

Minutes\*

**Senate Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, September 19, 2013**  
**3:00 – 4:00**  
**Room 238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Will Durfee (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Prahith Chakka, James Cloyd, Katherine Cramer, Eva von Dassow, Janet Ericksen, Frank Farleo, Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, Andrew McNally, Cynthia Murdoch, Ryan Olson, James Pacala, Paul Ranelli, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Chris Uggen, Jean Wyman
- Absent: Jigna Desai, Karl Freese, Justin Goodroad, Karen Mesce, Bill O'Neill, Thomas Sondreal, Alex Stangel
- Guests: David Satin (replacement for Professor Pacala 10/1/13 – 1/30/14); Ferdinand Schlapper (Boynton Health Service)
- Others: David Golden (Boynton Health Service); Jon Steadland (Office of the President); Vickie Courtney, Jeannine Rich (University Senate Office)

[In these minutes: (1) welcome and introductions; (2) University Senate docket approval; (3) request for issues (Regents scholarship); (4) policy on tobacco-free/smoke-free Twin Cities campus]

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Professor Durfee convened the meeting at 3:00, welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the academic year, and asked for a round of introductions. He commented that this is an interesting committee because it is broad-based, representing faculty, P&A staff, Civil Service staff, and students all together, and Committee members do not represent their individual campuses or colleges but look at issues from the University-wide perspective (or, in some cases, Twin-Cities-wide).

Professor Durfee reported that on behalf of the Committee he has asked two Senate committees to look at issues. He forward to the Senate Committee on Social Concerns an issue noted by Vice President Wheelock at the Faculty Consultative Committee retreat: the University's policy or practice of providing a living wage. The University could do a considerable amount of outsourcing to organizations that may not pay a living wage, but there is a sense that the University wants living wages to be paid, which raises the question of whether there is or should be a University policy. The Social Concerns Committee was asked to report back in the spring.

The other matter he referred was income-based diversity, to the Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity, especially in the student population. Is it or should it be included in the suite of factors the University considers in admissions, advising, and so on. Again, there will be a report back to this Committee in the spring.

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

## **2. University Senate Docket Approval**

Professor Durfee next noted that this Committee must approve the dockets of the University Senate and pointed out the one action item for the October 3 meeting, a resolution in favor of lactation support.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the docket.

## **3. Request for Issues**

Professor Durfee asked Committee members for suggestions for agenda items to be taken up this year.

Professor von Dassow recommended that the governance system take up the matter of restoring the Regents Scholarships to 100% for all employees. She remarked that the University gets no revenue from employees who cannot afford to pay 25% of tuition in order to take courses.

Professor Luepker reported that the Committee on Finance and Planning had viewed the original change (to charge employees) with reservations and expressed concerns; the result was that the charge to employees for pre-baccalaureate courses was dropped. They did learn about the source of the funds to pay for Regents Scholarships: they come from the cost pool, so everyone is taxed to pay for them. Then-Provost Sullivan said that the fund was running at a deficit and a concern about raising the fringe-benefit cost pool charges on all units. So there is "real money" involved. But Professor Luepker agreed that it is appropriate to revisit the question and ask whether the status quo ante could be restored.

Professor von Dassow outlined arguments for her proposal. The amount of money involved cannot be significant, she surmised, while the scholarship helps integrate employee groups and students, which is a benefit of incalculable value to the institution. As a result of the imposition of the 25% charge, employees do not (or cannot) take classes simply because they are interested in them—and their absence has contributed to the death of a number of small classes that are thus no longer offered for degree-seeking students who want them. So the imposition of the charge has affected the curriculum. The charge also means that employees cannot benefit from the educational mission of the institution they work for.

The cost makes it impossible to pursue one's intellectual interests; only if one sees a financial or career benefit can one justify the cost of taking a course. If the University wants to promote integration of the many parts that comprise the institution, offering a full tuition benefit to employees is an easy way to take a large step toward this goal at relatively little cost.

## **4. Policy on Smoke/Tobacco-Free Twin Cities Campus**

Professor Durfee now welcomed Mr. Schlapper to the meeting to discuss the proposed policy Smoke and Tobacco Free Campus (for the Twin Cities). He recalled that the University Senate last spring passed a resolution endorsing a smoke-free campus; President Kaler then appointed a working group charged to deal with the proposals from a number of different sources and develop a draft policy. He noted that the proposed policy does not replace the existing policy, which deals with indoor air, and is system-wide, while the new policy is just for the Twin Cities campus.

