



**Staff Council  
Your Voice**

606 Jefferson Building  
Iowa City, IA 52242  
319-335-3600 Fax 319-353-2273  
e-mail: [staff-council@uiowa.edu](mailto:staff-council@uiowa.edu)  
[www.uiowa.edu/~staff](http://www.uiowa.edu/~staff)

**Staff Council Agenda  
Wednesday, January 10, 2007  
2:30 to 4 p.m.  
Shambaugh Auditorium**

- 2:30 PM Attendance
- 2:35 PM 40 years of Staff Council (UI Interim President G. Fethke)
- 2:45 PM Review/Approval of Minutes (attached)
- December Staff Council Meeting (Draft)
  - December Staff Council Executive Meeting with Provost Hogan (Draft)
  - December Staff Council Executive Meeting (Draft)
  - December Staff Council Executive Meeting with UI Interim President (Draft)
- 2:55 PM Smoking Committee Report (S. Johnson, S. Buckley)
- 3:15 PM Staff Council Committee Reports
- Diversity Committee (C. Anderson)
  - Elections Committee (B. Spencer)
  - Bylaws Committee (D. Martin)
- 3:30 PM New Business
- 4:00 PM Adjourn to attend Kick-off Event for Martin Luther King Week

**Reminders:**

- Nominations for Staff Council will be January 17-30, 2007. If every councilor nominated two people, we would have more than 100 candidates running for Staff Council!
- Staff Council elections will be done electronically February 6 – 13<sup>th</sup>. Be sure and get out the vote.
- Next Staff Council Meeting – Wednesday, February 14, 2:30 p.m., CDD
- Nominations for Staff Council Officers will be accepted in February, voted on in March. Please consider nominating yourself or a Staff Council colleague
- Our March 2007 Staff Council meeting will be held on Wednesday, **March 21**, from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

**Staff Council  
Meeting Minutes  
December 13, 2006 2-4:30  
S401 PBB**

**Present:** Chris Anderson, Lori Bassler, Linda Bergquist, Kimberly Chamberlin, Stacy Coffman, Lori Cranston, Nancy Davin, Gerene Denning, Janet Duncan, Jennie Embree, Nancy Fick, John Forys, Jo Ann Franklin, Matthew Gilchrist, Martha Greer, Mary Greer, Mary Heath, Lisa James, Kathy Klein, Deborah Kohler, Kathleen Lilli, David Martin, Virginia Miller, Marian Muste, Steven Nelson, Mary Lee Neuberger, Sara Nichols, Janette Pettus, Sandra Reed, Kathleen Renquist, Helen Rittenmeyer, Gary Sanborn, Mark Schmidt, Heather Schnoebelen, Julie Sexton, Sheri Sojka, Barbara Spence, Duncan Stewart, Eileen Sullivan, Sarah Tallman, Carlette Washington-Hoagland, Jeffrey Wasson, Rhonda Weaver, Michelle Wiegand, Al Young

**Absent:** David Bergeon, George Hospodarsky, David Johnson, Deb Pfab, Karen Shemanski, David Fitzgerald, Anne Sopher,

**Administrative Liaisons:** Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources; Kevin Ward, Senior Associate Director of Human Resources

**Guests:** Doug Allaire, Chris Annicella, Ellen Bartos, Tim Barrett, Marlys Boote, Judith Brewer, Steve Collins, Ann Farland, Dawn Freerks, Bettina Hass, Michele Hogue, Dan Holub, Phil Jordan, Bob Kirby, Joy Kross, Kathy Last, Maureen McCormick, Jennifer Modestou, Sarah Prineas, Mike Shaffer, Katherine Tachau, Elizabeth Voss, Jane Warner

**The meeting was called to order at 2:00.**

**1. Staff Council President, Mary Greer**

- a. See attached comments from Mary Greer regarding resolution of no confidence in the leadership of the Board of Regents.
- b. Resolution of no confidence introduced by Staff Council Vice President/President-Elect, Kathy Klein.
  - i. Staff Councilors David Martin, Martha Greer, Gerene Denning, Duncan Stewart, Barb Spence, Al Young and Sara Nichols presented statements in support of the no confidence resolution.
- c. The resolution of no confidence was voted by paper ballot; the resolution passed with 38 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- d. Katherine Tachau spoke to Staff Council members and thanked the faculty, staff, and students involved in the presidential search process. She also thanked Staff Council for their support.

**2. Review/Approval of Minutes:**

- a. The addition of “DRAFT” to the meeting minutes is being used to indicate the minutes are a draft version.
- b. Staff Council Meeting Minutes, November 8, 2006, were reviewed with two changes in Section 7.
- c. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2006, were reviewed without comment.
- d. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, December 5, 2006, were reviewed without comment. Lori Bassler commented on the amount of Coke Funds Staff Council awards to the Tuition Assistance program in relation to the program’s total budget. Jennie Embree shared her appreciation in seeing how the Coke Funds are distributed.

**3. Staff Council Committee Reports:**

- a. **Government Relations Committee, Matt Gilchrist:** Matt stated the Government Relations committee met with Congressman-elect Dave Loebsack prior to the Staff Council meeting. He announced there will be regular meetings during the Iowa legislative session.
- b. **Diversity Committee, Chris Anderson:** Kathleen Renquist spoke on behalf of Chris Anderson. The Staff Council MLK Kick-Off Event & Reception will be at 4:00 in Shambaugh Auditorium with a reception in the Main Library's North Lobby. This year’s event will include a panel discussion on diversity. Kathleen commented that this could also be a day to consider community service in honor of the MLK celebration.

**4. Funded Insurance Retirement Committee Update, Dan Holub:**

- a. Health care costs at The University of Iowa increased 16% which is above the national average.
- b. The committee looked at health care services provided and which services should continue to be covered.
- c. The committee also discussed out-of-pocket maximums, deductibles and copays for each plan and if any of these should change.
- d. Discussion included raising deductibles or raising premiums to cover the rising costs. If deductibles are raised those using the services will pay more but if premiums are raised everyone will pay more.
- e. The question “Are those using health services using them wisely?” is being addressed.
- f. Dan provided information on the savings through the generic drug program and wellness programs.
- g. Comments are welcome and can be sent to the Funded Insurance Retirement Committee.

- 5. “Be Remarkable” UI Marketing Campaign:** Scott Ketelsen did not attend the meeting as planned. Information regarding the “Be Remarkable” UI Marketing Campaign will be added to the Staff Council website.

