



**University Senate  
TRANSMITTAL FORM**

<b>Senate Document #:</b>	12-13-07
<b>Title:</b>	Implementation of the Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions
<b>Presenter:</b>	Marcy Marinelli, Chair, Campus Affairs Committee
<b>Date of SEC Review:</b>	February 1, 2013
<b>Date of Senate Review:</b>	February 14, 2013
<b>Voting (highlight one):</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or</li> <li>2. In a single vote</li> <li>3. To endorse entire report</li> </ol>
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	In June 2012, the Board of Regents (BOR) instituted a policy requiring smoke-free environments at each institution throughout the University System of Maryland (USM). Each institution must implement this policy prior to June 30, 2013. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) with reviewing the USM policy on smoking and making recommendations on a related campus policy and an implementation process for the University of Maryland.
<b>Relevant Policy # &amp; URL:</b>	USM Policy VI-8.10 "Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions." <a href="http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/vi810.html">http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/vi810.html</a>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>The CAC recommends that the attached policy entitled, "VI – 8.10 (A) Policy on Smoking at University of Maryland" be adopted as official University of Maryland policy and be added to the Consolidated USM and UMD Policies and Procedures Manual.</p> <p>In addition, the CAC presents thirteen recommendations on the implementation of the policy for Senate consideration. These recommendations are organized under the following categories: Communication; Policy Management, Assessment, and Evaluation; Enforcement; Prevention, Education, and Treatment; and Reporting Responsibilities.</p>

<p><b>Committee Work:</b></p>	<p>The CAC began reviewing the charge and the USM policy at its meeting on September 6, 2012. The committee devoted six meetings to consideration of the charge.</p> <p>In order to organize its research and discussion over the course of the semester, the CAC formed a number of subgroups focused on different aspects of the policy and its implementation. The subgroups were charged with studying peer institutions, creating and disseminating a survey, researching prevention, education, and treatment resources on campus, exploring models of enforcement at institutions with smoke-free policies, considering the management, assessment, and evaluation of the policy, and considering communications strategies related to the new smoke-free policy. These subgroups performed research and made recommendations to the full committee.</p> <p>Over the course of its work, the CAC reached out to various units and groups on campus to better understand how the new policy would affect the community and its operations. The CAC spoke with representatives from the University Health Center, Resident Life, Residential Facilities, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, University Human Resources, and the Office of Legal Affairs, and also asked for feedback from the Senate Staff Affairs Committee.</p> <p>After much review and discussion, the Campus Affairs Committee voted to approve the recommendations and send them forward for consideration at its meetings on December 13, 2012 and January 24, 2013.</p>
<p><b>Alternatives:</b></p>	<p>The Senate could reject the proposed policy and the recommendations for implementing a policy tailored to the University of Maryland campus. The USM policy would remain as the official policy for the campus.</p>
<p><b>Risks:</b></p>	<p>There are no associated risks.</p>
<p><b>Financial Implications:</b></p>	<p>Financial resources may be needed to carry out some of the recommendations for implementation, particularly those affecting the University Health Center and its services.</p>
<p><b>Further Approvals Required:</b></p>	<p>Senate approval, Presidential approval.</p>

# **Senate Campus Affairs Committee**

## **Senate Document # 12-13-07**

### **Implementation of the Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions**

**January 2013**

#### **BACKGROUND**

In June 2012, the Board of Regents (BOR) of the University System of Maryland (USM) instituted a policy that requires smoke-free environments at each institution throughout the system (Appendix 4). Each institution is required to implement this policy prior to June 30, 2013. The University of Maryland (UM) Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) with reviewing the USM policy on smoking and making recommendations on a related campus policy and an implementation process for UM (Appendix 5).

#### **CURRENT PRACTICE**

The University Senate has previously considered whether to ban smoking on campus, and has received a number of proposals related to smoking policies over the past few years. In 2009-2010, the CAC was charged with reviewing a proposal to ban smoking from campus and chose not to recommend the adoption of a smoke-free campus policy. The CAC did, however, make administrative recommendations regarding the existing smoking policies on campus. In response, the Division of Administration and Finance (then known as the Division of Administrative Affairs) proposed that the campus smoking policy be amended to adjust the distance from buildings in which smoking is allowed. The CAC reviewed the proposal and recommended its adoption, which was subsequently approved by the Senate and the President in September 2011.

The recently approved USM policy on smoking (Appendix 4) prohibits smoking on all institution grounds and property. As a USM policy, this new initiative takes precedence over the current UM campus policy. However, the new policy allows each campus the latitude to establish limited designated areas in which smoking would be allowed at its discretion.

#### **COMMITTEE WORK**

Over the course of five months during the 2012-2013 academic year, the CAC considered its charge regarding the implementation of the policy banning smoking at UM. Throughout its review, the CAC discussed the complexity of implementing a campus-wide ban. The CAC recognizes that smoking is not illegal, and the committee is sensitive to the fact that smoking is an addiction that is difficult to quit. It is also cognizant of the campus climate and the message that the University wants to send about being smoke-free.

