

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AT PARKERSBURG BOARD OF GOVERNORS

DECEMBER 17, 2013
AGENDA

Members

Joe Campbell
Jamie Six
Violet Mosser
Curtis Miller
Jeff Matheny
Sam Winans

Rock Wilson
Cheryl Donohoe
Gerard El Chaar, Board Chair
Matthew Santer
Karen Facemyer
Tyler Ohr

Marie Foster Gnage
President



SCHEDULE

West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors

Wednesday, December 17, 2013

2:00 p.m.	Audit Committee	Wesbanco, Downtown
2:45 p.m.	Executive Committee	Wesbanco, Downtown
3:15 p.m.	Campus Development/Readiness Center Committee	Downtown Center
4:00 p.m.	Administrative Services Committee	Downtown Center
4:00 p.m.	Academic and Student Services Committee	Downtown Center
5:00 p.m.	Dinner	Downtown Center
5:45 p.m.	Board Meeting	Downtown Center
	Possible Executive Session	

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AT PARKERSBURG BOARD OF GOVERNORS
 Meeting of December 17, 2013
 Downtown Center
 5:45 p.m.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 1. | Call to Order | Board Chair, Gerard El Chaar |
| 2. | Roll Call | Brady Whipkey
Executive Assistant to the President |
| 3. | Board Chair Report | Chairman El Chaar
Salary Task Groups |
| 4. | President's Report | Dr. Marie Foster Gnage, President |
| 5. | Approval of Minutes | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular Meeting – November 19, 20135 | |
| 6. | Committee Reports | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee • Audit Review Committee • Administrative Services Committee • Academic and Student Services Committee • Campus Development/Readiness Center Committee | Chairman El Chaar
Jamie Six
Curtis Miller
Jeff Matheny
Joe Campbell/Curtis Miller |
| 7. | Possible Executive Session under the authority of WV Code §6-9A-4-2A
Personnel
Property | |
| 8. | Action Items | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Revision of Policy F-60,
Tobacco and Smoke-Free Environment • Designated Funds | President Gnage.....9
President Gnage.....19 |
| 9. | Consent Agenda | |
| 10. | Information Items | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal Update for 2013-2014 | |
| 11. | Board Comments/Announcements | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuition | |
| 12. | Next Meeting | |

13. Adjournment

MINUTES
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AT PARKERSBURG
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
November 19, 2013

A regular meeting of the West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors was held on Wednesday, November 19, 2013 in the College Theatre at the WVU Parkersburg campus beginning at 5:15 p.m. Board members present were: Joe Campbell, Jamie Six, Violet Mosser, Curtis Miller, Jeff Matheny, Sam Winans, Cheryl Donohoe, Gerard El Chaar, Matthew Santer and Tyler Ohrn. Others present included Dr. Marie Foster Gnage and Brady Whipkey.

Guests present included administrators, faculty, and staff.

1. Call to Order

Mr. El Chaar, Chair of the WVU at Parkersburg Board of Governors, called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by Brady Whipkey, Executive Assistant to the President, noting that a quorum was present.

3. Board Chair Report

Chairman El Chaar thanked members for attending the meeting and for also attending the Board Retreat. Chair El Chaar felt that the retreat was very fruitful and beneficial.

Next, Chairman El Chaar recognized Bob Cooper and Chuck Murrary for all they do for the campus and presented Board Award.

4. President's Report

President Gnage commended Bob Cooper and Chuck Murrary for all they have done.

President Gnage reported on being able to attend the Learning 2013 conference. The conference focused on establishing professional development training for businesses that could be applied towards college credits.

President Gnage also reported on working hand in hand with Workforce Investment Board; and the need to apply for grants collaborating and cooperating.

President Gnage reminded members that Commencement will be held on December 13, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. Reminders will be sent out to the Board.

President Gnage discussed Governor Earl Ray Tomlin's announcement of the cracker

plant and reminded members of the 2014 NLS Summit meeting in February.

5. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of October 9, 2013, were approved upon a motion by Mr. Winans and second by Mr. Campbell. Motion passed.

6. Committee Reports

Executive Committee:

Chair El Chaar reported that the Executive Committee met and discussed land and property acquisition.

Audit Review Committee:

There will be an Audit Review Committee meeting in December.

Administrative Services Committee:

No meeting held.

Academic and Student Services Committee:

No meeting held.

Campus Development and Readiness Center Committee:

Mr. Campbell reported that there is a meeting scheduled with General Hoyer on December 16, 2013 to discuss the Readiness Center.

7. Executive Session under the authority of WV Code §6-9A-4-2A

Chairman El Chaar asked for a motion to move into Executive Session. Mr. Six moved to adjourn to Executive Session. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed and the Board moved into Executive Session at approximately 5:34 p.m. The Board Chair requested that President Gnage join Executive Session. At approximately 6:12 p.m. Chairman El Chaar announced that the Board would return to the regular meeting. Mr. Miller moved to return to regular session. Mr. Santer seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Mr. Six moved approve the Honorary Degree Award as presented in Executive Session. Mr. Winans seconded the motion. Motion passed.

8. Action Items

- Request for Code Change Regarding Tuition:
President Gnage provided an overview of the Request for Code Change Regarding Tuition. After questions and discussion, Mr. Miller moved to approve the following resolution:

Resolved, that the WVU at Parkersburg Board of Governors will join other Community College Boards to officially request legislative amendment of W. Va. Code [§18B-10-1](#), ***Enrollment, tuition and other fees at education institutions; refund of fees***, as reflected in Attachment A.

Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- Adjustment of Distributed Learning Fee:
Dr. Rhonda Tracy, Dean of Academic Affairs provided an overview of the proposed Adjustment of Distributed Learning Fee. After questions and discussion, Mr. Ohrn moved to approve the following resolution with an implementation date of the summer semester:

Resolved, that the West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors approves the Adjusted Distributed Learning Fee for WVU Parkersburg Courses.

Mr. Winans seconded the motion. Motion passed.

9. Consent Agenda

Mr. Six moved to approve the following Consent Agenda items:

Social Justice Policy

Resolved, That the West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors authorizes a notice of proposed rulemaking for adoption of Policy A-61, Social Justice, and hereby authorizes adoption of said policy without further action by the Board if no comments are received.

Mr. Miller seconded the motion. Motion passed.

10. Information Items

11. Board Comments/Announcements

Need to add Research Corporation to next Board of Governors meeting agenda.

12. Next Meeting

The next Board of Governors meeting will be held December 17, 2013 at the Downtown Center.

