

Campuses Organized and United for Good Health (COUGH)

**Supporting Tobacco Control
Policy in California Post-
Secondary Institutions**

July 2008 to June 2010

Final Evaluation Report

9/27/2010

**CTCP Contract #05-45721
July 1, 2008—June 30, 2010**

Prepared by:

**Gregory Robinson, Ph.D.
Applied Research and Evaluation Services
and
Kimberlee Homer Vagadori , CYAN Project Director**

Submitted to:

**Vicki Webster, Managing Director
California Youth Advocacy Network, a project of:
Public Health Foundation Enterprises, Inc.**

**4811 Chippendale Drive, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95841**

**info@cyanonline.org 916/ 339-3424 voice
916/ 339-3425 fax**



This report was made possible by funds received from the Tobacco Tax Protection Act of 1988–Proposition 99, under Contract #05-45721 A-02 with the California Department of Public Health, Tobacco Control Program.

Suggested Citation:

Robinson, G. and Homer Vagadori, K. 2010. *COUGH final evaluation report*. California: Public Health Foundation Enterprises, California Youth Advocacy Network.

Abstract

In 2002, the California Youth Advocacy Network (CYAN) launched COUGH (Campuses Organized and United for Good Health), a statewide student-led advocacy campaign supporting healthy educational environments free of tobacco and tobacco industry presence.

Objective

The primary objective of CYAN's College Program for the two year period beginning July 2008 was:

By June 30, 2010, coordinate with local projects to implement the COUGH campaign with UC, CSU, CCC, or private/independent school systems within California to support policy efforts such as smoke-free areas, sponsorship, tobacco sales on campus, advertising and marketing, and cessation initiatives.

Primary Priority Area: (1) Counter Pro-Tobacco Influences

Secondary Priority Area: (2) Reduce Exposure to Secondhand Smoke

Primary Indicator (2.2.9), Secondary Indicator (1.1.8)

Project Description

Postsecondary educational institutions are key fronts in the movement to counter pro-tobacco influences and to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke. Total fall enrollment in California public and private degree-granting institutions in 2007 was 2,529,522 students, the highest in the nation (CA Postsecondary Education Commission). The support offered by COUGH is foundational to advocates striving to ensure a healthy educational environment free of tobacco and tobacco industry presence for students and the tens of thousands of staff, faculty and administrators who work on one of the 143 public or 209 private colleges or universities in California. CYAN assessed California colleges and universities finding that the majority of campuses sought to strengthen their tobacco use policies moving toward smoke-free and/or tobacco-free campus policies (which prohibit the use of all tobacco products).

To achieve its 2008-10 objective, CYAN implemented a variety of local community and statewide intervention activities, including 1) Recruit & coordinate a COUGH Student Advisory Board to develop a campaign strategy for the statewide movement and to inform the project about pressing tobacco control issues on college campuses, the social norms of college students, and culturally appropriate cessation and education messages for young adults; 2) Facilitate a four Statewide Days of Action on local college campuses, including annual Great American Smokeout and Earth Day events; 3) Develop sample policies, resolutions, and a policy database for local policy advocates at California colleges and universities; 4) Train college advocates at annual in-person and regional meetings to adopt, implement, and/or enforce new campus tobacco control policies.

Evaluation Methods

Reflecting CTCP's viewpoint in 2008 regarding the role of Statewide Technical Assistance grantees, outcome evaluation focused upon the documentation of project implementation indicators, or outputs. The evaluation design was non-experimental. Collaborating with TCEC, a Tracking Form was designed to record the training, technical assistance, coordination efforts, and materials disseminated to implement the COUGH campaign. Process evaluation focused upon what was happening in the field to inform and optimize the intervention. 1) One wave of six key informant interviews was conducted with campus representatives deliberately selected because their efforts to adopt and implement on-campus tobacco use policies were thought to have ended in success, or because their policy efforts encountered difficulty. 2) A web-based College Policy Implementation Survey sample was restricted to campus contacts known to be actively working on a tobacco use policy now or in the recent past. Utilizing a census approach, invitations to respond were e-mailed to 112 COUGH college contacts from 101 unique public and private institutions, resulting in 50 responses (49.5%). 3) All 81 instances of technical assistance provided to support COUGH were coded and analyzed.

Main Results

On 17 campuses the tobacco use policy in place in 2004 remains their current policy, on 23 campuses, a policy adopted *after* the 2004 policy is the current policy, 10 campuses adopted a third policy, which is their current policy. Campus policy work is a difficult and long-term endeavor conducted in a highly political and dynamic environment. Policies change not only to offer better protection from SHS but because earlier policies did not work. Absent or inadequate implementation is a key reason for policy failure. 48.6% report current policies do not include language concerning implementation and 35.1% did not develop an implementation plan, and enforcement is worse. 68.3% report notable resistance or problems with the current tobacco use policy. Faculty and especially Staff, account for higher proportions of the sources prompting formal reconsideration of a policy than students. Unions are especially problematic. Reactivity and susceptibility to formal reconsideration vary by policy type. 60% of TA requests focus upon policy adoption and less than 4% on implementation or enforcement.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Model implementation provisions for the primary policy types should be developed for inclusion in the written policy *at the point of adoption*. Model implementation plans should be identified or written and emphasized. Because 1/3 of persons named or appointed to oversee the implementation plan are campus health staff, education & resources should be allocated to assist them. CTCP funds to local grantees are vital to 40.6% of campuses that do not fund policy implementation. Strategies to deal with specific types & sources of resistance to campus policies should be developed. DSA policies should be discouraged in CA. Advocates need education re best practices for dealing with unions, which are powerful campus forces. 70% are working on new policies. Education regarding the key effect of strong implementation on policy acceptance, longevity and efficacy must be a priority in 2010-2013 to ensure their success.

Project Description

In 2002, the California Youth Advocacy Network (CYAN) launched COUGH (Campuses Organized and United for Good Health), a statewide student-led advocacy campaign. The mission of the COUGH campaign is to ensure a healthy educational environment free of tobacco and tobacco industry presence. The COUGH campaign promotes tobacco-free policy adoption, implementation, and enforcement; advocates for effective and accessible cessation services; and educates campus communities about comprehensive tobacco issues. When COUGH began, policy advocacy efforts focused on the California State University (CSU) system and its 23 campuses. Today, COUGH works with University of California (UC), CSU, California Community College (CCC), and private/independent schools and their systems on tobacco-related initiatives.

Background

COUGH was created in response to a legal issue in the CSU system. On June 13, 2001, the CSU General Counsel sent a memorandum to all campus presidents notifying them that they could not adopt any policy stronger than California State Law [no smoking within five feet of buildings (state law in 2001)]. This memorandum effectively prevented student advocates and tobacco prevention agencies from continuing any smoke-free policy work on a CSU campus. The memo from the Chancellor's Office also reversed any policies on campuses that exceeded the five foot law.

In response to the CSU General Counsel's memo, CYAN organized a Steering Committee including CSU faculty, staff, students, and California Tobacco Control Program (CTCP)-funded agency representatives. From the Steering Committee, a Student Workgroup developed including students from seven CSU campuses. This nascent student-led group created the identity and goals of what is known today throughout the nation as COUGH.

Shortly after being organized, COUGH student representatives together with CYAN College Program staff, appealed to the CSU Board of Trustees in May 2002 requesting that policy-making authority be granted to the individual campuses in the system. In response, the Trustees requested that the General Counsel's Office draft new policy language and report back to the Board in July. In September 2002, the Trustees unanimously adopted a Title V amendment giving power back to the campuses and recommending all campuses adopt a minimum 20-foot entryway policy. Within one year of the COUGH-directed policy change, 22 of the 23 CSU campuses adopted stronger campus tobacco-free policies. CYAN was recognized with two national awards for this accomplishment. For demonstrating leadership in a coalition and an innovative approach to tobacco policy, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services presented CYAN's College Program and COUGH with the 2003 *Innovation in Prevention Award*. The following year, CDC and the Directors of Health Promotion and Education awarded CYAN and COUGH *the State/Community Collaboration Award*.

In January 2004, AB 846 (Vargas) increased protection of building entryways by extending the 5-foot smoke-free area to 20 feet. In addition to increasing the smoke free distance around entryways, the language of the Assembly Bill was broadened to encompass all California public colleges and universities. This Bill marked a turning point for tobacco control advocates on college campuses. After alerting all 142 public colleges and universities in California to the new state law, CYAN began receiving requests to expand COUGH to post-secondary institutions outside the CSU system. One month following the implementation of AB 846, at the request of local advocates, CYAN revised the COUGH campaign's goals and objectives to include policy initiatives at the University of California as well as California Community Colleges.