From September 2012 to January 2013, the CAC focused on consideration of the smoking policy and its implementation. At its initial meeting, the CAC developed a plan and timeline for studying the issue.

In order to organize its research and discussion over the course of the semester, the CAC formed a number of subgroups focused on different aspects of the policy and its implementation. These subgroups performed research and made recommendations to the full committee.

The Peer Institutions Subgroup was charged with researching policies and practices related to smoking at peer institutions. This group reviewed the experiences of Towson University, Montgomery College, University of Missouri, Ball State, University of North Carolina, Oregon State University, and University of Michigan in their implementation of a smoke-free campus. The CAC discussed experiences at other universities, which sent conflicting messages when they included designated areas for smoking in their smoke-free policy. For example, the University of Michigan designed a policy with designated areas that included smoking pavilions, and specifically changed its policy after its implementation to remove the designated areas on campus, because it felt the existence of smoking pavilions weakened the smoking policy and made it less effective.

The Survey Subgroup was charged with creating a survey to measure campus-wide awareness of the USM policy and attitudes towards a smoke-free campus policy. A survey was created by the subgroup, with the committee's advice, and was sent to a random sample of faculty, staff, and students. The survey was also advertised on the Senate website, Facebook, and Twitter, and promoted at the Great American Smoke-Out event hosted by the University Health Center (UHC).

The smoking ban survey received over 2,900 responses (Appendix 3). Significant findings from the survey include the following:

- Only a small percentage (21.76%) of respondents were familiar with the USM policy;
- More than half (58.09%) of the respondents were in favor of banning smoking on campus;
- 58% of respondents would approve of having designated smoking areas;
- Respondents do not feel comfortable asking others to stop smoking – only 35.28% would feel comfortable doing so; and
- 21.48% of the respondents indicated that they were smokers. Of those who smoke, only 7.74% would be encouraged to quit because of the ban, and only 3.63% indicated they would take advantage of smoking cessation services on campus.

The Prevention, Education, and Treatment Subgroup was charged with researching smoking cessation resources available on campus through the UHC. It reported that services are provided free of cost by the UHC to students, faculty, and staff, and include smoking cessation counseling, nicotine patches, acupuncture, and the other services. These services are provided primarily in English, as well as in Spanish to some extent. The subgroup reported a concern that the UHC may have to impose a fee for these services if the smoking ban results in a great number of campus members seeking services. It noted that additional financial support for the UHC for increased staffing may be needed to continue to provide these services.

An Enforcement Subgroup focused on enforcement of the policy and explored models at peer institutions, while considering what scenarios may be appropriate for use at UM. It reported on the policies at University of Michigan, Frostburg State University, and Towson University, and found differing levels of enforcement at each institution, ranging from emphasis on a climate of respect and wellness to more severe enforcement methods involving fines and infractions as part of the staff performance, review, and development (PRD) process. The CAC discussed UM's campus climate and agreed that a policy focused on respect and wellness, rather than punitive actions, would be a better fit. The CAC agreed that communication, education, social norming, and a strong focus on the health benefits of a smoke-free environment would be better suited to the University than strict enforcement methods. The CAC also agreed that efforts to change the campus culture may prove more effective in aiding enforcement of the policy than punitive measures, and discussed ways to utilize the influence and passion of student groups to affect such change.

The Enforcement Subgroup also led a lengthy discussion on designated smoking areas. It presented the challenges of enforcing the smoking ban on UM's large, non-contiguous campus. It also noted that it would be difficult to prohibit activity on UM property that is legal on the property surrounding campus. The CAC discussed whether designated areas would weaken the policy and noted that the USM policy intentionally provides the option of designated areas.

The Policy Management, Assessment, and Evaluation Subgroup was charged with reviewing the exact specifications of the BOR policy and reporting on what a campus policy might entail. This subgroup presented its finding that it would be difficult to enforce designated smoking areas, and advocated that the committee recommend following the BOR's intent to create a smoke-free campus. It cited the University of Michigan's experience, where smoking pavilions were initially created in designated areas and then eliminated. Michigan's continued requests for additional pavilions eventually made them realize the smoke-free policy seemed to be moving in the opposite direction of its original intent. The subgroup recognized the difficulties in changing the culture on campus, and recommended that the first year of implementation should focus on education and communication tailored to each campus constituency to explain that UM is now a smoke-free campus.

The CAC discussed communications strategies at length and noted how important communication will be to implementation of the policy. Committee members agreed that communications should have a supportive and positive tone, and that they should be put in the context of a "smoke-free environment," while being sensitive to the challenges that smokers will face. The CAC discussed a phased-in communications campaign to start immediately, which would focus on awareness of the new policy and campus resources, involvement of the campus community, and implementation of the policy. A marketing campaign, similar to the "Nothing is Slower than a Sick Turtle" or the sustainability awareness campaigns, was discussed.

