



Sub-Committee to Review Smoking on Campus Research Summary

Additional file that should also be reviewed includes: Additional research detail file, which is a compilation of the following information:

- a) Successful Tobacco Policy Change Seminar notes
- b) Conference Call with Swagelok Company
- c) Hocking College Summary
- d) Taking the initiative summary
- e) Data Collected summary

UA Research

Regulation/legislation

- 1) University of Akron Rule 3359-20-05.5 – Health services and restrictions on smoking, alcoholic beverages and drugs (content provided at end of this summary)
- 2) Ohio Revised Code 3794 – Smoking Ban
- 3) Ohio Administrative Code 3701-52 – Smoking Prohibitions
- 4) Ohio Department of Health Web Page regarding the Ohio Smoking Ban. Their web page can also be located at the following link: <http://www.odh.ohio.gov/alerts/ohiosmokingban.aspx>
- 5) Violations against The University of Akron: No violations have been founded so far and we are still at the \$0 level. Locations of alleged violations:
 - a) Polsky Building
 - b) Olin Hall
 - c) Sisler McFawn Residence Hall
 - d) Student Union
 - e) EJ Thomas Performing Arts Hall

Important points

- 1) There is no smoking inside buildings, including Residence Life and Housing
- 2) There is no smoking permitted in the doorways or outside the doorways of buildings if the smoke infiltrates inside the doorway/building

Survey research

- 1) Responses are similar to attitude and attitude may not translate into that specific behavior
- 2) The representation of students and employees is not necessarily consistent with the representation in the entire campus population. However, the “weighted” results are not significantly different that the results from the sample
- 3) We should make a summary of the survey results available to the public and also provide the summary survey results to the Tobacco Policy Committee

Focus group research

- 1) Not representative of the different groups on campus. The facilitator does not believe the focus groups’ results would change significantly if these groups were included. However, if change is to be

made, it is important to generate buy-in from different groups. It may be beneficial to hold a validating focus group with on-campus students, other groups. The smokers were happy with the number of smokers represented in the survey.

- 2) Common themes: They were discussed in all of the focus groups, sometimes more than once and most of the individuals in the focus groups agreed with the theme. The first 2 bullets were the strongest themes presented.
 - a) The current policy is not clearly understood by most, nor has it been communicated widely on campus.
 - b) Most understand the policy to say that smoking is not permitted within 25 feet of an entrance to a building.
 - c) There is a lack of clarity regarding smoking in the parking decks.
 - d) The current policy is not enforced, nor is it understood how it should be enforced.
 - e) The current policy could be a good way for both smokers and non-smokers to coexist *if* it was enforced. For the most part, if the current policy were to be understood and enforced, that would satisfy most participants in the focus groups.
 - f) The cigarette butts littering the campus (outside of the smoking receptacles) are “disgusting.” Cigarette butts littering the parking structures are “disgusting” as well. (Interesting, the smoking employee group had the most to say about this theme.)
 - g) In general, most smokers are polite. However, the rude ones spoil it for the rest of them.
 - h) Need more ash cans throughout the campus.
 - i) Need to recognize the rights and needs of *both* smokers and non-smokers.
 - j) Recommend that UA look at what other universities are doing in terms of their smoking policies.
 - k) If the campus goes smoke-free, UA needs to offer smoking cessation support and other types of support or education for smokers, especially for employees.
 - l) All groups were interested in knowing the outcomes of the online survey, the focus groups, and task force’s work and recommendations. (The focus group facilitator did not offer this—it came up on its own in all four sessions. The facilitator made no promises about any type of follow up.)
- 3) All agreed the current policy is not enforced. Smokers want more ash cans throughout campus. Interestingly, students who smoke are not interested in cessation support from the University. Overall, smokers and non-smokers had empathy for one another.
- 4) Additional information provided in summary report:
 - a) Section IV: Themes from students who smoke
 - b) Section V: Themes from employees who smoke
 - c) Section VI: Students who do not smoke
 - d) Section VII: Employees who do not smoke

Impact of change on medical/insurance costs

- 1) Kaiser and Hometown would provide no more and no less support
- 2) Medical Mutual’s care management group is reviewing alternatives to maintain smoking-cessation-related programs
- 3) There would be no insurance rate reduction. The difference would likely be evident in medical claims.

Research on smoking

Potential benefits of the reduction of on-campus smoking

- 1) Prepares students entering work environments that are increasingly becoming tobacco free
- 2) May result in fewer students taking up smoking (social norming)
- 3) Protects *underage* students from a smoking environment
- 4) Protects the environment from second hand smoke and tobacco refuse

Additional information

- 1) Tobacco: Ohio Quits! Meeting: Not sure how much of this information is relevant given changes in use of Tobacco Settlement Funds; some information on free cessation programs may still be accurate and require further clarification depending on recommendations

Other organizations

Campuses

Note: Our institution is going to be unique from any other institution, so we ultimately need to consider what is going to work here.