**6. Bylaws Committee Proposals, Dave Martin:**

- a. Article XII, Section 1 was reviewed. Staff Council voted to approve the committee's recommendations to Section 1. The vote was 37 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- b. Article XII, Section 3 was reviewed. Dave stated that Robert's Rules of Order indicates the method for roll call voting as follows:
  - i. Individual's name is called.
  - ii. Individual states aye, nay or present (present indicating they abstain from the vote).
  - iii. Motion passes or fails.
  - iv. Meeting minutes would reflect the voting results.
  - v. A Staff Council member may request the vote be paper ballot.
- c. Mary Greer commented her preference for paper ballot for recording purposes.
- d. At a previous meeting, there was discussion regarding abstaining from the vote. Dave reported that he did not find any special rules regarding abstaining, and abstaining would be considered a no vote in the case of a close vote.
- e. After discussion of the proposed changes to Section 3 it was decided more revisions are needed. The Bylaws Committee will present revisions at another Staff Council meeting.

**7. Regents' Report, Sue Buckley:**

- a. The annual salary and benefits report was postponed until the February Board of Regents meeting at Iowa State University.

**8. New Business:**

- a. Sue Buckley reported that reimbursement for the Health Care Spending Account will soon be done daily if the individual participates in direct deposit. Checks will be issued for those not participating in direct deposit but will be done on a weekly basis.
- b. The University is making efforts to remove employee social security numbers on forms except when mandated by business necessity or legal requirements. Sarah Tallman is a member of the committee reviewing the use of social security numbers on University forms.
- c. Dave Martin commented on his appreciation of Mary Greer's leadership. This appreciation is shared by all of Staff Council.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.**

Respectfully submitted by,  
Mary Lee Neuberger, Secretary

Comments Regarding the Resolution of  
No Confidence in the Leadership of the Board of Regents  
By UI Staff Council President Mary Greer  
December 13, 2006

Colleagues:

Today we consider a resolution unlike one we have ever considered before, or hope to ever have to consider again: a resolution which formally declares that the elected Staff Council at the University of Iowa has lost its trust and confidence in the leadership of our Board of Regents.

Staff at the University of Iowa won't argue that it is the responsibility of the Board of Regents to select the president of this great center for higher learning. In fact, it is their statutory obligation to the people of Iowa. We get that.

We won't argue that strategic planning is something the leadership of the Board of Regents should be engaged in to help guide the future of our great University. We get that, too.

But what we don't get is why incivility and condescension dominate the way Michael Gartner and Teresa Wahlert, the president and president pro-tem of the current Board, communicate with us. Why promises are made and then broken. Why a dysfunctional approach to leadership is accepted by the rest of the Board. Why a blatant and disturbing pattern of secrecy, micromanagement, authoritarianism, and disrespect have plagued the leadership of the Board of Regents over the past two years.

Secrecy, micromanagement, and authoritarianism contribute to demonstrate the leadership's lack of respect for the university community and the public. Each and every

Comments Regarding the Resolution of  
No Confidence in the Leadership of the Board of Regents  
By UI Staff Council President Mary Greer  
December 13, 2006

member of the university community and the Board of Regents answers to the people of Iowa. A Board of Regents leadership that flaunts uses its authority to the pointpointing a waythis way, that it creatinges widespread anger and frustration, can neither do its job nor represent the best interest of lowans.

As we consider this vote, let's not make our decision solely based on emotion, as Gartner claims we do. Or be radical about it, as Wahlert would characterize us. Let's look at some facts:

Last winter, despite our excellent record of attracting outstanding presidents using a campus-based and led search process, the leadership of the Board of Regents selected a process in which four Regents were members of the search committee. With Regent Wahlert as chair and Regent Gartner on board, the committee was doomed to months of undemocratic processes and closed discussions.

Regents Gartner and Wahlert promised that they would allow the campus advisory committee to play a significant role in the search process, but it did not.

In the spring and summer, Regents Gartner and Wahlert publicly voiced their support for on-campus interviews, but then did all they could to subvert prevent them.

On July 20, Gartner initiated via e-mail a strategic planning process that included Wahlert and none of the other members of the Board of Regents. They met privately with our interim president and the ISU and UNI presidents. These secret

Comments Regarding the Resolution of  
No Confidence in the Leadership of the Board of Regents  
By UI Staff Council President Mary Greer  
December 13, 2006

discussions only came to light when the media uncovered the e-mail and forced Gartner to admit the sessions had occurred process was underway.

On November 9<sup>th</sup>, Michael Gartner announced that the Board of Regents was entering a closed executive session to discuss a personnel issue. That closed session was begun, and suspended and resumed no fewer than four times over the course of five days.

Between November 14 and 17<sup>th</sup>, deliberation about the candidates among by the board members meeting together in a closed session with a list of strengths and weaknesses about for each candidate available never took place. Instead, Gartner called each board member individually to secure the votes needed to fail terminate the UI presidential search and disband the committee. Candidates that the four members on the committee had deemed fit for the job, were suddenly not worthy of consideration.

Each year during my performance evaluation, I am invited to make an appointment with “the boss’s boss” as it were. I don’t often take this opportunity, but it is there if I want it. Today we have an opportunity to talk with the boss’s boss.

So we’ve made that appointment today—with the citizens of Iowa; the taxpayers of Iowa, those to whom Michael Gartner and Teresa Wahlert ultimately report. We’re nervous about it. We know what we have to say will be difficult and it may not change anything.

But we also know that we can’t go on like this, without making the boss’ boss acutely aware of our concerns. We’ve tried working with Gartner and Wahlert—only to be confronted with bullying, intimidation tactics, and untruths. If we don’t take this

Comments Regarding the Resolution of  
No Confidence in the Leadership of the Board of Regents  
By UI Staff Council President Mary Greer  
December 13, 2006

opportunity to tell the boss' boss, then we are returning to our cubes knowing that our silence supports the status quo.

This resolution is about something the leadership of the Regents owe the people of Iowa. It is called "duty of care." This is, in fact, Gartner and Wahler the leadership's obligation to take reasonable care in acting in the best interests of the state's citizens and of public higher education. By repeatedly violating that duty of care, the Board's leaders have demonstrated that we cannot trust them any longer to carry out their appointed responsibilities.