Mr. Schlapper expressed appreciation for the opportunity to provide an update because he recognizes that how best to address smoking and tobacco use on campus can be a contentious issue. He said that the working group that drafted the policy included representation appointed by President Kaler, Sr. Vice President Karen Hanson, Vice President Kathy Brown, and Vice President Pam Wheelock (it was not a Boynton Health Service team), and the question it faced was how to integrate 24 campus resolutions into one formal policy, supported by research data and current best practices. It was not a test of personalities or a contest to see who could push their views through. There was a wide range of opinion on the working group; it reviewed the research and best practices and came to a unanimous conclusion in support of the proposed policy, compliance mechanisms, implementation steps, and timeline.

The proposed policy read as follows, between the \* \* \*

\* \* \*

#### POLICY STATEMENT

The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities is a smoke- and tobacco-free campus (tentatively effective August 15, 2014).

All students, staff, faculty, and visitors are prohibited from smoking and using, selling, free distributing, and advertising tobacco products in all facilities and on all property owned, leased, rented, contracted, maintained, or controlled by the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

#### Exceptions

Tobacco use will be permitted on University of Minnesota, Twin Cities property only in these situations:

- Peer-reviewed, approved scientific studies related to the health effects of tobacco use, sanctioned and formally approved in advance by the University of Minnesota.
- Adult Native American tobacco use as part of a traditional Native American spiritual or cultural ceremony. A Native American is a person who is a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe. The time, place, and manner of tobacco use as part of a traditional Native American spiritual or cultural ceremony must be formally approved in advance by the University of Minnesota.
- Theatrical production where actors and actresses are permitted to use tobacco as part of the theatrical performance. The time, place, and manner of tobacco use in a theatrical performance must be formally approved in advance by the University of Minnesota and notice of tobacco use in a performance must be given to patrons in advance and will be included in the performance programs.

#### REASON FOR POLICY

The University of Minnesota is committed to promoting and protecting the health and well-being of all campus community members through education and practice. This commitment, along with the wealth of research documenting health risks associated with tobacco use, the assessments of regional and national trends, and input from the campus community provide the rationale for the establishment of the University as a smoke- and tobacco-free campus. Implementing this comprehensive policy protects and enhances the health of students, faculty, staff, and visitors, and promotes social norms that support healthy living and lifestyle choices, by discouraging tobacco use, protecting against involuntary exposure to harmful secondhand smoke, and encouraging and supporting cessation efforts.

#### DEFINITIONS

Property

All facilities, property and vehicles that are owned, leased, rented, contracted, used, maintained or controlled by the University of Minnesota.

#### Using tobacco

The act of using any cigarette, pipe, cigar, cigarillo, electronic cigarette, hookah, or other smoking equipment, the use of smokeless tobacco, and the use of any other tobacco product in any form.

#### Smoking

The inhaling, exhaling, burning, or carrying of a lighted cigarette, cigar, pipe, or other lighted smoking product. The burning of any type of lighted pipe, cigar, cigarette, or any other smoking equipment or device, whether filled with tobacco or any other type of material.

#### Tobacco product

Any product containing, made, or derived from tobacco that are intended for human consumption, whether chewed, smoked, absorbed, dissolved, inhaled, snorted, sniffed, or ingested by any other means, or any component, part, or accessory of a tobacco product, including but not limited to, cigarettes; cigars; little cigars; cheroots; stogies; periques; granulated, plug cut, crimp cut, ready rubbed, and other smoking tobacco; snuff; snuff flour; cavendish; plug and twist tobacco; fine-cut and other chewing tobacco; shorts; refuse scraps, clippings, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco, and other kinds and forms of tobacco.

Tobacco products exclude any tobacco product that has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for use as a tobacco cessation product, a tobacco dependence product, or for other medical purposes, and is being marketed and sold solely for such an approved purpose.

#### Electronic cigarette

Any oral device that provides a vapor of liquid nicotine, lobelia, and/or other substance, and the use or inhalation of which simulates smoking. The term shall include any such devices, whether they are manufactured, distributed, marketed, or sold as e-cigarettes, e-cigars, e-pipes, or under any other product name or descriptor.

