

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes  
2700 Posvar Hall  
May 6, 2008

Topic/Discussion	Action
<u>Call to Order.</u> President Baker called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.	The meeting commenced.
<u>Approval of the Minutes of the April 1 Faculty Assembly Meeting.</u> President Baker asked for approval of the minutes of the April 1, 2008, Faculty Assembly meeting. A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes. Assembly Member Wion asked to clarify the statement on page 6, paragraph 3, line 6. The statement “Provost Maher responded that librarians cited the Tempe Principles when responding to the changes in the Act” should be changed to: “Provost Maher responded that librarians cited the Tempe Principles <i>when advocating for</i> the changes in the Act”. Senate Secretary Bernardo will make these changes to the minutes.	The minutes were approved as amended.
<u>Introduction of Items of New Business.</u> President Baker asked for new items of business to be brought forward.	No new items were brought forward.
<p><u>Report of the President.</u> President Baker gave the following report:</p> <p>Michael Pinsky, the Chair of the Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee on Fitness for Life has asked the Senate Executive Committee to extend the life of the committee. Assuming there are no objections from Assembly members we will do so. Ad Hoc committees are appointed for two years, and need to be given a new name and charge to continue their work. The new committee will be called the Ad Hoc Fitness for Life II Committee. It will be chaired by Michael Pinsky.</p> <p>The charge to the Ad Hoc Fitness for Life II Committee is to work with officials of the UPMC Health Plan and our Benefits Office to try to implement some of the Fitness for Life recommendations that were proposed in the Risk Management Proposal that Faculty Assembly endorsed in 2007. Assembly Member Munro asked about the origin of this rule. President Baker replied that the Bylaws state that ad hoc committees can be appointed for a period of 2 years. The wording does not prevent the reappointment of an ad hoc committee after 2 years, so it depends upon how strictly the wording is interpreted. A new name is given to the Ad Hoc Fitness for Life II Committee because the Committee has a different mission. This new committee will work to implement the proposal developed by the first Ad Hoc Fitness for Life Committee. Vice President Greeno added that the purpose of the 2 year rule was to prevent an ad hoc committee from becoming a defacto standing committee. Immediate Past President Frieze asked if the new Ad Hoc Fitness for Life II Committee will work closely with the Senate Benefits and Welfare Committee.</p>	President Baker’s report was approved as submitted.

<p>President Baker replied that Professor Pinsky is a member of the Senate Benefits and Welfare Committee, and does apprise the Benefits and Welfare Committee of what his group is doing.</p> <p>June 3 will probably be our last Faculty Assembly meeting until September. If any of our committees would like to give a report or discuss an item of business at that meeting, please notify Lori Molinaro so that we can plan for the meeting.</p> <p>President Baker concluded his report. President Baker asked for any additional questions or comments. None were offered.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.</u></p> <p><u>Student Affairs Committee.</u> Professor Patricia Tuite, Co-Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, asked for the Assembly’s opinion on withdrawing from a course. There was a concern about students whose grades come in past midterm (after the 9<sup>th</sup> week of the semester). Withdrawing after the 9<sup>th</sup> week of the semester is monitored and requires a dean’s permission. Should students be allowed to withdraw without monitoring or a Dean’s signature up to the end of the semester? At this time, individual schools differ in the leniency with which they apply monitored withdrawal from a course. Some schools will not allow a student to withdraw from a course after the 9<sup>th</sup> week. This has resulted in students getting a poor grade in a course, preventing them from being able to transfer into another program due to poor grades.</p> <p>The Assembly asked about the withdrawal policy at other Universities; there are differences elsewhere. At Stanford, for example, students can withdraw from a course without monitoring even up to finals week. Some of the elite schools have taken a similar liberal policy, where students can take the course up to the final examination, receive an F, and the grade would not go onto the student’s transcript and be the same as not taking the course. The only penalty is a financial one.</p> <p>After discussing the fairness of withdrawing from a course under the current policy, Professor Tuite stated that she was hearing from Faculty Assembly that there is no need at this time to make any changes to the current withdrawal policy here at Pitt. She would report this consensus back to the Student Affairs Committee.</p> <p><u>Elections Report.</u> Professor Irene H. Frieze, Chairperson, distributed the elections report. John Baker was re-elected as President, Susan Hansen was elected Vice President, and Lisa Bernardo was re-elected as Secretary. A listing of newly elected Faculty Assembly members was included in the report.</p>	<p>Professor Tuite will take this information back to the Student Affairs Committee.</p>

