

SMOKE-FREE POLICIES: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **Smoking should be prohibited in all indoor places including student housing, campus restaurants, and bars and pubs. Institutions should consider extending these restrictions outside buildings, including entranceways.**

Evidence and Effectiveness

Exposure to second-hand smoke increases the risk of lung cancer, heart disease, and a variety of other conditions.¹ The most effective means of reducing this risk is to implement comprehensive smoke-free policies. Beyond reducing exposure to second-hand smoke, smoke-free policies have also been found to lower tobacco consumption among employees, to motivate quitting, and to help ex-smokers stay quit.^{2,3,4,5} Within the context of universities and colleges, smoke-free policies in student housing have been shown to reduce smoking, particularly among students who were not regular smokers before entering college.⁶ Overall, smoke-free policies are a critical public health measure that have been identified as a priority by Health Canada.⁷

Feasibility

Smoke-free policies are popular among students. More than 90% of all students—including smokers—support campus-wide restrictions, including bans in student housing, campus bars, and restaurants.⁸ To date, a number of Canadian institutions have prohibited smoking in all campus buildings, including student residences and campus bars. Other schools, such as Lakehead and Dalhousie University, have gone a step further by prohibiting smoking outside buildings, anywhere on campus.

Considerations

- When introducing restrictions, particularly outside buildings, it is important to consider campus boundaries, the proximity of buildings, and the layout of outdoor gathering areas.
- New restrictions need to be communicated to the campus community in advance to ensure awareness, compliance, and a smooth transition.
- Changes in policy require adequate signage indicating where students/staff can smoke.
- Although non-compliance is very rare, plans for enforcement should be established. Campus Security or others responsible for enforcement should be consulted while the policy is being drafted.
- Changes can be more easily implemented at the beginning of the academic year.

SMOKE-FREE ENTRANCES: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **Smoking should be prohibited within 10 metres of building entrances, exits, open windows, and in front of air intake ducts, to allow nonsmoking members of the campus community and visitors access to all buildings without risk of exposure to the effects of tobacco smoke.**

Evidence and Effectiveness

Removing smoking from entranceways and from air-intake ducts is an important component of comprehensive smoke-free policies. It ensures that tobacco smoke does not enter indoor workplaces through open doors and ventilation systems and that workers are not exposed to the health risks from second-hand smoke.¹ Overall, smoke-free policies are a critical public health measure that have been identified as a priority by Health Canada.⁷

Feasibility

Smoking restrictions in entranceways are currently in place at a number of post-secondary institutions across Canada and are already legislated in several jurisdictions. Although most institutions have found students and staff comply with smoking restrictions in entranceways, some institutions have reported difficulties with enforcement. The following considerations will help to ensure that smoke-free restrictions in entranceways are successfully implemented on campuses.

Considerations

- When introducing restrictions, particularly outside buildings, it is important to consider campus boundaries, the proximity of buildings, and the layout of outdoor gathering areas.
- New restrictions need to be communicated to the campus community in advance to ensure awareness, compliance, and a smooth transition. A communication strategy should include memos to faculty and staff, the campus newspaper, a notice to incoming students in the welcome package, and meetings with Campus Security and building maintenance staff.
- Changes in policy require adequate signage indicating where students/staff can smoke. As well, outdoor ashtrays should be moved outside the designated smoke-free zone.
- Plans for enforcement should be established. Identify and educate those who will be responsible for carrying out enforcement, such as residence assistants or Campus Security.
- Changes can be more easily implemented at the beginning of the academic year.

Enforcement

The Environmental Health and Safety Office or Campus Security should field all complaints about tobacco policy violations and if non-compliance remains an issue, it is important to examine what barriers are preventing compliance: Is there adequate signage? Are there any ashtrays within the smoke-free boundary that might be sending mixed messages? Are there consistent reminders from security staff about the policy at the beginning of the school year and periodically throughout? Is the policy well publicised? Many smokers may not realize that the policy even exists and need to be educated when new to the campus.

On the positive side, there will be praise from people who no longer have to walk through “clouds of smoke” at building entrances. Overtime, as smoke-free entrance-ways become the norm, enforcement will probably be required less often.

