## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2020, *The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB)* provided funding to the *Commonwealth Prevention Alliance (CPA)* for a preliminary survey assessment of higher education institutions in Pennsylvania to begin to collect data about current alcohol-related issues on campus and efforts to mitigate the negative effects of student alcohol use. The stated purpose of this initial study was to collaborate with Pennsylvania Colleges and Universities to open a discussion around college drinking on commonwealth campuses.

CPA convened an advisory team composed of representatives of the *National Alcohol Beverage Control Association* (*NABCA*), the *PLCB*, and the state's colleges and universities to provide guidance and direction for the project. In the beginning of Spring 2020, the advisory team reviewed more extensive studies conducted in Maryland and Virginia and developed a mixed method needs assessment design, including an online survey, to collect information about a range of issues affecting student alcohol use and focus groups that further illuminated survey findings. The online survey was distributed to chief student affairs administrators knowledgeable of alcohol-related issues at 143 colleges and universities located throughout the commonwealth and 52 completed surveys were obtained. Institutions completing the survey are representative of higher education institutions in Pennsylvania. The survey sample includes private and public institutions located in rural, suburban, and urban areas. Colleges and universities of different sizes are also included in the survey data although; smaller schools with less than 5,000 students account for two-thirds of the total. Additionally, three focus groups with a total of 21 Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) professionals were administered.

Unfortunately, at the time this online survey was being implemented, the Pennsylvania institutions of higher education were also grappling with the COVID-19 pandemic. With COVID as a backdrop to the assessment process, it is suspected that survey participation rates were suppressed as some AOD professional positions were being furloughed, terminated, or professionally reassigned during the data collection time period.