#### Scientific study

Any peer-reviewed scientific study related to the health effects of smoking, sanctioned and formally approved by the University of Minnesota.

#### Theatrical production

A theatrical performance sanctioned and approved by the University of Minnesota.

### RESPONSIBILITIES

The success of this policy will depend upon the thoughtfulness, consideration, and cooperation of everyone on campus, including tobacco-users and non-users. All members of the University community are responsible for enforcing this policy. Students, faculty, staff, and visitors who violate this policy should be reminded of the policy and asked to comply. Repeated violation of this policy may be cause for disciplinary action in accordance with applicable student or employee codes of conduct. Visitors who refuse to comply with this policy may be asked to vacate campus property.

#### Boynton Health Service and the University Wellness Program

Offer extensive cessation programs and services and nicotine replacement therapies for students, faculty and staff ready to quit tobacco use. (See attachment for additional information about cessation programs.

The policy can direct to a website listing all the cessation programs.)

#### Policy Owner

Assess the policy, to determine whether the policy, policy enforcement, communication, education, staff training, and cessation programs are effective. Update the document(s) and programs as needed.]

\* \* \*

Mr. Schlapper referred to the letter he sent to President Kaler on July 15, on behalf of the working group with their final recommendations. With respect to whether the policy would help advance the mission of the University; he cited a key paragraph in the letter:

The University of Minnesota is committed to promoting and protecting the health and well-being of all campus community members through education and practice. This commitment, along with the wealth of research documenting health risks associated with tobacco use, the assessments of regional and national trends, and input from the campus community provide the rationale for the establishment of the University as a tobacco-free and smoke-free campus. Implementing this comprehensive policy protects and enhances the health of students, faculty, staff, and visitors, and promotes social norms that support healthy living and lifestyle choices, by discouraging tobacco use, protecting against involuntary exposure to harmful secondhand smoke, and encouraging and supporting cessation efforts.

The working group report speaks to a number of issues, Mr. Schlapper said, and raises several points related to the theme of health. The most critical health concern on campus now is mental health, for which the University has comprehensive programs; research shows that nicotine has adverse effects on mental health (e.g., research links usage to increased levels of depression, suicide, anxiety, and panic disorders). As the University addresses mental health issues, it needs to address the use of tobacco. Tobacco use is also associated with lower academic performance.

Regarding other public health concerns, Mr. Schlapper pointed out that tobacco is the only product that, when used properly and as directed, leads to severe health problems and premature death. With most sugars, fats, salt, and alcohol, the concern is more related to overconsumption.

He was at Boise State when it was the first four-year public institution of higher education to adopt a campus policy ban on tobacco use; that was about ten years ago. Now there are about 1200 colleges and universities that have done so, about two-thirds are tobacco-free and one-third are smoke-free. The trend is overwhelming and none of the campuses that have adopted policies have subsequently said they over-reached because they see the impact on health when the policies are adopted.

Mr. Chakka noted that the report of the working group included a statement that electronic cigarettes deliver twice the amount of nicotine approved by the FDA for smoking-cessation aids. Mr. Schlapper said that the FDA has not approved electronic cigarettes as a cessation aid and has found that they are marketed to get youth, in particular, hooked on nicotine, to serve as a gateway to smoking or as a bridge to be used where someone cannot smoke. There is research on them; they contain carcinogens and toxic chemicals and increase nicotine use in young people. So they are being marketed to children (e.g., fruit and chocolate flavors, lower cost). Most organizations are adding e-cigarettes to their bans.

Mr. Chakka asked if the policy would be accompanied by more funding for programs to help students stop smoking. Mr. Schlapper said that Boynton has been offering cessation services and programs and nicotine replacement therapies (NRT) and will continue to do so, but they are a separate support service from the policy document. There is awareness among smokers of the resources available, he said; they have found that many smokers support the policy because the majority report that they are trying to quit, 2-14 attempts in the past year alone—and the policy promotes doing so by making it less convenient to have a quick cigarette, reducing consumption rates.