- 1) Cuyahoga Community College
 - a) Would like institutions/organizations to commit to being smoke free within a 2-year timeframe.
 - i) Participated in a 2-year grant, which allowed for a survey on smoking to students and employees in 2006.
 - b) Reasons to go smoke free:
 - i) Students begin smoking at 19-24 years of age
 - ii) Concern about student success
- 2) Cleveland Clinic: Tobacco-free campus starting July 4, 2005
 - a) Reason to go smoke-free
 - i. Prevent illness/foster health: change the current quality of life curve. If you quit smoking before you are 35, the life curve of the ex-smoker is undistinguishable from that of a non-smoker
 - ii. Be competitive: lower healthcare costs
 - iii. Good for costs, employability of graduates, sports teams, graduates live longer
 - iv. You foster what happens around you (data from two studies from Harvard's School of Public Health)
 1. 10-15% of college freshman smoke
 2. 30-40% of college seniors smoke
 - b) Smoke-free policy
 - c) How they did it:
 - i) Communicated the change 3-6 months in advance and the communication came from the top (the CEO)
 - ii) Set the date (July 4, 2005)
 - iii) NO Exceptions – even in cars or on the institution's property
 - iv) Strict enforcement: 1 warning and then you are fired
 - v) Free nicotine replacement
 - vi) Did not hire smokers – this is legal in 36 states.

vii) Error: Called the campaign “Smash the ash!” which provides the movement with a negative connotation. Should have been something like “Live beautifully!” Need to think in terms of how the smoker will feel.

d) Results

- i) Reduced heart coronary disease
- ii) Tobacco cessation decreased high blood pressure
- iii) Letters and emails were in favor 17:1.
- iv) 1,200 people signed up for smoking cessation and 50% succeeded.
- v) Smoking employees reduced from 15% to 11.4%.
- vi) Smoking applicants reduced from 15% to 2%.
- vii) There was no shortage of employees (this is a common assumption in the healthcare field)

e) Challenges: Visitors; Employees working 12-hour shifts

- 3) University of Cincinnati: Academic Health Center is tobacco-free
- 4) University of Toledo: Their medical school is smoke-free; regular campus beginning to consider pursuing the same
- 5) Case Western Reserve University: Effective Nov. 17, 2005: all walkways and grounds of the medical, dental and nursing schools – including the health sciences podium, the health sciences garage and other spaces – became entirely smoke-free
- 6) Hocking College: 2-year technical college; 100% tobacco free
- 7) Miami of Ohio: Institution implemented policy August 1st. Policy states:

In order to promote the health of our students, faculty, staff and visitors, all Miami University campuses are designated Smoke-Free Environments. Smoking is defined as the burning of tobacco or any other material in any type of smoking equipment, including, but not restricted to, cigarettes, cigars, or pipes.

Smoking is prohibited in all Miami University-owned facilities and on the grounds of any university-owned property. This includes all buildings owned or controlled by Miami University, shelters, indoor and outdoor athletic facilities, indoor and outdoor theatres, bridges, walkways, sidewalks, residence halls, parking lots and garages. Smoking is prohibited on sidewalks that adjoin University property. Smoking is also prohibited in any vehicle or equipment owned, leased or operated by Miami University.

Miami University actively promotes and provides smoking cessation assistance and nicotine replacement therapy to students, faculty, staff, as well as their benefit-eligible spouse/domestic partner. Many services are provided at no cost or a reduced cost. Interested employees should contact Employee Health and Well-Being at <http://www.admin.muohio.edu/phpapps/ehwb/website/>. Interested students should contact Student Health Services.

Exceptions

- **Personal Automobile.** Smoking is permitted in personal automobiles parked on University premises.
- **Hotel/Lodging.** The President is authorized to establish a designated smoking area in the exterior area surrounding any location that provides overnight guest

accommodations in a lodge or hotel fashion. This authorization includes the Marcum Conference Center, the Miami Inn, Climer Guest House, Simpson Shade Guest House, Patterson Place, and any other location housing overnight guests. The designated smoking area must be at least twenty-five (25) feet from any University building.

Violations

Faculty, staff, and students violating this policy are subject to University disciplinary action. Violators may also be subject to prosecution for violation of Ohio's Smoking Ban (Ohio Revised Code, Chapter 3794). Visitors who violate this policy may be denied access to Miami University campuses and may ultimately be subject to arrest for criminal trespass.

