✓ University of DU faculty meeting to announce grant award to faculty & staff
- ✓ ADAD submits Single Project Assurance application to OPRR.
- ✓ Project Director meets with subcontractors re contractual responsibilities.

November 99:

- ✓ ADAD fiscal officer completes processing of subcontracts.
- ✓ OPRR approves Single Project Assurance application.
- ✓ The University of Denver IRB approves the project.

December 99:

- ✓ Subcontracts are signed, authorizing official project start-up date for BACCHUS & GAMMA and University of Denver subcontractors.
- ✓ Evaluator orders Core Surveys from Southern Illinois University.
- ✓ Project Director and Evaluator attend CSAP New Grantee Meeting.
- ✓ Project Director submits budget revision request to CSAP, which is approved.

January 00

- ✓ CSAP approves budget request.
- ✓ Subcontracted project staffs meet to clarify roles and responsibilities; plan first Stakeholders committee meeting.
- ✓ Oversight committee meets and participates in conference call with consultant Koreen Johannessen, University of Arizona.
- ✓ CSAP approves exemption from CORE Measures and GPRA requirement.
- ✓ Evaluator changes sampling protocol for the intervention site to cluster sampling and for the comparison site to a simple random sample.

February 00

- ✓ DU IRB approves modification of the original sampling strategy.
- ✓ Evaluator conducts pre-tests at the implementation site.
- ✓ Project and Wellness Coordinators hold first Stakeholder meeting with University of Denver students and faculty, which includes training on social norms theory.
- ✓ Third Oversight Committee meeting takes place at DU.
- ✓ Office for Protection from Research Risks approves Assurance of Compliance documents to protect human subjects.

March 00

- ✓ Evaluator meets with Colorado College to finalize plans for sample collection and pre-testing.
- ✓ Project and Wellness coordinators begin planning materials development process. Coordinators meet with graphic designer to develop campaign materials, including photography and sample posters for review by Stakeholders group.
- ✓ Evaluator delivers questionnaires to DU Office for Assessment for coding and scanning.
- ✓ Pre-test scanning is completed. SPSS data files are created and initial computer analysis begins.

April 00

- ✓ Evaluator and Oversight Committee review survey data results to develop normative messages.
- ✓ Stakeholders' group provides input and approval of suggested messages for marketing campaign.
- ✓ DU students participate in photo shoot for future materials.
- ✓ Sample Posters are developed using messages and group photos.
- ✓ Stakeholders and student orientation leaders provide ideas for other campaign marketing materials.

May 00

- ✓ Stakeholder advisory group brainstorms campaign theme and logo.
- ✓ "URDU" logo is selected.
- ✓ Stakeholder group reviews second draft of posters.
- ✓ Final poster copy is sent for printing.
- ✓ SOAR (student orientation, advising and registration) leaders are trained in the URDU campaign and social norms model and provide ideas on marketing materials.

June 00

- ✓ Project staff researches promotional items and costs.
- ✓ Final materials are polished and printed.

August 00

- ✓ Resident Assistants are trained in the social norms model.

September 00

- ✓ Campus campaign implementation is initiated
 - Information sheet is distributed to stakeholders, new students, parents, faculty, department chairpersons and resident assistants.
 - Stakeholders are trained on handling potential responses to campaign
 - Materials are posted around campus.

3. Changes In Year One

1. Sampling design:

Sampling strategies were changed from a simple random sample (mail-in surveys) design to a cluster sampling technique (classroom survey collection). This change was based on fears of a small sample size and resulting low statistical power, and on advice from our University of Arizona consultant. The change has resulted in a higher survey return rate at DU.

2. Exemption from GPRA and Core Measures requirement:

This is a community-based grant that targets a universal population of college students. Therefore, the GPRA measures did not easily fit our program type. The evaluation tool was

mentioned but not included in the CSAP Core Measures Initiative Phase 1 Recommendations workbook.

3. Timeline revision:
Campus activity was postponed until after first of New Year due to delays in grant notification and in the fiscal contracting process.
4. Budget revision:
A delay in project start-up created overages in personnel, most of which were transferred to the evaluation budget to cover potential costs in survey administration. Funds were established to allow staff to participate in training on social norming and higher education issues. Funds were reduced for travel to grantee meetings.
5. Scanning of data:
Instead of sending the Core Survey results to the Core Institute at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale for scanning, the evaluator obtained an offer from the University of Denver assessment office for in-kind data scanning of Core results. This arrangement allowed sorting by academic discipline, creation of a case record for each survey, faster turnaround on database creation, and cost savings.
6. Focus Group Pilot Testing of Messages & Targeted Materials:
Due to a reduced timeline which coincided with spring break, there was limited time to focus-group pilot test the marketing messages and to create materials to target specific campus subpopulations as proposed. Therefore, the messages and materials components were created for broad campus change and tested simultaneously by the student stakeholders.

Do's & Don'ts/Lessons Learned – Year One

1. IRB: Conducting the IRB review prior to grant notification made it possible to submit our request for approval of Single Project Assurance shortly after notification of the grant award and upon receipt of notification from the Office for Protection from Research Risks. We thus obtained SPA approval early in the process, which allowed us to move forward with our project much sooner than many of the other community-initiated prevention grantees.
2. Sampling Design: Prior to moving forward with implementation, any change in the sampling design should be approved by the CSAP Project Officer.
3. Cluster Sampling versus Random Sample: Cluster sampling in the classroom yields a much higher return rate from students than a random sample mail survey.
4. Data Scanning: Look internally for in-kind scanning support. The availability of in-kind scanning services from the DU assessment office saved the project time and money.
5. GPRA: This type of grant did not fit well with the GPRA evaluation requirement; we have been exempted.
6. Timeline: Our timeline included unrealistic expectations that we could begin the project at the first of September. However, notification from CSAP occurred at the end of that month, followed by a 1 1/2-month delay in setting up contracts with the two subcontractor organizations. Implementation of most campus activity had to be rescheduled after the first of the next year. However, this did not affect the program's success during the first year.
7. Budget: After notification of the grant we learned that attendance at new grantee meetings is limited to the project director/PI and to the evaluator. We mistakenly budgeted for an additional three people to attend these meetings.

8. Consulting: Due to the social norms expertise of the subcontractor, BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network, it was unnecessary to use an outside consultant to train the Stakeholder advisory group. Look to your own experts.
9. Data contamination: If a school previously has posted social norms messages on campus as part of alcohol awareness week or another activity and plans to do it again, be sure to stop the postings and make sure that these materials are not in view when data collection is in process. This can contaminate the data.
10. Pilot Testing: It is not recommended that programs skip the in-depth focus group pilot testing of marketing messages and materials.

Year Two Chronology of Activities:

October 2000

- 1st - Campus-wide materials distribution.
- 2nd - Meeting of DU Communications, ADAD Public Relations and project staff members.
- 5th - Presentation of social norms theory and the DU campaign to University Dean's Council.
- 10th - Stakeholders Meeting.
- 10th - Campus-wide materials distribution.
- 13th - Presentation of social norms theory and the DU campaign to the Arts and Humanities Chairpersons.
- 17th - Project coordinators meet with graduate advisors to the Greek organizations to devise a plan for disseminating information to the Greek community more effectively.
- 18th - Colorado College Alcohol Abuse Task Force meeting.
- 20th - Informational table is set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
- 24th - Wellness Program Director meets with Graduate Resident Directors regarding the involvement of the Resident Assistants.
- 25th - Informational table is set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
- 31st - Presentation to Greek Leadership Councils (Pan Hellenic and Interfraternity).

November 2000

- 1st - Campus-wide materials distribution.
- 1st - Presentation to a diversity-themed mentoring class on the theory and campaign, followed by a discussion with the students.
- 2nd - Informational table is set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
- 9th - Informational table is set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
- 14th - Stakeholders Meeting.

January 2001

- 2nd - Campus-wide materials distribution
- 11th - Presentation to the Drugs and Society undergraduate sociology class, including a discussion of the social norms theory and the DU campaign.
- 17th - Meeting with chairperson for Winter Carnival (traditional University of Denver winter quarter celebration) to integrate the URDU campaign into the week's activities.
- 18th - Presentation to the University of Denver peer education group (the SEARCH Team) to provide information about the campaign as well as to gain the group's support of the campaign and discuss the possibilities of their future involvement.

- 19th - Campus-wide materials distribution
- 22nd - Announcement regarding the URDU campaign is made at the beginning of the Winter Carnival comedian show; with prizes distributed randomly.
- 23rd - Stakeholders Meeting.
- 24th - Announcement regarding the URDU campaign is made at the beginning of the Warren Miller movie; prizes are distributed randomly.
- 25th - Social Norms Training at Winter School on Addictive Behaviors, Grand Junction, Colorado.

February 2001

- 1st - Project coordinators meet with DU peer education (The SEARCH Team) advisor to discuss involvement with the URDU campaign.
- 6th - Wellness Program Director is interviewed by a student for a News Writing class.
- 8th - Associate Coordinator presents to the DU SEARCH Team regarding the social norms theory and the DU social norms campaign.
- 13th - Stakeholders Meeting
- 13th - Campus-wide distribution of materials
- 21st - URDU materials are used as giveaways during the DU radio station (KVDU) kick-off.
- 22nd - Key sorority and fraternity members are invited to a meeting to discuss the campaign and determine their future involvement.

March 2001

- 13th - Program Coordinators present to the DU Health Services staff.
- 13th - Stakeholders Meeting

April 2001

- 10th - Stakeholders Meeting
- 17th - Project staff present at annual ADAD conference.

May 2001

- 2nd - Members of the oversight team (Project Evaluator, Project Associate Coordinator and Wellness Program Director), and six undergraduate student panelists, present a program as a part of the Carl M. Williams Institute for Ethics and Values (a university ethics forum). “The 66% Factor,” is a discussion of the campaign open to all university faculty, staff and students.
- 9th - Stakeholders Meeting
- 18th - Wellness Program Director meets with student regarding the social norms theory and possible involvement in URDU campaign and stakeholders committee.
- 21st - Greek leaders attend a planning meeting to determine the most effective means to involve Greek students in the campaign.

July 2001

- 24th - URDU information, along with information on Greek recruitment (Rush), is mailed to all incoming first-year students.

August 2001

- 9th - Project team members meet to discuss the information gathered at the National Social Norms Conference and decide how to implement new ideas into the campaign effort.
- 28th - Stakeholders Meeting
- 29th - Sixty minute training of Residence Assistants (RAs) on alcohol use and abuse, as well as the social norms model and how it will be implemented on campus. Campaign materials are provided for each RA to post the materials on the floors they oversee.
- 31st - SOAR: Presentation to the SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising and Registration) leaders on the grant process, goals, and social norms messages. Each of the members is assigned a group of new students to lead and mentor during the weeklong new student orientation program. The group was given an opportunity to ask questions and give input regarding the campaign.
- 31st - Campus-wide distribution of 2001 campaign materials

September 2001

- 6th and 7th - SOAR Life Skills program for all first-year students addresses issues of alcohol use and abuse and the norms for alcohol use on the DU campus along with other pertinent first-year student information.
- 25th - Stakeholders Meeting

Changes in Year Two:

1. Project coordinators scheduled monthly Stakeholder meetings in advance, on the second Tuesday of the month at noon. This change allowed participants to plan ahead for meetings, and thus enhanced participation.
2. The project budgeted for stipends to pay a group of student stakeholders to disseminate campaign materials across the campus, conduct “prize patrols” and promote the campaign. The availability of paid student workers was a tremendous help to the project co-coordinators.
3. The project budgeted funds to provide the evaluator with administrative support.
4. The Project Director increased her time on the project from .20 FTE to .25 FTE.
5. Student models were not used in the second phase of campaign materials (see “Do’s and Don’ts”).
6. Only one campaign message was used in the materials developed in Year 02 (see Do’s and Don’ts).

Do’s & Don’ts /Lessons Learned – Year Two

Year 02 of the intervention provided many learning opportunities.

1. Student focus groups are critical for the acceptance of the message. Students critiqued the messages developed in Year 01 and implemented in Year 02 as being too administrative in appearance and too statistical. Students commented that marketing materials looked like a ploy by the DU administration to make the school look better for future students and their parents. Prompt receipt of survey data and subsequent message development allows time for the much-needed focus groups.
2. Use photos of students with caution and screen the student models well. Student feedback relayed that the photos of students only portrayed student leaders with whom typical students do not identify. In addition, it was pointed out that a student appearing on one poster [“Most DU students (66%) drink alcohol only once per week or less”] is known among students as a heavier

drinker on campus. While many students responded well to our response that 4 out of 5 students on the poster (80%) were all moderate to non-drinkers, this was a difficult issue to overcome and may have done some damage to the credibility of the campaign. In response to this issue, the new materials developed for the 2001-2002 academic year have a blurred image of students sitting in a popular area on campus as the background, but the students are not identifiable.

3. Students are interested in and discussing the campaign, but somewhat skeptical. In the spring of 2001, in groups, students voiced their skepticism, but in one-on-one conversations, students were more likely to rationalize the messages and agree with the campaign. Many group discussions assisted with the understanding and believability of the project and students seemed to become more empowered by September 2001. During the first presentation to resident assistants in August 2000, (the beginning of the implementation), participants had many questions and did not believe or support the program. However, in August 2001, when students disagreed with or “bashed” the campaign, other students voiced approval and support for the message and the goal to reduce high-risk drinking among undergraduate students.
4. Disseminating multiple messages over a short time period confuses the students, who mix up the statistics and don’t buy into the campaign. The stakeholders patrolling campus with prizes for those knowing the current message reported that there was some confusion about the messages and that students could come close to citing the messages, but didn’t believe them. Therefore, new materials produced for the campaign will include only one message.
5. Use student-friendly language and minimize the administrative appearance of materials. The message released in August/September 2001 (the start of the academic year and end of year 02), “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party” seems to be more accepted by students. Some students, typically those drinking moderately or not at all, say they believe the message, but suggest emphasizing the “fewer” part of the message, while others still believe most students drink more than 5 when they party. In addition, printing only one logo (that of the Wellness Center) on materials, rather than the four used last year has proven positive, as the materials look more student-friendly and less like an ad campaign from administration. Until we survey again, we will not know specifically what effect these changes have had, but the general feedback has been that the message is more believable and more accepted by students than the previous messages.

Year 03 Chronology of Activities

October 2001

- 3-5th - Project Coordinators present workshop at ADAD Workforce Development Conference
- 10th - Meeting of Project Team with CC constituents to develop implementation plan.
- 18th - Informational Table set up in Student Union
- 25th - Planning Meeting of Wellness Coordinator and Project Associate Coordinator
- Materials distribution throughout month (see Implementation section)

November 2001

- 6th - Stakeholders Committee meeting
- 12th - Program coordinators meet to organize staff transition
- 13th - Project Team meeting to prepare for staff transition

- 30th - Project Associate Coordinator, DU Wellness staff, Student stakeholders
- Materials distribution throughout month (See implementation section)

December 2001

- Project Team, Wellness staff and DU Student Health Center meeting to discuss staff transition

January 2002

- 15th - Oversight Committee Meeting
- 15th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
- 25th - Meeting of Project Team and Wellness Department
- Materials distribution throughout month (see implementation section)
- News article published in *The Source*

February 2002

- 1st - Planning meeting of Project Associate Coordinator, DU Wellness Coordinator and stakeholders
- 4th - Training by Wellness Coordinator, Residence Hall
- 5th - Training by Wellness Coordinator, Residence Hall
- 12th - Oversight Meeting
- 12th - Training on Social Norms Marketing for Stakeholders
- 12th - Training by Wellness Coordinator, Pan Hellenic meeting
- 26th - RUDU? Open Forum for DU students to ask questions about campaign
- Materials distribution throughout month (see Implementation section)
- News article on campaign published in *DU Neighbor News*
- Survey collection in DU classrooms

March 2002

- 4th - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator, Delta Gamma Sorority
- 6th - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator, Health Psychology class
- 11th - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator, Beta Theta Pi Fraternity
- 12th - Oversight Meeting
- 12th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
- Materials distribution throughout month (see Implementation section)
- Student Prize Patrols test students for correct campaign statistics
- Survey collection in DU classrooms

April 2002

- 2nd - Associate Project Coordinator and Project Evaluator meet to plan workshop
- 2nd - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator, Brown Bag Lunch Series
- 9th - Oversight Meeting
- 12th - Training by Associate Project Coordinator and associate, BACCHUS and GAMMA Spring Conference
- 16th - Stakeholders Committee meeting
- 16th - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator for students on probation

- 29th - Presentation by Wellness Coordinator, Gamma Phi Beta Sorority
- Survey collection at comparison site
- Posters distribution throughout month (see Implementation section)

May 2002

- 14th - Meeting to complete Fidelity Instrument, Key Stakeholders, Project Team
- 14th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
- 17th - DU Administrative Stakeholders' Breakfast on project
- 20th - DU Department Head Luncheon on project
- 22nd - DU Faculty/Staff Lunch Meeting on project
- 23rd - Project Associate Coordinator and Evaluator meeting to finalize program for
- National Conference on the Social Norms Model
- Survey collection at comparison site
- Materials disseminated (see Implementation section)

July 2002

- 8th - Project Team meeting to finalize details for presentation at national conference
- 12th - Presentation at the National Conference on the Social Norms Model August 2002
- 8th - Presentation at New Student Orientation Leader Training, DU
- 13th - Project Team meeting
- 21st - Presentation to Colorado College RA's on project

September 2002

- 3rd - Project Team Meeting
- 5th-6th - Presentation to Lifeskills Community Cornerstone Sessions
- Presentations to University of Denver Community Connections Classes (13th, 14th, 19th, 23rd, 16th, 26th, 27th)
- 17th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
- Materials dissemination (see Implementation section)

October 2002

- 8th - Project Team Meeting to discuss continuation plans
- Materials dissemination (see Implementation section)

November 2002

- Final Stakeholders Committee Meeting to celebrate end of project

December 2002

- Final Project Team Meeting

January 2003

- Final Report preparation and submission

Changes in Year 03

1. The original Wellness Coordinator left the project and that position was not filled in its original capacity.
2. The time allotted for work by the University of Denver Wellness Coordinator decreased after the departure of the original staff member.
3. The marketing plan developed early in the project was not followed, and dissemination of the message decreased dramatically. This was due to the limited staff time and oversight of student stakeholders.

