

APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

1. Submitted by College of Medicine Date 11/15/06

Department/Division offering course Behavioral Science

2. Proposed designation and Bulletin description of this course

a. Prefix and Number BSC788 b. Title* Drug Abuse: Contemporary Theories and Issues

*NOTE: If the title is longer than 24 characters (including spaces), write
A sensible title (not exceeding 24 characters) for use on transcripts Drug Abuse: Theor & Iss

c. Lecture/Discussion hours per week 3 d. Laboratory hours per week 0

e. Studio hours per week 0 f. Credits 3

g. Course description

This course is designed to familiarize students with major concepts and current issues in the field of substance abuse research.

h. Prerequisites (if any)

None

i. May be repeated to a maximum of NA (if applicable)

4. To be cross-listed as

NA

Prefix and Number

Signature, Chairman, cross-listing department

5. Effective Date Spring '08 (semester and year)

6. Course to be offered Fall or Spring Summer

7. Will the course be offered each year? Yes No
(Explain if not annually)

This is an elective graduate seminar fulfilling requirements for various master's and Ph.D. level students
in several different degree programs and so will be offered on a rotating basis with other department graduate seminars.

8. Why is this course needed?

This course is already offered as a BSC772 Special Topics Seminar. Due to its success (enrollments & positive student evaluations) and to department plans to continue offering it, a more permanent course title and number is needed.

9. a. By whom will the course be taught? Craig R. Rush, Ph.D.

b. Are facilities for teaching the course now available? Yes No
If not, what plans have been made for providing them?

NA

APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

10. What enrollment may be reasonably anticipated? 10-15 masters level and Ph.D. students
11. Will this course serve students in the Department primarily? Yes No
- Will it be of service to a significant number of students outside the Department?
If so, explain. Yes No
- The course is an elective for students in the recently created Col of Public Health, Col of Medicine's MS in Medical Science, Certificates in Behavioral Science and in Health Communication and graduate programs such as Gerontology and Psychology.
- Will the course serve as a University Studies Program course? Yes No
- If yes, under what Area? NA
12. Check the category most applicable to this course
- traditional; offered in corresponding departments elsewhere;
- relatively new, now being widely established
- not yet to be found in many (or any) other universities
13. Is this course applicable to the requirements for at least one degree or certificate at the University of Kentucky? Yes No
14. Is this course part of a proposed new program:
If yes, which? Yes No
No, but several students from new programs will enroll in it (see above).
15. Will adding this course change the degree requirements in one or more programs?
If yes, explain the change(s) below (NOTE – If “yes,” a program change form must also be submitted.) Yes No
- NA
-
16. Attach a list of the major teaching objectives of the proposed course and outline and/or reference list to be used.
18. If the course is 400G or 500 level, include syllabi or course statement showing differentiation for undergraduate and graduate students in assignments, grading criteria, and grading scales. Check here if 400G-500.
19. Within the Department, who should be contacted for further information about the proposed course?
- Name Craig R. Rush, Ph.D. Phone Extension 3-6130

APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

Signatures of Approval:

<u>12/07/06</u> Date of Approval by Department Faculty	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by Department Chair
<u>[Signature] 4-17-07</u> Date of Approval by College Faculty	<u>[Signature] 4-27-07</u> Reported by College Dean
<u>[Signature] 2-19-07</u> *Date of Approval by Undergraduate Council Curriculum Committee	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by Undergraduate Council Chair
<u>[Signature]</u> *Date of Approval by Graduate Council	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by Graduate Council Chair
<u>6/19/07</u> *Date of Approval by Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC)	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by HCCC Chair
<u>[Signature]</u> *Date of Approval by Senate Council	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by Senate Council Office
<u>[Signature]</u> *Date of Approval by University Senate	<u>[Signature]</u> Reported by Senate Council Office

*If applicable, as provided by the Rules of the University Senate

BSC 788: Drug Abuse: Contemporary Theories and Issues
Fall 2008, Monday, 3:00-5:30 p.m., Rm. 104 COMOB

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to familiarize students with major concepts and current issues in the field of substance abuse research. This course is also designed to familiarize the student with behavioral and social issues related to substance abuse. The course will examine different research approaches used by the behavioral scientists and clinical researchers. In other words, while the pharmacological aspects of substance abuse will receive some attention, they will *not* be the major emphasis of this course. This course will be taught in a seminar format at the graduate level.