The resolution before you is motivated by the conviction that a change in the Board leadership is essential to accomplish the interrelated goals of finding and retaining an outstanding president to lead this institution and restoring a functional governance structure within the Board of Regents and between the Regents and the institutions they oversee.

**Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with Provost Hogan**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 14, 2006 9:00-10:00 a.m.**  
**111K JH**

**Present:** Linda Bergquist, Nancy Davin, Nancy Fick, Mary Greer, Kathy Klein, Mary Lee Neuberger, Sarah Tallman

**Absent:** Lori Bassler, Sandra Reed

**Administrative Liaisons:** Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources

**1. Staff Council President, Mary Greer:**

- a. Mary would like to change the frequency of meetings with Provost Hogan to every two months instead of the current quarterly schedule. Provost Hogan is in favor of this.
- b. Provost Hogan reported local shared governance proposals for all colleges and the Office of the Provost have been submitted. The SCEC will review the proposals.
- c. The Shared Governance Council meets monthly. The chairperson for each charter committee has been invited to speak at the meetings and suggest resources needed for their committee (ie. website space for committee meeting agendas and minutes).
- d. Mary reported Vicky Sharp (Faculty Senate President-elect) inquired how the Staff Council President's hours are reimbursed. There has been discussion on how other CIC institutions address this issue. Sue Buckley stated this had been discussed with past SC presidents about a year ago. Currently, 75% of the SC President's salary is paid by his/her current position and 25% special assignment.

**2. Other Agenda items:**

**a. Local Shared Governance Proposals:**

- i. Nancy Fick shared the CLAS Shared Governance website banner, discussed the construction of the website pages, plans for keeping the pages updated and focus on communication. There will be an advisory group to elicit ideas.
- ii. Kathy Klein stated this may be more difficult in the Graduate College because there are many different groups involved. She added developing a local shared governance proposal has been an excellent opportunity to share ideas and concerns and learn from each other.
- iii. Sue Buckley suggested Staff Council consider organizing a meeting in the spring to discuss "best practices" with local shared governance.

- b. Staff Council 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary:** 2007 will be the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Staff Council. Heather Schnobelen, Kathy Klein and Mary Greer have started celebration plans.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Mary Lee Neuberger, Secretary

DRAFT

**Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with Interim President Fethke**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 20, 2006 8:00-9:00 a.m.**  
**101 JH**

**Present:** Linda Bergquist, Nancy Davin, Nancy Fick, Mary Greer, Kathy Klein,  
Mary Lee Neuberger, Sandra Reed, Sarah Tallman

**Absent:** Lori Bassler

**Administrative Liaisons:** Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources

**1. Interim President Fethke's Comments:**

- a. Interim President Fethke commented Susan Shullaw from the UI Foundation will be working on outreach activities internally and externally.
- b. The Chicago Center opened at 150 Michigan Avenue; two staff are currently in the center. This will create a presence for The University of Iowa in Chicago and aid in increasing minority enrollment on campus.
- c. University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics and the College of Medicine are working on coordination and theme based delivery service lines with more focus on patient satisfaction.
- d. There is ongoing discussion regarding the scope of benefit offerings and relationships to third party payers. This is a complicated issue as The University of Iowa is both a provider and a customer of services.
  - i. Questions include "What can we do to make ourselves more efficient as a provider of services?" and "Could we partner with other customers to increase bargaining power and access to services?"
- e. David Johnsen, Dean of the College of Dentistry, has been named the chair of of the UI presidential search committee.

**2. Staff Council President, Mary Greer:**

- a. Mary would like to invite Dean Johnsen to a Staff Council meeting to discuss the presidential search process.
- b. Mass e-mailing is used to communicate information across the campus. It is important that employees do not receive e-mails containing similar information. All mass e-mails must go through the appropriate channels in the University.
- c. The Staff Council research representatives met with UI leaders in 2005 to discuss a number of concerns. The SCEC met with Dean Keller of the Graduate College in February, 2006 to begin discussions about creating a master's program in the sciences at UI. The research representatives would like to schedule another meeting with UI leaders in 2007. Marsha Adolph will assist Mary in scheduling this meeting.

**3. Shared Governance Council, Mary Greer:**

- a. Charter committee chairs have been meeting with the Shared Governance Council. Charter committees will send meeting agendas and minutes to Lucille Heitman who will post them on the University website.

**4. Coke Funds, Mary Greer:**

- a. Staff Council receives \$50,000 each year to distribute to programs on campus. The application process was reorganized this year and is now online. The applicants are asked to include information about the number of staff benefiting from the program and the percentage of the program budget funded by the Staff Council funds. The SCEC met in December to review requests and were pleased to fund all requests.

**5. Associate Vice President Sue Buckley's Comments:**

- a. Sue Buckley will send a "Staff News and Updates" letter to all staff at the beginning of the spring semester. The email will review changes and new initiatives that occurred in the fall semester.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Mary Lee Neuberger, Secretary

DRAFT

**Staff Council Executive Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
December 20, 2006 2:30-4:30 p.m.  
603 JB**

**Present:** Lori Bassler Linda Bergquist, Nancy Davin, Nancy Fick, Mary Greer, Kathy Klein, Mary Lee Neuberger, Sandra Reed, Sarah Tallman

**Absent:** None

**Guests:** Heather Schnoebelen

**The meeting was called to order at 2:30.**

**1. Staff Council President, Mary Greer:**

- a. Mary updated SCEC on the recent and future presidential search.

**2. Issues for Discussion:**

**a. Extra Meritorious Pay Proposal, Heather Schoebelen:**

- i. Heather presented the MSE/C committee proposals. There are 2 types of awards—the Exceptional Performance Awards and the SPOT Performance Awards. SCEC recommended the committee present two options to Staff Council; one option as it was presented today, and a second option with the Exceptional Performance Awards separate from the SPOT Performance Awards.

**b. Board of Regents Staff Excellence Awards, Heather Schoebelen:**

- i. The University of Iowa does not have a designated BOR Staff Excellence award for MSE/C staff members. Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa have designated BOR Staff Excellence awards for MSE/C staff.
- ii. The MSE/C proposal is to designate up to one BOR award to a MSE/C staff member bi-annually (even-numbered years). SCEC recommended job classification of previous recipients should be reviewed. The proposal will be reviewed when there is more information.