TOBACCO EVENT SPONSORSHIP & PROMOTIONS: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **Any events sponsored by, or affiliated with tobacco companies including bar and nightclub events, should be prohibited from occurring anywhere on campus.**

Evidence and Effectiveness

Canadian tobacco companies have recently increased promotional events, including bar and nightclub events. Events such as the *Definiti Series* (Imperial Tobacco Ltd.) combine popular DJ's and contest giveaways with "cigarette girls", product displays, and extensive brand promotions in mainstream nightclubs and campus bars. These events integrate cigarettes into the social environment of students and are a primary means of building client data bases for more direct forms of advertising. In many cases, students who think they are attending a concert aren't aware of the tobacco connection until they enter the bar or nightclub. Overall, these promotional events are a highly successful means of promoting smoking and brand information directly to your students.⁹ In 2004, more than 80% of universities were approached to host a tobacco sponsored event and 18% had actually hosted such an event.⁸

Feasibility

The overwhelming majority of students support bans on all tobacco promotions and sponsorships on campus.⁸ Indeed, universities and colleges that have hosted such events have experienced a public backlash in the media and among their students.¹⁰ Policies prohibiting tobacco-sponsored events have been introduced at a number of institutions, including Memorial University, the University of Saskatchewan, and most recently at the University of Lethbridge.

Considerations

The main challenge of implementing bans on tobacco sponsorship and promotions is to ensure compliance. It is not immediately apparent that events such as the *Definiti* series are, in fact, affiliated with a tobacco company. As a result, it is critical that bar and nightclub staff explicitly ask whether an event is associated with a tobacco company when booking sponsored events.

TOBACCO ADVERTISING: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **All forms of tobacco advertising on campus should be prohibited, including campus newspapers, campus radio, as well as signage at campus bars and pubs. In addition, distribution of tobacco-related products and paraphernalia with tobacco logos should be prohibited.**

Evidence and Effectiveness

Tobacco advertising has a strong influence on smoking behaviour, and young adults and university students are particularly susceptible to tobacco advertising.^{9, 11} Since 1998, direct brand marketing has been prohibited by federal law in Canada; as of October 2003, sponsorship advertising also became prohibited. There has been a dramatic decrease in tobacco advertising in campus newspapers since the sponsorship advertising ban was introduced. However, despite federal restrictions, tobacco advertising is permitted in various forms, including promotional events, retail promotions, and signs and posters in bar settings. Print advertising and other more traditional forms have also been observed since the sponsorship ban.

Feasibility

There is strong student support for banning tobacco advertising on campus: approximately 91% support university-wide bans on tobacco promotions and agreements made between tobacco companies and student unions.⁸ To date, several institutions have prohibited tobacco advertising on campus, including Memorial University, Red River College, and New Brunswick Community College.

Considerations

Unlike most other policies, campus bans on tobacco advertising may entail some loss of revenue. In the past, some student executives have indicated that tobacco advertisements generate important funding for the campus paper and paid for colour printing. This issue needs to be addressed directly. Put simply, student executives and administrators should not pursue revenue at the cost of student health. Compliance of advertising bans must also be enforced. Newspaper editors, bar managers, and members of the administration must be aware of the policy and must confirm with agencies that their ads are unrelated to tobacco products or companies.

TOBACCO RETAIL PROMOTIONS AND MARKETING: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendations

- **Remove all signs, displays, and other tobacco paraphernalia from campus retail outlets.**
- **Remove shelf displays of cigarettes or “power walls” and place tobacco products under the counter or in an otherwise obscured location.**
- **Prohibit contracts and all payments to display tobacco products.**

Evidence and Effectiveness

Point-of-purchase (POP) marketing includes any merchandising devices, signs, or advertisements used inside or outside a retail store that provide information about products with the purpose of influencing purchasing behaviour. “Power walls” are the most vivid example of POP marketing: shelving or special display units of cigarette packs are placed behind the retail counter at eye-level. These shelves allow stores to carry and display quantities of stock that far exceed demand and form “walls” of cigarette packages and brand images for all customers to see. Tobacco companies have also expanded their use of counter top displays of cigarette packs and other branded paraphernalia. These “in-store” promotions are so common, that many people fail to recognize them as tobacco marketing. In fact, POP promotions have a significant impact on consumer behaviour and are particularly effective at reaching youth^{12,13,14} Consider that, in 2002, Canadian tobacco companies spent over \$70 million dollars on direct payment to retailers. Is your campus store one of them?

Feasibility

There is strong support among university students for removing cigarette displays from campus retail outlets. Over half of students support their removal, while fewer than 14% oppose removing cigarette displays from campus stores.⁸ To date, tobacco displays and point-of-purchase marketing bans have been introduced at a number of institutions, including the University of Toronto, Memorial University, and Grant MacEwan College.