PREREQUISITE

None

OBJECTIVES

1. Expose students to several contemporary theoretical approaches to drug abuse.
2. Enable students to apply information from their own social science education (i.e., anthropology, communication, epidemiology, psychology, and sociology) to investigations in drug abuse.
3. Develop students' awareness of practical, ethical, and methodological issues associated with research in drug abuse.

INSTRUCTOR

Craig R. Rush, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Behavioral Science
127 College of Medicine Office Building (COMOB)
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40536-0086
Office Phone: (859) 323-6130
Lab Phone: (859) 257-5383
Office FAX: (859) 323-5350
Lab FAX: (859) 257-7684
e-mail: crush2@pop.uky.edu
Office Hours: By appointment

TEXT

Appropriate readings will be assigned. The student is responsible for obtaining a copy of the assigned readings.

ATTENDANCE

As this is a graduate level course, you are expected to attend class and be prepared to discuss the required readings. If you have a university excused absence you should notify the instructor prior to the class, when possible. Each unexcused absence will result in 5% reduction in the final grade for the course.

COURSE PHILOSOPHY

This course will be taught at the graduate level. That is, while students are not expected to begin with knowledge of the specific content of the course, they are expected to have some interest in drug abuse, as well as a level of commitment to the course well beyond that expected for undergraduates in their courses. Students are expected to read the assigned materials before class. Multiple readings of the assigned material will probably be necessary.

It is, of course, understood that students will work independently on all projects. While students are encouraged to discuss the course with their colleagues, once they begin writing an individual assignment they are asked not to discuss it with other individuals in the class. Cheating on individual assignments, or plagiarism, whether from printed materials or the Internet, will not be tolerated. In accordance with university policies, the minimum penalty for an academic offense is an E for the assignment.

The format for this course will involve both lecture and discussion. Students are encouraged to ask questions, disagree with the instructor or guest lecturers, and raise relevant issues during class time. Students are also encouraged to meet with the faculty outside of class for further discussions.

GRADED ACTIVITIES

1. Review Paper (30%). A 15-20 page, double-spaced, review based on a topic related to drug will comprise the largest portion of the grade. The topic of this review paper should be discussed with Dr. Rush to ensure that it is appropriate. The topics listed below can be used, but the review paper should cover material that was not covered in class. The quality of this review paper should be the same as the introduction to a doctoral dissertation, published review, or book chapter.
2. Discussion leader (25%). Each week, at least one student will be assigned a series of articles on which they function as the "local expert". The "local expert" will lead the class discussion of the selected reading, pose interesting questions to the class, and maintain the focus of the discussion. If necessary, you can meet with Dr. Rush prior to functioning as a "local expert" to clarify any issues. Each student will function as the "local expert" twice during the course.
3. Debate participation (30%): Student will be randomly assigned to a position, for or against drug legalization. Each team will be responsible for compiling a list of four readings. The readings should be given to Dr. Rush during class on November 24, 2006. Each team will then have one class to present their case. The order of the presentations will also be determined randomly. Each student will receive the grade assigned to the team.
4. Class participation (15%): Each student is expected to contribute to class discussions.

EVALUATION

Each assignment is worth a total of 100 points. The exercises will be weighted as indicated above. The final course letter grade assigned by the faculty will be determined using conventional standards (i.e., A = 90% or above; B = 80-89%; C = 70-79%; D = 69% or below).

With a reasonable degree of effort all students will earn satisfactory grades. All assignments will be submitted by the dates listed. Late submissions will not be accepted unless a student has an acceptable reason. Such exceptions will be negotiated with the faculty.

