

Community College *of* Philadelphia

MEETING MINUTES
Institution-Wide Committee
Monday, March 28, 2016
2:30 p.m.
Isadore A. Shrager Boardroom

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Pascal Scoles at 2:31p.m.

II. Attendance

Delegates

Federation: Sue Ellen Liebman, Eric Massenburg, Bridget McFadden, Pascal Scoles
Administration: Mary Anne Celenza, Jacob Eapen, Judith Gay, Samuel Hirsch,
Students: Nadia Mendez, Robert Casey

Alternates

Administration: Sharon Thompson
Students: Giovany Gonzalez

Guests Present

Harry Moore

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion: Approve the minutes as corrected (Moved: Jacob Eapen; Seconded: Eric Massenburg)
The minutes of February 22 were approved as corrected (Yes = 11, No = 0, Abstain = 0).

IV. Policies and Procedures Memorandum No 151: Smoke-Free Campus Policy

Harry Moore presented a revision to P & P #151 which was sent forward by the Business Affairs Committee.

There have been five revisions to the Smoking Policy since the late 1980's. Each revision has been successively more stringent than the previous one. The Business Affairs Committee began consideration a few years ago to recommend changing to a smoke free campus. The committee felt that any attempt to enact this change in policy would require notice well in advance of the change as well as coordination with smoking cessation resources. Last year the Business Affairs Committee received a grant to foster education and support the implementation of a smoke free institution. Brochures and other materials have been made available at student fairs and recently cigarette receptacles have been bought for installation at main campus entry points. The committee has applied for a second year of grant funding. Subsequently, a sub-committee of the Business Affairs Committee has been working to develop a smoke free policy for recommendation to the IWC. The policy you have before you today is simple in that it prohibits smoking anywhere on campus. The committee debated extensively about the merits of making

specific reference to disciplinary action within the policy. It was decided that both the Student Handbook and the Employee Handbook state disciplinary actions for breach of College rules and these documents should suffice for enforcement of the policy.

Question 1: There is no definition of what “smoke-free” means. Does a person have to move to the sidewalk to smoke? Can they smoke in the College’s garage or parking lot?

Response: The policy defines “smoke-free” as refraining from smoking and using any nicotine-delivery system. The College’s property line ends where it abuts the pavement. Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth streets surround the College and are City Property.

A suggestion was made to add something about third-hand smoke to the policy in the first paragraph since third-hand smoke sticks on surfaces.

Question 2: How will individuals be held accountable for the policy since the policy seems to have more to do with informing those individuals that they are in violation of the policy?

Response: Employees are being asked to support the policies. College policies must be followed.

The words “by following this policy” seem to imply that employees are being asked to consider this as a suggestion and not as a mandated policy to inform others when they are in violation of the policy. It was suggested to take out the words “by following this policy” in the second paragraph. The statement will now read “All employees of the College are asked to support smoke-free campus efforts by informing those who are in violation of the policy.

Question 3: If this policy has “no teeth” how will it be enforced?

Response: There is a statement in the Employee Handbook on page 20 and a statement in the Student Code of Conduct in the Student Handbook on page 61 defining a policy as the written regulations of the College. Thus a policy needs to be followed.

Question 4: What is the process to insure that a violation to this policy is followed up on and who are the enforcers?

Response: The informant will give the violator a card stating that the College is a smoke-free environment. If the person persists in smoking then the person who is observing the event should report it. Each person at the College is responsible for enforcing the policy.

Question 5: If people know who the smoker is, how does this get reported?

Response: The person smoking should be asked to move to the pavement.

Question 6: How does the policy deal with the fact that if there is no enforcement of the policy, people may not want to engage the smoker?

Response: The policy is not intended to go into effect until January 2017. This will give the Business Affairs Committee time to bring people along and not seem punitive.

Question 7: What happens now when people smoke in the building?

Response: Security responds to any reported event of smoking inside the building.

Question 8: Would security continue to investigate reports of people smoking?

Response: It would take security too much time to police every door to the building.

Question 9: What does the word campus mean?

Response: There will be an education component to alert individuals to what smoke-free means. Campus means both inside and outside of College Property. Signs can also be put around the campus indicating that the College is a smoke free campus. Plans are in place for additional receptacles to be placed around the campus. Also the ash trays can be moved to the sidewalk only at the edge of the College's property.

Question 10: If there is no security report, how will this be enforced for students? Without an incident report, a violation of the Code of Conduct can't be initiated?

Response: Other institutions were looked at and they seem to be enforcing a smoke-free campus in a similar way

Reply: Delaware County Community College has a policy that does have some teeth.

Response: We do not have the number of security personnel to enforce this policy in light of their other responsibilities. This policy might just be a first step. Compliance with the current policy is not followed extensively but some people do comply. A survey showed that students were in support of the smoke-free campus policy. It is important to have the policy despite the fact that it is not enforceable. Since the policy is not effective until January, 2017 there is enough time for educational programs about the policy.

Motion: Accept the policy as written with the provision that the outcomes be assessed at a later date. (Moved: Judith Gay; Seconded: Eric Massenburg). The motion passed. (Yes = 7, No = 2, Abstain = 0). *

* Two students had to leave the meeting before the motion was made. Thus the count went from 11 to 9 voting members.

V. New Business

- 1) A question was raised regarding the approval of the revised Liberal Arts Curriculum. At the meeting to approve the revision to the Liberal Arts Curriculum, the first year experience course (FYE101) was not yet finalized. Therefore, it was thought that once FYE 101 was created and approved, the curriculum would come back to IWC for approval because there could be concerns about how the course would be implemented in the curriculum.

Other IWC members did not agree with the assumption that the revised Liberal Arts Curriculum would return to IWC with the FYE 101 course. How FYE 101 is implemented is a decision at the course level and courses do not come to IWC. IWC members stated that they approved other measures for the Liberal Arts revision until such

a time that FYE 101 would be completed. They believed that the Liberal Arts revision was approved with the inclusion of FYE 101 with a provision that students would not be held responsible for taking the course until it was created and approved. Thus the requirement for taking FYE 101 is effective beginning with students new to the College as of Fall 2016. Thus the concept of a FYE course was approved in the Liberal Arts revision as presented to IWC.

- 2) A second question was raised as to why Proficiency Certificates do not go through the governance committees and subsequently come to IWC for approval. This was presented as a concern especially for “stand-alone” proficiency certificates.

In response to the question raised, it was stated that only degrees come to a standing committee. The charge of the IWC on the governance website should be checked.

It was also explained that all Proficiency Certificates should have internal connections to a degree program. That is, courses in the Proficiency Certificate would count towards the degree and thus provide a career ladder. Proficiency Certificates, when first created, were done so that the College could respond more rapidly to the needs of employers. An example was provided as to how the recently created Ophthalmic Technician Proficiency Certificate was presented to a selection of potential employers. These individuals were highly enthusiastic about the proposal and requested implementation as soon as possible.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.