Do's & Don'ts/Lessons Learned – Year 03

Year 03 of the intervention provided many learning opportunities.

1. Although we learned much about what appeals to students, the only way to really hit the target is to do in-depth focus groups. To do this, data must be collected early enough to provide program staff time to glean positive norms, develop messages, pilot test and refine. This process should allow at least two months to complete the testing and refining, unless there is at least one staff member assigned to the project on a full-time basis.
2. It is crucial to the success of such a large undertaking to have absolute, top-down administrative support from the institution. While we began with this support, it was lost along the way as changes occurred at the university and among project staff. Although our team worked well together and we received appropriate direction, it appears that one solution might be to have an upper administration university staff person serve as the Project Director or in another position of authority, so that this individual would have to answer directly to the funding organization (in this case CSAP). This would provide great accountability to the institution.
3. Maintaining a consistently high level of message saturation is also an important piece of this model. As we saw in the first year of implementation, this takes great planning and oversight, but is doable with student stakeholders overseen by project staff. When there was less staff time for oversight of this piece of the project, the message was much less recognizable.
4. The ability to change slightly or “tweak” messages, without changing the initial message, in response to student feedback is also important. By adding a simple parenthesis to our message, “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer (that’s 0-5!) when they party,” we were able to appeal to a wider audience without alienating the initial target population. In addition, by empowering student abstainers and those who drink in a low to moderate-risk fashion, it created a more outspoken normative group from the original very quiet one.
5. Maintain student stakeholder interest. Make sure that any staff changes are dealt with appropriately as to minimize student attrition in program involvement.

6. Develop good materials that are useful to students. Novelty items tend to disappear from campus quickly, while items of high utility remain and continue to spread the message.
7. Ensure that materials are developed for special populations at particular risk for not believing messages (e.g. Greeks).
8. Begin a sustainability plan for the university early in the project, so that when the grant ends there will be the means to continue the project over the long term.
9. Develop a shorter and more consumer-friendly survey collection method, such as a web-based survey, for use on campus.

F. Evaluation

Data collected for this study included 1294 randomly selected undergraduate students attending a small liberal arts university. Baseline data were collected from 432 students and follow-up data from 439 students in Year 02 and 421 in Year 03 were also collected. In addition, 220, 298 and 131 surveys were collected in each of the respective years from the comparison site in this study. Data collected during the second year of this study used a cluster sampling design. At the intervention site, the evaluator obtained a list of all undergraduate classes in the winter quarter from the university registrar's office and selected a random sample of classes. For both the baseline and follow-up data, a total of 25 classes were selected for inclusion in the sample. Upon selection, each faculty member conducting the selected class was personally contacted to gain permission to administer the survey. On a pre-arranged day, the researcher visited each class and administered the study instruments. At the comparison site during the Year 02 and Year 03, classes were selected at random and teachers distributed the surveys to the students.

Resources Required:

Project Staff: A social norms marketing campaign targeting a university campus must involve staff, faculty and administrators from that university, and must be supported by top university officials, beginning with the Chancellor. During the grant application process, we identified key University of Denver representatives who would need to be involved in the project. These included an evaluator from the Department of Sociology, a DU Wellness Center contact person to represent the University and co-coordinate project implementation, and co-coordinators from BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network, experts in social norms marketing and college-based programs whose national headquarters is located on the grounds of DU. Overall approval of the project concept was obtained from the Dean of Student and Residence Life, who in turn obtained support from the Chancellor. The Dean then hosted a meeting with other key faculty and staff whose involvement are essential to the process. Later involvement of the university media department and assessment office provided us with additional resources, which were invaluable. In Year 03, the campaign suffered from the loss of an on-campus coordinator with time to focus solely on the grant, and from a reduction in top-level support due to university reorganization and attrition. These campus-based resources are key to the success of a social norms marketing campaign and should not be taken lightly.

Student and Staff Volunteers: It would be impossible, and unconscionable, to develop a campus marketing campaign without involving the community that is targeted. Essential to this project is the establishment of a campus-based advisory group of stakeholders including faculty, staff and students. The purpose of this group is to provide feedback regarding the development of campaign messages and materials, and to help ensure the successful implementation of each stage of the campaign. Critical to the success of the project is the stakeholders' knowledge and familiarity with social norming and with the specific materials used.

Funds: Out of a total budget of \$125,971 for Year 01 and \$125,181 each for Years 02 and 03, we funneled the majority of the funds to our subcontractors to conduct the evaluation and to implement the campaign. To implement a social marketing campaign, it is extremely important to budget sufficient funds for the purchase of marketing materials to saturate the campus with the messages of healthy behaviors. Our project budgeted \$20,000 per year for this item, which made it possible to buy graphic art services and to order high quality marketing materials including posters, lanyards, refrigerator magnets, table tents, visors, dry erase markers, stickers and a variety of other eye-catching giveaway items. Although some campuses have limited their messages to posters produced on desktop publishing software, the BACCHUS & GAMMA project coordinators recommended high visibility marketing items. In our project, these items have given the campaign increased credibility.

E-Mail Capability: Due to the location of the Project Director, Evaluator, and Project Co-ordinators in separate offices in different parts of the campus and city, it was essential to have e-mail capability. Throughout the project we have effectively coordinated our activities, including the writing of CSAP reports, electronically.

Comparison Site: A research project of this nature requires a comparison site that: 1) has similar demographics to the intervention site; 2) will collaborate with the evaluator to survey a comparable sample of undergraduate students on the campus, and 3) and is willing to postpone any major social norms marketing campaigns during the course of the research. The Colorado College met these criteria. In addition, CC is located in Colorado Springs, one hour from Denver, so travel and communication between the two sites has been relatively easy.

C. Program Goals and Objectives

The Community Initiated Prevention Intervention Study Goals were as follows:

1. To determine how effective the selected prevention intervention model is in preventing, delaying, and/or reducing substance use and abuse in the intervention group, as compared to the comparison group of the target population, in the local community setting.
2. To measure and document reductions in substance abuse and associated problems in the intervention group as compared to the comparison group of the target population. These associated problems include social, emotional, cognitive, and physical developmental problems and/or abuse that precede and/or relate to substance use and/or abuse.

The Project goals, listed below, were a reflection of the CSAP goals but were adapted to the specific target population – undergraduate students, to the model to be tested – social norms, and to the behavior to be changed – binge drinking:

1. To determine how effective the social norms model is in preventing, delaying, and/or reducing binge drinking among undergraduate students at the University of Denver, as compared with students at Colorado College.
2. To measure and document reductions in alcohol abuse and associated problems at the intervention site as compared to the comparison site.

Project objectives.

Project objectives involved implementation of a social norms marketing plan that is detailed in the training manual, *Social Norms Marketing (The Montana Model)* by Linkenbach and D’Atrie (1998). Year 01 was devoted to Steps 1-6 of this model: 1. Planning and Environmental Advocacy; 2. Baseline Data; 3. Message Development; 4. Marketing Plan; 5. Pilot Test and Refine Materials; and 6. Implementation. The campaign continued through years 02 and 03. Evaluation was ongoing with outcome and process measures. Details of the marketing plan are covered in the implementation section.

Modifications to date

There were no significant modifications of the original plan, with the exception of the following: in Year 01, due to time limitations there was a reduced emphasis on focus group interviews and pilot testing of materials; and in Year 02 comprehensive pilot testing of materials still did not occur due to the late availability of data results compared to the end of the school year.

D. Target Population

Overview

The target population for this project was undergraduate students attending a small private university, the University of Denver (DU). DU was selected because it falls into a category of colleges that are at-risk for experiencing problems with alcohol use among students. The Colorado College was selected as the comparison site because it has many of the same characteristics as the University of Denver, a small liberal arts college with an affluent and predominantly white student body. The particular intervention, the social norms model, was directed at reducing the level of alcohol use and related problems among college students. This model requires data collection at the college or university where the intervention will take place. For that reason, all full-scale social norms interventions must select representative samples of students attending the college or university that will be developing a social norms campaign. The sampling strategy for the social norms program at the University of Denver followed the procedures below:

A cluster random sample was designed to select undergraduate students at both the intervention and comparison sites. This process involved the following steps:

1. Selection of sample at intervention site:

- Randomly selected classes from the registrar's office;
- Personally contacted faculty in each selected class to explain the project and request permission to administer a survey;
- With permission of the faculty member, arrived at each class to administer the Core Survey.

2. Selection of sample at comparison site:

- Randomly selected students from registrar's office
- Worked with staff and administrators to develop a plan to administer surveys
- Implemented survey plan based on administering surveys at on-campus residential meetings.

While the cluster sampling procedure was successful in collecting enough cases for a representative sample - 421 students - the sampling plan at the comparison site was not as successful. While data collection at the comparison site had been less successful than at the intervention site in the previous two years, this was especially true in Year 03. A low response rate from the comparison site - 127 cases - resulted from a major incident that occurred on campus during the data collection process. A violent crime focused the administration's attention on safety and led to a school-wide shut down for several days. This severely compromised data collection efforts.

Because of the nature of this particular intervention, issues of the selection of participants or any screening processes are not very relevant. A social norming campaign is by its nature a universal one where all undergraduate students, as well as faculty and staff, are potentially exposed to the intervention activities. Because students aren't "selected" to participate in a traditional sense, there are no specific issues related to retention.

However, with a social norming program on a college or university campus, there is always the problem of how students and faculty will react to the campaign. For this reason, it has become imperative that after the collection of the base-line data and particularly after the initiation of the actual intervention, project members meet often with various student and faculty groups on campus to explain the program as well as to respond to any questions about the manner in which the data was collected. So while traditional concerns of retention, screening, and participant selection are not paramount in this project, it's imperative that efforts are made to explain the project to interested parties on campus in order to increase its legitimacy and favorableness.

The risk factors addressed in this intervention were in the intersection between the individual domain and the school domain. The intervention sought to correct the misperceptions of student use of alcohol in order to produce a lower rate of consumption among students and to change the normative climate of the school through efforts to correct the misperceptions of student use.

Do's and Don'ts

1. It is imperative to explain the project to as many interested parties as possible on campus – including representatives from the faculty, administration, and student body.
2. Use the same sampling strategy at both the intervention and comparison site.
3. Work closely with the comparison site to oversee the proper sampling procedures.

E. Intervention

The project is driven by a marketing campaign, “advertising” the true norms of University of Denver undergraduate students concerning alcohol use across campus. Positive messages are developed to relay the number of students making responsible decisions concerning their use of alcohol and related behaviors.

The social norms marketing plan is detailed in the training manual, *Social Norms Marketing (The Montana Model)* by Linkenbach and D’Atrie (1998). Year one was devoted to Steps 1-6 of this model: 1. Planning and Environmental Advocacy; 2. Baseline Data; 3. Message Development; 4. Marketing Plan; 5. Pilot Test and Refine Materials; and 6. Implementation. In Year 02, Step 7, Evaluation was implemented, to complete the full model.

In Year 01, the program’s core components included: 1) the survey; 2) use of a Stakeholders’ advisory group consisting of university faculty, students and staff; and 3) promotional materials. Because this is a science-based, data-driven model, all of the materials were developed based on the collected data. A truly effective social norms campaign cannot be developed and implemented without this information.

Once the survey was completed and the data gleaned for positive norms, the Stakeholders were key in ensuring a successful campaign. Because this group was representative of the campus at large, their input on the materials and their ability to convey the message and reliability of the data was critical. They acted as messengers to the various areas of campus in which they were involved.

The last core component was the promotional materials themselves. The greater number of materials and greater variety of media used, the better. It was absolutely necessary to saturate the target population, in this case, DU undergraduates, with the messages, to achieve the goal of changing students’ misperceptions of their peers’ alcohol use. If the population saw the message only once or twice, they would be much less likely to learn and remember it. However, by seeing it multiple times, in multiple formats, they become more likely to discuss it, learn it, and eventually, truly believe it.

In Years 02 and 03, with all seven steps in place, the campaign truly took shape. The program’s components involved: 1) the survey; 2) use of the established Stakeholders’ advisory group consisting of university faculty, students and staff; 3) student focus groups; 4) promotional materials; and 5) evaluation of the program.

We used the seven steps, taken from training manual, Social Norms Marketing (The Montana Model) by Linkenbach and D’Atrie (1998), to describe the progression of our project as follows. Further in the report is a chronological description of the implementation process.

Step One - Planning and Environmental Advocacy:

Oversight Committee

In Year 01 upon award notification, the oversight committee was convened. This group consisted of the key stakeholders in alcohol and drug prevention and higher education issues in Colorado, including Project Director Melody Mock Durso from the Colorado Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division; Project Coordinator Drew Hunter and Project Associate Coordinator Cari Overton-Follett from the national organization, The BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network; Project Evaluator Robert Granfield, Ph.D., a University of Denver sociology professor with a background in alcohol and drug issues; DU Wellness Program Director Kristin Ream, as well as representatives from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and Coors Brewing Company, all of whom participated in the planning of the project. The oversight committee met monthly throughout the first year of the grant to oversee all activities related to the project implementation and evaluation. During Year 02 of the grant, the Oversight Committee continued to meet monthly and played an important role in the direction of the campaign. In Year 03, the University of Denver Department of Wellness underwent staffing changes with the departure of Kristin Ream in November 2001, followed by the appointment of Rick Ginsberg, Ph.D. to the position of Director and assignment to the project in February 2002.

By the end of the grant period, meetings of this group changed from the entire Oversight Committee, consisting of the Project Team (grant staff) and outside agency supporters, to only Project Team. This was due mainly to time constraints on the part of outside agency representatives, as well as changes in staffing at these organizations. However, by meeting regularly throughout the grant period, we were able to continue all steps of the model, address challenges as they were presented and be known as the “inner-workings” of the program to stakeholders, students and other interested parties. One of the keys of this was the creation of a successful avenue to address the various questions posed regarding the project. If one member was unable to appropriately answer a question or resolve an issue, the expertise of another project team member could be accessed to ensure a response to all inquiries.

Meeting with Leaders in the Social Norms Field

In Year 01, the oversight committee began meeting and consulting with leaders in the social norms field to begin development of the campaign. For this purpose, the budget included funds for consultant fees. Researching previously successful campaigns is highly important, to avoid wasting time “reinventing the wheel”. By borrowing ideas from other campuses and finding out what worked and what did not, we were able to streamline our process and to begin developing materials prior to receiving the results of the surveys. In addition, advice from consultants led to a decision to change the sampling procedures from direct mail to cluster sampling, and to reiterate the importance of disseminating information in a fashion to achieve a high saturation rate across campus.

Cultivating Administrative Support

During the first year of the grant, the Oversight Committee and DU's Vice-Provost brought together key administrators and faculty from the University of Denver in order to announce the grant and provide information on the Social Norms Model. The group was not reconvened during Year 02 because the grant committee felt it would be more beneficial to reconvene them after the implementation had cycled through a full year and we had collected a second round of data. Examples of their support included: clearing the path for posting materials, speaking to campus groups, and providing the "top-down" support necessary for the success of the project.

During Year 03 of the grant, the Oversight Committee invited the members of this group to a special meeting in order to update them on the progress of the campaign, as well as to brainstorm ideas for future funding of the DU social norming effort once the grant project was finished. However, support from this level was not as significant as the committee had hoped, and we were unable to attract their interest and attendance. In addition, the top-down support for the staff of the Department of Wellness was no longer strong. This became evident with the elimination of one Wellness staff position, resulting in limited staff time to continue the project's priority status and ensure successful implementation.

The Stakeholders Committee

The Stakeholders group, formed in February of the first grant year, was created to advise the grant committee on the development of campaign materials, to help legitimize the campaign on campus, and to identify those groups or individuals on campus who might limit or strengthen the campaign. This committee, consisting of undergraduate students, graduate assistants, various student activities staff, wellness staff, residence life staff, and health/counseling center staff in addition to the project staff, was an integral part of the implementation process. This group's knowledge and familiarity with social norming and with the specific materials used was critical to the success of the project. For that reason, during the first year of the grant members received training on the social norms model of prevention, specific data collected at DU, and how they would be involved in the grant. We then transitioned to specific tasks including brainstorming themes, choosing messages and critiquing preliminary materials. The feedback this group provided was critical for the campaign, as the members represented the campus at large.