13. Adjournment

With no further business to be discussed, Chairman El Chaar moved that the meeting adjourn. Ms. Donohoe seconded the motion. Motion passed. The next meeting will be December 17, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Brady Whipkey
Executive Assistant to the President

Gerard El Chaar, Chairman

Cheryl Donohoe, Secretary

**West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors
Meeting of December 17, 2013**

ITEM: Proposed Revision of Policy F-60, Tobacco- and
Smoke-Free Environment

RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION: *Resolved,* That the West Virginia University at
Parkersburg Board of Governors approves the
proposal to revise Policy F-60, Tobacco- and
Smoke-Free Environment as presented.

STAFF MEMBER: Marie Foster Gnage, President

BACKGROUND:

At its meeting on January 31, 2013, the Council for Community and Technical College Education approved a resolution advocating the establishment of tobacco free campuses at all West Virginia community and technical colleges. The resolution recommended that all institutional Boards of Governors implement a policy to establish a tobacco free environment on each campus.

As authorized by the Board of Governors at its meeting of August 14, 2013, a notice of proposed rulemaking was issued in accordance with the rulemaking process on August 21, 2013, regarding a proposed revision of Policy F-60, "Tobacco- and Smoke-Free Environment," which would eliminate designated smoking areas effective January 1, 2014. The 30-day comment period, which ended on September 20, 2013, provided an opportunity to receive input and perspectives from the campus community regarding this proposal. A compilation of comments is attached.

At the October 9, 2013, meeting of the Board of Governors, the board tabled action on the revision of Policy F-60 as recommended by President Gnage and the college administration to allow time for additional information and education.

Information regarding education efforts will be presented at the meeting.

COMMENTS RECEIVED
Revised Policy F-60, Tobacco- and Smoke-Free Environment
Public Comment Period: August 21 – September 20, 2013

Date Received	Comments
8/21/13	I would like to voice my opinion on the campus tobacco free policy.I think this policy takes our freedom a bit to far I am a veteran who served for our freedom and each little policy,procedure,rule or law erodes away that freedom.Tobacco users moved outside to use tobacco products Jan.1st 1990 23 years ago I'm not saying that was a bad idea but enough is enough.I saw a article a few weeks ago and one of the colleges in the United States banned all meat products on campus.WHATS NEXT???? Dave White
8/21/13	I don't believe that making the campus a tobacco free environment would truly benefit. Smokers are already limited to a handful of smoking areas around campus, I have seen very few individuals using other tobacco products. Will the policy infringe on the ability for students and staff to use nicotine products such as (e-cigs, gum, or patches)? Which are not tobacco products, however people still don't want to see e-cigs even when they are theraputic devices. Roy Caplinger, Jr.
8/21/13	enough is enough its our choice quit trying to take it away. we stay 15 ft away and its the non smokers choice to come around us so you keep your distance n we will keep ours. and try n find something else to complain about. maybe something that benifits everyone. Joshua Cayton
8/22/13	I feel its our right to smoke! Iam 56 years old and paying to come to this college, my money supports this college . If I want a smoke after or before a class that is my right. The school should make a covered area for the smokers, to shield us from rain and snow, because the college certainly charges enough to do it. if you take smoking away the school will lose alot of students because as I see the school is made up of about 90% smokers. It is not your right it is the smokers right. Rebecca Love
8/22/13	we should get to still smoke put it away from the school and mark it off so we know where to stay and smoke. there is nothing out back besides the door that says no smoking past this point thats why people are all over the back of the school. going off campus to smoke is not fair to us when we have 10 to 15 min in between classes. we cant walk off and get to class on time. there are teachers that smoke to, so its not fair for them to run back to teach class. Garnett Bennington
8/22/13	I don't think smoking should be banned from campus. Where the smoking area is located at now does not affect the students or professors that do not smoke, in any way. I go to the smoking area in between classes to smoke a cigarette, to help relieve stress & just associate with other students. Even if they have to move it a little further away from the doors, that would be fine, but to completely move it off campus, that would make it too difficult and stressful to try to get there & back by the time your next class starts. So please consider not changing the smoking policy at the school. Thank you very much. Jenny Powell
8/22/13	I would just like to take a moment to urge you to consider not passing this proposal. The on campus smoking policy currently in place is already sufficient and followed. I feel any alteration of that policy will only lead to conflict with smoking students, faculty, and visitors. Thank you for your time and consideration. Marc Harris
8/22/13	As a smoker I'm object to this. We have a smoking place that is away from the door, we smoke there in the sun and the rain, when its freezing and in nice weather. If this law passes there will be a lot of unhappy students as well as staff. This will force people to go to their cars. This could possibly cause people to leave WVUP and not come back. As a non smoker I'm sure you don't really care, but this law is unfair. Michelle Hoff
8/23/13	This is over-kill with smoking regulation. People have the right to smoke and should not be punished for doing so. Let them have a area designated for them. This is another layer of bureaucracy that people really do not need. I do not smoke, but this is wrong. If you can eliminate smoking then what is next? People are not going to fit in this mold that everyone agrees on. Tanner Hurst
8/23/13	Please don't pass this proposed rule due to more then half of students and faculty and staff smoke, or use some type of tobacco. Mark J. Maslowski
8/23/13	Yes, I think this needs to be thrown out. We as smokers at WVUP, due what is asked of us when smoking in the designated area's. We stay in our area's they stay in theirs. I have none smoking friends that choose to come out with us smokers and chat. That is a choice. If people dont like that I smoke then they need not come around me while im doing so . But , i dont say just because someone is a none smoker they need to be, or they will be. Smoking is a choice, just like going to school is a choice. We hear every year about less and less attendance, people keep limiting the freedoms of what we can do or what we have, people are going to start going to other school's. Peggy Deem
8/26/13	I am opposed to the revision of Policy F-60; I believe that taking away a person's choice as to whether or not to smoke is an infringement of my rights. As it stands right now smokers are on the back side of the building in designated areas and cannot be seen when people drive up to campus. Following this revision numerous individuals will be right in front of the building, beside the parking lot, and I fear in the cemetery beside the college property. It will look like a protest or strike every time classes let out if students only have fifteen or twenty minutes between classes or when employees take their breaks or lunch. The current version of this policy is also compliant with the Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department Clean Indoor Air Regulation as modified in 2013, which addresses all smoking products and devices. I do follow the rules and know many others that do when it comes to where we are allowed to smoke. Right now I usually go out back behind the science wing and there is absolutely no harm to anyone else in that area. I totally understand not smoking inside buildings or state vehicles and within so many feet of the entrances. I follow these same rules at home; I do not smoke in my house or car. It may seem far-fetched that the following scenario may happen, however, this may be the next crusade taken on campus. Imagine being in line at the cafeteria and placing your order for food. The waiter/waitress may tell you that you can't order that choice available on the menu because you are overweight. Also, I have heard rumors about taking all meat out of schools because it is considered unhealthy. This is how the smoking crusade started. People who have never smoked do not realize the stress and anguish that goes along with withdrawal. I know others that have stopped smoking for years and still have the urge and feel like they could start back at any time. Also, most people I know substitute one vice for another. Most replace smoking with eating and then gain so much weight that makes them just as unhealthy. Then they are constantly bombarded with comments about their weight. The insurance company is already charging higher premiums if your