Considerations

Tobacco retail promotions may generate some revenue. However, this revenue is generally quite modest, and is collected at a cost to student health: retail tobacco marketing increases sales and smoking among the students. When advocating for prohibitions on POP marketing it is important to acknowledge these arguments, and propose alternative sources of revenue.

CAMPUS TOBACCO SALES: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **The sale of tobacco products should be prohibited on campus property, including retail outlets run by the institution, as well as those that are leased from the institution.**
- **The policy should be enforced in any future contract between the university and new stores (private or student).**

Evidence and Effectiveness

The availability of tobacco products in campus stores reinforces the notion that smoking is a socially normative, sanctioned adult behaviour. More importantly, the sale of tobacco behind cash registers and counter displays stimulates regular and occasional smokers to purchase cigarettes when they may not otherwise do so. In prohibiting the sale of cigarettes, campuses are not denying the rights of students to buy and smoke cigarettes, but rather exercising their own right not to supply these cigarettes in the interests of student, faculty, and staff health. Both the American Cancer Society and the American College Health Association have endorsed policies to remove the sale of tobacco products from campus stores.

Feasibility

There is considerable support for removing tobacco sales from campus stores.¹⁵ Over half of university students typically support such a policy, with only one quarter opposing prohibition of tobacco sales on campus.⁸ There is also evidence that support for policies banning tobacco sales may increase following their introduction.⁸ Post-secondary institutions have the authority to prohibit the sale of tobacco products within student and administration-owned retail outlets, as well as in outlets leased to private businesses. To date, over 30 American colleges and several Canadian universities have already banned tobacco sales on campus, including Wilfred Laurier University, Brock University, Lakehead University, Grant MacEwan College, and Vancouver Community College.¹⁶

Considerations

Tobacco retail promotions may generate some revenue. However, this revenue is generally quite modest, and is collected at a cost to student health: retail tobacco marketing increases sales and smoking among the students. When advocating for prohibitions on POP marketing it is important to acknowledge these arguments, and propose alternative sources of revenue.

STOP-SMOKING SERVICES & SUPPORT: FACT SHEET

Policy Recommendation

- **Assign staff responsibility for smoking cessation services to public health nurses or other health service staff.**
- **Ensure health practitioners on campus are aware of clinical practice guidelines.**
- **Provide referral to counselling services, either on campus or off-campus resources such as the Canadian Cancer Society's local quit-line.**
(http://www.cancer.ca/ccs/internet/standard/0,3182,3172_49465673_langId-en,00.html)
- **Health plans should provide coverage of smoking cessation medications, including nicotine replacement therapies (nicotine gum and the patch) and bupropion for both staff and students.**
- **Promote awareness of cessation services on campus.**

Evidence and Evaluation

Approximately 80% of smokers between the ages of 17 and 25 try to quit each year, yet fewer than 10% succeed.¹⁸ At least one reason for this failure rate is that most smokers attempt to quit on their own, without any form of assistance.¹⁹ Although some smokers prefer to quit on their own, many young smokers lack appropriate access to smoking cessation services. Increasing access to cessation resources can help smokers to quit. Providing counselling services and full coverage of stop-smoking medications, including nicotine gum and the patch, are relatively low cost strategies to increase quit rates.^{17, 20, 21}

Feasibility

Smoking cessation services vary widely across post-secondary institutions: approximately half of institutions offer some type of smoking cessation program through student health insurance, but relatively few offer counselling, nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), and education.²²

Considerations

A number of institutions offering cessation programs have found that few students use these resources unless approached directly.²³ A lack of information or awareness of these services might also explain the low demand.^{24, 25} Cessation services must be publicized on campus to be effective. For example, some institutions have used email or campus media to promote cessation services. Information on student cessation needs and providing cessation services can be found at <http://www.leavethepackbehind.org/> or <http://www.ttac.org/college/index.html>