There were few complaints about the electronic ballot. The participation rate was slightly lower than usual, and it is not clear why. Professor Frieze asked for any thoughts on this occurrence. Assembly Member Munro asked if the notification process for the second year of electronic voting was comparable to the first year and the year before when voting was conducted with paper ballots. Professor Frieze reviewed the process for alerting faculty to voting; every faculty member received a paper mail notification of the election and one electronic reminder of the election. Assembly Member Munro commented that the electronic ballot is not as prominent as a paper ballot. Professor Jean Carr noted that she did not see all of the candidates at once, and needed to scroll down the screen. Having the candidates all listed on the page would be helpful. Professor Coley asked if more reminders could be sent. Professor Frieze responded that the Provost prefers not to overload faculty with emails and email reminders. Other suggestions were offered, including having additional email reminders sent to faculty and holding the elections before the end of the term. Professor Frieze asked the Assembly to contact Lori Molinaro or her for further comments on the elections.

Bylaws Committee. Professor Irene H. Frieze continued with the bylaws report. A recommendation from the Bylaws Committee was distributed. The proposed bylaws change was brought forward. Assembly Member Flynn asked for the reason for changing the voting status of the immediate past president and for making him/her chair of the Elections Committee, instead of having the committee electing a new chair each year. Immediate Past President Frieze replied that the Immediate Past President has knowledge of the process. President Baker noted that the role of the Immediate Past President was to certify the paper ballot election result, which is not applicable to the electronic ballot. This was the reason for the nonvoting status. Assembly Member John Close agreed that having a knowledgeable person in charge in this position is important. Assembly Member Close is a member of this committee, and wondered how appointment to the committee is made. Lori Molinaro replied that the Dean of each school appoints a faculty member to the election committee for a 2 year term, with the possibility of being renewed for 2 more years.

President Baker called for the vote to the proposed bylaws changes: Article V, Section 3 will read: The Elections Chair will be held by the immediate past president. If the immediate past president is seeking office, then the Committee for Elections will elect a chair from its membership. Article 5, Section 2b will read: The most immediate past president of the Senate shall be a voting member Ex Officio.

Immediate Past President Frieze noted that this is the first step in the

The motion carried and will be taken to Senate Council.

<p>process to get the bylaws changed. After this, the proposed bylaws change goes to Senate Council and then for public notification in the University Times and the Senate website.</p> <p>Immediate Past President Frieze continued with the recommendation that all offices be two years of service instead of one year. One reason for this change is that compiling the ballot is a huge job, which is a practical reason. Another thought, though, is that it may be harder to find faculty to serve if they are committed to an office for two years. Assembly Member Wion thought that the two year option was a good idea in that it provided continuity and gives faculty longer to settle in to a position, and would simplify elections. Immediate Past President Frieze noted that this request has come up numerous times in the past. The term limits would be adjusted, which is a separate issue being discussed by the Bylaws Committee.</p> <p>With regards to term limits, the Bylaws Committee raised the question of Senate officer service—is it a total of 3 years of service, or is it 3 consecutive years of service. Could a faculty member run again after serving 3 consecutive years and sitting out a year, or should there be term limits. There was some discussion on this issue.</p>	<p>Immediate Past President Frieze will take this discussion on terms of office to the Bylaws Committee.</p>
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business.</u>  <u>Engaging Faculty in Changing the Culture of Student Alcohol Misuse.</u>  Joe Mull, Coordinator, Health Education and Promotion (HEP) Center, gave the following report regarding alcohol use on campus. Also in attendance were Dawn Diehl and Nicole O’Barto-Trainer. Their presentation is attached to these minutes. The percentage of students who use alcohol has not changed, but the amount has changed. Mr. Mull presented the data from the National College Health Assessment (NCHA) comparing Pitt with other universities. Overall, a higher percentage of Pitt students (42%) reported having 5 or more drinks at one sitting compared to the national average (38%). When reporting the frequency (how often) students reported having 5 or more drinks at one sitting, Pitt is slightly higher than the national average. Of note is that 55% reported none, compared to 66% nationally.</p> <p>An evidence-based approach is needed to educate students on alcohol use throughout the campus. Mr. Mull reviewed the evidence-based efforts taking place at Pitt. In particular, the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) provides a grant to change alcohol behaviors on college campuses. Pitt students surveyed reported that the most believable source of health information was medical staff, health educators, faculty and parents.</p> <p>The HEP Center created a lunch and learn series, four of which were conducted this past year. The lunch and learn series provided</p>	<p>Information only; no action needed.</p>