Professor von Dassow asked when the University would ban bus and automobile emissions on campus. She cannot avoid bus exhaust but she can avoid smokers. She said she does not support compelling individual choices if the health of the community is a concern, rather than prohibiting buses and two-stroke engines, which affect her health a lot more than cigarettes. Mr. Schlapper said he agreed completely about the need to get rid of vehicle emissions on campus. However, he said that while Professor von Dassow believes she can avoid cigarette smoke, 81% of students reported they cannot, with the University of Minnesota campus being overwhelmingly the number 1 location of exposure in their lives. The research also indicates that 100% of smokers who quit are glad they did so and wished they had not started. Big Tobacco would have you believe tobacco use is a choice while they engineer their products to be more addictive than heroin. This policy is about helping people overcome their addiction.

Professor Durfee said that the question before the Committee today is smoke-free versus tobacco-free. This Committee and the University Senate endorsed a smoke-free policy, something the working group had to consider along with the 22 other resolutions that supported a tobacco-free campus. Mr. Schlapper highlighted the section of the Working Group's recommendation report that addressed the rationale for implementing a tobacco-free policy, not just smoke-free:

#### Tobacco-Free vs. Smoke-Free

- *Definitions:*
  - A *smoke-free policy* eliminates the use of smoke-producing tobacco (e.g., cigarettes, cigars). The primary goal of a smoke-free policy is eliminating secondhand smoke and cigarette litter.
  - A *tobacco-free policy* eliminates the use of all tobacco products (including, but not limited to, spit tobacco, snus, dissolvable tobacco, other “smokeless” products, hookah, electronic cigarettes). The primary goal of a tobacco-free policy is overall health and ethical behavior of the institution.
- A tobacco-free policy is consistent with other campuses in the region and nation. The vast majority of campuses in Minnesota have opted to adopt a tobacco-free policy (more than 40 campuses) rather than a smoke-free policy (3 campuses). Furthermore, 67% of campuses nationwide with policies are tobacco free.
- The rationale for adopting a tobacco-free policy is based upon the negative health and environmental impacts of all tobacco products. Smoke-free policies address only cigarettes and cigars, while tobacco-free policies are much more comprehensive, prohibiting hookahs, pipes, the wide array of smokeless tobacco products, and electronic cigarettes. Additionally, a smoking-only ban could inadvertently cause a rise in other tobacco usage. With no smoking on campus, campus community members may become more aware of smokeless tobacco use, perceiving it as “acceptable” behavior. It is well-documented that all tobacco products are harmful to one's health, the health of others, and the environment. Therefore, tobacco-free policies help achieve the most comprehensive health and environmental policy benefits.

- Tobacco-free policies also eliminate loopholes that might be exposed by the tobacco industry. The tobacco industry heavily markets both smokeless and spit-less products (e.g., snus, tablets, lozenges). Many of these products target young adults, and tobacco-free policies help counter the tobacco industry's efforts to increase the usage of smokeless tobacco among young adults.
- Tobacco-free policies are easier to communicate and enforce as they eliminate confusion for faculty, staff, students, and visitors about the types of tobacco the policy covers.
- The policy will help establish a new norm regarding tobacco use at the University of Minnesota.
- A "tobacco-free and smoke-free" campus will be as encompassing as possible (including marijuana) and reduce the need to revisit the policy in the future. Because of the focus on secondhand smoke exposure and tobacco products, the policy should include marijuana and medical marijuana use but not other recreational drugs.
- The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and other groups did not discuss tobacco-free vs. smoke-free and likely were supporting the idea of reducing exposure, not making the distinction between smoking tobacco and all tobacco products.
- Both smoking and nonsmoking tobacco products cause significant costs to facilities management for clean-up.
- Tobacco-free policies are more effective than smoke-free policies
- Research indicates that the initiation of smoking is complete by age 25 (Pierce et al, JAMA 2011). The majority of University of Minnesota students fall in this age group.
- Many of our students are at a vulnerable age for the initiation of smoking, and seeing others use (even smokeless) tobacco products makes it more likely that they will initiate smoking and it makes it more difficult for those wishing to quit.
- The American College Health Association (ACHA) has adopted a no tobacco use policy and encourages colleges and universities to be diligent in their efforts to achieve a 100% indoor and outdoor campus-wide tobacco-free environment (ACHA, 2009).
  - Further, the American Lung Association recommends that all colleges and universities completely prohibit tobacco use, specifically outdoors to reduce the social acceptability of tobacco use and encourage quitting (American Lung Association, 2008).