	<p>waist is larger than their guidelines allow.</p> <p>I am not saying smoking is good for anyone; however, it is not illegal. I do pay a higher premium for insurance and think that is enough punishment for the choice I make. I feel like smokers are being treated as second class citizens with no consideration for our rights as an adult. I think the bullying should stop. Thank you, Tess Martin</p>
8/26/13	<p>I can see where people will be walking out to the street on breaks/lunch etc. to smoke if there are no designated smoking areas. Kevin Whitmore</p>
8/26/13	<p>I for one am completely and utterly disgusted by these proposed changes. I'm all for the designated smoking areas, I'm a former smoker and cannot pretend that others are not annoyed, disgusted, or downright allergic to this habit. Even though I've eliminated my bad habits, to ban it outright for others is completely ridiculous. To start we have an incredibly large campus, with designated areas already alienating the almost 27% (Forbes.com) of adult smokers we have. Some people do. It for fun, some do it because it's an addiction, one doesn't need someone causing more stress for something they might already be incredibly sensitive about. You just sent out an email about the safe zone for LGBTQ individuals. You talk about combating forms of oppression yet you are enforcing one upon us yourself. And not only that, you're going to fine us for a legal substance? You're going to resort to blackmail, holding our future in jeopardy over something again that I will restate throughout this which is 100% legal? Which brings me to my second focus. Cigarettes are legal. This ban is for something that is completely legal. I don't see a ban on other legal substances such as caffeine. I hope that if this ban goes through you also ban coffee, energy drinks, pop, and any substance that has caffeine. One might try to make to make a counter point that they do not contain the amount of carcinogens that a cigarette does, but that only brings a third point. Why ban electronic smoking devices? Caffeine and its effects are no worse than nicotine, they are both incredibly similar stimulants. An electronic smoking device has fewer harmful chemicals in it than a bottle of soda. And are you scared of second hand smoke from an electronic device? No; the only second hand that comes from it is water vapor. It's completely ludicrous to even consider it in the same ballpark of danger as regular cigarettes. And if it's the nicotine that you are banning, are you also going to be banning smoking cessation devices such as the patch or nicotine gum? They provide the same chemical, so will this Hitler-esque ban cover those as well? We are paying students, grown adults, and most of all capable of making our own decision on legal products. This ban would just be oppressive, stress inducing, judge-mental, and a completely unnecessary decision. -Daniel Sjostedt</p>
8/26/13	<p>WVUP boasts of social justice and tolerance for all students regardless of race, creed, sexual orientation, or handicap, yet does not foster tolerance for those of us who smoke. I am an adult student returning to college nearly 20 years out of high school. Why is it okay to discriminate against myself and others who choose to smoke and not okay to discriminate against others who are handicapped or gay? Please don't think that I am racist or that I do not support LGBT rights. In fact, I am quite the advocate for equal rights. As such an advocate, I believe that discrimination against smokers should not be tolerated either. Most smokers that I associate with are considerate to their neighbors. I do not smoke in someone's house or car that does not smoke. I go outside in the back of the building like a shunned leper to damage my own lungs and spare others of the dreadful effects of second hand smoke. Is it the mere sight of me standing outside in the rain to have a cigarette that offensive to you that you cannot even tolerate my smoking on your property? I place my butts in the appropriate containers. I am definitely over the age of 18, making it legal for me to purchase and consume tobacco. My problem with the "No Smoking on Campus" Policy is that sometimes I only have 10 minutes between classes, or may only get a 10 minute break in the middle of a long class session, which is not enough time for me to gather my supplies, walk to my car, drive off of campus, smoke my cigarette, then come back and find a new parking space, gather my supplies from my car, and get to the classroom in time. As previously stated, I am almost 40 years old. I have been smoking for 20 years. I have worked in the healthcare field for almost that entire 20 years. If seeing first-hand what the effects of smoking are to my lungs has not stopped me from smoking already, I don't believe that making me drive off campus and be tardy for classes is going to stop me. You can't save me. I don't want to be saved. My solution to not being allowed to smoke on campus would be to possibly convert to the e-cigarette, as there is no harmful second-hand smoke, only water vapors released when I receive my nicotine fix. You have chosen, however, to include the e-cigarette in this policy. I would like to point out that the e-cigarette does not include tobacco, therefore, should not be included in this policy. This is a safe alternative to smoking a cigarette, in which I only receive the nicotine that I am addicted to without the other harmful carcinogens. Please reconsider this discriminatory policy. Give those of us with this addiction the same courtesy that you provide others who have disabilities. I can live with standing outside smoking an e-cigarette that does not contain tobacco. This policy, however, is unacceptable. Thank you, Barb Cecil</p>
8/27/13	<p>Hello, my name is Andrew Brozak and I am currently attending WVU-P. I am studying to be a Cisco Certified CCNA and for other certifications in the CIT program such as the A+, Linux Certification, MCP Windows Server 2008, and will be focusing on network security in the near future. I'm not concerned, however, with the CIT program but rather the revision of Policy F-60, Tobacco and Smoke - Free Environment. I read through the revisions and found a number of points that I find highly disconcerting. First and foremost, Section 2.1 "The use of all tobacco and smoking products, including e-cigarettes electronic smoking devices, is prohibited in all facilities West Virginia University at Parkersburg owned, leased or operated property, buildings and vehicles of West Virginia University at Parkersburg. This policy applies to all buildings of WVU at Parkersburg in all locations and all state vehicles owned by WVU at Parkersburg." --One of the points in this section that has me concerned is the inclusion of "electronic smoking devices". Electronic smoking devices are still relatively new and under-researched so the effects are still not known to be harmful to Non-smokers. Also, e-smoking devices are known to have ZERO tobacco in them. They contain a water soluble solution that typically contains nicotine, when "smoked" the device vaporizes the solution thus resulting in exactly that. Water vapor. They do not contain tobacco nor do they emit smoke and therefore should be exempt from this revision. --On the topic of the full ban of all tobacco products from the campus, I believe it to be overreaching and impractical, to say the least. For students who use tobacco, they will be forced to either leave the campus and come back in order to smoke (raising pollution of the immediate vicinity due to the toxic fumes that automobiles produce as well as raising they're gas bill) or they will run the risk of prosecution for doing something no different to them than biting their nails or twiddling their fingers. It would be like taking a child that has eaten a peanut butter and jelly sandwich everyday after school for years and all of a sudden banning and consequently punishing them should they ever eat another because their parents read an article about "The Hidden Dangers of Peanut Butter!" Whats more, these are not children you are dealing with but full fledged adults, fully capable and empowered to make whatever good and/or bad decisions they see fit. If you take away our right to smoke, and I say "our" in reference to the students AND teachers (professors) AND workers, the alienation that will be felt will be felt all across the school and dare I say will be affecting a great many that are crucial to making this school a fine place of higher education. Its hard to pretend you love teaching something when you feel alienated by both your peers and superiors. Not to mention on top of fighting constant nicotine withdrawals, I believe the general mood across the school would take a major slump which could quite possibly cause a major slump in grades and attendance. -- Speaking strictly business, banning all tobacco products from the campus of WVU-P would be horrible for the finances of the school. Everyone who walked outside to smoke a cigarette and</p>