It is essential to hold regular meetings with Stakeholders in order to keep them informed, gather anecdotal information, continue training, and to problem solve when members are unsure about how to answer questions or respond to comments about the URDU campaign. In Year 01 we met monthly when classes were in session, beginning in February. Students and staff requested a set day and time to meet, so they could plan their schedules around the meetings. Meeting at lunchtime is easier for students, as fewer classes are scheduled, and providing lunch was truly an asset, rewarding members for giving up their lunchtime to work with us.

Consistent attendance at meetings was somewhat of a challenge during the first few months of the project. This was addressed in part by scheduling lunch meetings and by picking a consistent time and day for meetings. An additional challenge was to achieve more diverse representation of the student body at our meetings. This challenge has been ongoing due to the largely homogeneous student population at DU, a fact that our CSAP project officer has acknowledged as a reality to be accepted.

Throughout the second year of the grant, most of the original members remained active in the group and many new members joined, increasing the participation of both student and staff members at Stakeholders' meetings. (It is believed that the provision of financial incentives for the "paid" student stakeholders may have enhanced attendance, although the majority of participants did not receive payment for their participation and remained involved due to their enthusiasm for the project.) Through their training and participation, members gained knowledge of the actual alcohol use norms at DU, correcting their own misperceptions. At each monthly meeting (held only during the academic year), the group was given an opportunity to provide input on the development of the campaign and to present any obstacles encountered for resolution. The students, faculty, and staff involved became a central force to validate the campaign by sharing their knowledge with other students and staff as the grant campaign was implemented.

Dosage: Student participation at the Stakeholders meetings increased from an average 2.4 students per meeting in the first year, to 3.8 students per meeting in the second year.

Year 02 participation by student stakeholders is demonstrated in the grid below, with dosage calculated at one hour per student:

Month	Total Attendees	Number of Undergrads	Percent of Undergrads	Number of Graduate Students	Percent of Graduate Students
October	7	1	14%	0	0%
November	14	2	14%	3	21%
January	15	6	40%	2	13%
February	17	5	29%	3	17%
March	10	3	30%	0	0%
April	11	2	18%	1	9%
May	22	9	41%	2	9%
August	15	2	13%	0	0%
September	14	4	29%	0	0%

Year 03 brought a number of challenges to the project and the Stakeholders committee. With the departure of Kristin Ream, momentum was lost with this group, as she had built a strong rapport with the members and continually sought out new members, especially students. With no staff permanently assigned to the project until February of 2002, the immediate reaction of stakeholders was to commit to seeing the project through the transition. However, without ample staff time and support, the momentum diminished, and the number of highly committed Stakeholders decreased. From Year 02 to Year 03, the number of meetings declined by two (from nine to seven) and the average number of attendees decreased from 13.9 to 12.7. However, with overall attendance decreasing slightly, the number of student stakeholders actually increased slightly.

Year 03 participation by student stakeholders is demonstrated in the grid below:

Month	Total Attendees	Number of Undergrads	Percent of Undergrads	Number of Graduate Students	Percent of Graduate Students
October	**No meeting, due to late September and early November meetings.				
November	12	7	58%	0	0%
January	14	5	36%	0	0%
February	14	5	36%	1	7%
March	18	7	39%	0	0%
April	11	5	45%	0	0%
May	13	4	31%	0	0%
August	No meeting scheduled.				
September	7	1	14%	0	0%

Dosage: Student participation at the Stakeholders meetings increased from an average 2.4 students per meeting in the first year, to 3.8 students per meeting in the second year and 4.9 students in the third year.

Without the solid structure of this group, meeting monthly while classes were in session, it is likely, we would not have had the behind the scenes support that we did. The members of this committee cleared the path for our involvement in everything from Greek recruitment to major campus events, the unveiling of the new campus radio station, to new student orientation. While the stakeholders who were staffed by the University were not among the upper administration, they were the key DU staff members who work with students throughout the year, providing necessary eyes and ears to bring comments, questions and concerns to the overall group to be addressed. The student stakeholders were also critical, due to the peer influence existing within student culture. With their ability to reach their peers at a level unattainable to staff and faculty, these student representatives helped drive the campaign, focus grouping messages and materials, emphasizing the true norms through prize patrols and by participating in major campus events on behalf of the campaign.

Activities

Many of the activities achieved during years 01 and 02 apply both to environmental advocacy and implementation. While planning for the success of the program and gaining campus-wide support, participants in these activities also learned about the project and received materials to post and information to share with others. During the many meetings and presentations to various groups on campus, the social norming theory and message were disseminated broadly across campus, and, over time, many students were able to effectively talk to other students about the campaign. In Year 03, although many of the same activities were continued, much of the activity was done on a smaller scale than in years one and two, due to the reduction in staff time from the University of Denver. Following are some of the key activities:

Meetings with Various Greek Organizations.

During Year 02 of the grant project, the coordinators held several meetings with various Greek groups on campus, a targeted high-risk group in the grant for focused messages. Outreach did not occur during Year 01, and it was clear that the Greek population had little buy-in into the campaign and that little had been done during the first year of planning to garner their support. In Year 03, several meetings were attempted with members of the Greek System, yet little to no response was received. This may have been, in part, to the lack of a familiar name and face associated with the project, and was almost certainly due to the increased pressure on the fraternities and sororities from administration to limit social activities involving alcohol. The Year two meetings are described as follows:

- The Pan Hellenic and Interfraternity leadership councils' representatives received a 30-minute presentation on the social norms theory in October of year 02. This interaction helped the grant team begin to gain the trust and buy-in of the Greek community. Social norms materials were distributed and all presidents were asked to display the materials in their respective houses. While the group was attentive, there was still a feeling of skepticism among the members. Dosage: 30 minutes per student, 35 students
- Several Greek leaders attended two different planning meetings to determine the most effective means to involve Greek students in the campaign. Once the program coordinators clarified that the meeting's purpose was to help the Greeks rather than to highlight high-risk drinking in the Greek population, the tone at the meetings became very positive and collaborative. The students who attended were excited to be "part of the solution" and they offered many useful suggestions. For example, the students suggested that incorporating the URDU campaign into Greek Rush week would be a great way to influence the first-year students as they develop opinions about the meaning of "Greek Life". Also, the students explained that the Greeks want to feel included in the campaign (i.e. using models wearing Greek letters on the poster), but not singled out. Dosage: 2 hours per student, 10 students.

During Year 03, although several attempts were made to host general meetings encouraging Greek leaders to give feedback, we received little to no response and were forced to cancel these meetings due to lack of interest. Although the University of Denver Director of Greek Life became increasingly involved with the Stakeholders committee in Year 03, he was not able to peak interest in this particular student population. This may be due, in part, to the change in the Director's job description, expanding to include various other student activity responsibilities. In response to the decreased interest in attending "general" Greek meetings, information on the URDU campaign and social norms theory was infused into existing programs that Greeks were attending. During these presentations, the URDU campaign and the social norms of DU were discussed. Four of these meetings occurred during Year 03.

- The Pan Hellenic leadership council representatives received a 15-minute presentation on the URDU campaign in February of Year 03. The intention of this meeting was to continue explaining the campaign to sorority members and to gain greater Greek community involvement in the project. It also served to explain how the URDU campaign could be addressed by attaching the issue, and thus the conversation generated by the campaign, to other topics of interest and concern among sorority members. Social norms materials were distributed and all

Chapter Presidents were asked to display the materials in their respective houses. The group was generally attentive to the information being presented.

Dosage: 15 minutes per student, 22 students.

- The Delta Gamma Sorority received a 45-minute presentation on the drinking norms of DU, stress management, the relationship between drinking and stress, and the URDU campaign in March of Year 03. This was the first attempt to discuss the URDU campaign and social norms theory within the context of other topics of interest to sorority members. The hope was to link the issue of DU drinking norms to stress reduction in order to promote a wider scope of conversation about the URDU campaign. Campaign materials were handed out and stakeholder involvement was solicited. The presentation was generally a successful one, with students weaving together the two topics and using the information from the URDU campaign to justify and argue their points.

Dosage: 45 minutes per student, 47 students.

- The Beta Theta Pi Fraternity received a 60-minute presentation on anger management and drinking, the drinking norms of DU, and the URDU campaign in March of Year 03. The presentation was geared toward explaining the drinking culture of DU by using data from the URDU project, and emphasizing responsible behavior (including anger management and group de-escalation) by connecting it to the responsible drinking behaviors that the majority of DU students were exhibiting. Campaign materials were handed out and stakeholder involvement was solicited. The presentation was highly successful, and it resulted in intense debate among fraternity members about the URDU campaign, and whether or not the data being used in the campaign materials were accurate. A large amount of skepticism was displayed at first, but many students helped explain social norms theory to skeptics, and engaged in conversation with the presenter about how the URDU campaign could increase its effectiveness.

Dosage: 60 minutes per student, 34 students.

- The Gamma Phi Beta Sorority received a 45-minute presentation on eating issues, body image, and drinking in April of Year 03. The intention of the presentation was to link a frequently overlooked link between female alcohol use and body image. The presentation was successful in helping sorority students discuss eating issues and body image within the context of other social pressures at DU, such as drinking. Discussion was promoted regarding social norms theory and peer pressure, and how these issues impacted both drinking and the way in which women viewed their bodies. Parallels were discussed between sorority women's relationship with food and their relationship with alcohol. Campaign materials were handed out and stakeholder involvement was solicited.

Dosage: 45 minutes per student, 65 students

Presentations to Resident Assistants (RAs)

During both Year 01 and Year 02, the RAs were trained on alcohol use and abuse, the social norms model and the plan for its implementation on campus. Both years, campaign materials were provided for all the RAs to post on the floors they oversee. The presentation that was given in Year 01 yielded little conversation from the RAs in attendance. However, by Year 02, the campaign had become a dominating topic of the question/answer section of the presentation. While some students were outwardly critical of the campaign, many of their criticisms were answered, not by the

presenters, but by other students who understood the social norms theory. In Year 03, another conversation was held with RAs regarding the URDU campaign, discussing how the social norms of DU could be infused into programming for residence halls. The RAs in attendance knew of the campaign and social norms theory, and much of the discussion centered around the students' dislike of the message ("Most DU students drink 0-5 drinks when they party") because they thought the numbers were either too low, and thus not believable, or too high, and thus counterproductive to advertise.

Dosage decreased only gradually between years one and two, but dropped significantly in Year 03. The first two years, the program was included as a part of the overall training required of all RAs, which resulted in much higher attendance.

Dosage (Year 01): 30 minutes per student, 70 students in attendance

Dosage (Year 02): 60 minutes per student, 66 students in attendance

Dosage (Year 03): 45 minutes per student, 38 students.

Presentations to the student leaders of Student Orientation, Advising and Registration (SOAR)

During all three years of the project, student leaders of the SOAR program (Student Orientation Advising and Registration – a program for first-year and transfer students) received a presentation on the grant process, goals, and the social norms messages. Much like the presentations given to the RAs, during Year 01 the students listened to the presentation but had few questions. Conversely, during the presentation given in Year 02 the students had many questions and comments about the campaign and the theory, and gave much good feedback regarding the campaign materials. During the presentation given in Year 03, students also provided feedback regarding campaign materials and message development.

Dosage (Year 01): 60 minutes per student, 52 students in attendance

Dosage (Year 02): 30 minutes per student, 46 students in attendance

Dosage (Year 03): 35 minutes per student, 39 students in attendance

University of Denver Community Connections (UDCC) Classes

In the last month of Year 03, several presentations were done to UDCC classes about the URDU campaign and social norms theory. UDCC classes are two-credit classes for first-year students taken during their first quarter at DU. The classes are specifically designed to address pertinent campus issues, provide information to students about resources on campus, and introduce students to staff and faculty members who can offer students engaging and interesting educational experiences. Eight, 20-minute presentations were done in such classes during the month of September in Year 03. Campaign materials were disseminated and student stakeholder involvement was solicited during these meetings.

Dosage: 20 minutes per student, 87 students total.

Other Presentations:

Additional presentations were conducted involving the target population:

Year 02:

- A Diversity-themed mentoring class requested a short presentation on the social norms theory. The theory and campaign were presented to the group, and a discussion with the students followed.

Dosage: 30 minutes per student, 11 students

- A presentation was given in the Drugs and Society undergraduate sociology class. This consisted broadly of a discussion of the social norms theory and specifically on the campaign at DU.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 32 students
- Meeting with the chairperson for Winter Carnival (traditional University of Denver winter quarter celebration). This meeting was to discuss and plan the involvement of the URDU campaign with the activities of the week.
Dosage: 60 minutes per student, 1 student in attendance
- A presentation was given to the University of Denver's peer education group (the SEARCH Team) to provide information about the campaign, to gain the group's support of the campaign and to discuss their role and involvement in the future.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 4 students in attendance

Year 03:

- The Associate Project Coordinator provided training for the Stakeholders Committee on the Social Norms theory and the specific model being used for the project. It was felt that this training was essential for those stakeholders who were new, and that it would be helpful to those stakeholders who had continued their commitment.
Dosage: 30 minutes per person, 5 students in attendance

The following activities are those in which the target population was not involved. Dosage, therefore, is not applicable:

Year 02:

- A meeting of the ADAD public relations staff, DU Communications, and members of the Oversight Committee was held to ensure communication of media opportunities related to the grant project. A member of the DU Communications department became a member of the Stakeholders committee as a result of this meeting. Her work ensures that any campus-wide and campus-community media attention from the University is accurate and consistent.
- A presentation was made to the Dean's Council to ensure their knowledgeable participation in the campaign and to address any questions they may have regarding the messages and materials.
- A presentation much like that to the Dean's Council was made to the Arts and Humanities Chairpersons, to establish an understanding of the project and materials to be distributed across campus.
- The Project Associate Coordinator and Wellness Program Director met with the graduate advisors to the Greek organizations as a first step to find ways to better involve students participating in the DU Greek system. It was determined that grant staff and/or members of the Stakeholders committee needed to plan meetings with the student leaders and each chapter, and provide packets of the campaign materials to each of the Greek houses.

- A presentation was made to the Graduate Resident Directors to gain their participation and assistance in disseminating campaign materials to resident assistants (R.A.) for posting on their “floors”. They were also asked to track which R.A.’s created bulletin boards using the materials in order to distribute prizes as a reward for supporting the campaign.
- The University of Denver Health Services staff were given a presentation about the project and provided a question and suggestion period to determine how they might best support the efforts of the campaign. They were provided with campaign materials to post in the health center and asked to receive a packet with each new message/material distribution. In addition, they discussed talking with students about the true norms of alcohol use among their peers, especially when meeting with students referred for campus alcohol policy violations.
- A presentation was made to the Graduate Resident Directors to gain their participation and assistance in disseminating campaign materials to resident assistants (R.A.) for posting on their “floors”. They were also asked to track which R.A.’s created bulletin boards using the materials in order to distribute prizes as a reward for supporting the campaign.
- A presentation was made to students in the Masters of Science in Management Higher Education Program. While these students are not part of the target population, management of alcohol use is an integral part of programming and decision-making in higher education and many campuses are implementing social norms programs, making the information helpful for their future experiences. In addition, many graduate students work directly with undergraduate students in various areas on campus and therefore, if well informed, can promote the positive messages and their validity.

Year 03:

- The Program Associate Coordinator and Wellness Coordinator (Kristin Ream) presented the training, “Social Norms: Implementing the Seven Step Model,” at the Colorado Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division Workforce Development Training in Silverthorne, Colorado. This training provided a brief introduction to the theory of the social norms model and the process utilized in developing and implementing the normative message campaign at DU.
- During the staff transition at DU, members of the project team met with Wellness Department staff, the Director of Health and Counseling who oversees Wellness, and the Associate Vice-Provost of Campus Life to ensure that grant activities continue without interruption.
- The Program Associate Coordinator followed up with staff at Colorado College to provide sample materials, feedback and suggestions as they begin development of their social norms project. In addition, the Wellness Department’s Outreach and Technical Coordinator provided alcohol information training focused on social norms to residence life staff at Colorado College when the Associate Program Coordinator was unable to provide the training.

A. Step Two: Baseline Data

The baseline data, collected in February and March of 2000 during the first year, was used extensively throughout the second year to garner campus support of the campaign. Once students, faculty and staff began to understand that the campaign messages were based on data from a campus-wide survey, they were more open to learning about the campaign and the social norms theory. The baseline data was used in Year 01 (October 99 – 00) to develop the Year 02 messages that were implemented in October 2000 through May 2001.

In Year 02's survey, several questions were added to gather data on how believable the messages were to students and how well saturated the campus was with the materials. When collecting data in Year 03, the Core survey, again with some supplemental questions was used to gain greater insight into the various successes of the campaign and what might be changed in the future (i.e., was saturation high enough, are students buying into the message?). The data, in essence, become part of Step 7, Evaluation, and create a baseline for believability and campus saturation for the future. The data collected leads to step three, in which messages are developed utilizing the survey results.

B. Step Three: Message Development

During Year 01 of the project, prior to receiving the final compilation of data, development of materials began. As this model has been used successfully on several other campuses across the country, review of previously developed materials, obtained through BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network, was very helpful. Common themes were identified and discussions with social norms supporters provided a template of sorts for initial development.