CYAN subsequently led two additional system-wide advocacy campaigns, which have resulted in groundbreaking policy change. From 2004-2007, COUGH focused upon eliminating tobacco industry sponsorship within the CSU system. After three years of advocacy efforts, monitoring campus events, working with local CTCP-funded agencies and college advocates, providing training and technical assistance to advocates working on similar local policies, and working

directly with the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Chancellor's Office adopted a policy prohibiting tobacco industry sponsorship of CSU organizations and events. To date, CYAN continues to monitor events and report policy violations and successes to the Board of Trustees.

Also from 2004-2007, CYAN, through the COUGH campaign, partnered with the City of Berkeley, Council for Responsible Public Investment, and numerous University of California faculty, staff and students to advocate for a system-wide policy prohibiting tobacco industry funding of academic research. Before this UC-focused campaign began, the UC Office of the President adopted a policy that disallowed academic units (e.g., schools of public health) from denying funding from external sources such as tobacco companies. CYAN staff, along with other tobacco control advocates, worked extensively with key decision makers at UC to overturn this policy. This advocacy campaign included educating key decision makers on tobacco industry research funding, testifying at Board of Regents meetings, media advocacy activities, creating and maintaining a campaign website, producing educational materials, and organizing advocacy efforts among college students, faculty, and staff.

To gain the support of the UC Board of Regents, CYAN worked with and received endorsements from the Chairman of the Board of Regents, Lieutenant Governor John Garamendi, Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante, former Department of Justice attorney Sharon Eubanks, Senator Leland Yee, former Attorney General Bill Lockyer, and numerous other influential tobacco control and elected officials. In September 2007, the UC Board of Regents adopted a policy requiring additional oversight and approval of funding proposals submitted to tobacco companies. Since the adoption of this policy, no new tobacco funding has been awarded to a UC researcher.

Although COUGH's statewide work has garnered much public attention, it is the local work that continues to create daily change. CYAN's College Program has parlayed the training staff has received from the Midwest Academy, understanding of the theory of change, and

comprehensive knowledge of college systems and young adult tobacco use to train individuals from CTCP-funded agencies, non-funded organizations, and college campuses to build policy campaigns and to advocate for tobacco-free college and university campuses.

Objective

The primary objective of CYAN's College Program for the two year period beginning July 2008 was:

By June 30, 2010, coordinate with local projects to implement the COUGH campaign with UC, CSU, CCC, or private/independent school systems within California to support policy efforts such as smoke-free areas, sponsorship, tobacco sales on campus, advertising and marketing, and cessation initiatives.

Primary Priority Area: (1) Counter Pro-Tobacco Influences

Secondary Priority Area: (2) Reduce Exposure to Secondhand Smoke

Primary Indicator (2.2.9), Secondary Indicator (1.1.8)

Rationale for Selecting this Objective

Since beginning work with young adults in 1999, CYAN has continuously addressed tobacco-related problems on college campuses associated with the primary and secondary indicators. CYAN regularly assesses college campuses to determine training and technical assistance needs and to identify tobacco-related issues on campus that should be addressed through local and statewide advocacy campaigns. The four core indicators are assessed on all public colleges and universities and on selected private, trade, and technical colleges at the beginning of each fiscal year.

CYAN has identified a trend in tobacco-free policy change on college campuses since the initiation of the COUGH campaign. In 2002, the primary focus of local advocacy work was reducing exposure to secondhand smoke. Following two years of successful smoke-free advocacy campaigns at the state and local level, the focus shifted at the CSU and UC systems to

countering pro-tobacco influences and reducing the availability of tobacco on campus. In 2007, the primary focus shifted back to reducing exposure to secondhand smoke. Unlike the CSU and UC systems, reducing secondhand smoke exposure has been the main indicator addressed on community college campuses as well as private institutions in California.

To choose the indicator for the 2008-2010 grant period, CYAN assessed California colleges and universities finding that the majority of campuses sought to strengthen their tobacco use policies moving toward smoke-free and/or tobacco-free campus policies (which prohibit the use of all tobacco products). The type of smoke-free/ tobacco-free policy is dependent on the type of college proposing the policy; however, many campuses are advocating for transitional policies, or policies that gradually eliminate smoking or tobacco use on campus by moving from a designated area policy to a completely smoke-free policy. At many community college campuses, which tend to be smaller in student population and size, advocacy efforts focus upon the adoption, implementation, and enforcement of 100% smoke-free policies or policies that eliminate smoking on campus with the exception of parking lots. On larger campuses, such as those in the CSU and UC systems, campus advocates are seeking designated area policies, which will transition to 100% smoke-free policies within 1-2 years.

As a result of an in-depth review of campus policies, including policies affecting tobacco use, sales, sponsorship, advertising and marketing, and available cessation services, it is clear that the need to address all four core indicators on college campuses continues. Reduction of secondhand smoke is the primary indicator; however, due to the unique nature of college campuses and policy development, it is often possible to combine policy language affecting the other three indicators ensuring that California colleges and universities adopt policies that decrease tobacco use and eliminate tobacco industry influence on campus.

Intervention Activities

To achieve its 2008-10 objective, CYAN implemented a variety of local community and statewide intervention activities. The key activities included:

- Recruiting and coordinating a COUGH Student Advisory Board (SAB). The Student Advisory Board consists of students from California's three public institutions of higher education who have experience working on tobacco-related issues on their campuses. CYAN worked with the SAB to develop a campaign strategy for the statewide movement and regularly communicated with SAB members to learn about pressing tobacco control initiatives on college campuses, the social norms of college students, and culturally appropriate cessation and education messages for young adults. CYAN met with students face-to-face at least once annually and communicated regularly via e-mail. Student leaders on the SAB provided valuable feedback on statewide educational and policy campaigns and assisted with trainings for other student advocates working on local tobacco control initiatives.
- Facilitating a total of four Statewide Days of Action on local college campuses. The two annual Days of Action – Great American Smokeout and Earth Day – served as opportunities for California colleges to address tobacco issues on the same day as other schools throughout the states. CYAN selected the Great American Smokeout as a Day of Action to encourage colleges to promote local and campus-based cessation services and Earth Day to support tobacco control advocates to educate campus communities regarding the destructive influence of tobacco on the environment—an issue that concerns many individuals and college groups at this time. CYAN sent registration materials to all CTCP-funded organizations and college contacts, distributed advocacy campaign materials such as quit kits and reusable bags to participating campuses, provided event ideas and sample flyers in an event turnkey kit, and supported the development and placement of personalized advertisements in campus newspapers. All advertisements developed by CYAN are sent to TECC for their library collection.

- Development of sample policies, resolutions, and a policy database for California colleges and universities. CYAN researched policies in place at all public colleges and universities and organized the policies by school and type of policy. The policy database is available at www.cyanonline.org. Here, policies are categorized by location (national and California), educational system (UC, CSU, CCC), and policy type (tobacco use, sponsorship, advertising and marketing). The California policy lists are updated on a regular basis. The national tobacco-free and smoke-free lists are updated whenever the author organization (American Lung Association of Oregon and Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights) makes changes to the lists. In addition to maintaining the online database, CYAN makes available to college and tobacco control advocates its collection of sample policies and resolutions. CYAN sent general or campus-specific policies and resolutions in response to requests by colleges, organizations, or individuals. CYAN staff also works with local advocates to present sample policies and resolutions to key decision makers on campus.
- Training college advocates at an annual in-person meeting. CYAN invites college advocates working on local campus-based tobacco control initiatives to regional and statewide advocacy trainings. Regional trainings were designed for local CTCP-funded projects and college faculty and staff working on a tobacco-related issue on a college or university campus. Statewide advocacy trainings were conducted for college students advocating for the adoption, implementation, and/or enforcement of a new tobacco policy on campus.

Evaluation Methods

Reflecting CTCP's viewpoint in 2008 regarding the role of Statewide Technical Assistance grantees, this objective was categorized as "other, with measurable outcome." In this framework, outcome evaluation focused upon the documentation of project implementation indicators, or outputs. Collaborating with TCEC, a Tracking Form was designed to record the

training, technical assistance, coordination efforts, and materials disseminated to implement the COUGH campaign. With outcome evaluation focused upon documenting implementation activities, process evaluation was designed to focus upon what was happening in the field.

In the final approved evaluation plan, a series of key informant interviews was specified to inform a case study highlighting successful and unsuccessful college policy adoption, implementation and enforcement activities in California's public institutions of higher education. In addition to analyzing the experience of individuals connected to these policy efforts, the case study was designed to consider the role of CYAN's technical assistance and training and advocacy activities, coordination with local advocates, and the materials it disseminated to support campaign activities. This imparted a "formative evaluation" emphasis to the case study in that an analysis of the obstacles and facilitating factors encountered during tobacco control policy adoption and implementation efforts would inform COUGH's training activities and materials, optimizing them for field use.