**3. New Business:**

- a. Mary met with Susan Shullaw from the University of Iowa Foundation to discuss internal communication. Options to improve communication include a newspage for Staff and Faculty in the Daily Iowan and developing an intranet for the University (similar to The Point at UIHC).
- b. Linda Bergquist presented an update on mandatory Sexual Harrassment training and the training that will be occurring. Recommendations have been sent to the President's office.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.**

Respectfully submitted by,  
Mary Lee Neuberger, Secretary

DRAFT

## Greer, Mary

---

**From:** Martin, Dave  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 03, 2007 11:04 AM  
**To:** Staff Council  
**Cc:** Greer, Mary  
**Subject:** info for SC packet

This should go out with SC packet. We need to vote on adding sections 3 and 4. I could not get my committee together until this Friday so I would like to send some more proposed changes for discussion out first of next week.

Dave

\*\*\*\*\*

Article XII Quorum/voting

Section 1. In order to transact business that requires a vote, a quorum of one more than one half the Council members must be present. (passed at 12/06 meeting)

Section 2. To carry a motion, affirmative votes must be cast by one more than one half of those voting.

***Section 3 -- All voting in meetings of the body of the whole will be done by voice or by hand or by paper ballot. If the vote is an election, it must be performed by secret ballot.***

***Section 4 -- Upon the request of any Council member, and with the approval of 20% of the Council members present, a roll call vote by voice or paper shall be taken on the pending motion, and the minutes shall record the names of those voting aye, nay, and present***

Dave Martin  
Pomerantz Business Library  
University of Iowa  
j-martin@uiowa.edu  
319-335-3078

**SMOKING POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

The University of Iowa  
November 16, 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	2
Process	
Charge .....	4
Campus Input .....	6
Actions to Date .....	7
Background Information and Research	
Toxicology of Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) .....	8
Health Effects of Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) .....	8
University Internal Environment .....	9
University External Environment .....	9
2005 California Environmental Protection Agency Report .....	10
Benchmark Data: Smoking Policies .....	10
Corporate: Smoke-free Environment .....	11
University of Iowa Data .....	11
Recommendations .....	13
Iowa House .....	14
University Apartments .....	14
Theatre Arts .....	14
External Environment .....	16
Compliance .....	16
Smoking Cessation .....	17
Procedures for Review and Input .....	17
Implementation .....	17
Healthy Campus Culture .....	18
Primary Resources .....	19
Appendix .....	20

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On December 22, 2005, President Skorton created an *ad hoc* committee to revisit the University smoking policy. President Skorton requested that the committee review two areas:

- To identify all allowed or *de facto* practices of smoking within University buildings, and to recommend whether any changes in such practices or the policy in regard to them should be made.
- To examine whether there should be any local or campus wide changes to the smoking policy outside campus buildings.

The committee has met on average twice a month since convening February 20, 2006. The committee obtained campus-wide input through three primary methods. First, two open forums were held to which all students, staff, and faculty were invited. Second, an electronic mailbox was established to collect input via e-mail. Third, committee members consulted with or received input from the three major governance groups on campus and from a significant number of administrators across the University.

### Background Information

In order to make informed recommendations with regard to the University's smoking policy, the committee reviewed the available literature and the practices of other Universities and comparable organizations. Key findings indicate the following:

- More than 50 carcinogens have been identified in environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) and it is classified by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a Group A carcinogen, that is, a substance known to cause cancer in humans. The 2006 Surgeon General's Report *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke* concludes that secondhand smoke causes premature death and disease in children and adults who do not smoke.
- The impact of ETS in the external environment is less clear. The studies appear to support the concept that secondhand smoke in confined outdoor areas presents a possible exposure level similar to an internal environment where smoking is allowed. In outdoor areas that are not confined, it appears that particulate quantities diminish to the background level at about 7 meters (23 feet) from the source of the ETS.

- Institutions belonging to the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), that is, Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago, do not allow smoking in the internal environment. In the external environment, smoking is not permitted within a certain distance from entrances or exits to buildings. None of the CIC institutions comprehensively ban smoking in the external environment on their main campus.

### Committee Actions

To date, the committee has taken two specific actions.

- On February 28, 2006, the committee recommended to President Skorton that the Health Science Colleges be allowed to proceed with developing a plan for a smoke-free health science campus policy.
- On August 14, 2006, with the approval of Interim President Fethke, the committee announced an interim measure that no smoking be allowed within 25 feet of all occupied campus building entrances and exits, to include enclosed parking ramp stair towers, elevators, and their lobbies not already covered by the UIHC campus smoke-free policy.

### Committee Recommendations

The committee makes the following recommendations:

- All residents of University Apartments who choose to live in a smoke-free building should be accommodated by the beginning of fall semester, 2007.
- All University Apartment buildings should be smoke-free by the fall semester, 2008.
- On-stage performances should stop using tobacco products, and instead use tobacco-free substitutes by July, 2007, or as soon as an acceptable substitute is available.

Concurrently, the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should conduct an academic review on the acceptability of tobacco-free substitutes prior to July 2007 and advise the Faculty Senate of their findings. The Faculty Senate should then consider these findings and make recommendations to the President and Provost.

If the President and Provost determine, upon the advice of the Faculty Senate, that an acceptable tobacco-free substitute is not available by July, 2007, then clear notice should be included in all marketing for performances that include on stage smoking.

- The current restriction of a 25 foot smoke-free perimeter around entrances/exits to buildings should be expanded on July 1, 2007 to a 25 foot perimeter around the entire perimeter of all campus buildings, and including athletic facilities, parking ramps and enclosed parking facilities.

- Two years after the 25 foot smoke-free perimeter is implemented, the campus should become entirely smoke-free in both the internal and external environment.
- A broad range of educational activities are needed to create awareness of the regulations and expectations for behavior. In cases where there is a clear and persistent lack of compliance with the new regulations by a University student, staff, or faculty, it is recommended that normal processes be applied, as currently used, to change other types of student or employee behavior.
- Resources to assist with smoking cessation should continue to be available to all members of the campus community. This assistance should include behavioral modification services, nicotine replacement therapy, and prescription medication.
- The Interim President should seek immediate and wide review of these recommendations, to be completed no later than the end of the 2007 spring semester. New restrictions should be implemented in a timely manner as outlined in the specific recommendations.
- A work group should be appointed to help operationalize the new policies. The work group will need to focus on communication surrounding the new policy, resource availability for current smokers, and education related to enforcement.
- Other aspects related to supporting individuals in providing them with healthy choices need to be considered by campus. These types of environmental supports may include healthy food choices in vending machines, cafeterias, food carts, and catering; the physical environment to include ample, accessible, and lighted walkways; and additional incentives related to healthy lifestyles.