information for faculty who want to reach out to students with potential alcohol problems. Strategies that faculty can implement for alcohol education and awareness were explored in this series. Mr. Mull described the marketing strategies his office used to invite faculty to the workshops. A total of 41 faculty attended, and the results were overwhelmingly positive. The HEP Center resubmitted their PLCB grant for another year to continue this series. Curriculum infusion roundtables will be developed.

Mr. Mull circulated a sign up sheet for email reminders of upcoming programs. He invited feedback on the issue of alcohol use by students, as well as ways to improve their delivery of workshops and series. He invited questions from the Assembly.

Assembly members and Mr. Mull discussed alcohol use and abuse as it is related to antisocial behaviors; Greek life; and sexual assault. The HEP Center has submitted a SAMSA grant for an SBIRT intervention directed at Greek organizations that will allow them to screen their members for alcohol-related problems and refer them for counseling.

Questions arose regarding the faculty's role in sharing health-related information with students, considering that students rate faculty higher than parents as a credible resource for this type of information. There were Assembly members who expressed a willingness to discuss alcohol use with their students and embedding such content in their syllabi, while other Assembly members expressed concern with this approach, which seems outside of the faculty job description. Faculty were encouraged to consider such health promotion and responsible alcohol use if it fits within their academic missions. Additionally, the Pitt Pathways will include health promotion and responsible alcohol use programs, which encompasses learning outside of the classroom. President Baker thanked Mr. Mull for his presentation.

IRB Advisory Committee for Social Behavioral Research.

Professor Irene H. Frieze gave the following report; a handout was also distributed to the Assembly. Professor Frieze gave a brief history of the concerns related to the IRB that were brought before the IRB Advisory Committee. In response, the IRB certification process was streamlined for less medical-related research. Individual faculty have been helped with the IRB submission process. Communication has been improved. The Committee has advocated for change; individual units are now verifying the scientific merit of proposals. The Committee will be evaluating that in the fall.

Improvements have taken place in clarifying the types of protocols that go to the IRB, and there has been better action on exempt proposals,

Information only, no action needed

<p>with entire IRB staff devoted to these submissions. They continue to work on the electronic submission system. The IRB office is open to consulting, and they are urging faculty to come in and talk with them before submitting their proposals. The Assembly was reminded that if a response is not received from the IRB within a few weeks of submission, faculty should check in with the IRB staff.</p> <p>The IRB Advisory Committee will be working on unit certification this fall, along with a payment process for research participants. Professor Frieze asked for questions. Comments were made about problems experienced with the OSIRIS electronic submission system, where proposals cannot be reviewed through this system. Professor Frieze replied that she was willing to talk further about this issue.</p> <p>President Baker asked for questions or comments; none were raised.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements.</u> President Baker reminded the Assembly that the next Faculty Assembly meeting is June 3, 2008.</p>	Information only; no action needed.
<p><u>Adjournment.</u> The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.</p>	Meeting adjourned.

Members attending:

Baker, Balaban, Bauer, Beatty, Belle, Bernardo, J. F. Carr, Cham, Chasens, Chattopadhyay, Close, Coley, Coontz, Costantino, Daley, Flynn, Frieze, Gallagher, Greeno, Hansen, Hughes, Juffs, Molinaro, Munro, Rohrer, Rubin, Siskin, Slimick, Smitherman, Tuite, Twiss, Wendell, Wion, Withiam

Members not attending:

Brush, Butt, S. L. Carr, Coat, Constantine, Deasy, Delude, Erlen, Fabian, Feuer, Galloway, Hall, Hawthorne-Burdine, Hoffmann, Jones, Kirkwood, Lausberg, Lotze, McKinney, Nicoletti, Pike, Rechter, Rougeux, Sanders, Skledar, Slaughter, Smethurst, Smolinski, Soska, Stillely, Stuckart, Towers, Tress, Weiss, Yarger

\*Excused attendance:

Bircher, Carlin, Hampton, Harbert, Hartman, Husted, Kelly, Muenzer, Novosel, Olson, Petracchi, Saunders, Seitz, Shear, Stoy

Others attending:

Blair, Brendel, Diehl, Fedele, Hart, Mull, O'Barto-Trainer, Pack, Siegel

\*Notified Senate office

## Faculty Assembly Attendance Roster

	29-Jan	26-Feb	1-Apr	6-May	TOTAL
<b>ELECTED MEMBERS:</b>					
Baker	1	1	1	1	4
Balaban*	1	1	1	1	4
Bauer	0	1	1	1	3
Belle	1	N	1	1	3
Bernardo	1	N	1	1	3
Brush	N	N	N	N	0
Butt	1	1	0	0	2
Carlin	N	N	1	N	1
Carr, J. F.	1	1	N	1	3
Cham	1	1	0	1	3
Chasens	1	1	0	1	3
Chattopadhyay	0	0	0	1	1
Close	1	1	1	1	4
Coat**	0	N	0	0	0
Coley	1	N	0	1	2
Constantine	N	1	0	0	1
Coontz	1	1	0	1	3
Costantino	1	1	1	1	4
Daley	1	0	0	1	2
Deasy	1	1	1	0	3
Delude	0	0	0	0	0
Flynn	N	N	N	1	1
Frieze	1	1	1	1	4
Gallagher	1	1	N	1	3
Greeno	1	1	1	1	4
Hall	0	0	0	0	0
Hampton	1	1	1	N	3
Hansen	1	1	1	1	4
Harbert	1	1	N	N	2
Hartman*	1	N	1	N	2
Hawthorne-Burdine	0	1	0	0	1
Hughes	1	1	1	1	4
Husted	N	N	N	N	0
Juffs	1	0	1	1	3
Kirkwood	1	0	0	0	1
Lotze	1	0	0	0	1
McKinney	1	1	0	0	2
Molinaro	1	1	1	1	4
Muenzer	N	0	1	N	1
Munro*	1	1	1	1	4
Nicoletti**	N	0	0	0	0
Novosel	1	1	1	N	3

	1	1	1	N	3
	29-Jan	26-Feb	1-Apr	6-May	TOTAL
Olson					
Petracchi	N	N	N	N	0
Pike*	1	1	0	0	2
Rechter**	0	0	0	0	0
Rohrer*	0	1	1	1	3
Rubin	N	1	N	1	2
Sanders	N	0	0	0	0
Saunders	N	N	N	N	0
Seitz	1	1	1	N	3
Siskin	1	1	1	1	4
Skledar	1	0	0	0	1
Slaughter	1	0	0	0	1
Slimick**	1	N	1	1	3
Smitherman*	1	0	0	1	2
Smolinski*	0	0	0	0	0
Soska	0	1	0	0	1
Stoy	N	N	N	N	0
Stuckart**	0	0	0	0	0
Towers	N	0	0	0	0
Tress**	0	0	0	0	0
Twiss	1	1	1	1	4
Wendell	1	1	N	1	3
Wion	1	1	1	1	4
Withiam**	1	1	N	1	3

**29-Jan      26-Feb      1-Apr      6-May      TOTAL**

**CHAIRS/CO-CHAIRS**

Beatty	1	1	1	1	4
Bircher	1	1	1	N	3
Carr, S. L.	0	0	0	0	0
Fabian	0	0	0	0	0
Feuer	0	0	0	0	0
Galloway			1	0	1
Hoffmann	1	0	1	0	2
Kelly	1	0	1	N	2
Shear	0	1	0	N	1
Smethurst	0	0	0	0	0
Stilley	0	0	0	0	0
Tuite	1	1	1	1	4
Weiss	0	1	0	0	1

\*Elected Member and Chair/Co-Chair

\*\* Regional Campus

N Notification/unable to attend

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE FOR ELECTIONS  
ELECTION RESULTS 2008**