In the course of its work, the CAC reached out to various units and groups on campus to better understand how the new policy would affect the community and its operations. The committee spoke with representatives from the University Health Center, Resident Life, Residential Facilities, and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, to make them aware of the smoking ban and learn how this might affect their operations. The CAC met with representatives of University Human Resources (UHR) on their perspective on the new USM policy. UHR had concerns about how it might affect faculty and staff differently, in terms of enforcement and possible disciplinary action. For instance, staff members have limited breaks in their schedule, and requiring them to leave campus to smoke may place more of a burden on staff than on faculty or students who smoke.

The CAC also reviewed feedback that it received from the Senate Staff Affairs Committee about the smoking ban and its potential impact on staff members. The Staff Affairs Committee noted that there has been little communication about the impending smoking ban, and committee members felt that more should be done to inform the campus community of the upcoming changes. Members of the committee also agreed with the idea of a progressive system of implementation that focuses on communication and education first.

In addition, the CAC consulted with the Office of Legal Affairs on the text of a draft policy on smoking at UM (Appendix 2).

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

At its meetings on December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012 and January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the Campus Affairs Committee voted in favor of recommendations on the implementation of the smoke-free campus policy.

The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the attached policy (Appendix 2) entitled “VI – 8.10 (A) Policy on Smoking at University of Maryland” be adopted as official University of Maryland policy and be added to the Consolidated USM and UMD Policies and Procedures Manual. In addition, the CAC presents the following recommendations on the implementation of the policy for Senate consideration.

### ***Communication***

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance and University Relations lead the development and dissemination of an appropriate communication and signage strategy for the campus, beginning with awareness communication to start immediately. A smoke-free campus identity campaign should be promulgated throughout campus, and adequate and appropriate signage should be located at all entrances to campus, as well as at major public thoroughfares and spaces, and in campus buildings.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the smoke-free policy be continually communicated to the University community in a simple, positive, and respectful manner throughout each phase of implementation.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the smoke-free policy be adequately communicated to external constituents, including but not limited to, applicants for admission and employment, contractors, visitors to campus, and vendors.

### ***Policy Specifications, Management, and Evaluation***

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that all University of Maryland property be smoke-free. Any limited and specific designated areas in which smoking may be permitted would be subject to the designation of the President.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the new smoking policy be administered by the Division of Administration and Finance, with appropriate involvement of relevant groups on campus, including University Relations, the University Health Center, the Division of Student Affairs and other appropriate units as designated by the President. The committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance have responsibility to oversee implementation and manage enforcement of the policy, and recommends that it involve faculty, staff, and students in its processes when appropriate.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance develop a centralized reporting mechanism for concerns regarding the policy from the campus community.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the University conduct periodic evaluations of effectiveness of the policy during the first five years of its implementation. The data collected could include measurements of the utilization of health and educational services, and annual surveys of random faculty, staff, and students, among other sources.

### ***Enforcement***

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that enforcement and administration of the smoking policy focus on respect and wellness as opposed to discipline and punitive measures by utilizing a progressive enforcement program whereupon we seek voluntary compliance before any strict sanctions. Such a program should focus on warnings and persuasion first; referrals to resources

second; and punitive measures as a last resort in situations of blatant or repeated violation of the policy. The committee recommends that any punitive enforcement be delayed during the initial year of the policy to allow the University to first focus on communication and preparation.

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance (or other appropriate units as designated by the President) work with University Human Resources and the University Health Center to develop resources for faculty, staff, and students that empower them to assist in achieving campus compliance with the smoke-free policy through peer interaction.

### ***Prevention, Education, and Treatment***

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the University Health Center continue to be designated as a centralized resource for information regarding both on-campus and off-campus smoking cessation resources and peer education programs for faculty, staff, and students.
- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that prevention, education, and treatment strategies be equally geared towards all constituencies and that steps be taken to ensure that faculty, staff, and students all have access to the services provided. One way to accomplish this goal would be to effectively promote services to faculty, staff, and students through concerted communication efforts.
- Campus Affairs Committee recommends that sufficient resources be allocated to the University Health Center to support smoking cessation efforts for faculty, staff, and students, and that the current smoking cessation services offered by the University Health Center be expanded, where appropriate.

### ***Reporting Responsibilities***

- The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance (and other appropriate units as designated by the President) provide status reports to the University Senate on the progress and outcomes of implementation as well as on campus compliance with the policy each year for the first five years of the smoking policy.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Suggestions for Implementation

Appendix 2 – Proposed Policy on Smoking at University Of Maryland (VI – 8.10(A))

Appendix 3 – Campus Affairs Committee Smoking Ban Survey – Abbreviated Results

Appendix 4 – University System of Maryland (USM) Policy VI – 8.10 Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions

Appendix 5 – Senate Executive Committee Charge on Implementation of the Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

The Campus Affairs Committee discussed implementation scenarios and options in depth from September 2012 through January 2013. As a result, the CAC would like to share suggestions for how implementation could proceed, while ultimately encouraging the administration to conduct its implementation efforts however it feels appropriate outside of the recommendations the CAC has previously presented.