## **PROCESS**

### Charge

On December 22, 2005, President Skorton requested that Susan Buckley, Associate Vice President for Finance and Operations and Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty, co-chair a small ad hoc committee to review the University of Iowa smoking policy.

The current University of Iowa policy states:

35.5 PROHIBITIONS IN USE OF FACILITIES.

(Amended 9/92; 10/94; 9/98; 9/99; 2/00)

a. Smoking. Smoking is prohibited in all buildings and vehicles owned or leased by The University of Iowa, regardless of location. This policy applies to all indoor air space, including individual faculty and administrative offices. Outdoor spaces, specifically the immediate areas surrounding fresh air intakes for University buildings, may be designated as no-smoking areas. Facilities may be posted "smoking permitted" to accommodate bona fide artistic performances, when smoking is an integral part of the work. Posting will be the responsibility of the director of the primary program housed in that facility.

Specifically, President Skorton directed the review to address the following areas:

- (1) Within University Buildings – Please identify all allowed or *de facto* practices of smoking within University buildings across campus (e.g., on-stage theater performances, the Iowa House, family housing), and recommend whether any changes in practices and/or policy should be made; and,
- (2) Outside University Buildings – Please review whether there should be any local or campus-wide changes to the smoking policy outside campus buildings. In considering those issues, I ask that you consult with the UIHC regarding its policy, the health sciences colleges, and any other relevant and interested groups and individuals across campus. While I have no preconceived notions about the wisdom and feasibility of any such changes, if you do recommend any changes to the policy, please provide recommendations regarding implementation and enforcement of those changes.

The composition of the committee is as follows:

Susan Buckley, Associate Vice President for Finance and Operations, Human Resources  
Nancy Davin (Staff Council Appointee), Administrative Assistant II, Student Health Service  
Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty, Office of the Provost  
Wilfrid Nixon (Faculty Senate Appointee), Professor, Civil-Environmental Engineering  
Amanda Russell (Student Government Appointee) Graduate Student, Health Management and Policy  
Joni Troester (Presidential Appointee), Director of UI Wellness, Organizational Effectiveness

The UI Smoking Policy Review Committee convened on February 20, 2006. Generally, the committee met twice per month with additional, specially scheduled meetings as needed.

#### Campus Input

Three primary methods to solicit campus input were utilized.

1. Open Forums – all students, staff, and faculty were invited, via mass e-mail, to two open forums, April 19 and 24, 2006. Approximately 50 people attended the forums.
2. Electronic Mailbox – all students, staff, and faculty were invited to send their comments to an electronic mailbox at [smokingpolicyreview@uiowa.edu](mailto:smokingpolicyreview@uiowa.edu). Over a six month period the committee received 327 comments.
3. Governance – representatives of the committee interacted with:
  - a) Staff Council
  - b) Faculty Council
  - c) Student Government

Administrative – the full committee or a representative of the committee consulted with or received input from the following individuals or groups:

- d) Mark Abbott, Assistant to the Director, Athletics
- e) Helen Baker, Manager, University Apartments
- f) Michael Barron, Director, Admissions
- g) John Cameron, Professor, Theatre Arts and Acting Program
- h) Council of University Deans
- i) David Grady, Associate Vice President, Student Services
- j) Charles Green, Assistant Vice President and Director of Public Safety
- k) Donald Guckert, Associate Vice President, Facilities Management
- l) Meredith Hay, Vice President, Research Administration
- m) Michael Hogan, Executive Vice President and Provost, Office of the Provost
- n) David Jackson, Assistant to the Director, Facilities Management
- o) Phillip Jones, Vice President, Student Services
- p) Scott King, Director, Office of International Students and Scholars
- q) Susan Klatt, Director of Administrative Services, Facilities Management
- r) Alan MacVey, Professor, Theatre Arts

- s) Belinda Marner, Assistant Vice President, Student Services
- t) David McGraw, Production State Manager, Theatre Arts
- u) Christopher Merrill, Director, International Writing Program
- v) Marcus Mills, Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel
- w) Harry Ostrander, Director, Recreational Services
- x) Steven Parrott, Director, University Relations
- y) William Reisinger, Associate Provost and Dean, International Programs
- z) David Ricketts, Director, Parking and Transportation
- aa) Thomas Rocklin, Associate Provost and Dean, Undergraduate Education, Office of the Provost
- bb) Christopher Squier, Associate Dean, College of Dentistry
- cc) Von Stange, Director, Residence Services
- dd) Douglas True, Senior Vice President, Finance and Operations
- ee) Kevin Ward, Director, Employee and Labor Relations
- ff) UIHC Smoke-Free Environment Task Force

#### Actions to Date

1. On February 28, 2006, the Smoking Policy Review Committee recommended to President Skorton that the Health Science Colleges (Medicine, Public Health, Nursing, Dentistry, and Pharmacy):
  - a. proceed with developing a plan for a smoke-free health science campus policy
  - b. develop a plan to address various elements, such as communication strategy, assistance to smokers, inclusion of faculty, staff and students in planning, etc.
  - c. submit the final plan to the President for review and approval prior to implementation

The committee anticipated that the efforts would take a minimum of six months.

2. Given the impact of the UIHC smoke-free policy and the June 27, 2006, release of the Surgeon General's report on secondhand smoke exposure, the University Smoking Policy Review Committee, after consultation with administrative and governance leaders and

with the approval of Interim President Gary Fethke, announced in early August an interim measure to go into effect on August 14, 2006. The measure is as follows:

- a. No smoking will be allowed within 25 feet of all occupied campus building entrances and exits. This will include enclosed parking ramp stair towers, elevators, and their lobbies not already covered by the UIHC campus smoke-free policy (25 feet mirrors the NIH standard).
- b. Kinnick Stadium will be excluded. Enforcing such a rule with the public during football games on short notice is not practical.
- c. A very few selected areas may have somewhat larger boundaries e.g. the back doors to the Field House, near Ramp IV.

Signage and the moving of smoking receptacles currently within the 25 foot zone began, as appropriate, after August 14. Enforcement of the interim policy will follow normal procedures.