Actual message development began once the baseline data (collected in February and March 2000) was available. Messages were created for use in September 2000 (year 01) and in October 2000 through March 2001 (year 02).

The following positive social norms campaign messages were created from the baseline data:

- “Most DU students...drink moderately or not at all. 66% of DU students use alcohol 1 time or less per week.” (August-September 2000)
- “Most DU student (66%) drink alcohol only once per week or less.” (October 2000)
- “Most DU students (89%) have not damaged property due to drinking or drug use.” (November 2000)
- “Most DU students (64%) have zero-5 drinks per week.” (January-February 2001)

Due to the delayed start of the grant, these messages were not thoroughly focus-grouped. Instead, they were developed entirely by the students, faculty and staff on the Stakeholders committee, and correlated behaviors.

In addition to creating the materials, the Stakeholders group developed a campaign theme and logo to maintain continuity between all campaign materials within each academic year and from one year to the next. This theme became “URDU” (You are DU). The logo was designed to resemble a Colorado state license plate and displays the messages “URDU” and “University of Denver.” The intent of the message is to establish an inclusive feeling for the campaign, and to provide a way to

link all campaign materials together. The logo was determined to be effective and was used on all materials for the entirety of the grant period.

As the materials were disseminated across campus and the project staff gathered anecdotal information on the messages, the following points became clear for this particular step of the campaign.

- Students were confused by too many messages and could not remember single messages well.
- The percentages were too close (64% and 66%) and were thus confused.
- The difference between frequency and quantity was confusing.
- The materials were seen as something developed by the DU administration for positive public relations, and thus, were not believable.
- Focus groups are critical to ensuring student-friendly messages and to gain a better understanding of the target population.

In February and March 2001 (Year 02), the Core Survey of Alcohol and Other Drug Norms was administered for the second time during the grant period. A supplemental survey included questions regarding dosage and believability. The resulting data was then gleaned for changes in attitudes and/or behaviors, positive norms existing among the students concerning the high-risk use of alcohol, and student receptivity to the messages. In addition, anecdotal information was gathered from the Stakeholders group and from the data gathered by the student stakeholders' "prize patrols", where students received prizes for knowing the message. This information was used to start development of new messages. A critical issue discovered during this step was ensuring timely and complete reporting of the data. This is critical in the development of the most appropriate and most easily accepted messages as well as ensuring time to focus group the messages and materials by students (Step 5).

To avoid the confusion created by using multiple messages in the first year of implementation, we determined in Year 02 that any new materials would have only one message, disseminated in a variety of ways across campus. The project team looked carefully for a more student-friendly message to be focus grouped prior to the end of the spring quarter. The most positive, student-friendly normative data was that 68.4% of students report drinking five or fewer drinks at a party. Several posters were developed using the percentage or stating "five or fewer", "five or less" or "zero to five". Feedback from the focus groups provided critical information for development of the final message. This included the information that students did not like the use of the percentage because it created the feeling that they were just another number; using "zero" was less believable; and "five or fewer" sounded better than the other options. Therefore, the message developed into "Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party".

Although the poster image was developed along with the message, once the final message was identified, the same message was placed on a number of layouts to determine what was most attractive to students. Changes in fonts, colors and images were made according to the feedback from these focus groups. Once the poster was developed, we began production of other materials and the "5 or fewer" logo, using the same font and various colors from the poster.

One of the other items developed for the campaign was a series of table tents with different messages that reflected the data collected anecdotally and via the Year 02 supplemental survey.

Data indicated that the percentage of students seeing the materials at least 1-2 times per week was 80.7%, confirming that the marketing plan achieved successful saturation of the campus. However, the percent of students reporting that they believed “66% of students drink once a week or less” was 42.5% and the percentage believing “64% of students have 0-5 drinks per week” was 45.7%.

Through focus groups, programs and presentations, informal gatherings, and reports from stakeholders, the project team discovered several myths that were being communicated around campus regarding the campaign and how the data was collected. The data on believability confirmed that these myths needed to be confronted. The following are the “myths” and corresponding “realities” which were used to create five different table tents to be disseminated in the fall quarter of 2001, crossing over Years 02 and 03. Myth #5 was disseminated in early September 2001, with myth #4 posted several weeks later, myth #3 several weeks after that and so on.

Myth 1: The surveys were administered Friday mornings in Natural Sciences classes

Reality: 22 classes were chosen at random to complete the surveys. These included classes held on various days and at various times in departments across all academic divisions (Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering; Arts and Humanities, & Social Sciences; and the Daniels College of Business.)

Myth 2: URDU is a PR campaign from the University for prospective students and their parents.

Reality: While URDU is a PR campaign of sorts, it is not one about propaganda, but about truth. Part of a federally funded research grant from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, its purpose is to educate the campus and community about the true norms of student alcohol use and emphasize the responsible choices made by most DU students. The Colorado Human Services Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division, The BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network and DU Wellness Department are the collaborative organizations working on the project.

Myth 3: The survey was given only to student leaders and overachievers.

Reality: 439 undergraduate students in randomly selected classes took the survey. (This is 11% of the undergraduate population - statistically, a very reliable sample.)

Myth 4: The URDU materials are just another way to "crack down" on students.

Reality: The URDU materials were designed with the assistance of DU students, to identify and promote the safe, moderate practices of our students related to drinking, reduce potential harms, and advertise that most DU students ARE making responsible choices concerning alcohol use.

Myth 5: When DU students party and socialize, they're all drinking heavily--that's what college students do!

Reality: Research, both nationally and right here at DU, shows most college students reporting that they have five or fewer (that's 0-5) drinks when they party. However, stories after social events where alcohol is involved are rarely "Did you see how sober Bob was last night?" or "Karen was drinking really moderately last night!" The stories usually revolve around unhealthy behaviors.

As we continued to receive feedback from students, it was felt that a mention of “five or fewer” meaning “zero to five” was necessary to empower abstainers and low-risk drinkers. In addition, this acted as a reminder to the heavier drinkers that most students choose to drink 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 drinks when they partied and decreased the emphasis on the “5”. Thus, as we began developing materials for the Winter Quarter, we added a piece to the message, creating “Most DU Students drink 5 or fewer (that’s 0-5) when they party” and “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” using these in addition to the original “5 or fewer” message to be more inclusive and garner support from a wider array of students.

In addition, through reports from students, stakeholders and the project team, it was discovered that by advertising the “5 or fewer myths” we might have inadvertently emphasized them. Although we were not surprised at students vocalizing the myths, since this is where they came from in the first place, we were surprised at how few recognized the reality statements. Therefore, in January, a new poster referred to as “Facts” was developed and disseminated. The messages were clearly facts, as it stated: “Fact: Most DU Students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001!; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project. Do you know the facts? Get them at www.du.edu/wellness/urdu.”

In February and March of Year 03, data was collected once again via the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey and attached supplemental survey. As planning for the 2002-2003 academic year began, we felt it important to develop a new message only should the survey data have shown a significant change. It seemed that students had started to catch on to the message, and anecdotally, that recognition of the campaign had grown. It was felt that this message had become integrated into the university and that to maintain it would increase the opportunity to create perceptual and behavioral change among students. When a more comprehensive data set was received in late May, it was gleaned for any significant, positive change in either perception or behavior. While there were small changes overall, and clear change among the female population, the project team felt it would be detrimental to future success to change the message. Therefore, “Most DU Students have 5 or fewer when they party” remained the primary message throughout year three and beyond, through the fall 2002 quarter.

Overall, our efforts to develop appropriate, productive and believable messages were significant. One challenge we encountered was the timing of data collection, as it did not allow ample time to receive survey results, analyze them for positive, normative messages and focus group the messages with time to review and refine them. While we feel we have begun the process and over time, should the project be continued, it will become easier to accomplish this task and create change among students. It is our hope that the University of Denver will continue the project, gathering data to test results of the campaign, and revising the message to address changes in student alcohol use norms.

Step Four: Market Plan

The marketing of messages is what ensures that the target population will be exposed to the campaign. It also determines the different marketing approaches that may be needed to reach specific sub-populations, such as members of the Greek letter organizations at DU.

Because the grant years run from October 1 to September 30, across academic years, different messages are developed, implemented and reported for one grant year. The theme and promotion of the campaign is consistent throughout each academic year to ensure full message saturation.

During both Year 01 and Year 02 of the campaign, the implementation team created a marketing materials rollout plan listing all campus facilities and the number of materials needed for posting. The plan was adhered to during each posting period to ensure thorough and consistent saturation of the campus. While this marketing plan was in existence for use through Year 03, it was not utilized by the new staff upon the departure of Wellness Coordinator Kristin Ream at the end of the Fall Quarter.

Another important piece of the marketing plan was the solicitation of opinions from the Stakeholders group and SOAR leaders on how best to saturate the campus with the campaign messages. In Year 01, these campus representatives agreed that traditional materials, such as posters and table tents, were necessary to attain widespread saturation. In addition, less traditional marketing materials were used. These materials included static cling decals to be placed on windows and mirrors, refrigerator magnets, lanyards, visors and dry-erase markers.

As a result of such successful saturation levels in the project's first/second year, a similar market plan was followed for Year 02/03 of the grant. Posters and table tents were used as the main source of message dissemination, complimented by less traditional marketing materials to integrate the message into the campus culture. These methods included: post-it note pads, pens, granola bars, and highlighters. Additionally, project staff developed a URDU website containing campaign information, data, materials, and a feedback section. Finally, as the stakeholders' committee suggested in Year 01 of the project in order to achieve broader saturation, advertising and student-written articles were placed in *The Clarion*, DU's student newspaper, throughout the year to promote the campaign.

During Year 01 and Year 02 and the beginning of Year 03, campaign coordinators & volunteers heavily saturated certain areas on campus in order to reach specified target populations. Residence halls, where most first-year students reside, and the Driscoll Center (student union) were targeted for the maximum number of materials allowed for posting. All academic buildings containing bulletin boards were saturated with posters, and academic buildings with no bulletin boards or strict posting policies were saturated with table tents and static clings. The Greek organizations received materials to post in their Greek houses as well.

In year 03, due to staffing challenges and reduced student stakeholder participation, the rollout plan previously developed was not adhered to, thus reducing message saturation across campus. Posters continued to be the primary means by which the message was disseminated, however, at the suggestion of the new Wellness Director, no additional table tents or static cleans were developed, as they disappeared from posting areas too quickly. As was done in Year 02, a variety of materials were developed to maintain student interest and visibility of the message. These materials included: microwave popcorn for Homecoming; post-it note pads; "Five or Fewer" labels for coffee cup sleeves in the student union; postcards with zipper pulls with the "Five or fewer" message and prize coupons to reward students for wearing and knowing the message; "5 or fewer" logo printed on t-

shirts and water bottles for the student spring celebration, “May Daze”; CD cases for orientation; travel mugs; key chains; and pens with a message window that changes each time the pen is clicked.

One component of the market plan that differed from year to year was the attention paid to the Greek student population. While in Year 01 the project team was unable to address the needs of the higher-risk and more disbelieving Greek community (one of the grant’s target groups to receive focused messages), in Year 02 the first year Greek students were targeted with campaign materials. This process began over the summer of 2001 when all incoming students received a mailing inviting them to participate in Greek recruitment. The mailing included a postcard that reminded the recipients that there is much more to Greek life than “partying” and it cited the “5 or fewer” message. Then, in September 2001, the first year students participating in Greek recruitment were given granola bars packaged with the social norms message.

With challenges in project staffing at DU and difficulty coordinating with Greek leaders, this group was not targeted in the same fashion in Year 03, but did remain a focus of the campaign. Each sorority and fraternity chapter received marketing materials to post in their respective houses, and several chapters were recipients of programs done by DU’s Wellness staff. New to the campaign was the printing of an advertisement in a new Greek Life publication, developed by the office of Greek Life. The ad was developed to advertise student norms to potential Greek pledges, prior to their membership. Unfortunately, Greek leaders did not have as much interest in participating in Year 03, and the brainstorming meetings, which were so successful in Year 02, were not held due to lack of interest.

While there were many challenges for the project overall in Year 03, perhaps most challenging was to maintain the past success of the market plan and dissemination of materials. Although in the Fall quarter of 2001 the campus remained saturated with various materials, with the loss of Kristin Ream as the Wellness Coordinator on the project in November, came a loss of knowledge from the past plan and lack of determination to maintain fidelity to the model. . In response to a decrease in staff time allotted to the project, a senior student stakeholder oversaw the dissemination of materials for much of the spring (2002). However, without close supervision by a person of authority, and organized communication with student stakeholders on a weekly basis, the level of message saturation decreased. Although ample documentation had been developed early on and provided by Ms. Ream upon her departure to ensure the program’s success, with no staff from the University of Denver permanently assigned to the project until February 2002 and a lack of dedicated time to the project, the plans were not closely adhered to and the saturation levels decreased significantly from Years 01 and 02 to Year 03

The following section provides details on the marketing items and dissemination details for the entire grant period.

October 2000

“Most DU student (66%) drink alcohol only once per week or less.”

- Posters were disseminated for posting across campus.
- Static cling decals were placed on windows, doors and bathroom mirrors.
- Table tents were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus.

- A letter was mailed to Department Heads with posters attached, requesting that they hang the posters and return a “feedback” form with information on the location of the posters and an estimate on how many students should see them on a daily basis.
- A banner was hung across an indoor pedestrian bridge (high-traffic area).

November 2000

“Most DU students (89%) have not damaged property due to drinking or drug use.”

- Posters were disseminated for posting across campus.
- Static cling decals were placed on bathroom mirrors, windows, and doors
- Table tents were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus.
- A letter was mailed to Department Heads with posters attached, requesting that they hang the posters and return a “feedback” form with information on the location of the posters and an estimate on how many students should see them on a daily basis.
- A banner was hung across an indoor pedestrian bridge (high-traffic area).
- “URDU” stickers were placed on coffee cup sleeves used at the student center coffee shop.

January-February 2001

“Most DU students (64%) have zero-5 drinks per week.”

- Posters were disseminated for posting across campus
- Static cling decals were placed on bathroom mirrors, windows, and doors
- Table tents were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus.
- A letter was mailed to Department Heads with posters attached, requesting that they hang the posters and return a “feedback” form with information on the location of the posters and an estimate on how many students should see them on a daily basis.
- A letter was mailed to faculty with posters and feedback sheet.
- Pens were distributed.
- Post-it® note pads were distributed.
- A website was created.
- A banner was hung across an indoor pedestrian bridge (high-traffic area).
- “URDU” stickers were placed on coffee cup sleeves used at the student center coffee shop.

August-September 2001

“Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party”

- Posters were disseminated for posting across campus.
- Static cling decals were placed on bathroom mirrors, windows, and doors.
- Table tents (the first of 5 in a series) were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus. On one side of the table tent is the same image as the poster. On the other side is a myth about the campaign (something we have heard from many students) and the “reality” that provides an answer to the myth.
- Highlighters were distributed.
- A letter was mailed to Department Heads and faculty with a highlighter and posters attached, requesting that they hang the posters and return a “feedback” form with information on the location of the posters and an estimate on how many students will see them on a daily basis.
- Envelopes with the “5 or fewer” logo to use for letters and packets of materials were printed.

- Granola bars were distributed during new student orientation and sorority and fraternity recruiting.

October-November 2001,

- Table tents (#3, #4 in a series of five) were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus. On one side of the table tent is the same image as the poster. On the other side is a myth about the campaign (something we have heard from many students) and the “reality” that provides an answer to the myth.
- “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” posters disseminate across campus
- Zipper pulls attached to postcards stating the message as part of a quiz. Student stakeholders walked the campus talking to students. If students knew the “5 or fewer” message, they received \$1; if they were wearing the zipper pull, they received a certificate for a free bagel sandwich at a local restaurant.
- Students pledging Greek organizations received laundry bags with the message on one side and various letters from the Greek alphabet on the other.
- Lip balm was distributed during homecoming activities.
- Microwave popcorn was distributed with flyers during finals, encouraging students to make smart choices during this high-risk period before the holidays.
- “Five or Fewer” labels were placed on coffee cup sleeves in each of two coffee houses on campus.

January-June 2002

- “Facts” posters disseminated (“Fact: Most DU Students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001!; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project. Do you know the facts? Get them at www.du.edu/wellness/urdu.”)
- Table tents (#5 in the series of five) were placed on tables and desks in high traffic areas across campus. On one side of the table tent is the same image as the poster. On the other side is a myth about the campaign (something we have heard from many students) and the “reality” that provides an answer to the myth.
- Zipper pulls attached to postcards stating the message as part of a quiz. Student stakeholders walked the campus talking to students. If students knew the “5 or fewer” message, they received \$1; if they were wearing the zipper pull, they received a certificate for a free bagel sandwich at a local restaurant.
- “Five or Fewer” labels were placed on coffee cup sleeves in each of two coffee houses on campus.
- Water bottles were given out during “May Daze”, DU’s outdoor spring celebration for students
- T-shirts printed for May Daze had the URDU logo and message printed on the sleeve.

September-November 2002

- CD cases printed with the message were distributed to first year students and residence hall residents.
- Travel mugs were distributed on information tables in the student union.
- Advertisement in Greek Recruitment Publication with the message and an explanation of social norms, distributed to potential sorority and fraternity members.