### ***Communication***

The CAC stresses that communication should be the first priority of implementation of the smoking policy, and it should begin immediately. The CAC has found that most faculty, staff, and students are not familiar with the policy and do not know that the University will be smoke-free by June 30, 2013. There is a great deal of confusion over whether it will in fact be implemented. Understanding this reality, the CAC developed its recommendations regarding communication with the consensus that these are the most critical for implementation of the policy.

In its committee work, the CAC discussed many options for implementation of its communication recommendations. The committee discussed breaking communications strategies into phases, to appropriately focus efforts at specific points before and during implementation. It suggests focusing first on awareness and education about the policy, next on engaging the campus community in discussions about the policy, and then focusing on the actual details of the policy and its implementation.

Immediate communication efforts could start small and grow as appropriate.

- The CAC found the countdown ticker on the UHR webpage, and suggests incorporating a similar effort into other critical websites, such as the UM homepage.
- Websites and promotional materials that reach external constituents, such as applicants for admission and employment and visitors to campus, could incorporate notices about the smoke-free policy.
- Email messages or other communications from the University administration may raise the profile of the policy and greatly assist in spreading awareness across campus.
- Also, common venues that communicate campus news to faculty, staff, and students – such as *Between the Columns*, *Faculty Voice*, and *The Diamondback*, -- could be utilized as well.
- Physical signage campaigns take a great deal of time, so the CAC suggests that other strategies be utilized for quicker dissemination of information while physical signage is created. The committee suggests maximizing use of social media messaging, FYI advertisements, email messages, website announcements, and other digital methods as appropriate.

In discussing the content of communications, the CAC stresses a focus on positive language and the phrase “smoke-free environment” can be more effective than messages that single out those who smoke or focus on negative language, such as “smoking strictly prohibited.” Using such language is also one way of shaping the context for the policy and building a campus identity that could lead to a genuine acceptance of the policy. As an example of a simple, positive, and respectful messaging campaign, the CAC discussed the “Nothing Slower Than a Sick Turtle” flu prevention campaign and suggests development of a similar messaging tool that can be placed on windows, doors, or elsewhere throughout campus to serve as a positive daily reminder of the smoke-free policy.

### ***Policy Specifications, Management, and Evaluation***



The CAC believes that the leadership of the Division of Administration and Finance (DAF) in administering the policy will help provide centralization for the efforts associated with the smoking policy and significantly impact its success. The committee feels that many of the critical aspects of the policy will involve different departments in DAF – from UHR to Facilities Management to Finance and Community Engagement – and that it warrants the oversight of the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF).

However, the CAC would not suggest that the DAF work alone in its efforts and offers the following suggestions for implementation process:

- The CAC suggests that the DAF work closely with other groups across campus as necessary to implement and enforce the policy.
  - Other universities have found it helpful to form smoke-free environment implementation committees or work groups with all of the relevant departments represented. Such a committee could be useful in:
    - Carrying out implementation details,
    - Tracking the progress of implementation across campus, and
    - Making decisions as new developments unfold.
- The DAF should engage with faculty, staff, and students whenever possible as it makes decisions about implementation and policy assessment. The DAF could:
  - Conduct surveys where the campus or specific constituencies are asked to rate their preferences on different implementation options;
  - Invite representatives of different constituencies to meetings; or
  - Hold specific meetings or open forums with each constituency.

The CAC stresses the importance of continual evaluation of the smoking policy. By evaluating the effectiveness of the policy on an annual basis, the University will have an opportunity to identify pieces that are not working and adjust its procedures over time. The CAC suggests that evaluations:

- Examine the violations of the policy, including violations resulting in “formal” action (such as referral to smoking cessation resources or further measures) and the trend of violations over the years;
- Attempt to illustrate the extent to which smoking remains a problem on campus over time; and
- Seek to determine whether the campus culture is changing to incorporate a smoke-free identity.

### ***Enforcement***

The CAC stresses a policy based on respect and wellness, and feels that, consistent with policies at other campuses, such a policy will be more likely to be respected. However, the committee also understands that further enforcement options should be available for more serious violations of the policy. It recommends a progressive enforcement system, and presents the following suggestions for such a program.

The CAC found that in most peer institutions, implementation of a smoke-free policy is a multi-year process, and the CAC is concerned about the level of understanding of and preparation for the new policy in the UM community. The CAC suggests that any aspects of implementation that involve punitive enforcement measures be delayed initially, and that the University place emphasis on awareness and preparation within the first year of the policy.