The committee communicated to the campus and the public via a press release, Deans, Directors, and Departmental Executive Officers (DDDEO) memo, and a mass e-mail to all students, staff, and faculty on August 14, 2006 and on September 19, 2006.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RESEARCH**

### Toxicology of Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS)

More than 50 carcinogens have been identified in ETS or secondhand smoke. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has classified secondhand smoke as a Group A carcinogen, a substance known to cause cancer in humans. The EPA does not recognize a safe level of exposure to Group A carcinogens.

### Health Effects of Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS)

Many negative health effects associated with exposure to secondhand smoke have been documented beginning with the 1972 Surgeon General's Report, *The Health Consequences of Smoking*. The major conclusions of the 2006 Surgeon General's Report, *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke* are listed below verbatim:

1. Secondhand smoke causes premature death and disease in children and adults who do not smoke.

2. Children exposed to secondhand smoke are at an increased risk of sudden infant death syndrome (SID), acute respiratory infections, ear problems, and more severe asthma. Smoking by parents causes respiratory symptoms and slow lung growth in their children.
3. Exposure of adults to secondhand smoke has immediate adverse effects on the cardiovascular system and causes coronary heart disease and lung cancer.
4. The scientific evidence indicates that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke.
5. Many millions of Americans, both children and adults, are still exposed to secondhand smoke in their homes and workplaces despite substantial progress in tobacco control.
6. Eliminating smoking in indoor spaces fully protects nonsmokers from exposure to secondhand smoke. Separating smokers from nonsmokers, cleaning the air, and ventilating buildings cannot eliminate nonsmokers' exposure to secondhand smoke.

#### University Internal Environment

Numerous studies have demonstrated that smoking inside buildings increases the indoor particle concentrations of toxic substances associated with secondhand smoke. Per the 2006 Surgeon General's Report, current heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems alone cannot control exposure to secondhand smoke in the internal environment. Additionally, the operation of a heating, ventilating, and air conditioning system can distribute secondhand smoke throughout a building. According to the 2006 Surgeon General's Report, individual homes and the workplace are the predominant locations for exposure to secondhand smoke. According to the 2005 California Environmental Protection Agency Report, *Identification of Environmental Tobacco Smoke as a Toxic Air Contaminant*, current typical indoor concentrations of nicotine in California are estimated in the range from near zero to approximately  $6.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in the home environment. In workplaces, most smoking is banned. However for bars where smoking is allowed, nicotine levels have been measured as high as  $76 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

#### University External Environment

Few studies have reviewed the concentrations and subsequent effects of secondhand smoke in the external environment. A study by Klepeis et al (2004) measured mean outdoor secondhand smoke where smokers were intermittently active. In some cases concentrations were comparable to indoor settings. However, outdoor concentrations appear more variable because secondhand smoke does not accumulate and peak concentrations are more susceptible to wind conditions. Repace (2005) conducted an experiment related to smoking outdoors and the idea that smoke

plumes immediately dissipate into the environment. His findings demonstrated that outdoor smoking levels around smokers do not approach background levels for fine particles until approximately 7 meters (23 feet) from the source of the smoke.

2005 California Environmental Protection Agency Report – Identification of Environmental Tobacco Smoke as a Toxic Air Contaminant. The California Air Resources Board measured levels of ETS in ambient air by monitoring nicotine concentrations at several outdoor smoking areas. Depending on location and number of smokers present nicotine levels ranged from .016 – 4.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Overall the results indicated that concentrations of nicotine correspond mainly to the number of smokers in the smoking area, the size of the smoking area, and meteorological conditions.

These studies appear to indicate that secondhand smoke in confined outdoor areas presents a possible exposure level similar to an internal environment where smoking is allowed. The concentration of particles in the air is dependent on the number of smokers in the identified area and outside meteorological conditions. Moreover, smoking near ventilation ducts and/or building air intakes may pull harmful particles into buildings and create an “indoor smoking environment” when in fact the internal environment is designated as smoke-free.

#### Benchmark Data: Smoking Policies

The smoking policies of peer Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) institutions, other colleges and universities, and government agencies were reviewed by the committee. See Appendix One for comparison of CIC institutional smoking policies and government agencies smoking policies. Policies across CIC institutions vary, especially regarding the external environment. Related to the internal environment, a more uniform approach exists with all institutions having a no smoking policy in effect for indoor facilities, noting a few exceptions.

Policy benchmark data was examined related to academic institutions throughout the United States. A listing of colleges and universities with smoke-free campus policies can be found at [www.no-smoke.org](http://www.no-smoke.org). Upon review of this list it is worthy to note that no campus of similar scope and size as the University of Iowa has implemented a smoke-free campus policy, which includes the external environment in its entirety. Finally, smoking policies for government agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) were reviewed.

### Corporate: Smoke-free Environments

Many corporations such as Dow Chemical, Union Pacific Railroad, and Nike have instituted smoke-free policies for their respective corporate campus. Lockheed Martin recently announced that they will move in this direction instituting a smoke-free corporate campus effective January 1, 2007. These companies, as well as others, note the rising cost of health care and the expense demonstrated to be associated with individuals who smoke as one of the main reasons for instituting these policies. While some comparison can be made to the University of Iowa, it would appear to be a more complex issue for a large decentralized research University to consider given campus boundaries, enforcement challenges, the student population, and public access.

### University of Iowa Data

#### *Open Forums*

Two open forum opportunities were provided for UI faculty, staff, and students to provide feedback to the committee on the current smoking policy, and any possible changes.

Approximately 50 individuals attended the two forums. The following themes were noted:

#### Internal Environment

- Consideration of artistic freedom within the Theater Arts related to smoking as part of artistic performances.
- University Apartments – consideration of individual choice and cultural norms.
- The Iowa House – consideration of specific groups, e.g. International Writing Program related to smoking in limited guest rooms.

#### External Environment

- Favorable responses related to limiting smoking around entrances, exits, air intakes, and ventilation systems.
- Varied response to smoke-free campus.

#### Enforcement

- Consistent response that enforcement must be addressed with any policy modification.