Analysis of the transcripts resulting from the first wave of key informant interviews, however, surfaced problems with the plan to characterize the adoption, implementation and enforcement of campus tobacco policies as successful on some campuses, and as ending in impasse or failure on others. The accuracy of such characterizations, we learned, is transient. The process of campus tobacco control policy adoption, implementation and enforcement is complex, lengthy, and extremely dynamic. The experience of each campus is unique and dependent upon its political culture and the particular social and structural influences that impinge upon it. Each campus key informant experienced both "success" and "failure" as she or he negotiated shifting circumstances and responded to unique opportunities or particular areas of resistance over time.

The policy process is frequently enacted over multiple years. One CSU campus, for example, has been in a planning phase for three years. Policy adoption infrequently marks the end of advocacy, but sets the stage for continuing implementation and enforcement efforts and/ or

serves as a way station on the path to a more stringent campus policy. Even with a one-year retrospective timeframe (two waves of interviews were planned during this two-year contract period), building a case study contrasting successful and unsuccessful tobacco use policy processes was tantamount to evaluating a chess master based upon a few moves. The loss of a piece appearing to be a setback in the short term might appear very differently (e.g. an insightful positioning strategy) later in the game. More perspective on the policy process over time was required to understand the dynamic processes playing out in the field, and expanding the number of campuses in the study sample was necessary to identify patterns and common experiences. This knowledge is necessary to transcend consumer satisfaction and to conduct an accurate assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the COUGH project. During the second year of the contract period, both CYAN's evaluator and project director had concluded that something was needed to supplement key informant interview results to craft the resources and services that would most effectively support local policy advocates.

Presenting this rationale, CTCP responded positively to the request to substitute for the second wave of key informant interviews a campus survey detailing policy processes and activities from 2004 to the present time. The first wave of key informant interviews had confirmed a finding from survey work conducted during the 2005-08 work period. Despite the fact that the process of accomplishing tobacco control policy adoption or enhancement on each campus differs, particular aspects of the effort tend to be relevant across settings. For example, the extent to which a strong implementation plan is "built in" to a campus policy *at the outset* has a bearing on the length of time required to achieve an accepted, workable and effective campus policy, and enforcement provisions are necessary for compliance. Hence, the College Policy Implementation Survey was conceived.

Although they were certainly shaped to be responsive to the field, the training, coordination efforts, and materials disseminated to implement the COUGH campaign were guided by the work plan and mostly initiated by CYAN staff. The Tracking Form stipulated for the "collection of outcome data design" documented these activities. It occurred to us that it would be useful

as well to analyze data we had collected regarding *requests from the field* for technical assistance met by CYAN College Project staff. Looking at the nature of these requests in light of the data we collected on campus tobacco use policy processes, we reasoned, would best inform future support for local advocacy for campus tobacco control.

Research Design

This evaluation design was non-experimental. A wave of six key informant interviews was conducted during the first year of this two-year project, and the College Policy Implementation Survey was conducted near the end of the second year. Evidence of campaign implementation such as trainings, coordination activities, and materials disseminated was recorded on a Tracking Form throughout the project, and records of technical assistance provided also were maintained from July 2008 to June 2010. Regarding outcome evaluation, whether project activities led to the achievement of the objective becomes a tautological question when the objective is to implement the activities. Regarding process evaluation, we consider the data collected for this and related objectives¹ to be sufficient given the resources available to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention.

Sample Selection

Key Informant Interviews: In the first wave, six campus representatives were deliberately selected because their efforts to adopt and implement on-campus tobacco use policies were thought to have ended in success, or because their policy efforts encountered difficulty. In addition to community-based tobacco control advocates, and pro-tobacco control campus personnel, the pool of qualified participants was expanded to include input from organizational

¹ CYAN's first objective during this grant period was to provide simple and complex technical assistance to CTCP-funded programs and other health organizations and individuals on issues and campaigns including COUGH (Campuses Organized and United for Good Health). A large sample of technical assistance recipients was interviewed to obtain their feedback.

units like Human Resources, faculty and staff unions, and college administrators; groups that are frequently construed as “the opposition” in campus policy adoption and implementation work. One interview of the six in wave one was in this category.

College Policy Implementation Survey: Because of the depth of the survey questionnaire, rather than selecting a random sample, the survey sample was restricted to campus contacts that were known to be actively working on a tobacco use policy and/ or had worked on a policy in the recent past. Utilizing a census approach, invitations to respond and links to the College Policy Implementation Survey were e-mailed to 112 COUGH college contacts from 101 unique public and private institutions (98 public and three private). Invited survey respondents included representatives from CTCP-funded and non-funded organizations, college student health center personnel, college staff, college faculty, and students.

Eight incomplete survey responses were omitted, and ten duplicate responses (two or more contacts from one campus) were consolidated, resulting in a sample of 50 complete responses from the 101 unique California post-secondary institutions invited to participate. Because the sample was not randomly selected, no statistical technology exists to quantify sampling error. This response rate (49.5%) is certainly lower than optimal for generalization to the population of California public institutions of higher education actively or recently engaged in tobacco use policy development. The sample is geographically dispersed across the state from San Diego to Shasta County, however, and the distribution of responding campuses is equivalent to the distribution of campuses in the three California public college/ university systems. In sum, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that this sample accurately represents the population of inference (campuses recently or presently engaged in tobacco use policy adoption, implementation and enforcement), or that it is not a reasonable cross-section of that population.

Another limitation of a sample of 50 is the small size of particular subgroups of interest (e.g. educational system, campuses with a current policy of a particular type). The number of cases

in any statistical test exerts a strong influence upon the determination of statistical significance, and low cell sizes in this sample limit the extent to which statistically significant relationships will result from the analysis of these data.

CYAN College Project Technical Assistance Recipients: All 81 instances of technical assistance provided to support COUGH were excerpted from a total of 231 incidents of TA provided by CYAN in this contract period. This technical assistance was provided in response to requests from the field, as opposed to the activities reported on the tracking form, most of which were initiated by CYAN.

COUGH Project Implementation Tracking Form: Forty-one entries were recorded on the tracking form throughout the duration of the contract period from August 11, 2008 to June 22, 2010.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Key Informant Interviews: A semi-structured interview guide (See Appendix A) was developed by the evaluator and project director and pilot-tested during the first reporting period of the contract term. Stimulus questions were designed to capture the context, history, and outcome of efforts to adopt, implement, and enforce tobacco use policies on college campuses. The interview guide was deliberately left open, to allow the persons on the front line of campus policy efforts to tell their stories in the initial wave of key informant interviews. Interviews with campus personnel and local advocates associated with tobacco-control policies were scheduled at the respondents' convenience in May and June 2009. They were administered by the project evaluator over the telephone, audio-recorded with the interviewee's permission and transcribed.

College Policy Implementation Survey: CYAN's external evaluator and the CYAN Project Director collaborated to develop the College Policy Implementation Survey questionnaire. Five successive drafts were constructed and two were pilot-tested to refine the final questionnaire (See Appendix B), which was programmed into a web-based application for administration. Invitations to respond and links to the College Policy Implementation Survey were e-mailed to 112 COUGH college contacts from 101 unique public and private institutions. Two to three reminder e-mails or telephone calls were placed to current non-respondents to encourage their participation. Fifty respondents completed the College Policy Implementation Survey questionnaire in May, 2010. The ten-page survey questionnaire included 66 items, some of which were fixed-response, but many of which were open-ended, requiring both short and some rather extensive answers. The length and depth of this survey instrument may have contributed to limit the completion rate to 49.5%.

CYAN College Project Technical Assistance Records: All instances of technical assistance are recorded by CYAN staff on a reporting form. These data were processed and coded by the CYAN project director for the present study, to indicate the agency/ organization requesting assistance, the educational system of the referent campus, the type of policy under consideration, and the particular activity in the policy process for which technical assistance was provided. The coding sheet for the activities may be reviewed in Appendix C.

COUGH Project Implementation Tracking Form: CYAN's external evaluator collaborated with TCEC to develop a tracking form for use as an outcome data collection instrument. This form (See Appendix D) was posted on a web-based application, completed by CYAN staff as activities were completed, and monitored by the project's external evaluator.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data in the form of transcripts resulting from audio-recorded key informant interviews were content analyzed to identify themes, which are supported in reports by direct quotations, citing the transcript number and page. Data from the College Policy Implementation Survey was downloaded from a web-based application into a MS Excel spreadsheet where some questionnaire responses were recoded to facilitate quantitative analysis. This spreadsheet was imported into a statistical application (SPSS) for analysis including descriptive (e.g. frequencies, cross-tabulations) and inferential (e.g. ANOVA) techniques. Nonparametric measures of association (e.g. Spearman's rho) were computed to correlate categorical responses. CYAN College Project Technical Assistance Records were enumerated and coded into a MS Excel spreadsheet which was similarly imported into SPSS for analysis.