	<p>decided to get a bite to eat at the cafeteria will now be buying their food elsewhere because they must leave the campus to smoke; putting them in the vicinity of many other much larger food service stations. Why bother getting a coffee or coke out of these vending machines down the hall if I already have to drive by Go-Mart to smoke then I might as well buy my coffee and coke there too. This activity would not only affect the smokers but also the non smokers as well. If I don't smoke but a couple of my friends do and they want to go to Go-Mart and Arbys for food and coffee and its a free ride for me then I'd say yes (esp. with gas at 3.42+ a gallon). I have more to say on the issue but for now I think I've said my piece. I have a few links I am going to share with you at the bottom of this message. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me. Thank you for reading, Andrew Brozak</p> <p>http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2008/07/01/scientific-evidence-shows-secondhand-smoke-no-danger http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2010/01/19/smoking-ban-health-miracle-myth http://detroitescapade.wordpress.com/2008/05/15/michigan-smoking-ban-is-it-a-communist-bill-does-it-threaten-liberty/ -The link directly above touches on the issue (the most important one in my opinion) of our freedom. I will write you about that at a later date.</p>
8/28/13	<p>I feel that the smoking ban is a terrible idea. For those who are smokers, it is a place to socialize and meet people from all walks of life. There are numerous students and faculty that responsibly use the smoking area in behind the cafeteria. For non smokers, they do not have to go into the area. If anything, the rules just need to be more strongly enforced so as to people not breaking the specifications if the allotted area. Thank you James Bower</p>
8/28/13	<p>I personally don't think there should be a smoking ban of WVU Parkersburgs campus. It is hard enough with all these classes, and stress of tests. If we do not have a place to go, to relax, and smoke we will go insane. What I mean is we should have the freedom to keep smoking our designated areas. Yes smoking is bad for us, but it is our right, and we choose to do so. It is nice to have smoking areas because, they are close by and we don't have to stand in the road to smoke. We can stay safe where we are and not be all over campus smoking, but in our designated areas. Thank You. Shelby Thomas</p>
8/28/13	<p>My name is Joel Davis, and I am new to WVU-P. I am not a regular smoker, however, during finals week I do like to have a cigarette to calm my nerves. I do not believe this is a fair rule to implement to any college or university because tobacco is a stress reliever for smokers, and most smokers become stressed at school. This would negatively affect the morale of many students who are regular smokers, taking away one of the very few places they have left to smoke. Joel Davis</p>
8/28/13	<p>While I agree that smoking should be banned campus-wide, I do believe that banning Electronic Smoking Devices would be a mistake on the part of the Board of Governors. Electronic Smoking Devices have been cited in numerous studies to be an effective harm reduction technique as well as an aide to quit smoking. To ban a tool that can actually be used to help students quit smoking would not be acting in students' favor, but rather would not be in the students' best interest. If the goal of the Board of Governors is to reduce harm to all students by eliminating things such as secondhand smoke and tobacco products then the Board should vote to completely eliminate tobacco products from campus, but eliminating Electronic Smoking Devices would over exceed and overextend both the recommendation from the CTC and possibly the mission of the Board of Governors. It is my belief as a non-smoker and the belief of many students, faculty, and staff to not ban Electric Smoking Devices. Thanks, Joshua Campbell</p>
8/29/13	<p>I would just like to say that I greatly oppose the idea of removing the smoking area and prohibiting the use of vapors on the WVU campus. There are many reason why i do not think this is a good idea. I feel that if someone would like to smoke then that is their right to do so as long as they do not do it around those who do not. (smoking area). Non smokers know where the smoking area is located therefor if they wish to not have the smoke around them then the campus provides MANY other options and places for them to go other than the one area that smokers have. I do not personally feel it is fair to ostracize smokers from the rest of the school or to somewhat "punish" them by forcing them to go well off campus just to have cigarette or vapor. This could potentially cause them to be late for class, as well as cause them more expense for gas, thereby pretty much forcing them to stop smoking all together. Which should ultimately be a persons choice. Thank you Chelsea Bishop</p>
8/29/13	<p>I am writing this comment in opposition to the proposed change to policy F-60 in regards to the tobacco free campus. One of the main issues I foresee is where the students, faculty, and staff are going to smoke. WVU – Parkersburg is not like most colleges and universities that are on 25 mile per hour streets that are fairly safe to cross to get off campus to smoke. I feel this will create safety issues. some will go to their vehicles to smoke, or use smokeless tobacco. The proposed wording of this policy seems to prohibit tobacco use in vehicles that are parked on campus. Persons using tobacco in vehicles will make a safety concern for Security trying to enforce the policy. If people are not allowed to smoke in their vehicles, they will go to Cedar Grove Road to smoke, creating a traffic problem. At any time during the day there can be anywhere from one to twenty people smoking in the smoking area behind the cafeteria. If they all walked to Cedar Grove Road to smoke, the effects can obviously be imagined. If Security, the Sheriff's Department or State Police runs people off from Cedar Grove, they will go across Rt. 47, which will end up getting someone hit. They will also stand in the church, or resident's yards, and throw their cigarette butts in their yards, which will source complaints from these residents. I feel that the current smoking areas work well. Some people, mostly new students or visitors, may need to be told the correct area to smoke during the first few weeks of classes, however most will go to the correct area once they are told. Others may not heed the warnings, but they end up getting fined for their disregard for the current policy. They are out of sight from the front of the building, and are not located in any areas someone is forced to walk through. Prohibiting tobacco use will cause people to smoke in more visible areas, while off campus, but creating an image problem. If the board chooses to prohibit tobacco products, I feel that electronic smoking devices and smokeless tobacco should be allowed, only if used outdoors. Electronic smoking devices are not tobacco products, and their only product produced from use is water vapor. I understand prohibiting these devices indoors, however, outdoors they should be allowed. Smokeless tobacco should be allowed outdoors because it does not produce harmful smoke that can inhaled by third persons, and does not affect anyone other than the person using it. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully submitted; Tyler Lewis</p>
8/29/13	<p>I am writing this to voice my opposition to this policy. I feel that this policy is in violation of my personal rights. I have absolutely no problem with smoking in designated areas, but to be take those designated areas away from tax and tuition-paying adults is simply unfair. As a student, I am paying tuition to be here and I follow the policies and rules that apply to me as a student. If this in fact becomes a policy, I will be forced to consider spending my tuition funds at another school. If that requires me to relocate, well then, I am willing to consider that too. Sincerely, Angela Sayre Profit, Student at WVUP</p>
9/3/13	<p>My name is Jason Ross. I am currently a sophomore at WVU Parkersburg enrolled in the RBA program. I have represented the school on the Speech and Debate team, serve on the student council, and am President of Phi Kappa Delta. Concerning the revisions of Policy F-60 being proposed, I have some concerns. They are as follows: 1. The changes being proposed alter the policy to such an extent that the original intent of the policy (to provide a safe and healthful environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors) is no longer the main emphasis. If suck were the case, a simple moving of the smoking area to another on campus location (closer to the tree-line next to the rear</p>