*Electronic Mailbox*

On April 6, 2006, a mass email was distributed to faculty, staff, and students inviting them to two open forums, but also inviting their feedback about the smoking policy to [smokingpolicyreview@uiowa.edu](mailto:smokingpolicyreview@uiowa.edu), a special mailbox specifically set up for feedback. Between the period 4/6/06 to 9/30/06, 327 responses were received, broken down as follows:

Students	90
Staff	165
Faculty	51
Unknown	21

Of those 327 responses, 142 were received following the announcement of the interim measure implementing a 25 foot non-smoking perimeter from building entrances. Of those 142, 47% specifically expressed thanks for this measure. In all of the emails, the themes of comments were tracked (see table below). Some emails could not be grouped into the following categories and some were applied to more than one category:

	<u>Total Ban</u>	<u>No Further Restrictions</u>	<u>Building Perimeter</u>	<u>Prohibit Near Air Intakes, etc.</u>	<u>Designated Entrance</u>
Students	31	6	24	15	5
Staff	67	19	53	28	11
Faculty	21	6	12	8	1
Unknown	3	2	2	0	0

Most of the comments expressed support for further restrictions, but also expressed concern regarding enforcement. In addition, concern was expressed about placement of receptacles and regular emptying, litter generated by those who don't use receptacles, the need for designated smoking and non-smoking outdoor spaces, fear of smokers moving to private property, increased time needed for breaks, the need for compassion for smokers in inclement weather, and particular problem areas on campus.

*University Apartments Survey:*

Currently, University Apartments allows smoking in all apartments and does not designate smoke-free apartment buildings. A survey was conducted by the Office of Student Services in

Spring 2006 which obtained feedback from the residents of University Apartments on a number of issues, including smoking behavior, how it affects their quality of life, and their interest in having designated smoke-free buildings. The survey had an overall response rate of 25%. Of the respondents, 123 individuals supported smoke-free buildings as compared to 26 who were not supportive. Additionally, 104 individuals would like to move to a smoke-free building as compared to 44 who would not.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The committee reviewed scientific data, policies of other institutions, and received input from many members of the campus community. The committee examined different rationales that have been put forth to support or oppose further restrictions on smoking. Arguments against further restriction primarily centered on individual liberty. Arguments that support further restrictions include a possible ethical obligation on the part of the University to encourage healthy behaviors among our students, the practical issue of reducing unsightly litter on campus, and the likelihood that more restrictions will enhance smoking cessation among our community members which could lead to a variety of benefits, including lower health care costs.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, employees who smoke average \$1429 per smoker per year in increased health care costs compared to non-smoking employees. Additionally, various studies suggest smokers are absent from work, on average, up to an estimated 33% more than non-smoking peers.

The rationale we found most compelling, however, was the evidence of the adverse health effects of secondhand exposure to smoke. The evidence of harm has become stronger in recent years, and leads us to recommend additional restrictions in University policy and practice.

### **1. Iowa House**

The Iowa House had two guest rooms designated as “smoking” rooms.

The committee endorses the current plan of the Iowa House to be entirely smoke-free after November 15, 2006.

## **2. University Apartments**

The committee is strongly convinced that the evidence that exposure to secondhand smoke in confined places is harmful. This position is supported by the 2006 Surgeon General's report, which summarizes the evidence that such exposure contributes to both short term and long term adverse health effects. In addition, the current practice at University Apartments is at odds with the existing University policy. For these reasons, the committee recommends that indoor smoking at the University Apartments be eliminated.

- The committee recommends:
  - All residents who choose to live in a smoke-free building should be allowed to do so by the fall semester, 2007.
  - All buildings should be smoke-free by the fall semester, 2008

## **3. Theatre Arts**

The committee recognizes that in this situation there are academic issues to consider; indeed these considerations led to the revision of the University policy several years ago to include: "Facilities may be posted 'smoking permitted' to accommodate bona fide artistic performances, when smoking is an integral part of the work." Also, the effects of secondhand smoke experienced during a theatre performance are likely limited to the potential for exacerbating asthma and allergies of other performers and audience members. For these individuals, however, this is not a trivial matter. The ideal solution would be a tobacco-free product that could be used when on-stage smoking is important to the production. However, it is not clear to the committee that there is such a substitute that would be acceptable to the UI Theatre faculty at the present time.

- The committee recommends that the exception allowing smoking of tobacco products in productions in Theatre Arts be eventually eliminated:

- Performances should stop using tobacco products, and instead use tobacco-free substitutes by July, 2007, or as soon as an acceptable substitute is available.
- Concurrently, the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should conduct an academic review on the acceptability of tobacco-free substitutes prior to July 2007 and advise the Faculty Senate of their findings. The Faculty Senate should then consider these findings and make recommendations to the President and Provost.
- If the President or Provost determine that an acceptable substitute is not available by July, 2007, then clear notice should be included in all marketing for performances that include on stage smoking.

#### **4. External Environment**

The committee believes that the scientific evidence regarding the risks of secondhand smoke in the out of doors is more difficult to interpret. The evidence that secondhand exposure to “cluster smoking,” as might occur with a group of people smoking together is harmful to long term health is reasonably solid; and it is clear that there is immediate harm from such exposure to persons who have medical conditions such as asthma and allergies. The committee’s opinion is that members of the campus community and the public should not be subjected to such concentrated smoke exposure as they go about their routine activities on campus. The obvious places for this type of concentrated exposure are at the entrances/exits to buildings, and, inside the building if people are smoking near open windows or fresh air intakes. It was these concerns among the campus community that led us to recommend the August 14, 2006 interim restriction against smoking within 25 feet of doors on all campus buildings.

The magnitude of long term harm (e.g. cardiovascular disease, cancer) from occasional exposure to small amounts of secondhand smoke in the open air is less clear. The competing interest, in a setting of real, but low risk, is that smoking is still a legal activity in this country. Many campus members who provided input were in favor of additional restrictions, but expressed concern about banning a legal activity altogether.

- The committee recommends that the current restriction of a 25 foot smoke-free perimeter around entrances/exits to buildings be expanded on July 1, 2007 to a 25 foot perimeter around the entire perimeter of all campus buildings, and including athletic facilities, parking ramps, and enclosed parking facilities. However, if city property falls within the 25 foot smoke-free perimeter, that property is not covered by this policy. In addition, the committee recognized the challenges associated with eliminating designated smoking areas within the stadium. Nonetheless, the committee recommends smoking be phased out in these designated areas over the next two years.
- The committee recommends that two years after the 25 foot smoke-free perimeter is implemented, the campus should become entirely smoke-free in both the internal and external environment. The committee suggests a two-year timeframe given that a number of major issues will need to be addressed to make a smoke-free campus a reality, including if, how, and where smokers would be accommodated.