- Multi-message pens (click pens that have a message window which changes with each click)
- Carabiner key chains (look like carabiner clips used for rock climbing)

Throughout the grant period, we found that using a variety of media to disseminate the message was a critical piece of our marketing plan. While posters are seen as the main piece seen by most members of the DU community, other items proved valuable, such as table tents and static clings in areas with strict posting restrictions. Soliciting student input on popular student items also proved valuable. Items creating the most interest included first and foremost the popcorn given out during finals week and granola bars provided for orientation, along with the water bottles, coffee mugs, pens and Post-it[®] notes.

Another important marketing piece was the development of a marketing “map” of campus showing each building and the type and number of each material to be disseminated in that location. This organization made coordinating volunteers a much simpler process and ensured that the entire campus would be blanketed with the message. The buildings were grouped so that volunteers could be assigned to an area, versus just one building. Students were asked to pick one of the groupings based on their living arrangements and travel across campus to easily integrate the task as part of their existing schedule. They were then provided an ample number of materials and supplies to post, ensuring their areas were saturated. When this plan was followed, the saturation results were impressive (over 80% of students surveyed reported seeing the messages at least 1-2 times per week), even in the eyes of prominent Social Norms practitioners. When the plan was not adhered to, the saturation level dropped to only 67%.

Step Five: Pilot Test & Refine Materials

Due to time limitations, during Year 01 of the project the materials were pilot-tested only with the Stakeholders Committee. While this approach allowed for faster decision-making, it did not provide the project team with sufficient student feedback to create materials to which the general student population could relate. Therefore, in Year 02 the project staff made pilot-testing a priority in materials development and refinement. In the limited time available, the message and campaign materials were focus grouped in several different ways: paid student Stakeholders conducted focus groups in Greek houses, on residence floors, and among their classmates; a URDU web page was added and the campaign materials were available on-line with an attached on-line response form, to which 35 students responded; finally, the materials and message were focus grouped with the Stakeholders group itself. While we know that 50 students gave their feedback in formal focus groups, many other students provided feedback in informal settings (such as at the end of presentations or just in passing on campus).

Due to the short implementation timeline for the Year 01 campaign (implementation began on September 1, 2000 and the grant year ended on September 30, 2000), anecdotal data wasn’t collected from students on campus regarding the campaign’s prevalence or believability. However, throughout the grant’s second year anecdotal data was collected on students’ knowledge of the actual alcohol use norms among DU undergraduates, how they were made aware of the information, and why they believed/did not believe the information. This information was collected in three ways: feedback from presentations to students, paid student stakeholders administering short surveys to students on campus, and formal data collection. The formal data collection consisted of a

supplemental survey included with the Year 02 Core Alcohol and Drug Survey administered in February of 2001. The supplemental survey addressed the questions of saturation and believability of the messages. In addition, the stakeholders were asked to report any reactions and discussions regarding the campaign they had had with other students and professionals.

Looking at the feedback collected, the project team and stakeholder committee decided to keep the message, “Most DU Students drink 5 or fewer when they party” as the main focus for the 2001-2002 academic year (crossing over from Fiscal Year 02 to Fiscal Year 03), with additional materials addressing issues brought up by students and members of the stakeholders committee. One such material was a poster, with just the facts: “Fact: Most DU students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project.” The idea behind this poster was to address concerns and misperceptions regarding the campaign, such as students believing the messages were a marketing ploy by the university’s public relations department. Strategies such as this, that provided the facts and attempted to correct myths surrounding the campaign, were an important piece in our overall marketing plan. In addition to this message, we continued to use “Most DU Students drink 5 or fewer when they party” and “Most DU Students drink 5 or fewer (that’s 0-5) when they party” alternately on various materials to continue appealing to a broader student audience.

Moving into the 2002-2003 academic year, with the grant ending September 30, 2002, the project team and stakeholders committee agreed that the message should remain the same, as the statistics for general students had not changed significantly. However, to change the flavor of the campaign, two student stakeholders developed a new poster concept and the artwork and color scheme was integrated into a new poster for the quarter. These students had suggested using the art department and/or students to develop a new look and were encouraged to take on this task. Although the exact design could not be used, as it would have been very costly to print with the number of colors and technicality of the design, the art and prominent colors used in the original were integrated into a new design and disseminated in September 2002. Using the colors and fonts from the poster, the other materials were then developed to complement the new design.

Due to the time of data collection each academic year and the receipt of analyzed data, it was difficult to adhere strongly to this step. Each year, we had approximately 1 month to develop, pilot test and refine the message and materials prior to students leaving for the summer. Although we came up with several unique piloting ideas, such as the on-line review of materials and inviting stakeholders to solicit input from students with whom they had contact, the more formal focus groups directed by project staff would likely have provided more valuable information and increased the success of the project.

C. Step Six: Implement the Campaign

In this step, it is critical that the marketing plan developed in Step 4 be followed, as that is the foundation created to ensure successful implementation. On September 1, 2000, the plan was put into place as the first phase of the URDU campaign was rolled out. This phase included the dissemination of posters, table tents, letters to faculty and department chairpersons, and lanyards in all student residence hall boxes. Since the grant year ended on September 30, 2000, little implementation was undertaken in Year 01.

However, during Year 02 of the grant, from October 1, 2000 until June 1, 2001 (the end of the DU academic year), the social norms campaign was continually implemented on campus. Not only were various materials posted (see Step 4: Market Plan), but the project team also worked to integrate the campaign and the social norms message into campus culture by participating in campus activities. For example, the URDU campaign sponsored prizes that were given away at the beginning of various events during Winter Carnival, DU's annual winter celebration event, and at the kick-off event for KVDU, DU's new radio station. (A comprehensive listing of all events is included later in the report.)

One of the activities that was carried out in Year 01, but was not needed again in Year 02 was a presentation by Jan Gascoigne, Ph.D., and Director of Health Promotions for The BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network. Prior to the actual rollout in Year 01, the stakeholders were invited to a session on what to expect when the information was disseminated, and how to answer questions. Dr. Gascoigne spoke to the group about her experiences working with eleven different campuses implementing social norms campaigns. She suggested that most questions would be about the statistics, who had developed the materials and why the information stated how much or how often students used alcohol. This presentation was not duplicated in year two because the majority of stakeholders had already received the training and we included discussion of these issues in stakeholders meetings to promote internal training by sharing experiences with the group. The ability of the Stakeholders group and other student leaders to respond to questions and discuss the campaign was a positive force across campus.

The second year of implementation (falling at the end of Year 02 and through Year 03) began on August 31, 2001, just before the beginning of the 2001-2002 academic year. The implementation date was scheduled several days before the new first-year students arrived on campus, and one week prior to the arrival of returning students. A team consisting of students who lived on campus and were available before the start of classes; staff; and some members of the Stakeholders committee, assisted in the rollout. These volunteers were provided with posters, table tents and static clings to place on all bulletin boards and any approved posting areas across campus. The importance of identifying these "approved posting areas" is a critical one, as campus posting policies can be strict, as at DU, and materials are removed promptly if posted in unapproved locations.

As the messages infiltrated the campus, the stakeholders were asked to advocate the messages and to relay comments to the Association Program coordinator and Wellness Coordinator. These comments were then used to determine what groups and activities would be most beneficial to the program's success. As Year 02 progressed, the staff continued speaking to groups and inviting the participation of additional stakeholders to increase the acceptance of the messages. This included asking students and staff to voice their opinions about the messages and materials in order to gather feedback for the development of a new message for the 2001-02 academic year. The next message was implemented starting in late August of 2001, as new and returning students arrived on campus.

During Year 01 and Year 02, campaign materials were distributed during various orientation sessions. All new students are required to participate in a weeklong orientation program, SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration). One aspect of this program is a "Life Skills" session in which many pertinent topics are covered. One of these topics is the use of alcohol on

campus. During Year 01 of the campaign, approximately 900 new students participated in a Jeopardy game that consisted of questions/answers dealing with alcohol, tobacco, and other drug issues and the social norms campaign statistics. In addition, SOAR leaders were provided with the information sheets on the campaign and given sun visors with the campaign logo.

During Year 02 of the campaign, all Life Skills facilitators were made aware of the social norms campaign and all facilitators gave out granola bars bearing the “five or fewer” message during their respective Life Skills sessions. Additionally all first-year students received a new student guide/calendar containing tips regarding the DU campus and the surrounding Denver community. This guide included information about the URDU campaign and had the campaign’s logo as a watermark on each page. Finally, the DU student recreation and wellness guide contained a full-page about the campaign. The latter two projects were collaborative efforts. The student guide/calendar was developed and paid for by the University of Denver’s Center for Academic Resources and the Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) program, along with help from this grant. The recreation and wellness student guide was developed and paid for by the University of Denver’s Recreation and Wellness departments.

Implementation in Year 03 presented a greater challenge that it had in previous years, greatly due to decreased DU staff time allocated to the project. Although staff was involved with the new student orientation program, the dates of activities were not clearly communicated and the CD holders developed to disseminate to new students arrived after the programs they attended as a group had concluded. They were thus disseminated at various events and at information tables on campus. However, during the 2002 SOAR Life Skills program (end of Year 03), which included peer theatre in which students acted out many scenes addressing life as a college student, messages about the social norms of DU were integrated into the issues addressed, including alcohol use and abuse, sexual assault, drinking and driving, and academic integrity. Throughout the performance, the social norms were discussed, emphasizing the most DU students make healthy choices, and more specifically, that “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party.” Following the performance, students divided into smaller groups to attend a facilitated discussion about the program, as well as their perceptions of college life and the policies of the university.

Although it was planned that a new poster for this academic year would be one developed in the spring by a student stakeholder, the student who developed it did not return to campus and due to computer file conflicts, only parts of the original could be used to create a new poster, delaying printing and delivery to campus. The project team determined that posting the two posters from the winter and Spring 2002 quarters would be the best solution to limit the loss of message saturation and campaign momentum. On September 18, 2002, when the first stakeholder meeting was held, these materials were first disseminated for posting. Shortly following this meeting, the new posters arrived and were posted across campus in the following weeks. The other materials followed, with limited planning, as the Wellness Coordinator was out on family leave for most of October and only one staff person at DU was left to coordinate the distribution.

In Year 03, as had been done in Year 02, we collected anecdotal data regarding the campaign and reinforced the social norms message through “prize patrols” on campus, where student stakeholders were armed with prizes and randomly asked students if they knew the social norms message. (These prize patrols were not conducted in Year 01 because there was only one month of implementation

time before the end of the first grant year.) During Year 02 and Year 03, student stakeholders had the opportunity to give students coupons and cash (\$1) if they knew the currently posted message(s). This provided valuable input to the stakeholders and project staff as well as promoting both the messages and the project in a positive light among students.

Another valuable tool used to promote campus norms and the project itself, were information sheets. They were used during all years of the project, but most heavily in Year 02. These sheets were designed to provide clear, concise details on the campaign, while correcting the misperception that most DU students drink frequently and heavily. Information sheets were designed for specific audiences (i.e. parents, SOAR staff, faculty, and students). Additionally, the information sheets provided ways in which the reader could support the social norms effort. The following products were distributed: a campaign information sheet for parents of incoming first-year students; a campaign information sheet for SOAR leaders so they could be informed about the campaign, as well as be aware of the myths that surround the campaign; and general campaign information sheets to all of the faculty and department chairpersons, keeping them up to date from one quarter to the next and year to year.

Finally, during both Year 01 and Year 02 of the campaign, faculty and Department Chairpersons received packets containing social norms information and a project overview. During Year 01, each person received a campaign information sheet and a dry erase marker, as well as a letter describing the campaign. During Year 02, faculty and department chairpersons received new packets of information each time a new campaign poster was rolled-out (this occurred three times between October 2000 and June 2001). In addition to campaign materials, for the September 2001 rollout each person received two academic articles discussing the social norms theory and how the model has been used at campuses across the country. This dissemination to faculty and administration occurred on a more limited basis in Year 03 due to the transition of DU staff and the decrease in staff time allotted to the project.

At the end of Year 01 and throughout Year 02 of the project, the campus was saturated with campaign materials. As a result of the thorough posting and distribution of campaign materials, as well as presentations regarding the campaign, the population was saturated with the true norms of alcohol use among DU students that directly contradicted the misperceptions of most students, staff and faculty. Although materials were posted and specific social norms presentations continued to be conducted in Year 03, it was on a more limited level, creating ease in the momentum developed in the previous years. However, in each year, significant dialogue about student alcohol use continued, which raised critical awareness of the issue and a more open atmosphere for discussion of alcohol issues. In addition, by year three, DU's Department of Wellness had integrated social norms and campaign statistics into most of their student presentations and became a known resource for information on this issue.

Step 7: Evaluation

This step leads directly back to step two, Baseline Data. Each year, the same survey was administered to undergraduate students during the months of February and March. While this data provided critical information on the success of the program (whether or not high-risk alcohol use by undergraduate students had been reduced), it also provided the necessary information to develop the

next generation of messages and/or change the current messages. This step is absolutely essential for conducting a social norms program.

Because the evaluation process is a significant one, it is covered thoroughly in the Methodology section of the report by the evaluator himself.

The following is a chronological history of project implementation:

Year 01

DECEMBER 1999

1. The Oversight Committee (see page 14) reconvened once the award was granted. This committee directs the development and implementation of the project.
2. Oversight Committee worked with the DU Vice-Provost and Department of Wellness to announce the grant and solidify the buy-in of DU administration and faculty.

JANUARY 2000

The oversight committee began meeting and consulting with leaders in the social norms field to begin development of the campaign.

FEBRUARY 2000

Evaluation:

Robert Granfield, Ph.D., the grant evaluator, began the survey process at DU. See the evaluation section for more information on the surveying process.

Stakeholders Group:

The project team invited University of Denver faculty, staff and students to be a part of the DU Stakeholders group. The purpose of this group is to provide feedback regarding the development of campaign messages and materials, and to help ensure the successful implementation of each stage of the campaign.

MARCH

DU is on a quarter system. Since final exams and spring break take place in March, the Stakeholders committee did not meet. Project staff remained busy planning, developing materials and analyzing data.

Materials Development

Prior to receiving the final compilation of data, materials development began by reviewing previously developed materials, obtained through BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network. Common themes were identified and discussions with social norms supporters provided a template of sorts for initial development.

Posters

While the data was being compiled, staff created sample posters to present to the Stakeholders group for input on everything from general feel, to specifics on clarity of message, photographs, and use of color. By developing initial materials prior to stakeholder input, we were able to include all the

required organizational logos, and to give participants a visual example of what information should be included.

APRIL

Reviewing Data/Message Development

The survey data gathered by researcher, Bob Granfield, Ph.D., was reviewed first by the Oversight Committee. In this review we were looking for positive norms regarding alcohol use and related high-risk behaviors. For example, question #14 on the survey is, “Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you had five or more drinks* at a sitting?” “A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.” We hoped that the majority of students would answer, “zero” telling us that one message could be “Most DU students have four or less drinks per sitting.” This was not the case, so we needed to look to other questions regarding the number of drinks consumed in a week, and how many days alcohol was used. From this data, we could add together how many students had zero to five drinks per week to create a normative message. Suggested messages were presented to the Stakeholders group for their input and approval. The following are the messages developed during year one, which will be used over the 2000-2001 academic year.

- A. “Most DU students drink moderately or not at all. 66% of DU students use alcohol 1 time or less per week”
- B. “Most DU students (89%) have not damaged property due to drinking or drug use”
- C. “Most DU students (64%) have zero-5 drinks per week”

Developing Materials

Photography

We gathered DU students for a photo shoot, to provide photo images of actual DU undergraduate students for future materials. Students were chosen by the DU Department of Wellness Program Director based upon their moderate drinking habits, reliability as role models, and diversity. The session went well. Photos were taken around campus, in front of DU landmarks recognized by DU students, faculty and staff. Using campus landmarks helps ensure acceptance of the campaign as one specific to DU.

Posters

After receiving the photographs, posters were developed using the previously chosen messages and different group photos. These posters were presented to the Stakeholders group for review. The committee made suggestions for changing wording, color and font of the messages, and general layout. These changes were then made and presented for review at the next Stakeholders’ meeting.

Other Materials

While development of the theme and posters was critical, we needed to focus on how best to saturate the campus with the messages. We asked the stakeholders and student orientation leaders for suggestions. We printed some materials to be used broadly across campus, others that would appeal to faculty and staff, and targeted some materials toward first year students and their parents, hoping to teach them DU’s true norms prior to being influenced by returning students. The materials were as follows:

Campus-wide: posters, table tents, static cling decals (for windows or mirrors)
First-year students: lanyards
Orientation leaders: visors
Parents: refrigerator magnets
Faculty: dry erase markers

MAY

Materials

Theme

From our previous materials research, we concluded that posters were a necessity, as was a campaign theme and logo for placement on all materials. The purpose behind a theme and logo is to link all materials together to create a comprehensive campaign. The Stakeholders group brainstormed the theme, “U R DU...Most DU Students are making healthy choices” and the “license plate” logo. “U R DU” (You Are DU) was chosen, because it is positive and inclusive, but simple enough to attract attention. Our hope is that students will embrace the idea that the university really is its students, and that they can make it what they want. In the context of the campaign, we hope that means they take notice of the positive choices being made and join the majority of their peers in making healthy decisions.