	<p>parking lot, for instance) would be sufficient to accomplish this goal. Proposing to make ours a smoke free <i>campus</i> has a political connotation to it, not merely concern for its constituents. I believe a change such as this would require proposal of a new policy, rather than revisions of an old one. 2. The Mid Ohio Valley Health Department Clean Indoor Air Regulation defines "smoking" as: "Smoking" means inhaling, exhaling, burning or carrying any lighted cigar, cigarette, pipe, plant or other smoking equipment in any manner or in any form." and should in no way include the use of electronic smoking devices which have little to no environmental or second-hand health harms. It should also be noted that the vapors released from electronic smoking devices should not be considered "smoke" as nothing is being burned in the process of heating the solutions present in these devices. These devices have been proven to be an effective, less harmful means of controlling an individual's urge to smoke and should be welcomed on our campus. While the effects of electronic cigarettes not yet conclusive, the majority of skeptics agree that any harms generated to the environment and second-hand breathers are greatly diminished.</p> <p>http://www.news-journal.com/features/health/health-experts-question-electronic-cigarette-benefits/article_74d01ad0-3557-5122-8a45-bc927ad467ba.html 3. Removing designated smoking areas is another main concern, and for a few reasons: 1). The Health Department has no jurisdiction to enforce the Clean Indoor Air Regulation outside of its listed 15 feet boundary from any entrance. This means that anyone deemed to be in violation of the school's policy could not be penalized by the Health Department as long as they meet the approved distance. 2). Without designated smoking areas anyone planning to violate the policy would be free to do so anywhere on campus (15 feet away from any entrance) because any punishment incurred would be the same everywhere. 4. With tobacco users having to leave campus to get their fix, many will flock to the neighboring properties to do so. This will cause a disturbance to our neighbors, who will now have smokers standing adjacent to their property. The migration of smokers from a secluded area behind the school, to the more visible areas surrounding the college will make smoking much more visible to the outside public. Given these reasons, I recommend that the revisions to the currently policy be rejected, and or revised. I feel that electronic smoking devices should be allowed in the current smoking area, and that a new smoking area for traditional smokers be placed farther away from the building, but not to go completely smoke free. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Jason T. Ross</p>
9/3/13	Don't do it! Adam Wells
9/7/13	<p>I am emailing my comment to you regarding the proposed smoking ban for WVU Parkersburg.</p> <p>First off, I am upset that, as a Democracy, students were not informed and involved in the decision more than they have been. I know Tyler Ohrm was very upset at what was said about this ban and that Underwood straight up told him that this was not a Democracy and that this smoking ban was going to happen. Seems that no matter what the student or professors think, this will be happening anyway. Is this legal? I will be doing my research, thoroughly. I am ashamed at how this school handled this subject, as a great portion of our students and professors are not the average student like would be found at a bigger university. Many of these students and teachers smoke. To not even offer an option to smoke in your car, or to have one smoking area..... seriously?! Not even ONE smoking area....Maybe further away from school buildings? Banning E-Cigarettes on top of regular cigarettes is just the icing on this unfair cake. Let's ban equipment that helps a smoker become and stay cigarette free. That makes sense. Does this school even care about its students anymore? Cutting pay for staff was already enough, but now more professors are going to consider leaving this school. I am positive many students will be reconsidering their enrollment at this school as well. But hey, Underwood and all those guys will get their way. They get what they want, not what is best for their school, students, professors, and campus. It is sad, really. Well, I have already wasted enough time sharing my feelings on a subject that seems to have already been decided on. I hope to just get my degree and get out of this school before in goes down hill even more. It is a shame really. Good professors and students have already left, and will continue to. All because this college does not want to offer at least ONE smoking area. This is not a big name school like WVU- this is a community college. What is good for big universities is not necessarily good for us. Again, wish the students and staff were cared about more. These are my feelings- the feelings of a Non-Smoker who wishes that the rights of smokers were not going to be infringed upon by the Board. Justina Morris</p>
9/11/13	<p>I would like too respectfully give my opinion on the proposed smoking ban. I think it would cause more problems than it is worth to take away our designated smoking areas. The one by the basement is not even in an area people walk by or really see and I have gotten too know most the people who go back there. We keep it clean and if we see a cig butt on ground we pick it up and throw it away. I have met people too study with and have even gotten to know some of the instructors better. If you ban smoking then the students will eventually start dumping cigarettes in the parking lots and on the streets. Students in the winter will be parked up and down the streets or at gas station smoking and littering with no respect for their surroundings. To many students will be involved to be able too pinpoint who should get cited. Students will be cranky and not pay attention as well in class because all they can think about is getting somewhere to grab a cigarette. Smokers should have rights too, if it is not offending the ones around them. I do understand a non smoker doesn't want to walk through a cloud of smoke. I say if you must take the smoking area away from the cafeteria then do so, but please leave the one near the basement. Thank you for listening, Regina Goodwin</p>
9/17/13	<p>I think that this smoking ban would be doing a small favor for the non smokers at our college while highly frustrating the students and faculty who choose to smoke. The only complaints I've heard from non smoking students and faculty have pertained to people who walk out the back door behind the cafeteria to get to the Caperton center. If we simply moved the smoking area further away from the door we could solve this problem without stepping on the rights of the students and faculty that choose to smoke.</p> <p>Thank you, Jake Frady</p>
9/18/13	<p>I do not see any reason to prevent smoking from being permitted on campus. There are smoking areas for a reason and as long as smokers only use those areas, they are not hurting anything. I am sure I can speak for alot of students when I say that there is sometimes barely enough time to walk to the smoking area between classes with the smoking areas being on campus, let alone if they had to walk all the way off campus to smoke. I do not agree with this policy, and I do not believe that they should make WVU-P a smoke free campus.</p> <p>Thank you. Lyndsey Hardman</p>
9/18/13	<p>I cannot believe the hypocrisy that occurs in academia. You people bend over backwards to accomidate gays, international students, etc..., but you think that it is perfectly alright to persecute one of the most diverse groups on campus. This discriminatory policy cannot be allowed to pass. Who will be next, people that eat cheeseburgers? Please reconsider this bad policy as it will only promote disharmony and negativity on campus. Jeff Ellison</p>
9/19/13	<p>I don't believe that a tobacco ban is a good thing.. I smoke and I have three classes back to back. There is no way I can leave campus and be back in time for my classes. I don't see a problem with the way it is now. Amber McClain</p>
9/19/13	<p>I am opposed to the smoking ban. How can the school take the position of selling Monster Energy drinks?(which have been directly linked to the death of children due to caffine poisoning) What makes it even worse, is you can purchase the same beverage from the cafeteria, what is to stop a young kid from buying a purchasing a few cans of monster from the cafeteria or the unsupervised vending machine and dying as a result of drinking hem? It is not illegal for a minor to buy energy drinks, it is however illegal for a minor to purchase tobacco</p>