The CAC feels that persuasion and peer interaction should be the basis of the first level of enforcement. Peer interaction is a powerful tool, and the CAC regards it as an important enforcement mechanism. While CAC’s survey results show that most people would not feel comfortable addressing smokers, the

committee believes that if individuals are given appropriate tools, they will be more likely to address situations they see arising across campus. The CAC suggests that tools and language specifically geared towards faculty, staff, and students be developed to give the campus community constructive ways to address smoking and smokers on campus with the goal of encouraging compliance with the policy.

The CAC also suggests developing a friendly reminder system that can be used by all campus members to encourage adherence to the smoking policy. Similar to the previously discussed communications strategies, the CAC suggests creating a simple, positive tool that each person can use to encourage others to adhere to the policy. The CAC discussed the friendly warning tickets used for first-time parking violations as a guide.

The tools developed should be widely shared and the community should be encouraged to use them appropriately. While the CAC is hesitant to suggest involving campus police too heavily in enforcement, the committee considered that the Police Auxiliary might be involved in dissemination of communications and friendly reminders about the policy. Likewise, student groups could be called upon to assist in spreading information about the policy in particular areas where smoking has been reported as a problem. These could be either existing groups that focus on smoking cessation or related activities that wish to be involved, or new groups created specifically for this purpose.

The second and third levels of enforcement would be reserved for repeat instances of violation of the policy. The CAC feels that referring individuals to the resources available to them is a critical step in enforcement of the policy. Referring individuals to the UHC or other resources on campus for smoking cessation, stress relief, or other assistance should be prioritized. In situations of blatant or repeated violations of the policy, additional intervention may be necessary and disciplinary measures can be considered. However, the CAC strongly rejects the idea that smoking should enter into any PRD discussions for faculty or staff.

### ***Prevention, Education, and Treatment***

During its review of the smoking policy, the CAC found that the UHC already has programs in place to provide resources and information about smoking cessation opportunities, and the CAC recommends that it continue to do so. The CAC was very pleased to hear that their services are open to all campus constituencies, and was also pleased to learn that some of the services are currently provided with Spanish translations. The CAC offers the following suggestions for enhancing the services already offered in the wake of the new smoking policy.

- The committee recommends that the UHC be given the resources it needs to appropriately fulfill their responsibilities under this new policy.
- The CAC feels that an expansion of UHC services may be warranted
  - In its review, the CAC found that some smoking cessation services are not provided due to cost considerations. The CAC suggests considering whether these services would be possible with appropriate additional funding.
  - The committee's survey results included many comments that asked for more options for smoking cessation services. Specifically,
    - Additional smoking cessation workshops and seminars,
    - Campus support groups,
    - Resources on how to adapt smoking habits around new schedules,
    - Extra stress management and reduction services as a component of smoking cessation
  - The committee also received many concerns that staff members feel that they are unable to take advantage of the services available to them. The UHC could consider:

- Providing more Spanish-language services and assessing whether additional languages would be appropriate,
    - Tailoring some services more effectively to staff members,
    - Offering certain events or resources at different hours to reach those with different schedules,
    - Offering more services and resources online, and
    - Communicating with supervisors about encouraging staff and faculty who choose to take advantage of these services.
  - The CAC suggests that peer education on smoking cessation be added to existing Peer Education programs.
- The CAC suggests that UHC evaluate the marketing of its smoking cessation programs and consider how to use the new policy to enhance awareness of its services.
  - The committee's survey showed that only 49.39% of those who reported that they smoked were familiar with the smoking cessation services offered by the UHC.
  - The CAC suggests that UHC work with the DAF to combine communication efforts where possible.

### ***Reporting Responsibilities***

Due to a short time-frame for implementation, it is unrealistic to expect full implementation and campus acceptance immediately. The CAC anticipates this reality, and will remain interested in the implementation and success of the policy as it progresses. To encourage communication between the representatives for the University's diverse constituencies and the administrators of this policy, the CAC recommends that the DAF report to the SEC once every year for the first five years of implementation of the smoking policy. The committee suggests that these reports contain a brief status update on how the implementation is progressing, what the DAF's internal evaluations of the policy find on its acceptance across campus, and what future steps need to be taken to successfully implement the policy. These updates can also serve as an opportunity for the DAF to ask the Senate for further review of any aspect of the smoking policy if such reviews become necessary.