Professor Satin asked if there is a track record for schools that have gone tobacco-free; what are the downsides? Who spoke for the civil liberties side? As a physician, he agrees with the arguments against tobacco use, but what about the other side? Mr. Schlapper said that the trend in the adoption of campus policies is as it is because the arguments against the policies have not played out. Many smokers have reported that a tobacco free policy has helped them to quit by reducing the opportunities to smoke. In addition, these policies improve productivity, reduce healthcare costs, and reduce facilities and grounds maintenance expense. Some schools feared that tobacco-free policies would hurt student recruitment but in fact schools have found that they actually help in recruiting.

Professor Durfee asked if there is research on the differences between campuses that have gone smoke-free and those that have gone tobacco-free. It is clear the campus will do one; is there a difference? Better mental health? Mr. Schlapper said one factor is campus cleanup; the cleaning costs for smokeless tobacco are greater than that for smoking, although both cost campus money. Mr. Golden reported that Boynton has been hired by the State of Minnesota to analyze policies in Minnesota schools about the impact of smoke-free and tobacco-free; they do not have results to release yet but he can say that they have found that the more restrictive the policy and the longer it has been in place, the more associated it is with lower rates of tobacco use.

Another opportunity cost was a concern about safety, Mr. Schlapper reported: if students are forced to go off campus to smoke, particularly in the evening, might they be put at risk? But in 1200 institutions, there has not been one documented case of a student who has been harmed as a result of this policy. On the other hand, research shows that 11-12% of today's college/university students will die a premature death due to tobacco use and exposure equaling 1.7-1.9 million current students.

Professor Ben-Ner said his primary reaction to the policy is that there should not be smoking on campus, but there is a gray area and there are opportunity costs for people. Reacting to the study that found that campuses with strict no-tobacco policies have fewer smokers, Professor Ben-Ner said that this may indeed be partly the result of the policies, possibly some students stop smoking, others never take it up, and perhaps smokers don't go to such campuses. It may also be biased self-reporting, with smokers not admitting to doing so, particularly where smoking would be almost always in violation of policies. He said he did not believe that staff and students who are smokers should be forced to go far away, in order to prevent loss of productive time. More generally, he said he supports acting on the proposed policy but that there should be an "out" for people and the policy should not provide zero liberties. If one really wanted to prevent tobacco use, the University should prohibit tobacco use among students and employees and enforce it with tests, but clearly it will not and should go that far. "We know full well that there are many things we shouldn't do and many others that we should, but we don't, and although we welcome nudges and incentives, we don't want to go too far in curtailing personal liberties." There needs to be leeway for "sinners" and the "weak-minded," which probably includes everyone in some respect, he concluded, and observed that there are many other ways for people to harm themselves besides the use of tobacco. He would prefer to limit the use of outright prohibitions to significant negative externalities. Mr. Schlapper said there is research about the opportunity costs for schools and corporations; on average, people take four 10 minute smoking breaks per day, which translates to their working 11 months to everyone else's 12 months during the year. When it is more inconvenient to take a tobacco break, consumption goes down, assisting people toward quitting completely.

Mr. Olson asked how many students start smoking on campus. Mr. Golden reported that currently 2.8% of the total student body smokes and about 5% of the faculty and staff. Of the students, about 25% report that they started smoking after they arrived on campus. Mr. Olson asked if the rate goes down on an urban campus when it adopts a policy. Mr. Golden said they do not have a specific number but it does go down. Dr. Schlapper said they would measure the effects and that there are many studies of the effects of policies.

Professor McCormick observed that the draft policy provides that all members of the University community are responsible for enforcement. Mr. Schlapper said that provision is common to almost all smoke-free policies. Police do not often write tickets in restaurants and theaters and they would not be doing so on campus. The enforcement is social and there is an education plan. There is an existing policy in place; this would expand it. Would anyone go get the police if someone lit a cigarette in this meeting, he asked? That would not happen; enforcement is social.

What if one sees someone on campus using a tobacco product, Professor McCormick asked? There are steps to take in approaching someone, Mr. Schlapper said, and that is part of the educational effort. Are there consequences if someone does not carry out their responsibility to help enforce the policy, Professor McCormick asked? Mr. Schlapper said he has never seen any. In general there is about 95% compliance with campus policies banning tobacco use, and 99% when people are approached about use. The 1% are dealt with as are any who violate University policies: there are employee and student

sanctions; visitors can be escorted off the campus for trespassing if they refuse to comply with University policies.