**OFFICERS OF THE SENATE**

PRESIDENT	JOHN J. BAKER
VICE PRESIDENT	SUSAN B. HANSEN
SECRETARY	LISA MARIE BERNARDO

**REPRESENTATIVES TO FACULTY ASSEMBLY**

A&S HUMANITIES	TROY BOONE NEEPA MAJUMDAR
A&S NATURAL SCIENCES	STEPHEN TONSOR
A&S SOCIAL SCIENCES	VAN BECK HALL ORYSIA KARAPINKA
BUSINESS	CHAD ZUTTER
DENTAL MEDICINE	JOHN CLOSE
EDUCATION	CHARLENE TROVATO
ENGINEERING	JOHN BARNARD
GSPIA	SABINA DEITRICK
HEALTH & REHABILITATION SCIENCES	PATRICK SPARTO
HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARY SYSTEM	JOHN SIEGEL

INFORMATION SCIENCES

GLENN RAY

LAW

SALLIE SMITH

MEDICINE

JAMES T. BECKER  
JEAN LATIMER  
L. DADE LUNSFORD

NURSING

RICHARD HENKER

PHARMACY

AMY SEYBERT

PUBLIC HEALTH

LINDA FRANK

SUBMITTED BY:

LORI A. MOLINARO

Director, Office of the University Senate

*Lori A. Molinaro*

04/21/08

---

Signature

Date

CERTIFIED BY:

IRENE H. FRIEZE

Immediate Past President, University Senate

*Irene H. Frieze*

04/21/08

---

Signature

Date

IRB Advisory Committee for Social and Behavioral Research  
Report for Faculty Assembly. May 6, 2008

1. *Establishment of Committee*

- a. The Committee was established in June 2004 in response to faculty concerns expressed at Faculty Assembly about lack of input into IRB policies and procedures, especially for researchers in social and behavioral science research areas and especially for those doing research classified as “Exempt.” Members were appointed by Randy Juhl to the committee. Irene Frieze, the Senate liaison, was elected chair. Other current and past members of the committee have included Susan Campbell, Phyllis Coontz, Katherine Greeno, John Levine, and Hide Yamatani.
- b. The Committee generally meets once in the Fall semester and once in the Spring semester. Staff members from the IRB attend meetings, along with faculty members of the committee. Discussions are quite open.

2. *Accomplishments of the Committee.*

- a. *New training modules for certification of researchers.* One of the big complaints of faculty was that the training materials and testing for IRB certification required before someone can submit a protocol or have their student submit a protocol was too medically oriented. The IRB Office shared this concern and we worked together to find training materials that were more relevant for researchers in social and behavioral fields.
- b. *Serve as liaison between faculty and the IRB Office.* One of the initial goals of the committee was helping researchers having problems with the IRB Office. As people learned about the committee and have concerns, they have asked us for help and we have generally been able to provide this.
- c. *Successfully advocated for additional communication between the IRB staff and faculty and students in the Provost area.* The IRB Office has had programs for such communication in place for some time. As a result of our discussions, Chris Ryan and other staff have met with faculty and students in schools to discuss IRB policies directly with faculty. Periodically, we sent out letters to all faculty involved with human subjects research to let them know that such meetings could be requested, and explaining new IRB procedures. Other forms of communication have included Senate Matters columns and having Chris Ryan, the Director of the IRB Office come to Faculty Assembly to discuss the IRB, We have also encouraged the development of more informational webpages on the IRB website.