Posters

The posters, having been revised according to previous Stakeholder suggestions, were presented for additional review. Overall, at this point, the group was excited about the posters and asked to make small changes in font and color of the message. These were then made for the final copy, and sent out for printing.

Training Student Leaders

SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising and Registration) Leaders

During their general training, these student leaders were given a presentation on the URDU campaign. Information was provided on the grant, the social norms model, and what types of activities and materials would occur in September when students returned to campus. This time also was used to gather information on effective ways to promote the messages. The group suggested visors and dry-erase markers as two items in high demand by students. This type of information is critical to the campaign’s success, as students are the only people able to say what students would like and respond to.

JUNE/JULY

This time was spent researching promotional items and costs, in addition to polishing the final materials and getting them printed. Stakeholder meetings were not held because students and faculty were off-campus for the summer.

AUGUST

Training Student Leaders

Resident Assistants (RA’s)

Resident Assistants were trained in the social norms model prior to campaign implementation. Because student leaders are often in frequent contact with various student groups, they are crucial allies to increase the believability of the campaign. Their ability to validate the accuracy of the data,

by sharing their knowledge of how and where it was collected and who was collecting it, has been increasingly important, as students began asking questions and discussing the materials seen around campus.

SEPTEMBER

Campus Implementation

In addition to the professionally printed materials, we again borrowed ideas from other campuses that are using the social norms approach. First, we created an information sheet about the campaign, with information about the theme, goal, message and statistics. These materials were distributed as follows:

- To the stakeholders
- To new students, who received them in their orientation packets.
- To parents, who received them in their orientation packets along with a magnet.
- To the Department of Wellness Program Director asking that they become knowledgeable about the project and discuss it with their students.
- To department chairpersons, who received the information sheet and a dry erase marker as well, but also received a static cling decal for their offices and posters to hang in the department. They were asked to hang the posters and then to complete a reporting sheet, stating where the posters were hung and how many students, on average, passed by each poster daily. By returning this sheet, they were included in a drawing for a free coffee drink certificate from a local coffee bar.
- To resident assistants, who received a packet with the information sheet, posters, static cling decals, and a dry erase marker, all with campaign information, and several pamphlets on alcohol use from BACCHUS and GAMMA. They were asked to use these materials on their bulletin boards, to promote the campaign, and to discuss the campaign in meetings with their residents.

By providing information to each of these groups we were able to create a network of knowledge across the campus. As a resource for questions and validation of statistics, all target groups received contact information for both the Wellness Department Project Director and Dr. Robert Granfield, the project evaluator and a professor of sociology at DU.

Training

Prior to posting the materials on campus, it was imperative to prepare the Stakeholders so that they would be knowledgeable and confident about the project and data. Therefore, members were invited to a session on what to expect when the information was disseminated, and how to answer questions. Jan Gascoigne, Ph.D., Director of Health Promotions, from BACCHUS and GAMMA, spoke to the group about her experiences working with eleven different campuses implementing a social norms campaign. She suggested that most questions would be about the statistics, who had developed the materials and why the information stated how much or how often students used alcohol.

Keys points to remember about a social norms campaign:

- It is a harm reduction model, designed to provide information.
- It is designed to highlight positive attributes of the target group, rather than attack negative attributes.

- Although the messages contain information on use and behavior patterns, the campaign does not advocate, nor oppose a specific behavior, it simply states the actual student norms.

To validate the campaign, those involved in its development should be knowledgeable about the research. Therefore, a fact sheet was distributed to stakeholders to assist them in answering questions about the survey and data collection.

Posting of Materials

September 1st, students and staff volunteered to pick up materials and post materials in an assigned area on campus. They were provided with posters and thumbtacks and asked to post only in designated areas. It is extremely important to know the rules for posting across campus, to avoid unnecessary complications that would have a negative impact with campus administration. We were fully aware of this, and did not experience any problems.

Due to a delay in receiving materials and the arrival of incorrect materials, we were unable to prepare packets for faculty, department chairpersons, and resident assistants prior to the rollout date. In the future, we will provide an “absolute” deadline for receipt of materials no later than one week prior to the posting week.

Do’s and Don’ts - Year 01

While this was a time-consuming process, we have learned from the first “roll-out” and will be able to streamline the process in the future. Future changes include the following:

- Schedule material arrival a minimum of one week prior to roll-out week;
- Organize additional student assistance prior to posting day, to create packets;
- Have stakeholders choose a campus area to post and re-post each month, so the areas are covered consistently; and
- Make posting one of the requirements for student stakeholders earning a stipend in subsequent grant years.

The following is a chronological history of project implementation (continued):

Year 02

October 2000

- 2nd - Meeting of DU Communications, ADAD Public Relations and project staff members.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 5th - Presentation of social norms theory and the DU campaign to University Dean’s Council.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 10th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 1 student
- 13th - Presentation of social norms theory and the DU campaign to the Arts and Humanities Chairpersons.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 17th - Project coordinators meet with graduate advisors to the Greek organizations to devise a plan for disseminating information to the Greek community more effectively.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.

- 20th - Informational table set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.
- 24th - Wellness coordinator meets with Graduate Resident Directors regarding the involvement of the Resident Assistants.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 25th - Informational table set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.
- 31st - Greek Leadership Councils (Pan Hellenic and Interfraternity) were given a half-hour long presentation in October. This consisted of a short training on the social norms theory, and helped the grant team begin to gain the trust and buy-in of the Greek community. Social norms materials were given out and all presidents were asked to display the materials in their respective houses.
Dosage: 30 minutes per student, 35 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:	400
Table on Driscoll Bridge (Student Center)	20
Table Tents:	191
Static clings (mirror):	45
Static clings (window):	45
Markers:	1010
Residence Hall – Halls	350
Residence Hall – Towers	324
Residence Hall - J-Mac	216
Table on Driscoll Bridge	110
Grad students	10
Lanyards:	52
Grad students	10
Table on Driscoll Bridge	42
Prizes:	
To faculty for returning posting info sheet	6
To students for knowing message	120

November 2000

- 1st - A Diversity-themed mentoring class requested a short presentation on the social norms theory. The theory and campaign were presented to the group, and a discussion with the students followed.
Dosage: 30 minutes per student, 11 students

- 2nd - Informational table set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.
- 9th - Informational table set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.
- 14th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 2 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:	347
Table Tents:	222
Static clings (mirror):	125
Static clings (window):	125
Lanyards:	46
Prizes:	
To faculty for returning posting info sheet	2
To students for knowing message	110

January 2001

- 11th - A presentation was given in the Drugs and Society undergraduate sociology class. This consisted broadly of a discussion of the social norms theory and specifically on the campaign at DU.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 32 students
- 17th - Meeting with chairperson for Winter Carnival (traditional University of Denver winter quarter celebration). This meeting was to discuss and plan the involvement of the URDU campaign with the activities of this week.
Dosage: 60 minutes per student, 1 student in attendance
- 22nd - Announcement regarding the URDU campaign at the beginning of the Winter Carnival comedian show; prizes given away to random winners.
Dosage: 10 minutes per student; approximately 200 students
- 23rd - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 6 students
- 24th - Announcement regarding the URDU campaign at the beginning of the Warren Miller movie; prizes given away to random winners.
Dosage: 10 minutes per student; approximately 200 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:	428
Faculty	234
Dept. chairs	50
R.A.'s	120
Health Services	5

Counseling	5
Greek Houses	14
Table Tents:	200
Halls Res. Hall cafeteria	50
J-Mac Res. Hall cafeteria	40
Driscoll Student Center	50
Richie Center (Athletics and Wellness)	10
Daniels College of Business	50
Static clings (mirror):	352
R.A.'s	300
Greek Houses	42
Counseling	5
Health Services	5
Static clings (window):	352
R.A.'s	300
Greek Houses	42
Counseling	5
Health Services	5
Markers:	2324
R.A.'s (apartments)	40
R.A.'s (other)	300
Faculty	434
Dept. chairs	50
Residence Hall – Halls	600
Residence Hall – Towers	300
Residence Hall - J-Mac	600
Pens:	110
Winter Carnival	60
Pioneer Days	50
Prizes:	
To faculty for returning posting info sheet	19
To resident assistants for campaign bulleting boards	23
Winter Carnival events (comedian, movie, info table)	20
To students for knowing message	109

February 2001

- 1st - Project coordinators meet with DU peer education (The SEARCH Team) advisor to discuss involvement with the URDU campaign.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.

- 6th - Wellness coordinator interviewed with student for a News Writing class.
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 1 student
- 8th - Associate Coordinator gave a presentation to the University of Denver peer education group (the SEARCH Team) to provide information about the campaign as well as gain the group's support of the campaign and discuss the possibilities of their future involvement.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 4 students
- 13th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 5 students
- 21st - URDU materials used as giveaways during the DU radio station (KVDU) kick-off.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.
- 22nd - Key sorority and fraternity members were invited to a meeting to discuss the campaign and determine their future involvement.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 6 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:	50
Table Tents:	40
Static clings (window):	50
Markers:	144
KVDU (DU radio station)	144
Pens:	195
Pioneer Days	50
KVDU (DU radio station)	145
Lanyards:	32
KVDU (DU radio station)	32
Visors:	60
KVDU (DU radio station)	60
Prizes:	
To faculty for returning posting info sheet	1

February/March 2001

The follow-up surveys were administered to collect data regarding current use patterns and to document changes from the baseline data.

March 2001

- 13th - Program Coordinators presented to the DU Health Services staff.
Dosage: Does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 13th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 3 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:

1225-total re-posting March-May

April 2001

- 10th—Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 2 students

Materials Dissemination:

Posters:

Dist. by Paid Stakeholders 25

Table Tents:

Other areas on campus 7

Static clings (mirror):

R.A.'s
Greek Houses
Counseling
Health Services
IEV Presentation

Static clings (window):

R.A.'s
Greek Houses
Counseling
Health Services
IEV Presentation

Markers:

28

R.A.'s (apartments)
R.A.'s (other)
Faculty
Dept. chairs
Residence Hall - Halls
Residence Hall - Towers
Residence Hall - J-Mac
Table on Driscoll Bridge
Grad students
ADAD Conference

18

Pens:

Winter Carnival

Pioneer Days

ADAD Conference

18

May 2001

- 2nd - Members of the oversight team (Project Evaluator, Project Associate Coordinator and Wellness Program Director), along with six undergraduate student panelists, presented a program as a part of the Carl M. Williams Institute for Ethics and Values (a university ethics forum). “The 66% Factor,” was a discussion of the campaign open to all university faculty, staff and students.
Dosage: 2 hours per student, 9 students
- 9th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 9 students
- 18th - Wellness Coordinator met with student regarding the social norms theory and possible involvement in URDU campaign and stakeholders committee.
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 1 student
- 21st - Greek leaders attended a planning meeting to determine the most effective means to involve Greek students in the campaign.
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 4 students.

Materials Development:

The data results were distributed to the project team in May and gleaned for positive norms. Because it was determined that the message must be more student friendly, the data for “drinks at a party” was chosen. The graphic designer was provided with the basic message and other information to be printed on the posters and developed a number of different layouts and various versions of the message. These materials were then focus grouped with small groups of students, the stakeholders group, and via an online focus group page attached to the campaign website.

Materials Dissemination:**Posters:**

Faculty

Dept. chairs

R.A.'s

Health Services

Counseling

Greek Houses

Table on Driscoll Bridge (Student Center)

Dist. by Paid Stakeholders

Table Tents:

Halls Res. Hall cafeteria

J-Mac Res. Hall cafeteria

Driscoll Student Center

Richie Center (Athletics and Wellness)

Daniels College of Business

Other areas on campus

Static clings (mirror):

R.A.'s
Greek Houses
Counseling
Health Services
Institute for Ethics and Values Presentation 9

Static clings (window):

R.A.'s
Greek Houses
Counseling
Health Services
Institute for Ethics and Values Presentation 8

Markers:

R.A.'s (apartments)
R.A.'s (other)
Faculty
Dept. chairs
Residence Hall - Halls
Residence Hall - Towers
Residence Hall - J-Mac
Table on Driscoll Bridge
Grad students
ADAD Conference

Pens:

Winter Carnival
Pioneer Days
ADAD Conference

Prizes:

To students for knowing message 30

July 2001

- 24th - URDU information along with information on Greek recruitment (Rush) mailed to all incoming first-year students.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the passive nature of the program.

August 2001

Although year 02 of the grant ended September 30, 2001, the new academic year began in September and therefore the mass dissemination of the new campaign message and materials began in late August. As student leaders began arriving on campus for various training sessions, the

project implementation team worked to be a part of their training to gain their support for the campaign. The message disseminated in August and September 2001 was “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party.” While this message may change slightly during the 2001-2002 academic year, it will remain focused on the majority of students making healthy choices when they attend parties.

- 9th - Project team members met to discuss the information gathered at the National Social Norms Conference and decide how to implement new ideas into the campaign effort.
Dosage: Not applicable. Participants were not part of the target population.
- 28th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 2 students
- 29th - Residence Assistants (RAs) were given a 60-minute training on alcohol use and abuse, as well as the social norms model and how it will be implemented on campus. Campaign materials were provided for each RA to post the materials on the floors they oversee.
Dosage: 60 minutes per student, 66 students in attendance
- 31st - SOAR: Information regarding the grant process, goals, and social norms messages were presented to the SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising and Registration) leaders. Each of the members is assigned a group of new students to lead and mentor during the weeklong new student orientation program. The group was given an opportunity to ask questions and give input regarding the campaign.
Dosage: 30 minutes per student, 46 students in attendance
- 31st - 2001 campaign materials disseminated across campus

September 2001

- 6th and 7th - SOAR Life Skills program for all first-year students addresses issues of alcohol use and abuse and the norms for alcohol use on the DU campus along with other pertinent first-year student information.
Dosage: 15 minutes per student, approximately 900 students
- 25th - Stakeholders Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student; 4 students

Materials Dissemination

Posters:	720
Faculty	400
Dept. chairs	50
R.A.'s	150
Health Services	10
Counseling	10
Greek Houses	25
Dist. by Paid Stakeholders	75
 Table Tents:	 200
Halls Res. Hall cafeteria	40
J-Mac Res. Hall cafeteria	40
Driscoll Student Center	40
Richie Center (Athletics and Wellness)	10

Daniels College of Business	20
Other areas on campus	50
Static clings:	450
Highlighters:	600
Faculty	400
Granola Bars:	1000
Orientation	700
Greek recruitment	300
Prizes:	
To students for knowing message	5

By posting and distributing these items across campus as well as providing presentations regarding the campaign, the population is saturated with valid information regarding alcohol use, directly contradicting the misperceptions of most students, staff and faculty. The anticipated result is an increase in dialogue among students, faculty and staff regarding alcohol use and an increase in the number of students who believe moderate and non-drinkers are the norm among DU undergraduates.

Do's and Don'ts – Year 02

Year two of the intervention provided many learning opportunities.

1. Student focus groups are critical for the acceptance of the message. The messages developed in year 01 and implemented in year 02 were critiqued by students as administrative in appearance and statistical. Students commented that they looked like a ploy by administration to make DU look better for future students and their parents. Receipt of survey data and subsequent message development as quickly as possible allows time for the much-needed focus groups.
2. Use photos of students with caution and screen the student models well. Student feedback relayed that the photos of students only portrayed student leaders with whom typical students do not identify. In addition, it was pointed out that a student appearing on one poster (Most DU students (66%) drink alcohol only once per week or less) is known among students as a heavier drinker on campus. While many students responded well to our response that 4 out of 5 students on the poster (80%) were all moderate to non-drinkers, this was a difficult issue to overcome and may have done some damage to the credibility of the campaign. In response to this issue, the new materials developed for the 2001-2002 academic year had an image of students sitting in a popular area on campus blurred as the background, but the students are not identifiable.
3. Students are interested in and discussing the campaign, but somewhat skeptical. In the spring of 2001, in groups, students voiced their skepticism, but in one-on-one conversations, students were more likely to rationalize the messages and agree with the campaign. Many group discussions assisted with the understanding and believability of the project and students seemed to become more empowered by September 2001. During the first presentation to resident assistants in August 2000, (the beginning of the implementation), participants had many questions and did not

believe nor support the program. However, in August 2001, when students disagreed with or “bashed” the campaign, other students voiced approval and support for the message and the goal to reduce high-risk drinking among undergraduate students.

4. Disseminating multiple messages over a short time period confuses students and prevents them from buying into the campaign. The stakeholders patrolling campus with prizes for those knowing the current message reported that there was some confusion about the messages and that students could come close, but didn’t believe them.
5. Use student-friendly language and minimize the administrative appearance of materials. The message released in August/September 2001 (the start of the academic year and end of year 02), “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party” seems to be more accepted by students. Some students, typically those drinking moderately or not at all, say they believe the message, but suggest emphasizing the “fewer” part of the message, while others still believe most students drink more than 5 when they party. In addition, printing only one logo (that of the Wellness Center) on materials, rather than the four used last year has proven positive, as the materials look more student-friendly and less like an ad campaign from administration. Until we survey again, we will not know specifically what effect these changes had, but the general feedback has been that the message is more believable and more accepted to the previous messages.