CAMPUS FACT SHEETS: REFERENCES

- ¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1986). *The health consequences of involuntary smoking. A report of the Surgeon General*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control.
- ² Fichtenberg, C.M. & Glantz, S.A. (2002). Effect of smoke-free workplaces on smoking behaviour: systematic review. *British Medical Journal*, 325; 188-195.
- ³ Levy, D.T. & Friend, K.B. (2003). The effects of clean indoor air laws: what do we know and what do we need to know? *Health Education Research*, 18(5); 592-609.
- ⁴ Hammond, D. McDonald, P.W., Fong, G.T., & Cameron, A.R. (2004). Cigarette warning labels, smoking bans, and motivation to quit smoking: Evidence from former smokers. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 95(3); 201-204.
- ⁵ Chaloupka, F.J. & Wechsler, H. (1997). Price, tobacco control policies and smoking among young adults. *Journal of Health Economics*, 16; 359-73.
- ⁶ Wechsler, H., Lee, J.E., & Rigotti, N.A. (2001). Cigarette Use by College Students in Smoke-Free Housing: Results of a National Study. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 20; 202-207.
- ⁷ Health Canada. Federal Tobacco Control Strategy: A Framework for Action. Available at: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/pubs/tobac-tabac/ffa-ca/index_e.html
- ⁸ Hammond, D., Costello, M.J. & Fong, G.T. (2004, May). *Tobacco Industry Marketing and Policy Support Among University Students: Findings from the Campus Tobacco Survey*. Paper presented at the Ontario Tobacco Control conference; Toronto.
- ⁹ Ling, P.M. & Glantz, S.A. (2002). Why and how the tobacco industry sells cigarettes to young adults: Evidence from industry documents. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92; 908-916.
- ¹⁰ Critics blast big tobacco sponsorship: Rothmans inks deal with students' union. *Calgary Herald*, October 3, 2003.
- ¹¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Reducing tobacco use: A report of the Surgeon General. (2000). Atlanta, Georgia, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health.
- ¹² Feighery, E., Ribisl, K.M., Achabal, D.D., Tyebjee, T. (1999). Retail trade incentives: How tobacco industry practices compare with those of other industries. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89;1564-1566.
- ¹³ Schooler, C., Feighery, E., Flora, J.A. (1996). Seventh Graders' Self-Reported Exposure to Cigarette Marketing and Its Relationship to Their Smoking Behaviour. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86;1216-1221.

- ¹⁴ MacFadyen, L., Hastings, G., MacKintosh, A.M. (2001). Cross sectional study of young people's awareness of and involvement with tobacco marketing. *British Medical Journal*, 322; 515-517.
- ¹⁵ Bentley, J.P., Lombardo, T.W., Tracy, J.J., Bentley, S.I., McCarthy, M.A., Payne, T.J., & Crews, K.M. (2004, February). Student Support for a University Policy Prohibiting Tobacco Product Sales on a College Campus. Poster presented at the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco Annual Conference, Scottsdale, Arizona.
- ¹⁶ List of US Colleges that have banned tobacco sales on campus. *California Youth Advocacy Network, March 2002*.
- ¹⁷ Fiore, M.C., Bailey, W.C., Cohen, S.J., Dorfman, S.F., Goldstein, M.G., Gritz, E.R., Heyman, R.B., Jaén, C.R., Kottke, T.E., Lando, H.A., Mecklenburg, R.E., Mullen, P.D., Nett, L.M., Robinson, L., Stitzer, M.L., Tommasello, A.C., Villejo, L., & Wewers, M.E. (2000). *Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence: Clinical Practice Guidelines*. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service.
- ¹⁸ Health Canada. (2004) Summary of Results for Wave 1 (February to June) of 2003. Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey (CTUMS), 2003.
- ¹⁹ Hammond, D., Fong, G.T., McDonald, P.W., & Borland, R. (2004). Do Smokers Know How to Quit? Knowledge and Adoption of Cessation Assistance in a Representative Sample of Daily Smokers. *Addiction*, In press.
- ²⁰ Shiffman, S., Gitchell, J., Pinney, J.M., Burton, S.L., Kemper, K.E, & Lara, E.A.. (1997) Public health benefit of over-the-counter nicotine medications. *Tobacco Control*, 6, 306-310.
- ²¹ Schauffler, H.H., et al. (2001) Variations in treatment benefits influence smoking cessation: results of a randomised controlled trial. *Tobacco Control*, 10;175-80.
- ²² Halperin, A. (2002, November). Impact of Tobacco Related Policies and Industry Promotions on Smoking among College Students and other Young Adults. Presented at American Public Health Association Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- ²³ Willcox, M.L. (1997). Tobacco control programmes for universities: a feasibility study. *Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 19; 37-44.
- ²⁴ Environics Research Group. (2003, September). Final Report: The health effects of tobacco and health warning messages on cigarette packages (survey of youth). Prepared for Health Canada.
- ²⁵ Curry, S.J., et al. (1998). Use and cost effectiveness of smoking cessation services under four insurance plans in a health maintenance organization. *New England Journal of Medicine*; 339; 673-9.