

Staff Council Member Feedback on Smoke-Free Campus Policy

1. The underlying premise seems to be that the university is restricting the choices of individuals because it is going to accept responsibility for ensuring that MSU stakeholders do not engage in first-person unhealthy activities (e.g. smoking and dipping) while at work. This causes concern. If the same principle is applied, then we would also exclude Burger King and sugary soft-drinks in practically every public place and dorm rooms on campus. Is there any way to reconcile the apparent double standard in that the university would prohibit all tobacco use but profit from the sale of Burger King Whoppers and Coca Cola? Wouldn't it be better to focus on the negative impacts of 2nd hand smoke on the health of those that do not smoke, but are exposed to smoke while on campus?
2. Smoking tobacco affects the health of those people who choose not to smoke, but are exposed to 2nd hand smoke. This is very different than smokeless tobacco use that only negatively impacts the health of the user. Smokeless tobacco may be disgusting, but it doesn't harm others. Could the policy not include the prohibition against smokeless tobacco?
3. The ban on accepting money from tobacco companies seems misguided. What is the rationale for including this? What would be lost if it was not included? If we follow the same logic, should the university be making money from Burger King Whoppers or Coca Cola? Should we also band the advertisement of the "unhealthy" and "addictive" foods?
4. This policy and way forward statement seems too paternalistic and values-based, instead of it being a 2nd-hand smoke public health issue. Is there some way to get rid of the paternalistic nature of the policy by limiting the scope and rationale to 2nd hand smoke.
5. Recommend allowing electronic nicotine delivery devices. The fact that they are not FDA approved seems irrelevant. They are a better alternative to cigarettes and they don't foul the air and ground.
6. Will the smoke free campus policy apply to the off campus facilities?
7. The policy and FAQs say that guests, employees and students are "expected" to abide by the policy. What are the repercussions for those who don't abide by the policy? Just being asked not to smoke is not going to keep everyone from doing it.
8. I agree with the policy - but am interested in how it got expanded to all tobacco types - I understand smoking because it does affect other people's health, but the other types seem to only affect the user - why are those types included in the "ban"?
9. I thought we already had the "No smoking within 25 feet of building entrances"? But that is clearly not enforced...
10. How will it be enforced? Why are there no "penalties" associated with those not following the policy?
11. Do you really expect someone to go sit in their closed vehicle on a 100 degree day and smoke? What happens when/if someone should happen to become overheated by having to sit in their extremely hot closed vehicle due to this policy? Will the University be held responsible?

12. The first concern I have is an error in the text of OP 91.301. Under IIA, the word faculty is used twice, concurrently. I am assuming this is an error, and someone else has already noticed and corrected it.

13. The only other comment I have is about enforcement. I understand that we want this to be enforced by a mere kind word. And that will probably work in most cases. However, there will be that one employee that insists on continually breaking the policy. I didn't see anything in here addressing that. I am assuming that person would just be instructed over and over to stop. But is that something that could continue going on forever? It seems so under this policy.