- a) Survey online: out of 6,157 responses, 52% favored an all smoking ban, while 62% favored it if it included support for smokers who were trying to quit
- 8) Ohio State University
 - a) A proposal on next steps – declaring the campus non-smoking with 5/6 designated smoking areas – was drafted but has not moved forward
 - b) Concerns: Appearance/maintenance of smoking areas, “ring of smoke” around campus concept enforcement, impact on employees/students
 - c) 2 years ago their Health Sciences went smoke free. There is angst from the areas adjacent to the Health Sciences property, as they are turning into the smoking grounds for its employees
 - d) Have more information from meeting in Oct. 2007
- 9) KSU: Just beginning to look at the issue
- 10) BGSU, CSU, OU, and YSU: Have not done anything formally related to the issue
- 11) Ozarks Technical Community College (Springfield, Missouri)
 - a) Did long-term rollout of smoke-free with 2-3 years of promotion
 - b) 2 long-term employees left the institution because of the policy
- 12) Indiana University has several campuses, several of which are smoke-free
- 13) University of Iowa is in process of declaring it will be smoke-free by 2010
- 14) A sub-committee member used to work at an institution with a smoke-free policy. He mentioned the following:
 - a) Employees who did not smoke made up the difference for the employees who smoked that decided to leave the institutions
 - b) A “smokers’ cult” sort of developed on campus
 - c) Challenges: Vendors did not always follow the rules; Managing smoking at public events

Actions by other organizations

- 1) N. Royalton bans smoking in parks
- 2) N. Royalton smoking ban affects city-owned property
- 3) Medical Mutual of Ohio: Smoke-free workplace policy was implemented as part of a larger wellness campaign and required a culture change and a lot of communication
 - a) How they did it

- i) Part of a larger wellness campaign and required a culture change and a lot of communication.
 - ii) Provided: On-site fitness centers, On-site health screenings, Healthy café and vending, on-site smoking cessation through EAP, Ohio quit line and patch provided for free
 - iii) People earned points for discounts on their medical premiums or toward gift cards
 - iv) Incorporated wellness and policy in new employee orientation, management training, provided intranet notices and reminders.
 - v) 1999: Let people smoke in designated areas
 - vi) 2005: Follow state law
 - vii) September 2006: not hiring smokers; require urinalysis. Have not lost any candidates yet. (healthcare costs are 21% more for smokers)
 - viii) Results:
 - (1) From 2003 to 2006 went from 18% to 11% tobacco use. Estimated that \$625/year is saved per employee that quits smoking
 - (2) Overall response has been positive
- b) Tips
- c) The fear of negative feedback is greater than the actual negative feedback received
 - d) Wellness was ranked 3rd of 21 topics highly rated by employees in the 2007 employee survey
 - e) Employers currently bear the burden of 80% or more the cost of healthcare!!!
 - f) Consider reactions of key sponsors/supports, etc. Listen to key stakeholders
 - g) Requires commitment and support from the top
 - h) Cons: can be considered a “slippery slope” – unfair violation of personal rights, what’s next?
 - i) Overall, most smokers want to quit
- 4) Weyco Inc. a health benefits administrator based in Michigan
- As stated by the Associated Press at MSNBC.msn.com, Weyco Inc. a health benefits administrator had put into affect a smoking ban that wouldn’t allow smokers to work for the company at all.
 - 4 employees, who were presumed to be smokers, were fired for not submitting to a smoke test
 - 1 employee quit work
 - 14 others quit smoking before the rule went into affect.
 - It began testing the spouses of its employees, too, levying an \$80-per-month surcharge on those who don’t test clean.
- 5) Kalamazoo Valley Community College in Michigan
- Kalamazoo Valley Community College in Michigan quit hiring smokers for full time positions at both of their Michigan campuses.

6) North Miami, Florida: Police Department

Workshops/Meetings

- 1) “Making Your Campus Tobacco-Free” Workshop, Springfield, MO, April 11, 2008
 - a) “X” number of feet away from the door rules don’t tend to be effective because people don’t follow them. Also have found that designated smoking areas aren’t much more effective. Larger institutions may be better served by gradually becoming smoke-free (do not make designated smoking areas permanent structures).
 - b) There is a difference between smoke-free and-tobacco free
 - c) Think outside the box and take enforcement out of the issue. Seek compliance not enforcement.

- d) There are several different approaches one could take: we are helping you with your health, cleanliness - cuts cost on campus clean-up, child labor – how cigarettes are made, requested copy of a DVD on this issue
- 2) Tobacco Policy Wellness Council
- a) Provided a written summary of the sub-committee's research and action to date