## **5. Compliance**

Compliance with the new non-smoking regulations will primarily depend on persistent and consistent educational efforts directed toward students, staff, faculty, and visitors. These educational efforts need to create awareness of the regulations and expectations for behavior, as well as the rationale that explains their adoption by the University community.

Educational efforts will range from appropriate signage to forums on the adverse effects of secondhand smoke, from clear Operations Manual policy language to widespread publicity and access to cessation services. In cases where there is a clear and persistent lack of compliance with the new regulations by a University student, staff, or faculty, it is expected that normal processes be applied, as currently used, to change other types of student or employee behavior. In cases where there is a lack of compliance with the new regulation by a member of the public, it is recommended all University personnel adopt the responsibility to educate members of the public about the University's non-smoking regulations.

Regardless of whether individuals are affiliated with the University or not, in extreme situations that escalate to the threat of violence Public Safety should be contacted immediately.

## **6. Smoking Cessation**

These new restrictions will lead additional members of our community to consider smoking cessation, and the University should be prepared to provide assistance when asked.

Resources to assist with smoking cessation should continue to be available to all members of the campus community. Smoking cessation assistance should include support for behavioral modification services, nicotine replacement therapy, and prescription medication. Cessation efforts are most effective when a combination of behavioral and pharmaceutical services is used. Additionally, the University should pursue health insurance coverage for smoking cessation services, and associated nicotine replacement therapies and prescription medication.

## **7. Procedures for Review and Input**

The committee recommends that the President seek wide review by the campus community, including, but not limited to, the governance groups for faculty, staff and students. The aim should be to conclude the review by the end of the 2007 spring semester, so that new restrictions can be put into place in a timely manner, as outlined in the specific recommendations.

## **8. Implementation**

Upon approval of the recommendations, the committee recommends that a working group be appointed to help operationalize the new policies. The work group will need to focus on communication surrounding the new policy, resource availability for current smokers, and education related to enforcement. A variety of techniques and methods may be used by this committee. Some of those used successfully by UIHC as part of their smoke-free environment initiative include 1) policy Q & A, 2), Lunch and Learn Sessions for employees, 3) brochures, maps and other informational communication pieces, 4) offering cessation resources, and 5) smoking ambassadors. The workgroup should include representatives from University Relations, Facilities Management, UI Wellness, Human Resources, Student Services, and the Office of the Provost.

## **9. Healthy Campus Culture**

A smoke-free campus provides faculty, staff and students with a supportive environment and culture that promotes healthy living. Additionally, the data demonstrate that when restrictions are put on smoking and smoking cessation support provided, a decrease of smoking prevalence within the population will occur. Finally, a decrease in smoking prevalence among faculty and staff will also positively impact, over time, health care utilization.

It is important to recognize that at the same time restrictions in smoking may be implemented to promote a healthy campus environment and culture, other aspects related to supporting individuals in providing them with healthy choices would need to be considered by campus. These types of environmental supports may include healthy food choices in vending machines, cafeterias, food carts and catering; the physical environment to include ample, accessible, and lighted walkways; and additional incentives related to healthy lifestyles.

## PRIMARY RESOURCES

Center for Health Promotion and Publications. *The Dollar (and sense) Benefits of Having a Smoke-Free Workplace*. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Tobacco Control Program; 2000.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Office on Smoking and Health, USDHHS, Wellness Council of America, American Cancer Society. *Making your workplace smokefree: A decision maker's guide* 1996.

Halpern MT, Shikiar R, Rentz AM, Khan ZM. Impact of smoking status on workplace absenteeism and productivity. *Tobacco Control*. Sep 2001;10(3):233-238.

Identification of Environmental Tobacco Smoke as a Toxic Air Contaminant, California Environmental Protection Agency, March 2005.

Klepeis NE, Ott WR, Switzer P. Real-Time Monitoring of Outdoor Environmental Tobacco Smoke Concentrations: A Pilot Study. Stanford University Department of Statistics, Sequoia Hall, Stanford, California. March 1, 2004.

NC Prevention Partners. Buying Prevention Related Benefits: A 5-Step Guide for NC Employers. Available at: <http://www.ncpreventionpartners.org/basic/eguide.htm>. Accessed 3/19/2003.

Repace JL. Measurements of Outdoor Air Pollution from Secondhand Smoke on the UMBC Campus. June 1, 2005.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coordinating Center for Health Promotion, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2006.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke: A Report of the Surgeon General*.

**APPENDIX**

**Smoking Policies: Internal and External Environment**

**CIC Institutions and Government Agencies**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Internal Environment</b>	<b>Exceptions to Internal Policy</b>	<b>External Environment</b>
<b>Michigan State</b>	No smoking	Designated residential space and limited hotel rooms	No smoking near entrance/exits, reasonable distance
<b>Purdue*</b>	No smoking	Designated Union Club hotel spaces	No smoking 30 feet perimeter around buildings
<b>University of Chicago</b>	No smoking	Apartments and dormitories in buildings managed by Real Estate Operations	No smoking 15 feet from entrance/exit or enclosure of buildings.
<b>Indiana University, Bloomington</b>	No smoking	None	No smoking, 30 feet perimeter around buildings
<b>Michigan</b>	No smoking	Designated apartments, limited hotel/conference space	No smoking near entrance/exits, reasonable distance
<b>Northwestern</b>	No smoking	None	No smoking 25 feet from entrance/exits, designated outdoor facility
<b>Minnesota</b>	No smoking	Designated residence rooms	No smoking 25 feet from entrance/exits
<b>University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign</b>	No smoking	Designated overnight guest rooms	No smoking 25 feet front entrances/exits/fresh air intakes
<b>Ohio State **</b>	No smoking	Designated private residential space in University residence halls, apartments, hotel	No smoking in designated areas
<b>Penn State</b>	No smoking	Designated residential living such as apartments and hotel rooms	No smoking outside area adjacent to facility which would allow smoke to enter or affect internal environment, or affect those entering/exiting facility.
<b>CDC</b>	No smoking	None	No smoking on properties fully leased/owned by CDC; areas not under full CDC control, no smoking 20 feet of exit/entrances/air intakes and all covered parking
<b>NIH</b>	No smoking	None	No smoking 25 feet of exit/entrances, air intake ducts, no smoking covered parking

\* Indiana University/Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI) does have a comprehensive external ban.

\*\* All Ohio State University Medical Center locations are tobacco-free including main Medical Center Campus and associated clinic sites