Evaluation Results

Work in Postsecondary Settings is Key to Advance CTCP Goals

Postsecondary educational institutions are key fronts in the movement to counter pro-tobacco influences and to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke. Total fall enrollment in California public and private degree-granting institutions in 2007² was 2,529,522 students, the highest in the nation. The second highest, 1,269,098 (50.2% of California enrollment) was reported by the state of Texas. The support offered by COUGH is foundational to ensure a healthy educational environment free of tobacco and tobacco industry presence for these students and the tens of thousands of staff, faculty and administrators who work on one of the 143 public or 209 private colleges or universities in California. COUGH counts 112 college contacts from 101 unique public and private institutions including representatives from CTCP-funded and non-funded

² California Postsecondary Education Commission, data graphed at:
<http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/50StateGraph.ASP>

organizations, college student health centers, college staff, college faculty, and students among those who are actively working, or have very recently worked on a campus tobacco use policy.

Campus Policy Work is Vigorous and On-going

Establishing 2004 as a point of departure, Table 1 presents the type of tobacco use policy currently in place on the 50 campuses responding to the College Policy Implementation Survey by order of adoption.

Table 1. Current Tobacco Use Policy Type by Order of Adoption

Campus Tobacco Use Policy	Policy in Place Since 2004 Count (%)	Policy Adopted After 2004 Count (%)	Third Policy Adopted Count (%)	Current Policy Count (%)
No Smoking within 20 feet of entryways, state law	7 (41.2)	1 (4.3)	1 (10.0)	9 (18.0)
No Smoking within a distance greater than 20 feet of entryways, stronger than state law	5 (29.4)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (16.0)
Smoking only in designated areas	4 (23.5)	10 (43.5)	1 (10.0)	15 (30.0)
Smoking in all parking lots only	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	2 (20.0)	5 (10.0)
Smoking only in designated parking lots	1 (5.9)	3 (13.0)	2 (20.0)	6 (12.0)
100% Smoke free campus	0 (0.0)	2 (15.4)	1 (10.0)	3 (6.0)
100% Tobacco free campus (includes smokeless tobacco products)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	2 (20.0)	3 (6.0)
Other Policy Description	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (2.0)
Total	17	23	10	50 (100.0)

Table 1 shows that 17 campuses indicated that the tobacco use policy in place in 2004 remains their current policy. Twelve of these are community college campuses (30% of the 40 responding community colleges) and five are California State University campuses (71.4% of the seven survey respondents in the CSU system). On 23 campuses, a tobacco use policy adopted *after* the 2004 policy is the current policy. This category includes 19 (47.5%) of the 40 community colleges responding to the survey, two (28.6%) of the CSU campuses, one of the two University of California campuses and the lone private university in the sample. Ten campuses reported adopting a policy to replace their 2004 tobacco use policy, following that with the adoption of a third policy, which is their current policy. In this category are nine (22.5%) of the 40 Community College campuses and one of the two UCs.

The date of policy adoption on the 17 campuses where the tobacco use policy currently in place was the policy in place in 2004 ranges from 1987 to 2004. (In December 1987, Merced College adopted a policy banning smoking within 20 feet of entryways, presaging the state law adopted in January, 2004.) On the 23 campuses where a policy adopted after the policy in 2004 remains the current tobacco use policy, the year of adoption ranges from 2004 to 2010, and on the ten campuses that adopted a third tobacco use policy, the year of adoption ranges from 2006 to 2010.

Accomplishing Policy Adoption

Key informant interviews drive home the point that campus tobacco use policy work is hard work, and “it’s a constant battle.” It is important for advocates to recognize that typically, policy processes span several years. This is particularly true as the strategy of phased policy adoption, or transitional policies (e.g. from “designated smoking areas” to tobacco-free) are more frequently employed.

“This policy has been worked on by multiple agencies and students for the past 10 years.”

“AND I worked on this for a total of 5 years before accomplishing it.”

“Patience. Baby steps are OK.”

The fact that college and university campuses and systems are highly political environments can not be overemphasized. All key informants and many survey respondents stressed the importance of understanding the process of local governance. Knowledge of campus governance procedures is a prerequisite for successful policy advocacy. Complex, overlapping or diffuse structures of campus/ system governance can make matters difficult and prolong the process. For example, some university campuses support both general academic and medical school administrations, which operate completely independently. In community college systems, multiple levels of governance (campus administration, district administration, and a local Board of Trustees or Governing Board; all beneath a system-wide Chancellor) add complexity and present opportunities to policy opponents to misrepresent intentions or to stall the process. Moreover, as the CYAN project director observes, particular challenges arise from the California standard of shared governance:

“Campuses throughout the country are adopting 100% tobacco-free or smoke-free policies in a matter of months. Many of these campuses don’t have unions and/or don’t practice shared governance. Thus, campus administrators can adopt a policy without soliciting feedback from others on campus. In California, all our public colleges and universities practice shared governance and all of them have unions. Therefore, if a president or chancellor adopts a policy without feedback from students, faculty, and staff, backlash is certain.”

The Campus Policy Environment is Highly Dynamic

A review of Table 1 shows that stronger policies tend to be adopted to replace less stringent policies, and that more stringent policies are adopted more recently, but this isn’t always the case. For example, one community college campus advanced from a 2004 tobacco use policy consistent with state law to a policy relegating smoking only to designated parking lots, only to retreat to the previous policy. Policy advances are frequently motivated by the desire for more comprehensive protection from second-hand smoke. The CYAN project director hypothesizes that,

“Schools that change their policies 1-3 times do so because they have a weak policy (e.g. entryway) and/or the second policy they adopted didn’t work because it was too weak (e.g. Designated Smoking Areas). We have seen a trend of schools adopting slightly stronger policies that didn’t work and then a couple years later they go back and adopt stronger policies.”

A key element of this quotation is “policies that didn’t work.” Why don’t campus tobacco use policies work? We found that a central answer lies in the process of policy implementation, and to a lesser extent, in the process of policy enforcement.

Implementation Plans and Provisions Included in the Written Tobacco Use Policy

Of 37 College Policy Implementation Survey respondents, 18 (48.6%) indicated that, “our current tobacco use policy does not include any language concerning implementation” and 19 (51.4%) identified a total of 36 with a mean of 1.89 implementation provisions in their written policies.

Table 2. Implementation Provisions in Written Tobacco use Policies

Implementation Provision	Count (%)
Locations where policy will be posted or published (signage, campus catalogues, etc.)	10 (27.8)
The individual(s) responsible for policy implementation activities	8 (22.2)
Dates during which the policy will be implemented	8 (22.2)
A telephone number for questions, concerns, suggestions or complaints	5 (13.9)
Specific implementation activities (e.g. means of educating student body, relocation of ash cans, etc.)	5 (13.9)
Total	36 (100.0)

Survey respondents with current policies limiting smoking to designated areas ($n= 2$, $M= 3.5$) and those with 100% tobacco-free campuses ($n= 2$, $M= 3.0$) reported more implementation provisions on average than respondents with other types of current campus tobacco use policies

Among the 37 who answered, 13 (35.1%) reported that “No implementation plan was developed,” 11 (29.7%) did develop an implementation plan, “Prior to policy adoption,” and five (13.5%), “After policy adoption.” The remaining eight did not endorse any of these alternatives, but provided comments including:

“In progress,”

“Phase 1 implementation plan was developed prior to adoption, but Phase 2 was not,”

“No change in implementation since 2001,”

“We had an implementation strategy but this has evolved with time as we try to adapt to the resistance around us,”

“Just keeps getting ignored.”

As one might expect, the number of implementation provisions included in the written campus tobacco use policy differs significantly according to whether and when an implementation plan was developed. Among the ten respondents who answered both questions and reported that no implementation plan was developed, the mean number of implementation-related provisions in the written policy was 0.30; a much lower average than among the 11 campus representatives who reported developing an implementation plan, “Prior to policy adoption,” ($M= 1.91$ provisions in the written policy) and four whose plan was developed “After policy adoption” ($M= 1.5$ provisions in the written policy); $F(2,22)= 5.917, p < .01$.

Policy Implementation Detail

Half ($n= 17, 50.0%$) of the 34 campus representatives who answered the question indicated that someone was specifically named or appointed to oversee the implementation plan, and half indicated that no one was named or appointed. One third ($n= 5$) of these were vice presidential positions, most in student services or student affairs and one vice president of administrative affairs. Another third ($n= 5$) were health staff including coordinators of health

education/ wellness, health services staff, and a smoking cessation counselor and grant administrator. Oversight of the implementation plan was apparently provided by law enforcement personnel on two campuses, and other responses included, “Dean of Student Life,” “Director of Risk Management” and “Smoking Task Force Members.”