**APPENDIX 2 - PROPOSED POLICY ON SMOKING AT UNIVERSITY  
OF MARYLAND (VI - 8.10 (A))**

VI – 8.10(A) POLICY ON SMOKING AT UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND  
(Proposed Policy)

- I. Purpose and Scope
  - a. Purpose. This policy establishes standards and requirements to provide a smoke-free environment for all UMD faculty, staff, students, and visitors, in compliance with the Board of Regents Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions (VI – 8.10).
  - b. Scope. This policy applies to all UMD students, faculty, staff, contractors and employees of contractors providing services at UMD, agents, guests, and visitors.
  - c. The following policy, VI-8.10(A) Policy on Smoking at University of Maryland, replaces any policies or procedures previously established at the University of Maryland that are in conflict with the purpose, applicability, or intent herein.
- II. Definitions
  - a. “Institutional Property” means any property owned, leased, or otherwise controlled or operated by UMD, including buildings, other structures and grounds, and vehicles owned or leased by the institution.
  - b. “Smoking” means carrying or smoking a lighted tobacco product or the burning of any material to be inhaled including, but not limited to, cigarettes, cigars, hookahs, and pipes.
- III. Prohibitions on Institution Property
  - a. Prohibitions against Smoking
    - i. Consistent with Maryland law, smoking is not permitted in any institution building, including academic buildings, residence halls, administrative buildings, other enclosed facilities, or vehicles, except as provided in Section III(a)iii, below.
    - ii. Smoking is prohibited on all institution grounds and property, including walkways, parking lots, and recreational and athletic areas, except as provided in Section III(a)iii, below.
    - iii. Smoking in and on institution property will be permitted only as follows:
      1. For controlled research, and educational, theatrical, or religious ceremonial purposes, with prior approval of the President or the President’s designee;
      2. In limited and specifically designated areas on University property and areas leased to third parties as may from time-to-time be approved by the President; or
      3. Subject to any other exception to this policy recommended by the President and approved by the Chancellor.
  - b. Prohibitions against Sale. The sale of tobacco and smoking-related products is prohibited on institution property.
- IV. Smoking Cessation Assistance
  - a. Assistance Programs. The University Health Center shall make available smoking cessation assistance to students, faculty and staff, which may include opportunities to participate in smoking cessation seminars, classes, and counseling and the availability of smoking cessation products and materials.
  - b. Smoking Cessation Information. The University Health Center shall be designated to answer questions, refer students and employees to on-campus and outside resources, and otherwise provide information about smoking cessation assistance options and opportunities.
- V. Implementation Process
  - a. This policy shall be administered by the Division of Administration and Finance.

- b. **Communication.** The University shall provide initial and ongoing information to communicate the requirements of this policy, including:
  - i. Dissemination of the key elements of the policy to faculty, staff, students, and others on websites and in appropriate written materials; and
  - ii. The placement of exterior and interior notices and signs announcing that smoking is prohibited.
- c. **Community Outreach.** The University will engage in outreach to the community, as appropriate, to facilitate coordination with local government authorities and to assist residents and businesses near the institution in preventing trespass and littering that may result if members of the campus community seek to smoke in nearby off-campus areas.
- d. **Consequences.** The University may establish appropriate procedures and consequences, which may include fines or disciplinary measures, for violations of this policy.
- e. **Implementation.** The provisions of this policy shall be implemented at the University of Maryland no later than June 30, 2013.

**APPENDIX 3 - CAMPUS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE SMOKING SURVEY - ABBREVIATED RESULTS****NOTE: A complete record of survey comments is on file in the Senate Office.****Q1. How familiar are you with the University System of Maryland's new policy banning smoking on all campuses?**

Count	Percent	
209	7.12%	Extremely familiar
430	14.64%	Very familiar
893	30.41%	Moderately familiar
704	23.97%	Slightly familiar
701	23.87%	Not at all familiar
2937		Respondents

**Q2. Are you in favor of banning all smoking on campus?**

Count	Percent	
1301	44.30%	A great deal
405	13.79%	Considerably
226	7.69%	Moderately
146	4.97%	Slightly
859	29.25%	Not at all
2937		Respondents

**Q3. How will the campus-wide smoking ban make you feel about our campus community?**

Count	Percent	
206	7.01%	1 - Doesn't care about my health
177	6.03%	2
633	21.55%	3
620	21.11%	4
1301	44.30%	5 - Cares a lot about my health
2937		Respondents

**Q4. Do you favor asking people to leave campus entirely in order to smoke?**

Count	Percent	
636	21.65%	Strongly favor
574	19.54%	Favor
422	14.37%	Neither opposed or in favor
436	14.85%	Opposed
845	28.77%	Strongly opposed
24	0.82%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q5. Are you in favor of having designated areas on campus for smoking?**

Count	Percent	
1713	58.32%	Yes (where would you want these areas to be?)
979	33.33%	No
245	8.34%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q6. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Breathing smoke-free air in my daily environment is important to me**

Count	Percent	
1734	59.04%	Strongly agree
568	19.34%	Agree
282	9.60%	Neither agree nor disagree

**Q6. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Breathing smoke-free air in my daily environment is important to me**

Count	Percent	
130	4.43%	Disagree
194	6.61%	Strongly disagree
29	0.99%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q7. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Having smokers leave campus to smoke will lead to lost productivity**

Count	Percent	
815	27.75%	Strongly agree
796	27.10%	Agree
603	20.53%	Neither agree nor disagree
370	12.60%	Disagree
306	10.42%	Strongly disagree
47	1.60%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Having smokers who live on campus leave their residence hall at night to smoke is a safety concern**