The student should understand that a grade of incomplete (I) is given at the discretion of the instructor. Such a grade will only be assigned under extenuating circumstances and will not be given because the student did not have time to complete the assignments. If a grade of incomplete is assigned, in accordance with university policy, the student will have one year to complete the class assignments. **No extensions will be granted.**

Schedule

Class	Date	Topic	Lecturer	Local Expert
1	Aug 28	Introduction	Rush	NA
2	Sep 11	Operant Process in Drug Abuse	Rush	TBD
3	Sep 18	The Self-Medication Hypothesis of Drug Abuse	Rush	TBD
4	Sep 25	Vulnerability to Abuse Drugs: Individual Differences	Rush	TBD
5	Oct 2	Environmental Factors in Drug Dependence	Rush	TBD
6	Oct 9	Drug Abuse as a Problem of Impaired Control	Rush	TBD
7	Oct 16	The Gateway Hypothesis of Drug Abuse	Rush	TBD
8	Oct 23	The Emerging Problem of Methamphetamine	Rush	TBD
9	Oct 30	Prescription Drug Abuse: Stimulants	Rush	TBD
10	Nov 6	Prescription Drug Abuse: Opioids	Rush	TBD
11	Nov 13	Drug Abuse in the Elderly	Rush	TBD
12	Nov 20	Behavioral and Pharmacological Treatments	Rush	TBD
13	Nov 27	Drug Legalization: Pros and Cons	Class	TBD
14	Dec 4	Drug Legalization: Rebuttals	Class	TBD
15	Dec 11	No Class. Review Paper Due	NA	TBD

UNIVERSITY POLICY ON PLAGIARISM AND CHEATING

PLAGIARISM and CHEATING are serious academic offenses. In accordance with university policies, the minimum penalty for an academic offense is an E for the assignment.

The University regulations pertaining to this matter can be found at <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/>. Of particular relevance is Part II, SELECTED RULES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE GOVERNING ACADEMIC RELATIONSHIPS, Section 6.3 that can be found at <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part2.html>

These rules in particular say: PLAGIARISM All academic work, written or otherwise, submitted by students to their instructors or other academic supervisors, is expected to be the result of their own thought, research, or self-expression. In cases where students feel unsure about a question of plagiarism involving their work, they are obliged to consult their instructors on the matter before submission.

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate acknowledgment of the fact, the students are guilty of plagiarism.

Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work, whether it be published article, chapter of a book, a paper from a friend or some file, or whatever. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work that a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be. Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, but when the actual work is done, it must be done by the student and the student alone. When a student's assignment involves research in outside sources or information, the student must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where and how he/she has employed them. If the words of someone else are used, the student must put quotation marks around the passage in question and add an

appropriate indication of its origin. Making simple changes while leaving the organization, content and phraseology intact is plagiaristic. However, nothing in these Rules shall apply to those ideas which are so generally and freely circulated as to be a part of the public domain.

6.3.2 CHEATING. Cheating is defined by its general usage. It includes, but is not limited to, the wrongfully giving, taking, or presenting any information or material by a student with the intent of aiding himself/herself or another on any academic work which is considered in any way in the determination of the final grade. Any question of definition shall be referred to the University Appeals Board.

Readings

Required readings are in **BOLD**. All students should read the assigned material before class. Multiple readings of the material will likely be necessary. The “local expert” will discuss the other readings. The “local expert” will also probably need to read these articles several times. If needed, the “local expert” should discuss the assigned readings with Dr. Rush before class. All students should have read these additional readings before class.

Class 1: Introduction None

Class 2: Operant Process in Drug Abuse

Kamien JB, Bickel WK, Hughes JR, Higgins ST, Smith B J (1993). Drug Discrimination by Humans Compared to Nonhumans: Current Status and Future Directions. *Psychopharmacology*, 111: 259-270.

Spiga R, Roache JD (1997). Human Drug Self-Administration: A Review and Methodological Critique. In: Johnson BA, Roache JD (ed) Drug Addiction and Its Treatment: Nexus of Neuroscience and Behavior. New York: Lippincott-Raven, pp 39-72.

Preston KL, Bigelow GE (1991). Subjective and Discriminative Effects of Drugs. *Behavioural Pharmacology*, 2: 293-313.

Kelly TH, Stoops WW, Perry AS, Prendergast MA, Rush CR (2003). Clinical Neuropharmacology of Drugs of Abuse: A Comparison of Drug Discrimination and Subject-Report Measures. *Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews*, 2: 1-35.

Griffiths RR, Troisi II JR, Silverman K, Mumford GK (1993). Multiple-Choice Procedure: an Efficient Approach for Investigating Drug Reinforcement in Humans. *Behavioral Pharmacology*, 4: 3-13.

Dar R, Frenk H, (2004). Do Smokers Self-Administer Pure Nicotine? A Review of the Evidence. *Psychopharmacology*, 173: 18-26.