Nineteen (59.4%) of the 32 respondents who answered indicated that the campus or system covered the cost of implementing the current tobacco use policy, and 13 (40.6) that it did not. Thirteen of the campus representatives who replied that the campus or system did not cover implementation costs identified the entity that covered costs. Two of these answers indicated that there were no costs associated with the current policy, one respondent answered, “No one, the policy was never implemented,” and five named grant funds, e.g. “Tobacco prevention and education grant,” and “Mini grant from tobacco control.”

A sum of the reported frequencies for each of a number of specific tobacco use policy implementation activities was computed for the 39 campuses from which a representative reported that one or more of these activities had been conducted. This total implementation activity score ranges from three to 109 with a mean of 62.8 and median of 62. The total policy implementation activity score is not related to the public education system, to the current policy’s position in the implementation sequence (in place since 2004, a policy replacing the 2004 policy, or the third policy counting from 2004), or to the current policy type.

A relationship is evident, however, between the total policy implementation score and the existence and timing of an implementation plan. Although there is a great deal of within-category variation, the mean implementation activity score ($M= 79.9$) is highest among the eleven campuses that developed an implementation plan prior to policy adoption, lower ($M= 67.2$) among the five campuses that developed a plan after policy adoption, and lowest ($M= 54.7$) among the ten campuses that reported no implementation plan was developed. This result does not attain the threshold for statistical significance ($p= .094$), because of within-

category variability and because of the small number of cases ($n= 26$) with data on both measures.

Implementation Rating

Thirty-nine of 50 campus representatives rated the extent to which their current tobacco use policy had been implemented on a scale from 1= “Not implemented at all” to 4= “Implemented very well.” The mean rating is 2.69, corresponding to a position seven-tenths a point above “Not very well” and three-tenths below “Somewhat well.” This rating is not associated with the educational system, however there is weak evidence pointing to a positive association between the implementation rating and the number of implementation provisions included in the written tobacco use policy, between the rating and the policy progression process and year of policy adoption, and between the implementation rating and the reported frequency of all implementation activities. In contrast to these weak associations, respondents’ ratings of the campus tobacco use implementation process are significantly different according to *whether and when an implementation plan was developed*.

As the implementation rating increases, so does the average number of implementation provisions in the written policy (from zero to 1.86)—See Table 3, suggesting (perhaps the obvious) conclusion that campus tobacco use policy implementation is stronger when specific provisions are included in the written policy. This relationship is not statistically significant, primarily because of the small number of cases in the analysis.

Table 3. Mean Number of Implementation Provisions in the Written Tobacco Use Policy by Policy Implementation Rating

Implementation Rating	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> Implementation Provisions
Not implemented at all	2	0.00
Not very well	14	0.86
Somewhat well	9	1.78
Implemented very well	7	1.86
Total	32	1.28

The mean policy implementation rating from 1= Not implemented at all to 4= Implemented very well descends incrementally from a high of 3.56 ($n= 9$) among campus representatives who reported developing an implementation plan “Prior to policy adoption,” to $M= 2.80$ ($n= 5$) among those who developed a plan “After policy adoption,” and to a low of 2.25 ($n= 12$) among survey respondents reporting that no implementation plan was developed; $F(2,23)= 7.596$, $p < .005$.

Among the 15 respondents that indicated their current campus tobacco use policy was implemented, “Not very well,” the average total implementation activity score ($M= 56.7$) is based upon a range from 12 to 109 (the highest score in the distribution). Conversely, among the eight campus representatives that reported their current policy was implemented, “Very well,” the mean activity score ($M= 71.8$) is based upon a range from 32 to 106. It is curious that the total implementation activity score is not more strongly associated with the overall policy implementation rating. Apparently, the frequency of implementation activities doesn’t contribute as much to the overall assessment of policy implementation as does the early development of an implementation plan.

Tobacco Use Policy Enforcement

Table 4. Enforcement Provisions Included in Written Tobacco Use Policies

Enforcement Provision	Count (%)
That violators will be referred to the appropriate Dean, Director or HR representative	8 (38.1)
That violators will be cited by campus police-security	6 (28.6)
That violators will be issued a verbal warning	4 (19.0)
That violators will be issued a written warning	3 (14.3)
That repeat violators will be fined	0 (0.0)
Total	21 (100.0)

Sixteen (57.1%) of 28 respondents indicated that no enforcement provisions were included in their written campus tobacco use policies, eight (28.6%) identified one provision, one each identified two and three provisions, and two respondents noted four enforcement provisions for a total of 21 provisions among 12 respondents, and a mean across 28

campuses of 0.75 provisions. These are presented in descending order of their frequency of endorsement in Table 4. Enforcement provisions in written tobacco use policies are fewer and less frequent than implementation provisions. Voices from the field show that this is a mistake:

“Explore this first before you pass a policy.”

“Lack of enforcement makes implementing new policy very difficult.”

“Must have a clear and strong enforcement plan in place PRIOR to implementation.”

“Need well defined enforcement plan with responsible parties named.”

“It is very hard to enforce a policy without a plan on how to enforce it!”

“While the overwhelming majority of students, staff and faculty are not smokers and want a smoke free campus, they are less willing to approach their smoking peers and remind them of the policy change. As a result a core of student smokers continue to violate the policy and largely with impunity. Many people want to see the policy enforced but actually doing such a thing is not as easy as handing out tickets. As our Public Safety Director has pointed out to us, you need a system for identifying the violator and record this for first, second and third

violations, if a ticket is issued, how do you follow up on those who don't pay. How can it be enforced evenly across a campus population of students, staff, faculty and visitors especially when there are unions involved. The list goes on.”

Forty-three of 50 survey respondents rated the extent to which their current tobacco use policy was enforced on a scale from 1= “Not enforced at all” to 4= “Enforced very well.” The mean rating is 2.16, corresponding to a point about two/ tenths above “Not very well.” Compared to the rating of implementation ($M= 2.69$) this mean suggests that tobacco use policy enforcement is a greater problem on California campuses than is implementation. The mean enforcement rating is slightly higher on community college campuses ($M= 2.29, n= 34$) than on CSU ($M= 1.50, n= 6$) and UC campuses ($M= 2.00, n= 2$), but these differences between educational systems are not statistically significant. Like policy implementation, however, there is weak evidence pointing to a positive association between the enforcement rating and the number of enforcement provisions included in the written tobacco use policy, and between the enforcement rating and the policy progression process.

Problems with, or Resistance to Tobacco Use Policies

Of the 41 campus representatives answering the question, over two thirds ($n= 28, 68.3%$) indicated that there had been notable resistance to the current tobacco use policy, or that there had been problems with it. Less than one third ($n= 13, 31.7%$) reported no such problem or resistance. Sources of resistance identified included students ($n= 22, 40%$), Faculty ($n= 13, 23.6%$), Staff ($n= 11, 20.0%$), and Administration ($n= 7, 12.7%$),

Among the 28 survey respondents who reported a problem with the current tobacco use policy or notable resistance to it, 23 (82.1%) indicated that the resistance/ problem had not forced formal reconsideration of the policy, but five (17.9%) indicated that it had. The 23 campus representatives who reported problems or resistance that *did not* result in formal reconsideration of the policy reported a total of 42 sources of resistance ($M= 1.83$ sources per respondent) and the five who described resistance that *did* result in formal reconsideration

reported 13 ($M= 2.6$ sources per respondent); a higher average although the difference doesn't quite attain the threshold for statistical significance. Students comprised 45.2% of the sources of resistance when that resistance did not force formal reconsideration of the policy and 23.1% of the sources when resistance did cause the campus tobacco use policy to be formally reconsidered. Faculty and especially Staff, however, account for higher proportions (30.8%) of the sources prompting formal reconsideration of a campus tobacco use policy than the sources of resistance that did not cause the policy to be reconsidered (21.4% and 16.7%, respectively). The differences between proportions are not statistically significant, however.

Table 5. Count and Percent of Codes Assigned to Describe Resistance to the Current Campus Tobacco Use Policy

Type of Resistance	Count (%)
Assertion of Smokers' Rights	7 (18.4)
Lack of, or Difficulty with Enforcement	6 (15.8)
Implementation Issue, e.g. Signage, Ash Cans	5 (13.2)
Inconvenience of Designated Areas	5 (13.2)
Smokers Refuse to Comply	4 (10.5)
Smokers' Complaints	3 (7.9)
Unions, Framing Issue as Working Conditions	3 (7.9)
Nonsmokers' Complaints	1 (2.6)
Other	4 (10.5)
Total	38 (100.0)

Tied for third most frequently mentioned difficulty with campus tobacco use policies are implementation issues and complaints regarding the inconvenience associated with smoking only in designated areas.