Count	Percent	
858	29.21%	Strongly agree
914	31.12%	Agree
467	15.90%	Neither agree nor disagree
410	13.96%	Disagree
248	8.44%	Strongly disagree
40	1.36%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q9. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - I would feel comfortable telling a smoker that this is a non-smoking campus.**

Count	Percent	
498	16.96%	Strongly agree
538	18.32%	Agree
441	15.02%	Neither agree nor disagree
652	22.20%	Disagree
745	25.37%	Strongly disagree
63	2.15%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q10. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - No Smoking signs are effective at deterring smoking**

Count	Percent	
248	8.44%	Strongly agree
685	23.32%	Agree
621	21.14%	Neither agree nor disagree
714	24.31%	Disagree
629	21.42%	Strongly disagree
40	1.36%	Prefer not to respond
2937		Respondents

**Q11. Do you smoke (cigarettes, cigars, pipe, hookah, marijuana)?**

Count	Percent	
620	21.48%	Yes
2267	78.52%	No
2887		Respondents

**Q12. How often during the last 30 days have you smoked?**

Count	Percent	
181	6.27%	1 - 2 days
81	2.81%	3 - 5 days
50	1.73%	6 - 9 days
73	2.53%	10 - 19 days
77	2.67%	20 - 29 days
181	6.27%	All 30 days
2244	77.73%	I have not smoked in the last 30 days.
2887		Respondents

**Q13. Do you smoke on campus?**

Count	Percent	
427	14.79%	Yes
2460	85.21%	No
2887		Respondents

**Q14. Where on campus do you smoke? (Check all that apply)**

Count	Respondent %	Response %	
146	35.35%	15.45%	Outside my residence hall
161	38.98%	17.04%	Outside my office building
133	32.20%	14.07%	Outside the Stamp Student Union
189	45.76%	20.00%	Outside McKeldin and Hornbake Libraries
201	48.67%	21.27%	In the parking lots
115	27.85%	12.17%	Other (please specify)
413			Respondents
945			Responses

**Q15. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - When more restrictive smoking regulations are implemented at UMCP I would transfer to another college or seek employment elsewhere.**

Count	Percent	
46	11.14%	Strongly agree
41	9.93%	Agree
90	21.79%	Neither agree nor disagree
92	22.28%	Disagree
107	25.91%	Strongly disagree
37	8.96%	Prefer not to respond
413		Respondents

**Q16. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Having a no smoking policy on campus would encourage me to quit smoking.**

Count	Percent	
16	3.87%	Strongly agree



**Q16. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - Having a no smoking policy on campus would encourage me to quit smoking.**

Count	Percent	
16	3.87%	Agree
52	12.59%	Neither agree nor disagree
82	19.85%	Disagree
239	57.87%	Strongly disagree
8	1.94%	Prefer not to respond
413		Respondents

**Q17. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - I am familiar with the campus smoking cessation services.**

Count	Percent	
67	16.22%	Strongly agree
137	33.17%	Agree
63	15.25%	Neither agree nor disagree
58	14.04%	Disagree
72	17.43%	Strongly disagree
16	3.87%	Prefer not to respond
413		Respondents

**Q18. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: - After the smoking ban is implemented, I will take advantage of the campus smoking cessation services.**

Count	Percent	
4	0.97%	Strongly agree
11	2.66%	Agree
102	24.70%	Neither agree nor disagree
77	18.64%	Disagree
195	47.22%	Strongly disagree
24	5.81%	Prefer not to respond
413		Respondents

**Q19. What is your age?**

Count	Percent	
21	0.74%	17 years old or younger
1128	39.58%	18 - 21 years old
560	19.65%	22 - 26 years old
284	9.96%	27 - 30 years old
246	8.63%	31 - 39 years old
218	7.65%	40 - 49 years old
226	7.93%	50 - 59 years old
128	4.49%	60 - 69 years old
19	0.67%	Over 70 years old
20	0.70%	Prefer not to respond
2850		Respondents

**Q20. What is your classification?**

Count	Percent	
1398	49.05%	Undergraduate student
642	22.53%	Graduate student
281	9.86%	Faculty
336	11.79%	Exempt staff

**Q20. What is your classification?**

Count	Percent	
137	4.81%	Non-exempt staff
32	1.12%	Contingent staff (I or II)
24	0.84%	Other (please specify)
2850		Respondents

**Q21. Are you an international student?**

Count	Percent	
145	5.09%	Yes
2705	94.91%	No
2850		Respondents

**Q22. Where do you live?**

Count	Percent	
108	3.79%	On campus - North Campus
91	3.19%	On campus - Denton
68	2.39%	On campus - Ellicott
67	2.35%	On campus - Cambridge
170	5.96%	On campus - Commons
145	5.09%	On campus - South Hill
33	1.16%	On campus - Leonardtown
2168	76.07%	Off campus (please specify)
2850		Respondents

## APPENDIX 4 - UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND POLICY VI- 8.10 POLICY ON SMOKING AT USM INSTITUTIONS

### VI – 8.10 POLICY ON SMOKING AT USM INSTITUTIONS

(Approved by the Board of Regents, June 22, 2012)

#### I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

- A. Purpose. The University System of Maryland (USM) seeks to promote a healthy, smoke-free environment for students and employees. In recognition of the health risks of tobacco smoke, this policy establishes standards and requirements to provide a smoke-free environment for all USM faculty, staff, students, and visitors.
- B. Scope. This policy applies to all USM students, faculty, staff, contractors and employees of contractors providing services on USM campuses, agents, guests, and visitors.