Year 03 Chronological History of Project Implementation

October 2001

- 3rd-5th - “Social Norms: Implementing the Seven Step Model” – Cari Overton, Kristin Ream (ADAD Workforce Development Training)
Dosage: does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- 10th - Meeting of project team with Colorado college constituents regarding their plan to implement a social norms campaign in the fall of 2002.
Dosage: does not apply. The participants in this activity were not part of the target population.
- Informational table set up in student union as a means of passive programming.
Dosage: Unable to calculate due to the massive nature of the program.
- 25th - Wellness Coordinator and Program Associate Coordinator met to review implementation and materials development plans.
- “Most DU Students Drink 5 or Fewer When They Party” posters posted by student stakeholders across campus (100)
- URDU Myth #3 table tents disseminated across campus (300)
- Lip balm on a string with message imprint given out at Homecoming events (150)
- Static Cling decals disseminated by student stakeholders across campus (500)
- “Five or Fewer” labels put on coffee sleeves for two campus coffee houses.
- “Five or Fewer” postcards with zipper pulls provided at information tables and given out by student stakeholders
- “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” posters disseminated by student stakeholders

November 2001

- 6th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting

Dosage: 1 hour per student, 7 students

- 12th - Meeting of program coordinators to organize materials and records for DU staff transition.
- 13th - Meeting of project team to prepare for DU staff transition
- 30th - Meeting of Program Associate Coordinator with DU Wellness staff and student stakeholder to provide information on project and determine roles for Winter Quarter. Dosage: 1 hour per student, 1 student
- URDU Myth #2 table tents disseminated across campus (300)
- Dissemination of laundry bags to new fraternity and sorority members to emphasize true norms of student alcohol use. (350 bags)
- Lip balm on a string with message imprint given out at IACURH (collegiate housing) Conference (100)
- Coffee certificates for prize patrols (16)
- Microwave popcorn packages with URDU packaging were given out for Finals Week (1500)
- “Five or Fewer” labels put on coffee sleeves for two campus coffee houses.

December 2001

- 10th - Meeting of Project Team with Wellness staff, and Director of DU Student Health Center to discuss staff transition.

January 2002

- 15th - Oversight Meeting
- 15th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 5 students
- 25th - Meeting of Project Team and Wellness Department
- URDU Myth #1 table tents disseminated
- “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” posters disseminated to faculty and across campus by stakeholders.
- “Five or Fewer” postcards with zipper pulls disseminated. Students could wear them and receive prizes if spotted by the prize patrols.
- “Five or Fewer” prize coupons given to students wearing the zipper pulls; students knowing the message received \$1.
- Post-it[®] notepads disseminated
- Article, “Campaign distinguishes drinking fact from fiction” printed in the January issue of *The Source: University of Denver News for Faculty, Staff and Friend*.

February 2002

- 1st - Meeting of Program Associate Coordinator with DU Wellness Coordinator and student stakeholder to review roles and responsibilities to ensure tasks are accomplished. Dosage: 1 hour per student, 1 student
- 4th - “Snapshots of Alcoholism: University of Denver Drinking Norms,” Rick Ginsberg, Centennial Halls Residence Hall.
- 5th - “Drinking, Impairment, and the Social Norms at D.U.,” Rick Ginsberg, Centennial Halls Residence Hall
- 12th - Oversight Meeting

- 12th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 5 students
- 12th - “Social Norm Marketing” – Training and review of social norms model for stakeholders provided by Cari Overton.
- 12th - “Sororities and Drinking Norms,” Rick Ginsberg, Pan Hellenic meeting at University of Denver.
- 26th - “R U DU?” Program and open forum for questions on URDU campaign for students in DU’s Pub – Cari Overton, Bob Granfield, Rick Ginsberg.
- New Posters - “Fact: Most DU Students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001!; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project. Do you know the facts? Get them at www.du.edu/wellness/urdu.” disseminated.
- URDU Myth #1 table tents disseminated.
- “Five or Fewer” pen/highlighters disseminated.
- “Five or Fewer” postcards with zipper pulls disseminated. Students could wear them and receive prizes if spotted by the prize patrols.
- “Five or Fewer” prize coupons given to student wearing the zipper pulls; students knowing the message received \$1.
- Article “Separating Drinking Fact from Fiction” printed in February issue of *DU Neighbor News*.

March 2002

- 12th - Oversight Meeting
- 12th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 7 students
- 4th - “Stress Reduction and Drinking Norms,” Rick Ginsberg, Delta Gamma Sorority, University of Denver.
- 6th - “Information on the URDU project,” Rick Ginsberg, Health Psychology class, University of Denver.
- 11th - “Anger Management and Drinking: Are you part of the norm?,” Rick Ginsberg, Beta Theta Pi Fraternity.
- Posters - “Fact: Most DU Students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001!; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project. Do you know the facts? Get them at www.du.edu/wellness/urdu” were disseminated.
- Student Prize Patrols asked students how most DU students drink at parties, with a correct answer of “5 or fewer” earning them \$1.

April 2002

- 2nd - Meeting of Associate Program Coordinator and Project Evaluator to discuss program proposal for National Conference on the Social Norms Model.
- 2nd - “Healthy Relationships, Communication, and Substance Use: What are the norms?,” Rick Ginsberg, Brown Bag Lunch Series.
- 9th - Oversight Meeting
- 12th - “What Is Social Norms Marketing?” presentation by Cari Overton and Ann Quinn-Zobeck (Univ. of Northern Colorado) at BACCHUS and GAMMA Area 3 Spring Conference in Denver, CO.
- 16th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting

Dosage: 1 hour per student, 5 students

- 16th - “Drugs, Booze, and You,” Rick Ginsberg, Workshop for students on probation, University of Denver.
- 29th - “Eating Issues and Alcohol Use: How Both Effect You,” Rick Ginsberg, Gamma Phi Beta Sorority, University of Denver.
- Posters - “Fact: Most DU Students have 0-5 drinks when they party; Fact: This info came straight from you in February, 2001!; Fact: The URDU project is a federally funded research project. Do you know the facts? Get them at www.du.edu/wellness/urdu” were disseminated.

May 2002

- 14th - Fidelity Instrument meeting with key stakeholders and project team, facilitated by Wellness Graduate Assistant.
- 14th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 4 students
- 17th - DU Administrative Stakeholders Breakfast meeting to provide an update on the project and garner support for institutionalization of the campaign.
- 20th - DU Department Head Luncheon to provide an update on the project and garner support for institutionalization of the campaign.
- 22nd - DU Faculty/Staff Lunch Meeting to provide an update on the project and garner support for institutionalization of the campaign.
- 23rd - Project Associate Coordinator and Project Evaluator meeting to finalize program for National Conference on the Social Norms Model.
- “5 or fewer” water bottles disseminated to May Daze participants (DU’s spring student celebration).

July 2002

- 8th - Project Team met to finalize details of the program to be presented at The National Conference on the Social Norms Model.
- 12th - “Seeing May Not Be Believing: Assessing Student Reactions to a Social Norms Campaign” – Robert Granfield, Melody Mock Durso, Cari Overton Follett, Rick Ginsberg (The National Conference on the Social Norms Model)

August 2002

- 8th - “Understanding and Explaining URDU”, SOAR – New Student Orientation Leader Training, Tad Spencer and Rick Ginsberg, University of Denver
- 13th - Project Team Meeting
- 21st - “Resident Assistants and Social Norming Projects”, Tad Spencer (DU Wellness Outreach Coordinator), Colorado College.

September 2002

- 3rd - Project Team Meeting
- 5th-6th - “Introduction to the URDU Campaign and Social Norming,” SOAR Lifeskills Community Cornerstone Sessions facilitated by various staff including Cari Overton Follett and Tad Spencer.

- 12th, 13th, 19th, 23rd - “The First Year Experience and the URDU Project,” Rick Ginsberg, University of Denver Community Connections class.
- 16th, 26th, 27th - “The First Year Experience and the URDU Project,” Tad Spencer, University of Denver Community Connections class.
- 17th - Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Dosage: 1 hour per student, 1 student
- 17th - “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” posters disseminated by stakeholders.
- “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer when they party” poster disseminated.
- CD cases with the “5 or fewer” imprint disseminated to new students.
- URDU campaign/Social Norms advertisement in Greek Recruitment Publication.
- “Most DU students are making healthy choices” travel mugs disseminated to students.
- Message pens - Window on pen shows a different message with each click (“Most DU Students; are making healthy choices; www.du.edu/wellness/urdu; Most DU Students; drink 0-5 when they party; www.du.edu/wellness/urdu”).
- Carabiner Key Chains (look like clips used by rock climbers) disseminated.

October 2002

- 8th - Project Team Meeting to discuss continuation plans.
- “Most DU students are making healthy choices” travel mugs disseminated to students.
- Message pens - Window on pen shows a different message with each click (“Most DU Students; are making healthy choices; www.du.edu/wellness/urdu; Most DU Students; drink 0-5 when they party; www.du.edu/wellness/urdu”) disseminated.
- Carabiner Key Chains (look like clips used by rock climbers) disseminated.

November 2002

- 19th - Final Stakeholders Committee Meeting to celebrate completion of project.

December 2002

- Project Team Meeting (December 6) to finalize sustainability plan.

Year 03 Materials (and the number printed)

The following materials were developed in Year 02, and disseminated in Year 03:

- Lip balm (1000)
- Zipper pulls (3200)
- Table tents 4 through 1 (300 each)
- “How many drinks do you have when you party? Most DU students have 0-5!” poster (800 printed—disseminated in September: Year 02 and October – January: Year 03)

The following materials were developed and disseminated in Year 03:

- Microwave popcorn (2,100 printed)
- Post-it[®] notepads (1,050 printed)
- “Five or Fewer” labels (2,000 printed)
- “Five or Fewer” postcards (3,000 printed)
- “Five or Fewer” prize coupons (250 printed)

- “Facts” poster (800 printed)
- “Most DU students have 5 or fewer when they party” poster (800 printed)
- Water bottles (525 printed)
- Advertisement in Greek Recruitment Publication
- Travel mugs (480 printed)
- CD cases (1000 printed)
- Key chains (500 printed)
- Multi-message pens (750 printed)

Do’s and Don’ts – Year 03

Year 03 of the intervention provided many learning opportunities.

1. Although we learned much about what appeals to students, the only way to really hit the target is to do in-depth focus groups. To do this, data must be collected early enough to provide program staff time to glean positive norms, develop messages, pilot test and refine. This process should allow at least two months to complete the testing and refining, unless there is at least one staff member assigned to the project on a full-time basis.
2. It is crucial to the success of such a large undertaking to have absolute, top-down administrative support from the institution. While we began with this support, it was lost along the way as changes occurred at the university and among project staff. Although our team worked well together and we received appropriate direction, it appears that one solution might be to have an upper administration university staff person serve as the Project Director or in another position of authority, so that this individual would have to answer directly to the funding organization (in this case CSAP). This would provide great accountability to the institution.
3. Maintaining a consistently high level of message saturation is also an important piece of this model. As we saw in the first year of implementation, this takes great planning and oversight, but is doable with student stakeholders overseen by project staff. When there was less staff time for oversight of this piece of the project, the message was much less recognizable.
4. The ability to change slightly or “tweak” messages, without changing the initial message, in response to student feedback is also important. By adding a simple parenthesis to our message, “Most DU students drink 5 or fewer (that’s 0-5!) when they party,” we were able to appeal to a wider audience without alienating the initial target population. In addition, by empowering student abstainers and those who drink in a low to moderate-risk fashion, it created a more outspoken normative group from the original very quiet one.
5. Maintain student stakeholder interest. Make sure that any staff changes are dealt with appropriately as to minimize student attrition in program involvement.
6. Develop good materials that are useful to students. Novelty items tend to disappear from campus quickly, while items of high utility remain and continue to spread the message.

7. Ensure that materials are developed for special populations at particular risk for not believing messages (e.g. Greeks).

F. Evaluation

Data collected for this study included 1294 randomly selected undergraduate students attending a small liberal arts university. Baseline data were collected from 432 students and follow-up data from 439 students in Year 02 and 421 in Year 03 were also collected. In addition, 220, 298 and 131 surveys were collected in each of the respective years from the comparison site in this study. Data collected during the second year of this study used a cluster sampling design. At the intervention site, the evaluator obtained a list of all undergraduate classes in the winter quarter from the university registrar's office and selected a random sample of classes. For both the baseline and follow-up data, a total of 25 classes were selected for inclusion in the sample. Upon selection, each faculty member conducting the selected class was personally contacted to gain permission to administer the survey. On a pre-arranged day, the researcher visited each class and administered the study instruments. At the comparison site during the Year 02 and Year 03, classes were selected at random and teachers distributed the surveys to the students.

As in the previous year the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey was used to collect the majority of data for this study. In addition to general demographics, the Core Survey collects data on the frequency and quantity of alcohol and drug use. Several measures of alcohol and drug use are included on this questionnaire including use over the past year and over the past month as well as measures of weekly use and frequency of "binge" drinking. The Core Survey also assesses perceptions of alcohol and drug use among peer groups as well as behavioral outcomes associated with alcohol use such as hangovers, memory loss, getting into trouble with police, and damaging property. This instrument commonly has been used to examine college alcohol and drug use (Johannessen, Collins, Mills-Novoa & Glider, 1999; Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Meilman, Cashin, McKillip, & Presley, 1998) and generally has a high internal consistency with alphas and ranging on average between .60 and .90 for each of the sub-scales (Presley, Meilman, and Leichter, 1998).

In addition to the Core Survey, intervention students in Year 02 received a supplemental questionnaire. This questionnaire included items related to a student's perception of drinking by various groups on campus as well as an overall estimate of the percentage of students who drink five or more drinks in a sitting. Additionally, this questionnaire included items related to the frequency that students saw the social norm messages at various locations around the university and items related to the degree to which students believed the normative statistics and messages that were disseminated through the program. In Years 02 and Year 03, the evaluator developed questions to determine the "believability" of the messages.

The findings for Year 03 within the intervention site indicate effects that were similar to the previous year of the social norming campaign. The summary of these outcomes, which are outlined more fully in the research report within Part II of this document, are presented below:

- No statistically significant change in alcohol usage from Year 01 to Year 03. There was a statistically significant increase from Year 01 to Year 02; however, in Year 03 the rate fell slightly. Although it was still higher than the baseline, it was no longer statistically significant.

- There was a statistically significant reduction in the perceived frequency of times that students consume five or more drinks per occasion. This is consistent with social norms theory.
- Women reported statistically significant reductions in 30-day use and reported use in the previous year in Year 03 compared to Year 01.
- A higher proportion of students believed the social norms message in Year 03 than in Year 02.

While the findings within the intervention site suggest minor support for the social norming campaign, analysis of intervention and comparison site data suggest even stronger effects. A summary of these results is reported below. For a more elaborate discussion, see the research report contained in Part II of this document.

- There were statistically significant differences in the amount of heavy drinking between the intervention and comparison sites. Students attending the comparison site reported higher rates of heavy drinking.
- The comparison site sample reported higher rates of problems associated with alcohol use such as experiencing hangovers, driving while intoxicated, memory loss, and being injured than did students at the intervention site. Students at the intervention site, however, reported higher rates of missed classes and performing poorly on exams as a result of alcohol.
- No differences in perception of campus norms were found between sites.

These two groups of findings indicate that the social norms campaign had a moderate impact on the intervention site during Year 03 of the implementation.

During Year 03, the evaluator continued to work closely with the implementation team. Social norming campaigns are driven by data and for this reason the evaluator/researcher must remain involved throughout the various stages of message development and implementation. Overall, the relationship between the evaluator and implementation staff was positive. There are various ways to enhance this relationship such as:

- Conducting joint presentations to various groups;
- Meeting on a monthly basis to discuss issues of data collection, analysis, and implementation;
- Encouraging implementation team members to contribute comments to drafts of articles written by the researcher; and
- Inviting implementation staff to make presentations in university courses taught by the evaluator.

In Year 03 there were no problems at the intervention site with data collection or, once the database was created, with data analysis. However, there was a lower return rate at the comparison site in Year 03. As in the previous years, faculty members selected for participation were for the most part cooperative, although in the final year of the intervention faculty demonstrated an increased reluctance to participate in the study. At the comparison site, the evaluator continued to work with relevant individuals to help get the surveys distributed and collected. Also, maintaining good working relations with the comparison site is crucial. One way we accomplished this was to offer an overview of the comparison site data as well as the general developments at the intervention site to interested individuals at The Colorado College. The evaluator has provided consultation to the comparison site as they have begun to develop their own social norming campaign.

There were no issues in identifying the target population or working with an IRB. Since this project took place on a university campus, these issues did not produce problems.

The threats to validity, as in the previous year, were minimized through the following:

- The use of standardized measures;
- The use of an anonymous data collection procedure;
- Systematic analysis of the data to locate biased reporting trends as well as comparison with national data; and
- Comparison of sample and population parameters to assess match.