Table 6. Count and Percent of Campus Tobacco Use Policy Resistance Codes by Whether Resistance caused Formal Reconsideration

Type of Resistance	Did NOT Cause Formal Reconsideration Count (%)	DID Cause Formal Reconsideration Count (%)	Total Count (%)
Assertion of Smokers' Rights	5 (18.5)	2 (18.2)	7 (18.4)
Lack of, or Difficulty with Enforcement	5 (18.5)	1 (9.1)	6 (15.8)
Implementation Issue, e.g. Signage, Ash Cans	2 (7.4)	3 (27.3)	5 (13.2)
Inconvenience of Designated Areas	5 (18.5)	0 (0.0)	5 (13.2)
Smokers Refuse to Comply	3 (11.1)	1 (9.1)	4 (10.5)
Smokers' Complaints	2 (7.4)	1 (9.1)	3 (7.9)
Unions, Framing Issue as Working Conditions	1 (3.7)	2 (18.2)	3 (7.9)
Nonsmokers' Complaints	1 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.6)
Other	3 (11.1)	1 (9.1)	4 (10.5)
Total	27 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	38 (100.0)

Interestingly, problems related to policy enforcement appear to be less influential with regard to forcing formal reconsideration of a campus policy than problems or resistance related to implementation issues (second and third data rows in Table 6), which account for the largest proportion of issues on campuses where the policy was forced into formal reconsideration. It also appears that the involvement of unions, or framing tobacco use as a working conditions issue, tends to force a formal reconsideration of campus tobacco use policies. The latter point was emphasized by local policy advocates:

“Form committees and get influential people to join you. AND Union issue seems to be the biggest problem on the horizon.”

“The various Unions are such an obstacle!”

One campus representative described resistance leading to formal reconsideration of the policy *prior to its adoption*. Resistance was described as:

“Smoker's rights issues; over regulated; too much government; change of working conditions.”

This rather cryptic description of the problem with the proposed policy suggests that staff or faculty (and perhaps their union) became involved when the issue was phrased as a “change of working conditions.”

Considering the 28 campuses from which a representative reported a significant problem with, or resistance to the tobacco use policy, the number of constituencies involved appears to be related to the outcome of the resistance or problem. The average number of constituencies (students, staff, faculty, administration and “Other”) involved when the issue *did not* force formal reconsideration of the tobacco use policy ($n= 23$, $M= 1.83$) is lower than when the policy was reconsidered with an eye toward rolling it back or weakening it ($n= 3$, $M= 2.33$) and when the policy was reconsidered with an eye toward strengthening it, or replacing it with more stringent controls ($n= 2$, $M= 3.00$). Because of the small number of cases, this is not a statistically significant difference, nor is it (because of the small sample) a very reliable finding. It does suggest, however, that the action and involvement of multiple campus constituencies is related to policy change, for better and for worse.

From highest to lowest (proportionally), the policies that resulted in the most frequent resistance are 100% smoke free (problems with 3 of 3—100.0%); Smoking in all parking lots only (problems or resistance with 3 of 3—100.0%); 100% tobacco fee—includes smokeless tobacco (there were problems with 2 of 2—100.0%), No smoking near entryways—State Law (issues with 4 of 5—80.0%); Smoking only in Designated Areas (problems or resistance with 10 of 14—71.4%); Smoking only in Designated Parking Lots (problems with 4 of 7—57.1%); and

policies stronger than State Law prohibiting smoking at a distance greater than 20 feet from entryways (resistance with 1 of 6—16.7%).

Whether there was a problem with or significant resistance to a campus tobacco use policy is not related to the campus representative’s perception of how well the policy was implemented or enforced. Whether that problem or resistance forced a policy into formal reconsideration is weakly related to the implementation rating, however. As depicted in Table 7, the picture comes into sharper relief when the categories did/ did not force formal reconsideration are expanded.

Table 7. Mean Policy Implementation Rating by Circumstances Related to Policy Resistance, Formal Reconsideration and the Purpose of Reconsideration

Campus Circumstances	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> Implementation Rating
No Problems or Resistance to the Policy	11	2.91
Problems or Resistance that did not Cause Formal Reconsideration	21	2.76
Problems Forced Formal Reconsideration to Weaken Policy	3	2.33
Problems Forced Formal Reconsideration to Strengthen Policy	2	1.50
Total	37	2.70

Although between-group differences in the mean implementation rating do not achieve the threshold for statistical significance [$F(3, 33) = 1.771, p = .172$], this intriguing pattern of diminishing means certainly focuses attention upon the effect of policy implementation upon its (the policy’s) ultimate outcome.

Future Policy Intentions

In response to the question, “Are you and/or others on your campus currently working on or planning to advocate for a new (or stronger) tobacco use policy?” 28 (70.0%) of the 40 campus representatives who answered said “Yes,” and 12 (30.0%) replied no. The length of time a

policy has been in place is unrelated to plans to pursue a more stringent tobacco use policy in the future. Twelve (80%) of 15 campus representatives who report the current policy was in place in 2004 are working on a new policy, as are six (75.0%) of eight whose current policy is the third, counting from the policy in place in 2004. It is interesting to note that pursuing a new policy is *completely unrelated* to the experience of problems or significant resistance to the current tobacco use policy, the outcome of that resistance, and to the number of campus constituencies involved.

Importantly, however, whether a new policy is being pursued is related to the implementation of the current tobacco use policy. First, the mean number of implementation provisions written into the language of the current policy is significantly related to the pursuit of a future policy. Among 23 campuses that are pursuing new policies, the mean number of provisions ($M= 0.87$), is lower ($M= 1.70$) than among the ten campuses that are not pursuing a new policy; $F(1, 31)= 4.555, p= .041$.

Second, although the difference is not statistically significant, the mean sum of the reported frequencies for each specific tobacco use policy implementation activity reported (See page 24) is considerably lower ($M= 57.9$) among the 24 campuses pursuing a new policy than it is ($M= 71.3$) among the 12 that are not. Third, on the four-point policy implementation rating scale (1= Not implemented at all, 4= Implemented very well), the mean rating from the 24 survey respondents on campuses that are pursuing a new policy is ($M= 2.42$), significantly lower than the mean rating ($M= 3.10$) produced by respondents on the ten campuses that are not pursuing a new policy; $F(1, 32)= 4.640, p= .039$. Although the difference between means is not as great, and the analysis is not statistically significant, a similar pattern is observed on the mean rating of enforcement which is lower ($M= 1.93$) among the 27 campuses pursuing a new policy than on the 11 ($M= 2.45$) that are not; $F(1, 36)= 3.821, p= .058$.

Finally, ten (90.9%) of eleven campuses that did not develop an implementation plan for their current tobacco use policy are pursuing a new policy, compared to seven (53.8%) of thirteen

campuses that developed an implementation plan either prior to, or after policy adoption. This is not to say that strong implementation of a weak tobacco use policy is a happy endpoint. Pursuit of a more stringent tobacco use policy is always positive, and seven of ten campuses are doing so; campuses with current policies at every level of stringency. These findings do suggest, however, that implementation is key to a policy that a campus can live with. A survey respondent emphasizes this point:

“Planning the implementation phase really well [is important] and be prepared to sustain this phase for a year or more. It will have to be multi-faceted in its approach. It must be bonded with every facet of campus operations. It must be in information that goes out to prospective students, in tours given to prospective students and their parents, in letters of acceptance, in new student orientations, in residence hall orientations, articles in the school paper, evident at every campus function, the list goes on.”

College Project Technical Assistance

Analysis of the responses to the 81 requests for technical Assistance provided by the CYAN College project during its two-year work period show that over half ($n= 42$, 51.9%) originate from persons on college and university campuses, with the remainder originating from ALA branches ($n= 11$, 13.6%), LLAs ($n= 11$, 13.6%), other agencies ($n= 13$, 16.0%) and CTCP ($n= 4$, 4.9%).

The educational system of the referent campus is approximately proportional to the distribution of public colleges and universities, however private postsecondary institutions (11.6%) are underrepresented. Interestingly, the largest proportion of policy types for which assistance is required are entryway policies consistent with state law ($n= 38$, 54.3%), followed by Designated Areas policies ($n= 18$, 25.7%).

Over three of every five technical assistance requests ($n= 55$, 61.8%) concern policy adoption. Just three requests (3.4%) had to do with policy enforcement and three requests (3.4%) with

policy implementation. Cessation ($n= 7, 7.9\%$) and other requests ($n= 21, 23.6\%$) complete the distribution.

College Project Outcome Tracking Form and TA Recipient Feedback

Forty-one trainings, coordination activities, and I&E visits conducted between 8/11/2008 and 6/22/2010 were documented by CYAN College Project staff. It is difficult to assess the total number of event/ meeting attendees because units reported include the number of individuals in some cases and the number of college campuses in others. Across the 39 events in which data are recorded, attendance ranged from one to 150, with a mean of 29.6 and a sum of 1,153. The latter figure underestimates the number of individuals who received direct training or consultation from COUGH training staff. These program monitoring data are submitted to CTCP to solely to establish project accountability.