- d. *Unit Review of Scientific Merit of Proposals.* A large source of faculty complaints about the IRB was that IRB staff and review boards were making inappropriate comments about the scientific merit of proposed studies. As a result of this concern, the IRB office decided that each unit would be responsible for certifying that proposals from that unit had scientific merit.
  - e. *Clarification to faculty about what type of review is appropriate for different types of research proposals.* As a result of our discussions, the IRB Office has clarified for faculty that many research proposals in social and behavioral areas (including certain types of survey studies and research on educational practices and curricula) will meet criteria for an 'Exempt' review, and can be handled administratively by the IRB Office (for details, go to <http://www.irb.pitt.edu/Student%20Research.htm>). Studies using existing data [that is de-identified] may not even require a formal submission to the IRB, Class projects that are not intended to generate generalizable knowledge also do not require IRB approval. Nevertheless, if faculty have questions about whether or not a project needs to be submitted to the IRB, they should e-mail Christopher Ryan, IRB Director [ryanm@upmc.edu], or Sue Beers, Director of Exempt/Expedited Review Group [beerssr@upmc.edu].
  - f. *Hiring of additional staff to review Exempt proposals.* As a result of our discussions about the need to handle exempt proposals more quickly, the IRB staff in this area has been increased. As a result of these changes, Exempt proposals tend to receive approval more quickly than in the past.
  - g. *Working with the Office of Research to ensure that the new electronic submission system works well for Exempt and Expedited Proposals.* We have advised on the system as it has been developed. One continuing issue, though, is that people do need to make sure they use the correct category of proposal when submitting their protocol.
3. *Current Issues of Concern to Provost Area Faculty.*
- a. *Availability of IRB Office consulting.* Staff of the IRB Office are happy to work with faculty or students who have special research concerns. This should be done BEFORE the proposal is submitted. The IRB Office has regular office hours for such consultations. Hours are posted on the IRB website. There are also Ask The IRB sessions held every other week where people can go and ask questions.
  - b. *Need to make sure that proposals submitted to the IRB Office have been acted on.* Generally, Exempt proposals are processed within 2 weeks. Faculty are urged to check with the office if they have not gotten any communication from the IRB Office after 2 weeks.
  - c. *Functioning of Unit Certification of Scientific Merit.* This has sometimes led to problems. Our committee, the IRB Office staff, and the Vice Provost for Research will be meeting with people designated to do these reviews to answer questions and clarify procedures in the fall.

- d. *Using the new system for providing payment to research participants.* A new system is being implemented that will provide a credit-care like card that can be used like a gift card for human subjects. The system does require that social security numbers be added to the system when these are used, but it is possible to ask for a waiver to this requirement when payments are less than \$100/year per person. Forms can be obtained by e-mailing Christopher Ryan at the IRB Office.

---

# Engaging Faculty in Changing the Culture of Student Alcohol Misuse

---

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

**Joe Mull, M.Ed,**  
Coordinator, Office of Health Education & Promotion

**Dawn Diehl, MSW**  
Substance Abuse Prevention Specialist, Office of Health Education & Promotion

**Nicole O'Barto-Trainer, MS, LPC**  
Licensed Counselor, University of Pittsburgh Counseling Center

---

## What's the problem?

*“Underage drinking and excessive drinking have negative effects on everything we’re trying to do as a university. They compromise the educational environment, the safety of our students, the quality of life on campus, town/gown relationships, and our reputation.”*

—Dr. Judith Ramaley,  
Former President, University of Vermont

---

---

## The scope of the problem:

### What we know

- *Drinking is a culture.*
  - *Often viewed as an intractable problem.*
  - *Impacts all students across all areas of the University.*
  - *A variety of belief systems about the role of alcohol in the college setting.*
- 

---

## A look at Pitt...

*April 2007: American College Health Association's National College Health Assessment (NCHA).*

- *National research effort, collects data about the health of college students.*
- *300 questions. Assesses attitudes, beliefs, behaviors.*
- *Variety of content areas including violence, **alcohol**, tobacco, & other drug use; sexual health; weight, nutrition & exercise; & mental health.*

*Started in 2000. Taken by over 300,000 college students at over 300 colleges and universities.*

---

**The last time you partied/socialized,  
how many alcoholic drinks did you  
have? (“Binge” Drinking)**

shown in % of respondents

(Write-in question. Responses  
ranged from 0 to 30)

	<b><i>National</i></b>	<b><i>Pitt</i></b>
5 or more	38.0	42.5

**Think back over the last 2 weeks.  
How many times, if any, have you had  
5 or more drinks in a sitting?**

shown in % of respondents

	<b><i>National</i></b>	<b><i>Pitt</i></b>
None	62.9	55.0
1	13.4	15.9
2	9.0	11.1
3	5.3	7.2
4 or more	9.4	11.0