Dos and Don'ts

The following recommendations with regard to an evaluation of a social norming intervention should be followed:

Year 01

1. The researcher must participate closely with the project team, but must not lose sight of the importance of methodological rigor in collecting data.
2. When planning a social norms campaign, the researcher should be a member of the university community and preferably a tenured faculty member who can present information to other faculty and administrators as well as navigate the institutional review board process for their university.
3. When working with college aged students, the use of surveys normed for college students is imperative.
4. The researcher should take every opportunity to present at faculty groups, administrator's meetings, as well as classes to explain the project, data collection procedures, and relevant findings.
5. Data from surveys should be reported to the implementation coordinators with haste, as the information is needed to develop future social norms messages.
6. Efforts must be taken to work closely with the comparison site. A comparison site may not initially see the benefit of participating in a study as a control group and efforts need to be taken to help them understand the associated benefits. Also, the researcher needs to work with the comparison site to develop a sampling plan consistent with the one developed at the intervention site. Thus, the researcher needs to be of service to the intervention site as well as the comparison site.

Year 02

In addition to the above-mentioned recommendations:

1. The research and project team, wherever possible, should collaborate on presentations to various groups on campus as well as at research conferences.
2. During the implementation, it is necessary to collect data on believability and dosage in addition to general data on alcohol and drug use.
3. Continued efforts to work with the comparison site need to be undertaken in Year 02, as well as mechanisms developed to keep the comparison site "in the loop". In other words, the comparison site needs to feel it is getting something out of its participation in the study.

4. Researchers should attend conferences on the topic and interact with leaders in the field. Such interaction is useful to solicit assistance in interpreting trends as well as reviewing papers submitted from publication.

Year 03

In addition to the above-mentioned recommendations:

1. The researcher should begin to consider ways to maintain a cost effective approach to sustain the survey and data analysis efforts on campus.
2. The researcher should conduct a formal fidelity assessment to evaluate the degree to which the program model was followed.

G. Project Organization

ADAD Structure & Project Staff

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division of the Colorado Department of Human Services is the Single State Agency (SSA) in Colorado for administering the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant. ADAD is a division within the office of Health and Rehabilitation for DHS, which is one of 12 departments within the Colorado State government system. The Department of Human Services also includes social and mental health services and developmental disabilities services.

ADAD has two sections, one dedicated to prevention and the other to treatment. Both section supervisors report to the executive director. ADAD funds over 65 youth, family, and community prevention programs statewide using the 20 percent prevention block grant set aside. The first year, the Prevention Section Supervisor, Dr. Katheryn Akerlund, was built into this grant as a project advisor (.05 FTE). (This function was eliminated from the grant without negative repercussions after Dr. Akerlund experienced a serious illness.) Melody Mock Durso, the Project Director, (.20 FTE) is an ADAD prevention specialist and field services manager. ADAD has extensive experience managing federal grants. Prior to this assignment, the Project Director managed a three-year CSAP statewide Coalition grant, 'Connecting Colorado.' This position requires a minimum of five years experience at the state level, supervising substance abuse prevention programs and services and a Master's degree in a relevant area. See appendix for job description.

Support staff: Ralph Duran, from ADAD's Fiscal Office, is the Fiscal Grants Officer for this project and provides .025 FTE to write subcontractor contracts, pay all bills related to the grant, and submit required fiscal reports to CSAP.

ADAD subcontracts for the services described below:

University of Denver

Dr. Robert Granfield, project evaluator, is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Denver. A subcontract was established with the DU Office of Sponsored Programs for .25 FTE of his services. In Year 01 the University provided their indirect costs in-kind; these are included in the budget for Years 02 and 03.

Dr. Granfield formerly was the Project Evaluator for a NIAAA/NIDA/OSAP Faculty Development Grant, awarded to the Graduate School of Social Work at DU; in addition, he completed a qualitative

study of natural recovery from alcohol and drug addiction. Over the years, Dr. Granfield has worked with Dr. James Moran at the Graduate School of Social Work. Their most recent collaboration entailed work on a statewide prevention evaluation system funded by ADAD, primarily to develop an outcome assessment system. This position requires a Doctorate in the social sciences, with a strong qualitative research component, and a minimum of five years experience in the field of project evaluation, research design and analysis and three years experience in the substance abuse prevention field. See appendix for job description.

Ms. Kristin Ream, University of Wellness Center Project Director, provided in-kind services during the first year of the project and during years 02 and 03 was funded at .20 FTE (with .20 FTE in-kind) via the DU Office of Sponsored Programs. Ms. Ream, a health educator, joined the University of Denver Wellness Department in February 1999, where she designed and implemented programming regarding alcohol and drug awareness, sexual responsibility, eating disorders awareness and body acceptance. She collaborated with academic and student life departments to integrate wellness concepts into the curriculum and programming. Ms. Ream resigned from her position at DU in March 2001. Dr. Richard Ginsberg, Wellness Center Outreach Counselor, temporarily replaced Ms. Ream and in January 2002 was officially hired as Wellness Department Director, a broader role that also included Ms. Ream's grant responsibilities. Dr. Ginsberg has a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology.

In the co-project coordinator role, Ms. Ream and then Dr. Ginsberg, worked hand in hand with Cari Overton Follett, Associate Project Coordinator from BACCHUS & GAMMA, to implement the campaign. This position coordinated all communication related to the DU Stakeholders group and facilitates group meetings. Educational requirements include the minimum of a Bachelor's degree and training in social norms marketing campaigns. See appendix for job description.

BACCHUS & GAMMA

Founded in 1975, BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network is the oldest student organization committed to the education, training, and support for peer prevention programming on college campuses. BACCHUS' National Office is located in Denver, adjacent to the University of Denver campus, and has a full-time staff of six employees onsite and two off-site. The National Office provides support, resource materials, and management of BACCHUS & GAMMA, which is organized at the campus level through the formation of student-run affiliates. In partnership with ADAD, the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, BACCHUS & GAMMA's manages federal and state grants in excess of \$700,000.

Drew Hunter, Project Coordinator (.10 FTE), is Executive Director of BACCHUS. As project Coordinator, he supervised the Associate Project Coordinator, attended meetings of the Oversight Committee and the DU Stakeholders group, provided fiscal management for the BACCHUS subcontract, and assured that all reports were submitted in a timely manner to ADAD. A minimum of ten years' experience is required supervising substance abuse prevention programs and services at the collegiate level, and a master's degree in a relevant area. See appendix for job description.

Cari Overton Follett, Associate Project Coordinator (.50 FTE), served as the Associate Director of Program Services at BACCHUS. Ms. Overton worked hand in hand with the DU program co-coordinator to implement the campaign. Ms. Overton Follett coordinated the Oversight Committee

meetings and purchased all of the marketing materials through her office. Educational requirements include the minimum of a Bachelor's degree and training in social norms marketing campaigns. See appendix for job description.

Lines Of Communication Between ADAD, BACCHUS & GAMMA, University Of Denver

Melody Mock Durso, ADAD Project Director, was responsible for final oversight of grant objectives and funder expectations. She served as liaison with CSAP and participated in all Oversight Committee and Stakeholder group meetings. She provided oversight of the subcontractors, both at Oversight Committee meetings and by communicating by e-mail and phone. She oversaw all subcontract fiscal management. Drew Hunter supervised the work of Associate Coordinator Cari Overton Follett. Ms. Overton Follett coordinated her activities closely with the DU Wellness Center project co-coordinator; both oversaw the campaign implementation process. Dr. Granfield communicated directly with Ms. Durso.

Job Descriptions

Job descriptions are attached in the Appendix.

Use Of Volunteers

Volunteers included members of the Stakeholders group (DU students, staff and faculty), and interagency and business representatives at the Oversight Committee meetings, including the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Division of Criminal Justice, and Coors Brewing Company. Oversight Committee meetings took place approximately once per month for two hours. Interagency and business representatives' attendance at Oversight Committee meetings was sporadic.

Stakeholder volunteer time during the first year was estimated at one hour per month for meetings when school was in session, and for assistance posting campaign materials and interviewing students on campus. During Years 02 and 03, the grant provided financial incentives to a small number of stakeholders to encourage increased attendance at meetings and to ensure their availability for posting campaign materials.

• Training To Staff And Volunteers

○ Staff:

- BACCHUS & GAMMA staff are specialists in college populations & social norming approaches and did not need additional training.
- The Wellness Center Program Director was trained at the 1999 National Conference on the Social Norms Model before the beginning of the grant.
- The Project Director/Evaluator received training on federal grant expectations at the new grantee meeting in Washington, D.C. and at the 2nd and 3rd year grantee meetings in Annapolis, Maryland and Baltimore, Maryland, respectively.
- All staff attended the National Conference on the Social Norms Model held in Denver (Year 01), in Anaheim, California (Year 02), and in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Year 03).
- All staff received training/consultation from social norms expert H. Wesley Perkins from Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

- All staff received consultation by telephone from Koreen Johannessen, social norms expert from the University of Arizona.
- Volunteers (Stakeholder Group)
 - Stakeholders were trained in the social norms model by BACCHUS & GAMMA.
 - Stakeholders were trained in the baseline data collection process and results by the project Evaluator.
 - Stakeholders received hands-on involvement in the development of campaign materials.
 - Stakeholders were trained on how to handle questions about the campaign by BACCHUS & GAMMA.

H. Project Resources

Year 01 Budget

The initial budget for year one of the grant was as follows:

Personnel \$19,000; Travel \$5,560; Contractual \$94,730 (Evaluator \$35,900; BACCHUS & GAMMA Project Office \$58,830); Consultants \$3,870. Total direct costs were estimated at \$123,326 and indirect costs at \$2,645, for a total grant-funded budget of \$125,971.

The budget was revised in early January to reflect the following line item totals: Personnel & Fringe: \$22,532; Travel \$7,367; Supplies \$500; Contractual \$92,927 (Evaluator \$38,432; BACCHUS & GAMMA Project Office \$54,495); Consultants 0 (funds moved to BACCHUS & GAMMA). Total direct and indirect costs remained the same.

The DU Wellness program director contributed .40 FTE in-kind, a value of \$6,000. (In years 02 and 03, the budget included funding for this position.) The DU assessment office provided survey scanning in-kind, estimated as a savings of \$800. The DU Office of Sponsored programs agreed not to charge an indirect fee during the first year, which saved the project over \$15,000.

The majority of the funds (\$113,900) during Year 01 were used for project team salaries & fringe. The purchase of marketing materials, budgeted at \$20,000, represented the second greatest expense. The third greatest expense involved the purchase of CORE surveys for approximately \$3,000. Travel to required meetings was overestimated, as were consultant costs.

Our per participant cost analysis determined that in Year 01, at the current undergraduate enrollment figure of 3,300, \$27.95 per student was invested for each undergraduate student at the University of Denver.

Year 01 budget revisions

- Personnel & Fringe - Increased project director's time to .25
- Travel – reduced number of staff scheduled to attend New Grantees Mtg.; added funds for Project Director training and mileage expenses for DU meetings (\$1,807).
- Supplies - Added funds (\$500) for meeting expenses
- Contractual –

- Salaries reduced from 12 to 10 months due to 2-month delay in project start-up
- Increased funds for student incentives to complete CORE Survey (note: then changed plan to cluster sampling in classroom)
- Assigned BACCHUS job of paying consultants; ADAD had difficulty paying for personal services
- In-kind (no change)
 - DU Assessment Office (tallying of surveys)
 - .40 FTE DU Wellness Center Project Director
 - DU Indirect Costs

Year 02 Budget*

Year 02's slightly reduced budget (- \$790) did not vary significantly from Year 01. Direct costs were \$121,971 and indirect costs \$3,210, for a total of \$125,181. Personnel and fringe increased from \$22,532 to \$23,260; Travel was reduced from \$5,560 to \$3,313; and Contractual increased from \$94,730 to \$95,398 (Evaluator \$33,378; BACCHUS & GAMMA Project Office \$54,820; DU Wellness Center \$6,000; and DU indirect fees \$1,200). The DU assessment office once again provided survey scanning in-kind, estimated as a savings of \$800. The DU Office of Sponsored programs once again reduced their indirect fee, which saved the project over \$8,000.

Changes from Year 01 involved a reduction in ADAD travel expenses due to initial overestimates on the number of individuals required to attend grantee meetings, an increase in Project Director time from .20 FTE to .25 FTE due to a reassessment of the effort required to carry out grant responsibilities, coverage of 20% of the DU Wellness Center's Coordinator salary, addition of a contractual college worker (40 weeks x 1 day per week @ \$12 per hour) to assist the evaluator in conducting in-class surveys and preparing surveys for scanning, the addition of indirect fees paid to the University of Denver (waived during Year 01), food for Oversight Committee meetings, financial incentives for student stakeholders and DU peer educators, and the elimination of software, equipment and consultant expenses.

As in Year 01, the majority of the funds in Year 02 (\$77,277) were used for project team salaries & fringe. The purchase of marketing materials, budgeted at \$20,000, continued to represent the second greatest expense. A minor, though important, new expense (\$3,780) was added to provide food for stakeholder and oversight committee meetings and financial incentives to student stakeholders and peer educators.

Our per participant Cost Analysis determined that in Year 02, at the current undergraduate enrollment figure of 3,800, \$40.32 per student was invested for each undergraduate student at the University of Denver.

Year 03 Budget*

Year 03's budget remained the same as in Year 02, representing a reduction of \$790 from the start-up year of the grant. Direct costs were \$122,102 and indirect costs \$3,079, for a total of \$125,181. Personnel and fringe decreased from \$23,260 to \$18,905. Travel increased from \$3,313 to \$3,844, and Contractual remained at \$95,950 (Evaluator \$31,078; BACCHUS & GAMMA Project Office \$56,160; DU Wellness Center \$7,230; and DU indirect fees \$1,482 for a DU total of \$39,790). The

DU assessment office again provided survey scanning in-kind, estimated as a savings of \$800. The DU Office of Sponsored programs once again charged .20 of its normal .44 indirect fee, which saved the project almost \$8,000.

Changes from Year 02 involved the following: an increase in Project Director time from .25 to .30 FTE for the final year of the grant; the elimination of the Project Advisor salary; a small increase in Project Director travel for presentations at national college conferences; the addition of 20.5% fringe to the Wellness Center's Associate Project Coordinator salary; and an enhanced food budget for Stakeholder Committee meetings due to increased attendance. There were reductions in evaluator expenses for printing and copying and for the purchase of CORE surveys, since copies remained from Year 02. Items of significance that continued from Year 02 at the same level included financial incentives for student stakeholders and DU peer educators and the elimination of software, equipment and consultant expenses.

As in Years 01 and 02, the majority of the funds in Year 03 (\$75,738) were used for project team salaries & fringe. The purchase of marketing materials, budgeted at \$20,000, continued to represent the second greatest expense. An important, though minor, additional expense (\$3,780) involved providing the food for stakeholder and oversight committee meetings and financial incentives to student stakeholders and peer educators.

Our per participant Cost Analysis determined that in Year 03, at the undergraduate enrollment figure of 4,300, \$35.62 per student was invested for each undergraduate student at the University of Denver. The total average cost per participant for the three-year period of the grant was \$34.96.

*Budget figures are quoted from the originally approved budgets. These are insignificantly different than the actuals, per Cost Analysis.

Facility

Participating organizations donated office space for the Project Director, Evaluator and Project Co-ordinators, so no funds were needed for rent. The University of Denver supplied meeting rooms free of charge for the Stakeholders group (14-20 people) and the Oversight Committee (5-8 people). The social norms marketing campaign took place on the DU campus, where marketing materials were posted throughout the campus.

Agencies and Organizations Involved

The primary agencies and organizations involved in this project, other than paid staff, were the volunteers from business and government agencies that initially supplied letters of support, helped design the grant application, and subsequently attended the Oversight Committee meetings. Letters of support provided the extent of a formal agreement to participate. Attendance at meetings has been sporadic. A few local businesses in the University of Denver area subsidized the cost of student incentive items such as movie, coffee and bagel coupons to promote the URDU campaign.

Throughout the grant there were no conflicting perspectives about project management.

Unusual Circumstances or Resources

The University of Denver Wellness Department conducted a social norms campaign on campus, albeit a small one, the year before our project was funded. Then, in the start up year of the grant

(winter 1999-200), the Wellness Center Project Director produced posters for another small social norms campaign to coincide with alcohol awareness week. Due to concern that this would contaminate the data we were about collected on campus, the Evaluator asked the Wellness Center Project Director to take down the posters.

I. Other Information

- Description of Single State Agency resources

The Project Director, as an employee of the Single State Agency for alcohol and other drug abuse issues in Colorado, would be available primarily to in-state replicators interested in applying for SAMHSA funds to adopt social norms marketing approaches in Colorado's higher education arena. Ms. Durso could provide technical assistance in person at ADAD's offices in Denver, or by phone, mail or electronic communication. No fee would be charged for consultation time, but this time would be dependent on availability. No services would be available to replicators that were in the process of applying for ADAD's prevention block grant funds.

- Estimate of technical assistance expenses

- The evaluator, Dr. Robert Granfield, is available for evaluation consultation at \$60 per hour.
- BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network is the oldest student organization committed to the education, training and support for peer prevention programming on college campuses. This collegiate alcohol awareness and health education initiative has over 30,000 college student members from more than 900 colleges. Staff is available for consultation on how to design and implement social norms marketing approaches in the higher education setting. Their fee is \$30 - \$50 per hour.