	<p>products. It is hypocrisy. The current laws enforced by the government are sufficient and any additional infringements upon the rights of WVUP'S students and faculty is insulting. The vast majority of students at WVUP are adults and can make decisions about their health and what and where they consume anything. Is WVUP trying to communicate to College Students that we are not intelligent enough to make our own decisions? Phillip Arnel</p>
<p>9/19/13</p>	<p>The proposed revision to Policy F-60 will be impractical to enforce and will negatively impact student activity on campus. It also hinders students, faculty, and staff from reducing or eliminating their tobacco use and creates a potential safety hazard for pedestrian and vehicular traffic both on and surrounding the college campus. This proposed amendment to our current tobacco policy also puts an undue burden on members of the WVU Parkersburg community who engage in tobacco and/or nicotine use and eliminates electronic smoking devices which do not contain tobacco and can be used as a harm reduction method to smoking. The resolution passed by the West Virginia Council for Community and Technical Colleges in which this policy changed in referenced is actually over exceeded by our change in policy. In addition this policy change will negatively impact our standing in the local community and poses severe environmental risks. Enforcement of this policy change is extremely challenging and legally questionable due to the enforcement of students, faculty, and staff using banned products within their own private vehicle. Parked drivers smoking cigarettes in a tinted car with the windows rolled up or slightly cracked is likely to occur on a widespread basis and Campus Police & Security will be unable to identify many if not all of these violations. If a driver is approached by security with suspicion of use it would be doubtful that a driver could be charged with this violation. Also many students, staff, and faculty members have already pledged to simply drive around the parking lot and surrounding roads in an effort to evade detection. The increased traffic of tobacco and nicotine users creates a potential safety hazard with vehicles also entering and exiting the campus. The WVU Parkersburg campus is connected to an already high traffic roadway and this increased flow can lead to more accidents and collisions. This situation will also further compromise Campus Police efforts to enforce the tobacco and nicotine restrictions while continuing their duties in traffic enforcement, public safety, proper parking permit use, and related activities. Not only will this policy change have an impact on drivers of motor vehicles, it will endanger pedestrians who are both non-tobacco/nicotine users and tobacco/nicotine users. Students, faculty, and staff who use the banned products will be encouraged to leave school property to engage in their use. This will cause more pedestrian traffic in the parking lots and also the surrounding roads of the campus. Many of these users will cross Rt. 47 in an effort to evade enforcement. This increase of pedestrian traffic will further endanger safety in an already dangerous intersection. Pedestrian crossing in combination with inflated vehicular traffic adds another element of chaos for traffic enforcement and escalates an already dangerous situation. Faculty and staff performance will also be reduced if this policy is passed. Staff members are allowed two 15 minute breaks in addition to their 30 minute lunch. Currently staff members who engage in the use of these products can conveniently enter a designated smoking area and return to their office in the allotted amount of time. If Policy F-60 is changed staff members will be forced to leave the campus. Not only will they be rushed in an effort to use tobacco/nicotine products (which further solidifies the campus safety contention) but also it is much more possible that tobacco/nicotine users will be unable to return to work as quickly as before. As a result this will decrease institutional performance and lower employee morale. Faculty members will also be more likely to start class later than scheduled and/or spend more office time outside of the campus. Similarly this will hurt academic performance and lower faculty morale. The elimination of electronic smoking devices (which includes electronic cigarettes) would be a major mistake for the college to enact. A study published in the September edition of the medical journal <i>The Lancet</i> and led by the National Institute for Health Innovation in the School of Population Health at the University of Auckland in Auckland, New Zealand found that electronic cigarettes are just as if not more effective in helping smokers quit than those who used the nicotine patch. The study also determined that electronic cigarettes were more effective than other methods in reducing the overall amount of tobacco use. A link to an article reporting the study is provided below. http://www.dailymail.com/electronic-cigarettes-nicotine-just-effective-nicotine-patch-quitting-smoking The American Association of Public Health Physicians also views electronic cigarettes as an effective "harm reduction" method and endorses these products as a way to help smokers reduce or eliminate their use. According to the Library of the European Parliament in a briefing published on March 27, 2013 found that after surveying 222 vapers "31% did not smoke six months after purchasing their first electronic cigarette, and two thirds had reduced their cigarette consumption. The nicotine cessation rate was 10.6% after six months." The same briefing also notes that "A review of 16 studies concludes that "few, if any, chemicals at levels detected in electronic cigarettes raise serious health concerns" and that e-cigarettes are comparable in toxicity to NRTs and much less harmful than tobacco cigarettes. In 2009, a study by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) found dangerous substances "at very low levels". A recent laboratory study shows that levels of toxic substances in e-cigarette vapour are 9-450 times lower than in cigarette smoke and, in many cases, comparable with trace amounts found in medicinal nicotine inhalers." http://www.aaphp.org/Resources/Documents/20100402AAPHPEcigLegisStatemnt.pdf While research on the effects of electronic cigarettes is not entirely conclusive, it certainly looks promising. Banning these products would be unwise and would hinder students, faculty, and staff from reducing or eliminating their tobacco use. As an educational institution we should not be a barrier to people who wish to stop smoking. However the proposed change to Policy F-60 would certainly provide a road block for those who spend a considerable amount of time at the college. I find the full banning of electronic smoking devices and tobacco products to be deceiving and not within the spirit of the West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education resolution or the actual wording of it. I recognize that we already have an indoor ban on these products and I am perfectly fine with that. However the non-binding resolution simply recommends a "tobacco product-free environment" which by my interpretation we already have. Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines the common definition of "smoke" as "the cloud of black, gray, or white gases and dust that is produced by burning something". The proposed policy revision over exceeds the definition of what smoking actually is. "Tobacco" is defined as "a plant that produces leaves which are smoked in cigarettes, pipes, etc." and (tobacco) products are referred to as "being made from tobacco". "Environment" is defined as "the circumstances, objects, or conditions by which one is surrounded". Regardless it makes no mention of electronic cigarettes or electronic smoking devices which are covered in the policy change. Therefore it is incorrect to refer to the CTCE resolution as the basis of the policy change. Also the title of the proposed F-60 change is also confusing. Calling it a "TOBACCO- AND SMOKE-FREE CAMPUS" is not entirely correct. Electronic cigarettes produce water vapor and not smoke. This will continue to confuse students, faculty, and staff who believe that they can use these products. Forcing members of the college community to leave campus for tobacco/nicotine use will create a public relations nightmare for the institution. Instead of tobacco/nicotine users using a designated smoking area they will be forced to cross the street and people entering West Virginia University at Parkersburg will observe a trail of smokers lined up in front of the campus. If banning tobacco and e-cigarettes is partially based on a public relations issue it will actually do the complete opposite. This will not stop people from using these products and they will use them wherever they can. Instead of having an area away from the general public which includes bins for smokers to throw away cigarette butts, it will simply be thrown onto the ground causing an environmental issue. Not to mention this will certainly irritate the surrounding residents and businesses of the college. A great example of this would be the recent smoking ban of West Virginia University at Parkersburg in Morgantown. Students, faculty, and staff have simply walked off campus across the street to use banned products. This is not stopping WVU students from smoking and simply irritates the surrounding areas and</p>