To assess the extent to which CYAN technical assistance is perceived to be valuable in the field, on-going telephone surveys are conducted with TA recipients. On a 4-point scale where 4= "Excellent," "Strongly Agree," or "Very Satisfied," mean ratings provided by CYAN TA recipients were Courtesy (3.82), Knowledge (3.77), Helpfulness (3.71), Easy to Understand (3.82), Overall Satisfaction (3.77) and Perceived Quality of the TA received (3.95). These are remarkably high ratings, and they have been consistently obtained in the four reporting periods comprising this contract period. Clearly, CYAN has met its objective with regard to implementation of the COUGH program. The next section of this Final Evaluation Report provides recommendations that might further advance advocacy for local campus tobacco use policy,

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Collectively, these data convey a strong emphasis to supporting policy implementation. Its effect upon the policy process is profound. With due consideration to pragmatic concerns,

more stringent policies should be pursued to better protect students, faculty, staff and administrators not because previous policies failed because of poor implementation and enforcement.

- To the extent that they generalize across campuses, model implementation provisions for the primary policy types should be developed for inclusion in the written policy *at the point of adoption*. The finding that survey respondents with current policies limiting smoking to designated areas ($n= 2$, $M= 3.5$) and those with 100% tobacco-free campuses ($n= 2$, $M= 3.0$) reported more implementation provisions on average than respondents with other types of current campus tobacco use policies provides a start-point for a content analysis of policy language to identify and promote implementation provisions.
- Model implementation plans should be emphasized. The fact that 35.1% of survey respondents reported that “No implementation plan was developed,” indicates a strong need in this area. That three of every five technical assistance requests focused upon policy adoption points to the fact that advocates require education regarding the importance of implementation planning and the early development of an implementation plan.
- Data showing that frequency of implementation activities is not strongly related to successful implementation indicates that if you don’t have an implementation strategy, lots of activities may be presented, but they may not successfully reach key audiences.
- The fact that one third of the persons specifically named or appointed to oversee the implementation plan are health staff including coordinators of health education/ wellness, health services staff, and a smoking cessation counselor points to providing tobacco prevention and education resources to college health centers to assist them with policy implementation.
- The fact that 40.6% of survey respondents reported that the campus or system did not cover the cost of implementing the current tobacco use policy, and five named grant funds, e.g. “Tobacco prevention and education grant,” and “Mini grant from tobacco control,” as sources that covered this gap indicates the value of TCP funding to support colleges and universities to implement their policies.

- Weak evidence pointing to a positive association between the policy enforcement rating and the number of enforcement provisions included in the written tobacco use policy indicates that a secondary effort to educate and support local advocates to develop enforcement plans and to include enforcement provisions in policy language is warranted. Enforcement provisions in written policy language are few and infrequent.
- That over two thirds ($n= 28$, 68.3%) of 41 survey respondents indicated that there had been notable resistance to the current tobacco use policy, or that there had been problems with it may prepare advocates to expect it. Policy work isn't easy.
- The third most frequently mentioned difficulties with campus tobacco use policies are implementation issues and complaints regarding the inconvenience associated with smoking only in designated areas. The numerous problems with DSA policies, e.g. high levels of SHS in certain campus areas, stigmatizes smokers, creates social setting for smokers, policy too confusing weigh against further promoting these policies in California.
- Data indicate that the involvement of unions or framing tobacco use as a working conditions issue tends to force a formal reconsideration of campus tobacco use policies. Local advocates would profit from education regarding best practices for dealing with these powerful campus forces.
- Seven of ten survey respondents are working on new/ improved/ more stringent campus tobacco use policies. Education regarding the key effect of strong implementation on policy acceptance, longevity and efficacy must be a priority in 2010-2013 to ensure their success.

Appendix A

COUGH

Key Informant Semi-Structured Interview Guide

COUGH
Key Informant Semi-Structured Interview Guide

Opening Comments

You have been invited to participate in this discussion because of your activities to promote tobacco control policy adoption, implementation, and/ or enforcement on the campus of a California public post-secondary institution. The following questions are about the history of your efforts, the necessary constituents for policy advocacy, your perceptions about the opposition, the obstacles or barriers to policy adoption, implementation and enforcement and the factors that facilitate these outcomes.

Introduction to the Interviewer

My name is Gregory Robinson. I serve as the California Youth Advocacy Network's evaluator. My role is to ask these questions and to record your opinions and ideas.

Confidentiality

Whatever you say during this interview is going to remain completely confidential. Your name will not be associated with any comments that are made during this interview. The information that results from this discussion will be analyzed and utilized to develop a case study of the process of policy adoption, implementation and enforcement on college and university campuses. Because everything that you have to say is very important, I would like to audio tape our conversation. Any excerpts from the transcript utilized in the case study will be attributed only to an individual knowledgeable about campus tobacco control policies in California. Under those circumstances, is it all right to tape this discussion?

Thank you.

Interview Questions

Q1. What is the history of your involvement with campus tobacco control policies?

Probe: Adoption, Implementation, Enforcement

Q2. In your opinion, who are the necessary constituents for successful policy advocacy?

Probe: General student body, student government, Greek organizations, faculty members, faculty organizations, staff, unions, campus/ district administration, Human Resources, Facilities Management, Campus Police, Student Health Service

- Q3. In your experience, what have been the obstacles or barriers to policy adoption? To policy implementation? To enforcement?
- Q4. How do you characterize the opposition to your campus tobacco control policy?
- Q5. What factors have facilitated policy adoption/ implementation/ enforcement?
Probe: Have you been able to capitalize on any particular circumstances?
What partnerships if any, have supported your efforts?
- Q6. If you were advising someone on a campus in a different state who was beginning a policy adoption campaign, what would you tell them to watch out for?
- Q7. Lastly, have there been any unintended outcomes or a turn of events that has surprised you during this process?

Closing Remarks

Thank you very much for participating in this interview. Your comments and suggestions are highly valued and they will help us to construct a comprehensive case study.

Appendix B

COUGH

College Policy Implementation Survey Questionnaire

College Policy Implementation Survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. We want to learn about the implementation of tobacco use policies on college and university campuses and about the challenges and successes associated with policy implementation that you have experienced.

First, we will ask you to guide us to an understanding of the history of tobacco use policies from 2004 - 2010 on your campus. You will be asked questions about the policy in place in 2004, any policies that may have followed the 2004 policy that are different from your current policy, the current tobacco use policy on your campus, and any future policy goals.

For example, the 2004 policy might have been no smoking within 20 feet of buildings, the next previous policy might have established on-campus designated smoking areas, the current policy might limit smoking to parking lots only, and the future policy goal might be a smoke-free campus. On some campuses, however, more restrictive policies have been supplanted by less restrictive policies. If you aren't familiar with your campus tobacco use policy in 2004, a printed copy of the policy or a colleague knowledgeable about your campus's tobacco use policy history may be helpful.

Separate questions are asked about implementation or enforcement-related refinements, additions, or modifications to an adopted policy.

Because tobacco use policy processes advance (and at times, regress) so differently on each campus, if you work with multiple campuses (unless these are community college campuses collectively subject to one district-wide policy), we would deeply appreciate the completion of one survey per campus.

In this questionnaire:

"Tobacco Use Policy" refers to formally adopted administrative directives regarding the prohibition or restriction of smoking and/or other tobacco use.

"In effect" means the point at which the campus community was expected to comply with the policy.

A "Transitional Policy" is a placeholder, usually less restrictive than a policy adopted at the same time that will take effect later. An example transitional policy is, "campus opens Fall 2010 smoke free except for designated areas, campus opens Fall 2011, 100% smoke free."

"Current Policy" means the policy currently in place on campus.

"Implementation" refers to the execution of the tobacco use policy on campus.

"Implementation Phase" refers to the period during which campus constituents were actively educated about the policy before enforcement began.

1. What college campus is the subject of your responses to this questionnaire?

College Policy Implementation Survey

2. Please describe your campus tobacco use policy in 2004.

Our Policy in 2004 was:

- Don't Know
- No Smoking near entryways, weaker than state law (less than 20 feet from buildings)
- No Smoking near entryways, state law (20 feet)
- No Smoking near entryways; stronger than state law (more than 20 feet)
- Smoking only in designated areas on campus (Please identify # of areas in comment section)
- Smoking permitted in all parking lots only
- Smoking only in designated parking lots
- Other (please specify)

3. Has your campus changed its tobacco use policy since 2004?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

1. The next policy adopted after the policy that was in place in 2004 was:

- No Smoking near entryways, state law (20 feet)
- No Smoking near entryways; stronger than state law (more than 20 feet)
- Smoking only in designated areas on campus (Please identify # of areas in comment section)
- Smoking permitted in all parking lots only
- Smoking only in designated parking lots
- 100% smoke free campus
- 100% tobacco free campus (includes smokeless tobacco products)
- Other (please specify)

2. Comments, notes, description (optional):

	5
	6

College Policy Implementation Survey

3. Was the policy in place AFTER the 2004 tobacco use policy a transitional policy? (A transitional policy is a placeholder, usually less restrictive than a policy adopted at the same time that will take effect later. For example, “campus opens Fall 2010 smoke free except for designated areas, campus opens Fall 2011, 100% smoke free.”)