#### II. DEFINITIONS

- A. “Institution Property” means any property owned, leased, or otherwise controlled or operated by an institution, including buildings, other structures and grounds, and vehicles owned or leased by the institution.
- B. “Smoking” means carrying or smoking a lighted tobacco product or the burning of any material to be inhaled including, but not limited to, cigarettes, cigars, hookahs, and pipes.

#### III. PROHIBITIONS ON INSTITUTION PROPERTY

- A. Prohibitions against Smoking
  - 1. Consistent with Maryland law, smoking is not permitted in any institution building, including academic buildings, residence halls, administrative buildings, other enclosed facilities, or vehicles, except as provided in Section III(A)3, below.
  - 2. Smoking is prohibited on all institution grounds and property, including walkways, parking lots, and recreational and athletic areas, except as provided in Section III(A)3, below.
  - 3. Smoking in and on institution property will be permitted only as follows:
    - a. For controlled research, and educational, theatrical, or religious ceremonial purposes, with prior approval of the President or the President’s designee;
    - b. In limited and specific designated areas on institution grounds, as approved by the President; or
    - c. Subject to any other exception to this policy recommended by the President and approved by the Chancellor.

- B. Prohibitions against Sale. The sale of tobacco and smoking-related products is prohibited on institution property.

#### IV. SMOKING CESSATION ASSISTANCE

- A. Assistance Programs. Each institution may make available smoking cessation assistance to students, faculty and staff, which may include opportunities to participate in smoking cessation seminars, classes, and counseling and the availability of smoking cessation products and materials.
- B. Smoking Cessation Information. The President of each institution shall designate an individual or individuals to answer questions, refer students and employees to on-campus and outside resources, and otherwise provide information about smoking cessation assistance options and opportunities.

#### V. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

- A. Communication. Each institution shall provide initial and ongoing information to communicate the requirements of this policy, including:
  - 1. Dissemination of the key elements of the policy to faculty, staff, students, and others on websites and in appropriate written materials; and
  - 2. The placement of exterior and interior notices and signs announcing that smoking is prohibited.
- B. Community Outreach. Each institution will engage in outreach to the community, as appropriate, to facilitate coordination with local government authorities and to assist residents and businesses near the institution in preventing trespass and littering that may result if members of the campus community seek to smoke in nearby off-campus areas.
- C. Consequences. Each institution may establish appropriate consequences, which may include fines or disciplinary measures, for violations of this policy.
- D. Implementation. The provisions of this policy shall be implemented at each institution no later than June 30, 2013.

**APPENDIX 5 - SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE ON  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY ON SMOKING AT USM INSTITUTIONS**



**University Senate  
CHARGE**

<b>Date:</b>	September 5, 2012
<b>To:</b>	Marcia Marinelli Chair, Campus Affairs Committee
<b>From:</b>	Martha Nell Smith  Chair, University Senate
<b>Subject:</b>	Implementation of the Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions
<b>Senate Document #:</b>	12-13-07
<b>Deadline:</b>	January 11, 2013

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Campus Affairs Committee review the recently approved University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions (VI-8.10) and make recommendations on a related policy and implementation process for our campus.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the report of the 2010-2011 Campus Affairs Committee regarding the Proposal for a Tobacco-Free Campus (Senate Doc. No. 08-09-15).
2. Review similar policies and implementation strategies at other USM and peer institutions.
3. Consult with representatives from University Human Resources regarding the impact of such a policy on the University's employees,
4. Consult with a representative from the Office of Staff Relations.
5. Consult with a representative of the University Health Center regarding smoking cessation programs, including who will be designated to answer questions, refer students and employees to on-campus and outside resources, and otherwise provide information about smoking cessation assistance options and opportunities.
6. Consult with representatives from the Division of Administrative Affairs regarding potential implementation and enforcement procedures, and effective communication about campus policy.

7. Gather input from various campus constituents, including faculty, staff, and students, regarding the impact of such a policy.
8. Consider the impact of such a policy on external constituents such as visitors, alumni, patrons of University events etc.
9. Develop a campus policy that aligns with the USM Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions.
10. Develop potential implementation procedures for a campus policy.
11. Consult with a representative of the Office of Legal Affairs.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than January 11, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.