	<p>businesses. A link concerning the impact of this ban is provided below. http://www.wvgazette.com/News/201307170021 <i>The Daily Athenaeum</i> in my opinion gives fair coverage of the implementation of their smoking in a link provided below. WVU didn't even ban e-cigarettes and they are still having problems with enforcement. It states that most people are ignoring the ban and the lack of designated smoking areas is causing confusion on campus. Now WVU is even considering scaling back some of its restrictions indicating that the ban is not going as well as they planned. Of course the article asks the important question as to why they enacted the ban in the first place, which seems to be based around other universities enacting similar policies. I must agree with the writer of this article that it is a fairly weak argument and we should be enacting a policy simply because others are. Just because everyone else is doing it doesn't make it right. http://www.thedaonline.com/opinion/editorial-how-realistic-is-the-smoking-ban-1.3050922#UjuaNtKKLak This leads me to an analysis of the actual legal procedure for enforcing this ban. The Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department legally cannot enforce a smoking ban outside of fifteen feet of the entrance of a building. So using the Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department under the Clean Indoor Air Act when they have no legal jurisdiction makes no sense whatsoever. Furthermore I have been informed that our Campus Police & Security can only issue fines for issues dealing with parking and traffic enforcement so they will be unable to fine individuals who disobey the policy. Therefore the only way in which this can be enforced is through disciplinary action (probation, suspension, expulsion) which has to go through a proper hearing and may not even succeed. This would not be cost effective and would completely tie up our disciplinary system. Not to mention it would further encourage students, faculty, and staff to use these products wherever they please since it would be impossible for them to enforce. In conclusion while I would be open to a policy change that would address the needs of tobacco users, electronic smoking device users, and non-users of these products, the proposed revision to Policy F-60 does not address these needs. The issues of enforcement, public safety, environment, student/employee morale and productivity, student engagement, public relations, smoking cessation, and past failures of this policy all point towards a disapproval of the change in my opinion. Everyone is concerned with public health but we need to make policy changes that respect the rights of all students, faculty, and staff and also changes that can truly be enforced. The proposed change to Policy F-60 will have a negative impact on our campus and may actually prevent people from quitting tobacco. For these reasons I urge a negative vote on the resolution. Tyler Ohrn</p>
9/20/13	i think banning students from smoking is a bad idea. i do not support this... Angel Spangler
9/20/13	<p>Here is my comment for Policy F-60: I agree that a smoking band can help smokers quit smoking, but they way that the school is going about this is completely wrong. Doing this so abruptly without going to the smokers is plain rude. Along with that, the e-cigarettes that is included in the policy are suppose to help students quit, so the policy is taking away the aid to quit smoking.</p> <p>All-in-all, I think we need to scrap the policy completely and just continue everything to way it is by having designated smoking areas behind the school. If they school really wants to do something, just move the smoking areas another 10-20 feet away from the school and then everyone can be happy. I just think this policy is poorly written, poorly thoughts of, and just plain stupid. Thank You -- Brandon Cooper</p>
9/20/13	<p>My name is Jared Towner and I'm a student at WVU-Parkersburg. I'm writing this e-mail to express my concern and direct opposition for the proposed F-60 Tobacco and smoke free campus implementation. Though I love the idea of creating a healthier environment, I do have some very specific concerns directly associated with the viability of this policy at WVU-Parkersburg. 1.) As I understand it, F-60 was created from a model used and implemented at WVU and Marshall Universities. Understanding at the very least that WVU-Parkersburg is not a University, where students who wish to smoke can usually just cross a street and no longer be on University property; WVU-Parkersburg has a greater issue associated with that travel seeing how most students would have to walk 300 to 400 yards to find an area where they could smoke in accordance with the policy. The most obvious place that I believe smokers would congregate would be at the entrance to the college where people drive into and out College Property creating a increased risk of injury to student smokers and drivers as well as inevitably creating a great annoyance for Student Drivers, Faculty and Staff. Inherently creating a less safe environment for all those involved. 2.) Given the large amount of Non-traditional students at WVU-Parkersburg who are often more strapped for time due to family and work obligations I believe the proposed tobacco ban does not show this significant portion of the student body the respect associated with their lifestyles and previous experience. The wide belief of the student body is that the smoking ban will force people to not smoke. As a non-traditional student myself (I'm a 3 tour veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom with the United States Army and 34 year old man) who is has a wedding on the horizon, a day job, WV Army National Guard obligations and a small farm, I take what little spare time I have very seriously, and would be offended if the College administration and board of Governors made the decision that I would have to spend more time traveling for me to smoke or use tobacco if I so chose with out taking into consideration these previously mentioned factors and outside responsibilities. 3.) I believe because of the smoking ban the college cafeteria will loose money associated with more students traveling off campus to eat, so they can use tobacco at the same time. Given the 7.5% reduction in total spending that just hit WV Higher Education and a likely second 7.5% reduction looming in the very near future, I believe that the Board of Governors and Administration should do everything that they can to encourage students to spend their money at the college, rather than at the Hamburger shop down the street.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns, I look forward to a response on these issues that I have communicated to you. Jared E. Towner</p>
9/20/13	<p>The change to Policy F-60 is not in the best interest of WVU Parkersburg and does nothing to stop tobacco or nicotine use on campus. Its only point is to ban e-cigarettes which actually help people stop smoking. I do not understand why the College President would attempt to ban a product that promotes tobacco cessation. Does she want students and staff to keep using tobacco? Also there is no way WVU-P will be able to enforce this ban of our rights and freedoms. The Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department cannot enforce anything past 15 feet and Campus Police cannot issue fines for tobacco use. Instead of us having a secluded smoking area students will smoke everywhere since there is no way the disciplinary board would expel a student for rubbing snuff or using a nicotine based e-cigarette to help stop smoking. Everyone will be smoking around the campus and across the street creating a nightmare for our college. Furthermore, you're not a student or staff member there is literally nothing at all WVU-P can do about it. Everyone will now leave the campus and student participation in activities will greatly decrease. Cigarette butts will be all over campus hurting our environment and there will so many accidents caused by students and staff trying to evade detection. This hasn't worked at other college's and it certainly will not be effective at our campus. We shouldn't be playing follow the leader and instead stand up for what's right. The state resolution this policy is based off of doesn't even match up with what we are trying to do. This shows how out of touch Dr. Gnage is and if this succeeds it will be a low point for WVU-P. F-60 cannot be implemented and must be stopped. Matthew Roberts</p>
9/20/13	<p>I'm not proud to admit that I smoke, but I do for now, until I accomplish quitting! I would really appreciate it if you would please keep the designated smoking areas on wvup campus! In my opinion, as long as people abide by the rules & only smoke in the designated smoking areas, I really don't see how that would have a negative effect on any non-smokers! Also, the E-cigarettes would absolutely not harm anybody that is a non-smoker!! I feel sure that unfortunately there are quite a few people that attend this college that smoke & I do not think it would be fair to discriminate against all of them!! Thank you for your consideration to not ban the designated smoking areas on campus!</p>