Yes

No

4. If yes, please describe the transitional policy.

5. Is this policy the current tobacco use policy on campus?

Yes

No

1. Our current campus tobacco use policy is:

- No Smoking near entryways, state law (20 feet)
- No Smoking near entryways; stronger than state law (more than 20 feet)
- Smoking only in designated areas on campus (Please identify # of areas in comment section)
- Smoking permitted in all parking lots only
- Smoking only in designated parking lots
- 100% smoke free campus
- 100% tobacco free campus (includes smokeless tobacco products)
- Other (please specify)

2. Comments, notes, description (optional):

College Policy Implementation Survey

3. Is your current tobacco use policy a transitional policy?

(A transitional policy is a placeholder, usually less restrictive than a policy adopted at the same time that will take effect later. For example, “campus opens Fall 2010 smoke free except for designated areas, campus opens Fall 2011, 100% smoke free.”)

Yes

No

4. If yes, please describe the transitional policy.

The following questions pertain to the policy currently in effect on your campus.

1. When was the current tobacco use policy adopted?

Month:

Year:

2. What was the length of time in months between the point at which your current policy was adopted and the point at which the policy was “in effect?”

Months

3. Does the current written tobacco use policy include language specifying... [Please check all that apply]

- The individual(s) responsible for policy implementation activities
- A telephone number for questions, concerns, suggestions or complaints
- Locations where policy will be posted or published (signage, campus catalogue, etc.)
- Dates during which policy will be implemented
- Specific implementation activities (e.g. means of educating student body, relocation of ash cans, etc.)
- Our current tobacco use policy does not include any language concerning implementation
- Other implementation activities specified in the written policy:

College Policy Implementation Survey

4. Does the current written policy include language specifying...

[Please check all that apply]

- That violators will be issued a written warning
- That violators will be issued a verbal warning
- That violators will be cited by campus police/ security
- That violators will be referred to the appropriate Dean, Director, or HR representative
- That repeat violators will be fined
- Other enforcement provisions specified in the written policy:

5. What was the length of time in months between the point that the current policy took effect, and the point that enforcement began?

Months

6. In your view, how well was the current policy implemented?

- Not implemented at all
- Not very well
- Somewhat well
- Implemented very well
- Don't Know

7. In your view, how well was the current policy enforced?

- Not enforced at all
- Not very well
- Somewhat well
- Enforced very well
- Don't Know

8. Was there any notable resistance to the policy currently in place on your campus, or problems with it?

- Yes
- No

College Policy Implementation Survey

1. Was the source of resistance to your current tobacco use policy from...

[Please check all that apply]

- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Administration
- Other (please specify)

2. Briefly, what was the issue?

3. Did this resistance/ problem force formal reconsideration of the current campus policy?

Yes

No

4. If Yes, please explain:

The following questions concern the implementation and enforcement of the tobacco use policy currently in place on your campus.

1. Did your campus develop an implementation plan for the current policy...

Prior to policy adoption

After policy adoption, or

No implementation plan was developed.

Other (please specify)

2. How long in months was the implementation phase for the current tobacco use policy? [The period during which campus constituents were actively educated about the policy before enforcement began]

Months

College Policy Implementation Survey

3. Was anyone specifically named or appointed to oversee the implementation plan?

Yes

No

4. If someone was named or appointed to oversee the implementation plan, what was the title and organizational affiliation of that individual?

[If no one was specifically named or appointed, please skip this item and continue with the next question.]

Title

Organizational Affiliation

5. Did the campus or system cover the cost of implementing the current policy?

Yes

No

1. Who covered the cost of implementing the current tobacco use policy on your campus?

1. Please indicate whether any of the following implementation activities occurred:

	Did at least one time	Did once, have plans for follow-up	Did more than one time	Haven't yet, but plan to do	No plans to do
Installed New Signage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moved Ash Cans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Posted and/or Distributed Flyers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developed and Distributed Reminder Cards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Promoted Campus and/or Local Cessation Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

College Policy Implementation Survey

2. Please tell us whether presentations were made to, or formal or committee meetings were conducted with, and/or written correspondence regarding policy implementation was provided to any of the following:

	Did at least one time	Did once, have plans for follow-up	Did more than one time	Haven't yet, but plan to do	No plans to do
District/System Administrators	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Campus Administrators	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Human Resources	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Student Government	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Students Organizations	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Faculty	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Staff Organizations or Unions	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Campus Police/ Security	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Student Housing/ Residential Life	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Other	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

Please Specify:

3. Please indicate whether the policy was published or announced in any of the following:

	Did at least one time	Did once, have plans for follow-up	Did more than one time	Haven't yet, but plan to do	No plans to do
Student Handbook	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Class Schedule	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Class Catalog	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
College / University Website	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Campus Newspaper	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Other	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

Please Specify:

College Policy Implementation Survey

4. Were any of the following educational events conducted?

	Did at least one time	Did more than one time	Haven't yet, but plan to do	No plans to do
Health Fair	jn	jn	jn	jn
Great American Smokeout	jn	jn	jn	jn
Earth Day	jn	jn	jn	jn
Other	jn	jn	jn	jn

Please Specify:

5. Please identify any other activities that were conducted to implement your current campus tobacco use policy.

6. How is the current policy being enforced? (check all that apply)

- Violators are given a written warning
- Violators are given a verbal warning
- Violators are cited by campus police
- Violators are referred to the appropriate dean, director or HR representative
- Policy is informally enforced by peers/ general campus community
- Other (please specify)

7. Are you and/or others on your campus currently working on or planning to advocate for a new (or stronger) tobacco use policy?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

College Policy Implementation Survey

1. Our future tobacco use policy adoption goal is:

- No Smoking near entryways; stronger than state law (more than 20 feet)
- Smoking only in designated areas on campus
- Smoking permitted in all parking lots only
- Smoking only in designated parking lots
- 100% smoke free campus
- 100% tobacco free campus (includes smokeless tobacco products)
- Other (please specify)

2. Please describe any activities conducted to date in service to this policy goal (e.g., conducting surveys, resolutions, etc.).

Thanks so much for your answers so far. Your thoughtful replies to these next questions will be especially valuable.

1. Please identify successes associated with policy implementation on your campus.

2. Please identify challenges associated with policy implementation on your campus.

3. What is the most important lesson you've learned with regard to the implementation of campus tobacco use policies?

4. What is the most important lesson you've learned with regard to the enforcement of campus tobacco use policies?

5. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

College Policy Implementation Survey

1. Thank you for responding to this survey. Your time and thoughtful answers are deeply appreciated. If you would like to be entered into a drawing for a Target or Amazon.com gift card, please enter your email address.

Email Address:

Appendix C

COUGH

CYAN College Project Technical Assistance Record Coding Sheet

CYAN College Project Technical Assistance Record Coding Sheet

**Agency/ Organization
Requesting Assistance**

Campus	1
ALA or Breathe Branch	2
CTCP	3
LLA	4
Other Agency	5

**Educational System of
Referent Campus**

UC	1
CSU	2
CCC	3
Private	4

**Policy Type under
Consideration**

Less than State Law	1
State Law or Entryway	2
Designated Areas	3
Parking Lots	4
100% Smoke/Tobacco-Free	5
Other	6

Policy Process Activity

Adoption	1
Implementation	2
Enforcement	3
Cessation	4
Other	5

Referent Campus

Campus Name as Written

Appendix D

COUGH

COUGH Project Implementation Tracking Form

COUGH 11-E-0 Activity Tracking Form

Event Date	Event Title	Brief Event Description	Code	CYAN Staff	Recipient Organization(s)
------------	-------------	-------------------------	------	------------	---------------------------

This will be used internally to tie the event to a specific College Project activity.

Here, the lead CYAN staff person and other staff will be listed, with a brief description of their role in the training.

N of Attendees	Attendee Description	State	County	City	Venue	Street Address
----------------	----------------------	-------	--------	------	-------	----------------

Demographics, professional role, etc.; each event to include multiple descriptors.

State in which event is conducted (CYAN—and especially COUGH—is an ambassador for California's programs in other states).

e.g. Community College auditorium, LLA Conference Room

Training Materials	N of Participant Evaluations Returned	Comments/Remarks
--------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------

Count and Description of materials distributed at event/ meeting.

Particularly in/effective components, recommendations for future, general observations about materials used, how it went, etc.