---

## Specifics (18 to 24)

- *1 in 4 students report academic consequences (including missing class, falling behind, doing poorly on exams or papers, and receiving lower grades overall) related to alcohol use.*
- *31% of students meet criteria for a diagnosis of alcohol abuse and 6% meet criteria for alcohol dependence.*
- *1700 college students die each year from alcohol-related causes. (annual increase) (AY: 6/day)*

---

Hingson, R. et al. Magnitude of Alcohol-Related Mortality and Morbidity Among U.S. College Students Ages 18-24: Changes from 1998 to 2001. Annual Review of Public Health, vol. 26, 259-79; 2005

---

## Educational Approach

- *What we know: Multiple factors influence campus culture.*
- *Multi-dimensional, campus-wide efforts are crucial*
- *Evidence-based*
- *Harm-reduction philosophy*
- *Integrate across all aspects of the university.*

---

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2002, April). A call to action: Changing the culture of drinking at U.S. colleges. Available at [www.collegedrinkingsprevention.gov/Reports/](http://www.collegedrinkingsprevention.gov/Reports/)

---

## Efforts at the University of Pittsburgh

Since August, 2006:

- Overall change in philosophy (“do’s and don’ts” to how and why)
  - Dramatic revision of P.E.A.R (sanction) program.
  - Increased programming to Greek-letter organizations.
  - Integration into PittStart, Orientation and First-Year Programs.
  - Launch of PantherWELL Peer Health Education program.
  - Revisions to University Student Conduct process and sanctions.
  - Expansion of Late Night/Weekend programming
  - Intense effort to expand collaboration and communication
  - SBIRT grant (SAMHSA)
  - PLCB grant (State-level)
- 

---

## NCHA 07: Most believable sources of health information:

1. *Medical Staff*
2. *Health Educators*
3. **Faculty**
4. *Parents*

41% of Pitt students reported they usually get health related info from Faculty and/or coursework.

---

---

## Faculty Lunch & Learn Series

- *Two workshops during “lunch hour”*
  - *Facilitated by on-campus alcohol education personnel*
  - *Goals include*
    - *Raise awareness/deepen understanding of circumstances and problems*
    - *Identify strategies to address*
    - *Empower faculty to take action (with which they are comfortable)*
- 

---

## Faculty Lunch & Learn Series

- *Overview of data, behaviors, problems.*
  - *Explore characteristics of student population.*
  - *Review current efforts across U.S. that involve faculty.*
  - *Explore strategies from passive to active*
    - *Syllabus Statement*
    - *In-class programs available to faculty*
    - *Challenge enabling behaviors*
    - *Curriculum Infusion*
  - *Mini-training on doing a “Brief Intervention”*
-

---

## Faculty Lunch & Learn Series

- **Four workshops:**

- October 10, 2007
- November 8, 2007
- January 29, 2008
- March 3, 2008

- **Marketing:**

- Flyer sent by mail to all faculty (Fall)
  - Emails sent to Deans, Directors, Department Chairs
  - Broadcast message via Audix (Spring)
  - Email invitation sent via University Senate
  - Materials distributed at New Faculty Orientation
  - Advertising in The Chronicle and University Times
  - Individual faculty invites (via Student Affairs)
  - Promoted by PHEs
- 

---

## Faculty Lunch & Learn Series

- **41 Faculty attended**

- **Compiled evaluation results:**

Overall, please rate your level of satisfaction with the program.

**52%** Excellent      **48 %** Good      **0%** Fair      **0%** Poor

Do you think this program presented information that you can use?

**93%** Yes      **7%** Maybe      **0%** No

Do you think that this topic is of concern and/or interest to faculty?

**76%** Yes      **14%** Maybe      **3%** No      **7%** I don't know

---

---

## Faculty Lunch & Learn Series

- *Scheduled to occur again in 2008-2009*
  - *Addition of Curriculum Infusion roundtables*
  - *Incorporation of evaluation and anecdotal feedback*
  - *Seeking additional ways to*
    - *...reach and attract faculty*
    - *...improve relevancy and accessibility (content)*
  - *Have workshop, will travel!*
- 

---

## We need your perspective...

- *How does this issue impact your work?  
Your students?*
  
  - *How can we increase access, visibility  
and/or appeal of the FL&L program to  
faculty?*
-