Sincerely, Julie Ann Tripler



A Resolution Concerning Proposed POLICY F-60

WHEREAS, proposed WVU Parkersburg Board of Governors POLICY F-60 bans the use of all electronic smoking devices along with tobacco products, and

WHEREAS, this substantial policy directly affects a large section of our student population and the student population at large was unable to engage in discussion, and

WHEREAS, documented medical research supports the use of electronic smoking devices as a harm reduction method with the elimination of second-hand smoke, and

WHEREAS, this policy over exceeds the recommendations of the West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education by eliminating electronic smoking devices , and

WHEREAS, the implementation of this policy would bring an undue burden on the student body in a highly stressful academic environment and further hinder students and employees opportunities to reduce or eliminate tobacco addiction,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the West Virginia University at Parkersburg Student Government Association here assembled at West Virginia University at Parkersburg that the Board of Governors shall not adopt PROPOSED POLICY F-60 as currently written.

Introduced by Joshua Campbell

❖ *L. Tyler Ohm* _____

President of WVU Parkersburg Student Government Association

West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors

POLICY F-60
TOBACCO- AND SMOKE-FREE ENVIRONMENT CAMPUS

Section 1: General

- 1.1 Scope. This policy establishes a tobacco- and smoke-free ~~environment~~ campus at West Virginia University at Parkersburg in order to provide a safe and a healthful environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors.
- 1.2 Authority. W. Va. Code [§18B-1-6](#), [Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department Clean Indoor Air Regulation](#)
- 1.3 Effective Date. ~~February 19, 2013~~ January 1, 2014
Replaces version dated February 19, 2013

Section 2: Policy.

- 2.1 The use of all tobacco and smoking products, including ~~e-cigarettes~~ electronic smoking devices, is prohibited in all ~~facilities~~ West Virginia University at Parkersburg owned, leased or operated property, buildings and vehicles of West Virginia University at Parkersburg. This policy applies to all buildings of WVU at Parkersburg in all locations and all state vehicles owned by WVU at Parkersburg.
- 2.2 "Tobacco-Free Environment Campus" and "No Smoking" signs shall be displayed in appropriate locations.
- ~~2.3 Smoking may be permitted outdoors in designated areas only. The goal is to maintain a smoke free environment at all main entrances.~~
- 2.4 Designated smoking areas shall be identified by the institution and signs shall be posted to identify those locations. In accordance with the Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department's [Clean Indoor Air Regulation](#), smoking areas in these designated locations shall be 15 or more feet away from any entrance, window or ventilation/HVAC system.
- ~~2.5~~ 2.3 Educational programs on health issues related to tobacco use and smoking cessation workshops will be provided to employees and students.
- 2.4 Advertisements promoting tobacco and smoking products are prohibited in college publications and facilities.
- ~~2.6~~ 2.5 Violators of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action. Fines may also be imposed by the Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department for violations under the [Clean Indoor Air Regulation](#).

**West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors
Meeting of December 17, 2013**

ITEM: Designated Funds

RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION: *Resolved, That the West Virginia University at Parkersburg Board of Governors will designate funds from college reserves to be used for the Student Activities Center Project that is being constructed in partnership with WV National Guard.*

STAFF MEMBER: Marie Foster Gnage, President

BACKGROUND:

West Virginia University at Parkersburg and the West Virginia Army National Guard are partners in the construction of an Activity Center at the WVUP campus in Wood County. The development of the facility will focus on overlapping needs of West Virginia University at Parkersburg, the Wood County Community, and the West Virginia Army National Guard, which include spaces for gathering, training, and fitness. The Activity Center will be the first in a larger project that will include the construction of a new West Virginia Army National Guard Readiness Center and Field Maintenance Shop on the campus. The facilities will house the headquarters of the 1092nd Engineering Battalion, the 193rd Engineering Platoon, and Detachment 1, of the 199th Sapper Company. Once completed, the overall project will include nearly 120,000 SF at a total project cost of nearly \$35M.

The new facility will include a large multi-purpose gathering space that can be used for commencements, athletic events, trade shows, and performances. The space was designed to maximize flexibility, and will be able to seat over 4,000 people with a central stage, and 3,500 people with a stage as the focal point. The space can also seat more than 800 people in a banquet setting, or hold more than 120 booths in a trade show configuration. Additional functions will include flexible classroom space, a veteran's assistance office, as well as a large fitness area. The total facility will include nearly 60,000 SF, and will serve as a focal point for student and community activity on the campus. The construction of the facility is estimated to cost \$13,000,000; the cost to the college and its partners is estimated to be \$8 million.

The Board is being asked to set aside funds from the college's reserves to be used towards construction costs.