Class 3: The Self-Medication Hypothesis of Drug Abuse

Khantzian EJ (1996). The Self-Medication Hypothesis of Substance Use Disorders: A Reconsideration and Recent Applications. *Harvard Review Psychiatry*, January/February, 231-244.

Bigelow GE, Liebson I, Kaliszak J, Griffiths RR (1978). Therapeutic self-medication as a context for drug abuse research. *NIDA Research Monograph*, 20:44-58.

Dackis CA, Gold MS (1986). More on self-medication and drug abuse. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 143: 1309-10.

Weiss RD, Griffin ML, Mirin SM (1992). Drug abuse as self-medication for depression: An empirical study. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 18: 121-9.

Roache JD, Stanley MA, Creson DR, Shah NN, Meisch RA (1997). Alprazolam-reinforced medication use in outpatients with anxiety. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 45: 143-155.

Oswald LM, Roache JD, Rhoades HM (1999). Predictors of Individual Differences in Alprazolam Self-Medication. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 7: 379-390.

Class 4: Individual Differences

- de Wit H (1998). Individual Differences in Acute Effects of Drugs in Humans: Their Relevance to Risk for Abuse. In Wetherington CL, Falk JL (Eds) *Laboratory Behavioral Studies of Vulnerability to Drug Abuse, National Institute on Drug Abuse Monograph No. 169*. US Government Printing Office, pp 176-187.
- Lynch WJ, Roth M E, Carroll ME (2002). Biological Basis of Sex Differences in Drug Abuse: Preclinical and Clinical Studies. *Psychopharmacology*, 164: 121-137.
- Stoops WW, Fillmore MT, Poonacha MS, Kingery JE, Rush CR (2003). Alcohol Choice and Amphetamine Effects in Light and Moderate Drinkers. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 27: 804-811.
- de Wit H, Doty P (1994). Preference for ethanol and diazepam in light and moderate social drinkers: a within-subjects study. *Psychopharmacology*, 115: 529-538.
- Zacny JP (2001). Morphine responses in humans: A retrospective analysis of sex differences. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 63: 23-28.
- Vansickel, A.R., Hays, L.R. and Rush, C.R. (2006). Discriminative-stimulus effects of triazolam in women and men. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, in press.

Class 5: Environmental Factors in Drug Dependence

- Roehrs T, Papineau K, Rosenthal L, Roth T (1999). Sleepiness and the Reinforcing and Subjective Effects of Methyphenidate. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 7: 145-150.
- Jones HE, Garrett B E, Griffiths RR (2001). Reinforcing Effects of Oral Cocaine: Contextual Determinants. *Psychopharmacology*, 154: 143-152.
- Haney M, Comer SD, Foltin RW, Fischman MW (1997). Behavioral Contingencies Modulate Alprazolam Self-Administration by Humans. *Behavioral Pharmacology*, 8: 82-90.
- Bickel WK, Higgins ST, Griffiths RR (1989). Repeated Diazepam Administration: Effects on the Acquisition and Performance of Response Chains in Humans. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 52: 47-56.
- Stoops WW, Lile JA, Fillmore MT, Glaser PEA, Rush CR (2005). Reinforcing effects of methylphenidate: Influence of dose and behavioral demands following drug administration. *Psychopharmacology*, 177: 349-355.
- Stoops WW, Lile JA, Fillmore MT, Glaser PEA, Rush CR (2005). Reinforcing effects of modafinil: Influence of dose and behavioral demands following drug administration. *Psychopharmacology*, 182: 186-193.

Class 6: Drug Abuse as a Problem of Impaired Control

- Fillmore MT (2003). Drug Abuse as a Problem of Impaired Control: Current Approaches and Findings. *Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews*, 2:179-197.
- Bickel WK, Marsch LA (2001). Conceptualizing Addiction Toward a Behavioral Economic Understanding of Drug Dependence: Delay Discounting Processes. *Addiction*, 96: 73-86.
- Coffey SF, Gudleski GD, Saladin ME, Brady KT (2003). Impulsivity and Rapid Discounting of Delayed Hypothetical Rewards in Cocaine-Dependent Individuals. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 11: 18-25.
- Kirby KN, Petry NM (2004). Heroin and cocaine abusers have higher discount rates for delayed rewards than alcoholics or non-drug-abusing controls. *Addiction*, 99: 461-471.
- Moeller FG, Dougherty DM, Baratt ES, Schmitz JM, Swann AC, Grabowski J (2001). The impact of impulsivity on cocaine use and retention in treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 21: 193-198.
- Bickel WK, Odum AL, Madden GJ (1999). Impulsivity and Cigarette Smoking: Delay Discounting in Current, Never, and Ex-Smokers. *Psychopharmacology*, 146: 447-454.