Mr. Chakka noted that there is a policy banning smoking with 25 feet of a building entrance; how often are people approached for violating that policy? He has never seen it happen. Mr. Schlapper said that is the advantage of the proposed policy: it is clearer and everyone knows that someone smoking on campus is in violation. Compliance goes up dramatically when the policy is clear; when the policy is confusing, compliance is less and it is more difficult to enforce. The same is true when multiple zones are created—they are also confusing. The clearer the non-smoking zone, the more compliance there is with the policy.

Professor Durfee asked about public thoroughfares, such as walking down University Avenue. Can the University enforce policy there? Mr. Schlapper said that the University can enforce the policy within the boundaries of University grounds. The University Senate statement highlighted the University of Michigan policy, but it is one that Michigan is struggling with; it has not accomplished what was intended and is really a "don't smoke on the grass" policy. The majority of campuses enforces their policies and do not dissect the campus with streets where smoking would be permitted. The light-rail line will be smoke-free, so without a campus policy people will be able to get off the train and have a cigarette.

Mr. Schlapper pointed out that the policy ban does not include smoking in private vehicles, although one may not smoke in garages and ramps under the current policy.

Professor Uggen said he has been convinced by the physicians in the room to favor the policy. The tough cases are the difference between tobacco-free and smoke-free. Some of the language in the policy is heavy-handed; he knows a faculty member who chews nicotine gum and who also brings in millions of dollars in grant funding to the University. Mr. Schlapper said that individual would not be in violation of the policy because nicotine gum is approved as a cessation aid.

Professor Uggen said he was trying to create a window, along the lines that Professor Ben-Ner spoke about, so the policy is not unduly paternalistic and harsh. He said he believes the University can be paternalistic with students but he is less willing to see it take that position with respect to faculty and staff. Mr. Schlapper said that the majority of smokers are trying to quit and the policy will help them.

Professor Pacala said that the hardest part of the policy for him is also the question of smoke-free versus tobacco-free. A policy requiring a smoke-free campus is a public health issue and related to the rights of others as well as the smoker. The primary argument for a tobacco-free campus appears to be increased cessation rates. If one makes that argument, one can make the same argument for a number of legal products on campus (e.g., soda, fast food). He said he understood that this policy is difficult to square with individual rights. Mr. Schlapper said he was not deaf to the arguments but that there are critical points. One, the courts have held that there is no legal right to smoke, so it is not a personal legal right. Two, as he noted before, it is a product that when "used properly as directed" leads directly to severe illness and premature death, which is not true of moderate consumption of soda. Three, if the University is trying to create a healthy environment, why exempt some tobacco products, especially if "Big Tobacco" sees non-smoking tobacco as ways for people to bridge to the time they can smoke and keep them addicted? Professor Pacala said he understood but pointed out that in all the soda machines on

campus it is not possible to purchase a moderate amount (noting the size of the bottles that are sold). He agreed, however, that there is nothing good about tobacco.

Professor von Dassow said that Professor Pacala's remarks pointed to the slippery-slope argument: if one thing is banned, what will be next. Professor Ben-Ner invoked the language of "sin." "We are all 'sinners,'" she said: most don't get enough exercise; most have some poor eating habits; everyone does one thing or another that raises collective health insurance costs. Even if there is no legal right to smoke, people should be free of coercion and compulsion, and she does not want to be required by the institution to police her fellow community members' behavior.

Mr. Chakka said that in terms of tobacco-free versus smoke-free, smoke has harmful effects on others but other tobacco consumption does not, and it is a person's choice to use it.

Mr. Schlapper said he did not agree about the Bloomberg/slippery-slope argument. Tobacco, he maintained, is in a whole different category from soda in terms of how harmful. As the research continues to demonstrate the devastating health impact of tobacco use, 1,000's of industries, municipalities and schools are implementing tobacco-free policies across the country.

Professor Durfee thanked Mr. Schlapper for joining the Committee and the members of the working group for the many hours they spent on their proposal. He said the proposed policy is going through the usual institutional process. The Committee's minutes will help inform the discussion.

Professor Durfee adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota