Date: 2/19/2019
Present: Jonathan Beazley, Dustin Brentlinger Krishna Channa, Ben Christensen, Artemis Damble, Andrew Kelkres, Kelley Lafleur, Suzanne Onorato, Laurie Savino, Rebecca Walker, Tara Watrous
Absent: Maureen Armstrong, Monica Bullock, Melissa Foreman, Deb Hubbell, Rachael Levy, Lori Masters, Emily Pagano, Alessia Satterfield, Ashlee Stone, Sandy Valentine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Recap</td>
<td>Suzanne gave a brief overview of the upcoming case conference. She discussed Tom Workman and possible presentations around AOD and mental health. Dustin reviewed the last meeting and the committee’s discussions on mapping services, and how students are introduced to those services. He discussed the core map: Identifying Concerns, Modes of Connections, Services and Resources. This map forms a loop.</td>
<td>Save the Date: April 5th for the Annual AOD Call to Action Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Review of Map Loop| Dustin posed the question to the group on defining “Identifying Concerns.” Kelley stated a potential definition as “finding out what their needs are.” A discussion occurred regarding what a concern actually is, whether from the perspective of a healthcare provider or from the student. Jonathan offered the perspective of associative behavior, such as a student who comes in for anxiety and depression which might be an underlying cause or effect of alcohol and drug use. A discussion occurred around CMHS triage and audit scores. Jonathan discussed other methods of identifying students in need of intervention services. A question was asked regarding triage and whether someone ‘off the street’ could do it. Jonathan relayed that no, it requires a set of learned skills. There was some discussion related to different definitions of “triage.” The committee discussed the difference between screening and identifying concerns. It was noted that during some cases, screening is already a part of the intervention. The committee discussed CCAP, an evaluative tool that shows a range of concern and severity with students. There was discussion about normalized/safe drinking. Suzanne discussed the ‘point of entry’ for students and how the end result should be consistent (ie: no matter what door they walk into they get to the right level of care). The committee discussed identifying subsets of concerns, and how to create an early intervention that addresses a broad spectrum of concern. There was discussion around three points of entry: counseling, sanctions, ignoring the concern. Dustin
added that sometimes RAs and other staff might try to handle the situation on their own.

Jonathan posed the question: what would happen if all RAs were SBIRT trained? The committee discussed the possibilities and possible outcomes regarding this idea. The committee discussed resources across the university, versus all students funneling through CMHS. The committee discussed the difference between a punishment system and one that highlights potential growth and change.

The committee discussed the absence of a programmatic approach across the institution. Right now, it appears that the messaging and work being done around this topic is random, with different groups giving different advice and information. The committee discussed the confusion around the existence of multiple paths, and what could be done to rectify this.

The committee discussed having a system in place that supports and empowers staff throughout campus without burdening them. The committee requested having someone from Residential Life sit on the committee.

Dustin discussed a program called Starfish, and the methodology behind flag waving and indicating, at different levels, for something like alcohol use/abuse in halls. This would relate to level of concern, who’s waving the flag, and what the result would be.

Four potential areas to look into would be Faculty, Residential Life, Community Standards, Students themselves.

Next Meeting Date

3/19/19