Class 7: The Gateway Hypothesis of Drug Abuse

Kandel DB (2002). *Examining the Gateway Hypothesis: Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement.* In Kandel DB (Ed), ***Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis.*** New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-15.

Kandel DB, Yamaguchi K, Chen K (1992). Stages of Progression in Drug Involvement From Adolescence to Adulthood: Further Evidence for the Gateway Theory. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 53: 447-457.

Pentz MA, Li C (2002). *The Gateway Theory Applied to Prevention.* In Kandel DB (Ed), *Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-15.

Morall AR, McCaffrey DF, Paddock SM (2002). Reassessing the Marijuana Gateway Effect. *Addiction*, 97: 1493-1504.

Anthony JC (2002). Death of the 'stepping-stone' hypothesis and the 'gateway' model? Comments on Morral et al. *Addiction*, 97:1505-1507.

Lynskey M (2002). An alternative model is feasible, but the gateway hypothesis has not been invalidated: comments on Morral et al. *Addiction*, 12: 1505-1507.

Class 8: The Emerging Problem of Methamphetamine

McCain MJ, Obert JL, Marinell-Casey P, Rawson RA (2006). *Meth: The basics.* Hazelden: Center City, Minnesota.

Johnson D (2005). *Meth: The home-cooked menace.* Hazelden: Center City, Minnesota.

Castro GF, Barrington EH, Walton MA, Rawson RA (2000). Cocaine and methamphetamine: differential addiction rates. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 14: 390-396.

Rawson RA, Anglin MD, Ling W (2002). Will the methamphetamine problem go away? *Journal of Addictive Disorders*, 21: 5-19.

Cretzmeyer M, Sarrazin MV, Huber DL, Block RI, Hall JA (2003). Treatment of methamphetamine abuse: research findings and clinical directions. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 24: 267-277.

Colfax G, Shoptaw S (2005). The methamphetamine epidemic: implications for HIV prevention and treatment. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*, 2: 194-199.

Class 9: Prescription Drug Abuse: Stimulants

Isaacson JH, Hopper JA, Alford DP, Parran T (2005). Prescription drug use and abuse. Risk factors, red flags, and prevention strategies. *Postgraduate Medicine*, 118: 19-26.

Mansbach RS, Moore RA, Jr. (2006). Formulation considerations for the development of medications with abuse potential. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 83 (Suppl 1): S15-S22.

Kollins SH, MacDonald EK, Rush, C.R. (2001). Assessing the abuse potential of methylphenidate in nonhumans and human subjects: A review. *Pharmacology, Biochemistry and Behavior*, 68: 611-627.

Hall KM, Irwin MM, Bowman KA, Frankenberger W, Jewett DC (2005). Illicit use of prescribed stimulant medication among college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 53: 167-74.

McCabe SE, Teter CJ, Boyd CJ, Guthrie SK (2004). Prevalence and correlates of illicit methylphenidate use among 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students in the United States, 2001. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 35: 501-4.

Teter CJ, McCabe SE, Cranford JA, Boyd CJ, Guthrie SK (2005). Prevalence and motives for illicit use of prescription stimulants in an undergraduate student sample. *Journal of American College Health*, 53: 253-62.

Class 10: Prescription Drug Abuse: Opioids

Cicero TJ, Inciardi JA, Munoz A (2005). Trends in abuse of Oxycontin and other opioid analgesics in the United States: 2002-2004. *Journal of Pain*, 6: 662-72.

Sees KL, Di Marino ME, Ruediger NK, Sweeney CT, Shiffman S (2005). Non-medical use of OxyContin Tablets in the United States. *Journal of Pain and Palliative Care Pharmacotherapy*, 19: 13-23.

Brands B, Blake J, Sproule B, Gourlay D, Busto U (2004). Prescription opioid abuse in patients presenting for methadone maintenance treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 73: 199-207.

Trafton JA, Oliva EM, Horst DA, Minkel JD, Humphreys K (2004). Treatment needs associated with pain in substance use disorder patients: implications for concurrent treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 73: 23-31.

Manchikanti L, Pampati V, Damron KS, Beyer CD, Barnhill RC, Fellows B (2003) Prevalence of prescription drug abuse and dependency in patients with chronic pain in western Kentucky. *Journal of Kentucky Medical Association*, 101: 511-7.

McCabe SE, Teter CJ, Boyd CJ, Knight JR, Wechsler H (2005). Nonmedical use of prescription opioids among U.S. college students: prevalence and correlates from a national survey. *Addictive Behavior*, 30: 789-805.

Class 11: Drug Abuse in the Elderly

McGrath A, Crome P, Crome IB (2005). Substance misuse in the older population. *Postgrad Med J* 81: 228-31.

Widlitz M, Marin DB (2002). Substance abuse in older adults. An overview. *Geriatrics* 57: 29-34.

Ekerdt DJ, De Labry LO, Glynn RJ, Davis RW (1989). Change in drinking behaviors with retirement: findings from the normative aging study. *J Stud Alcohol* 50: 347-53.

Fitzgerald JL, Mulford HA (1992). Elderly vs. younger problem drinker 'treatment' and recovery experiences. *Br J Addict* 87: 1281-91.

Kelly KD, Pickett W, Yiannakoulis N, Rowe BH, Schopflocher DP, Svenson L, Voaklander DC (2003). Medication use and falls in community-dwelling older persons. *Age Ageing* 32: 503-9.

Moore AA, Hays RD, Greendale GA, Damesyn M, Reuben DB (1999). Drinking habits among older persons: findings from the NHANES I Epidemiologic Followup Study (1982-84). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 47: 412-6.

Class 12: Behavioral and Pharmacological Treatments

Higgins ST, Heil SH, Lussier JP (2004). Clinical Implications of Reinforcement as a Determinant of Substance Use Disorders. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55: 431-461.

de Lima MS, de Oliveira Soares BG, Reisser AA, Farrell M (2002). Pharmacological treatment of cocaine dependence: A systematic review. *Addiction*, 97: 931-949.

Higgins ST, Alessi SM, Dantona RL (2002). Voucher-Based Incentives: A Substance Abuse Treatment Innovation. *Addictive Behaviors*, 27: 887-910.

Stitzer ML, Walsh SL (1997). Psychostimulant Abuse: The Case for Combined Behavioral and Pharmacological Treatments. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, 57: 457-470.

Kosten T, Oliveto A, Feingold A, Poling J, Sevarino K, McCance-Katz E, Stine S, Gonzalez G, Gonsai K (2003). Desipramine and contingency management for cocaine and opiate dependence in buprenorphine maintained patients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 70: 315-325.

Poling J, Oliveto A, Petry N, Sofuoglu M, Gonsai K, Gonzalez G, Martell B, Kosten TR (2006). Six-month trial of bupropion with contingency management for cocaine dependence in a methadone-maintained population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63: 219-228.

Class 13-14: To be determined

Class 15: None

Grading Scale for Graduate Students

100-90% = A

89.9-80% =B

79.9-70% = C

< 69.9% = E

UNIVERSITY SENATE ROUTING LOG

Proposal Title:
Name/email/phone for proposal contact:

Instruction: To facilitate the processing of this proposal please identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal, identify a contact person for each entry, provide the consequences of the review (specifically, approval, rejection, no decision and vote outcome, if any) and please attach a copy of any report or memorandum developed with comments on this proposal.

Reviewed by: (Chairs, Directors, Faculty Groups, Faculty Councils, Committees, etc)	Contact person Name (phone/email)	Consequences of Review:	Date of Proposal Review	Review Summary Attached? (yes or no)
Department of Behavioral Science	John F. Wilson (3-6257, jfwilson@pop.uky.edu)	Approved	12/1/06	No
COM Curriculum Committee	DARRELL JENNINGS 7-5286	Approved	2-19-07	No
COM Faculty Council	ERIC SMARX 3-6412	Approved	4-17-07	No
COM Dean	Jay Periman 3-6582	Approved	4-27-07	No