

## **PROPOSAL FOR A NON-SMOKING CAMPUS**

For the last nine years the campus has been a non-smoking campus with designated smoking areas. At this time the proposal is to make the "non-smoking" with no designated smoking areas. In the time that this proposal has gone through consultation there have been several announcements of other campuses that have gone non-smoking completely. Following are excerpts from some of the emails I have received in last couple of weeks:

"Why does the #1 college in the nation still allow smoking on its beautiful campus? The writing is on the wall, eventually all the campuses in California are going to become smoke-free...what are we waiting for?"

<http://newsroom.ucla.edu/portal/ucla/quitting-time-ucla-is-tobacco-245462.aspx>  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_smoke-free\\_colleges\\_and\\_universities#California](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_smoke-free_colleges_and_universities#California)

Another campus goes smoke free!

<http://www.glendalenewspress.com/news/tn-gnp-0420-glendale-community-college-goes-smoke-free,0,812044.story>

This has been implemented on the majority of college campuses and has been effective in preventing the problem of second hand smoke and eliminating the litter and blight of discarded cigarette butts.

There are several reasons for prohibiting smoking on campus. The most obvious is cited in our policy: "to maintain a workplace that is conducive to the health and safety of our students and employees". The health hazard presented by smoking and second hand smoke has provided the rationalization for restrictions on smoking throughout the state and country. The issue for people with asthma or other respiratory diseases is well documented. The College is receiving complaints from the faculty, staff and students on the second hand effects of the smoking areas. The complaints are from having to walk past the smoking areas or the smoke becoming so dense as to drift into offices and classrooms even some distance away, and the blight of the smoking areas themselves.

"I have asthma. It's not a bad case, but I do use an inhaler everyday (Flovent). Today, however, I had my window open during office hours, and during the middle of a student conference I had to stop and take out my Albuterol emergency inhaler because of the smoke coming in my window. Can we do something about this? Is this is an OSHA issue?"

The smoking areas are always littered with discarded cigarette butts and trash, and are not pleasant to look at. The cigarette butts are a health hazard and pollute our oceans.

"I just walked past the smoking area that is perched right in front of the iconic fountain and view of the ocean on west campus. It was littered with dozens of cigarette butts. There are storm drains very near the site. Once it rains these butts will be transported quickly to the beach... I take my 4 year-old to that beach and am disgusted when she picks up an old butt and asks "what's this?" Pretty sad if I have to answer, "oh that's from daddy's work." Yes, melodramatic, but I suspect at some point the subject line of this email could be a headline for a newspaper article and that wouldn't look very good for us. This has been an ongoing problem. I suggest we put the smoking areas on probation. If the smokers cannot keep the area clean, then we should remove the smoking areas and ban smoking on campus entirely. This shouldn't be a responsibility of our over worked custodial staff or security... If there was a similar level of pollution created by any other sector of campus we would put a stop to it in short order, so I am asking we do the same here."

To address the needs of the smokers the change to the policy would not be implemented until the start of the fall semester in 2013. This would allow our faculty and staff who smoke time to resolve how they would address the change in policy. There are resources available if they choose to stop smoking.

Following are some Frequently Asked Questions and responses from the Center for Tobacco Policy on the implementation of the Smoke Free Entryway policy.

[http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/files/files/5319\\_SmokefreeEntrywayKit-8-04-Update.pdf](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/files/files/5319_SmokefreeEntrywayKit-8-04-Update.pdf)

**What is the concern about secondhand smoke?**

In 1993, the Environmental Protection Agency classified secondhand smoke as a Class A carcinogen, putting it in the same category as asbestos and radon. Class A carcinogens are known to cause cancer in humans. Secondhand smoke contains more than 4,000 chemicals, including nicotine, arsenic, benzene, formaldehyde, and carbon monoxide. Many of these chemicals are poisonous and deadly. Secondhand smoke kills nearly 3,000 nonsmokers each year from lung cancer in the United States and another 35,000 to 62,000 from coronary heart disease. Exposure to secondhand smoke can have immediate health consequences, including eye, nose and throat irritation, as well as asthma attacks and breathing problems in people with chronic lung disease. Secondhand smoke is especially harmful to children and has been linked to sudden infant death syndrome, low birth rates, acute lower respiratory infections, middle ear infections, asthma and other respiratory ailments.

**Isn't it safe to smoke outside?**

We used to think it was safe to smoke outdoors and encouraged smokers to step outside. While smoke does dissipate more quickly outdoors, studies conducted by former Environmental Protection Agency researcher James Repace and others show the deadly particles linger in the air long enough to be breathed into the lungs. The fact is secondhand smoke is not safe, not even outdoors.

**Are smoke-free laws fair to smokers?**

Smoke-free laws are fair to smokers. Both federal and state courts have determined there is no legal right to smoke. These policies do not keep smokers from smoking, they just restrict where smoking can occur just as other laws restrict where activities can occur in public. We aren't allowed to drink alcohol in entryways either. We live in a society where millions of people have to coexist together, so we must set policies that protect the rights of all people. The public has a right not to be subjected to a deadly substance. Are there any other benefits? Another benefit of smoke-free policies is they help to reduce tobacco use, the number one preventable cause of death and disease in this country. Smokefree policies encourage smokers to quit and make it easier for those trying to quit to succeed. They also help to reduce tobacco use by de-glamorizing smoking and making it less attractive to young people.

Following is the current policy with the proposed changes.

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT POLICY NO. 3555  
GOVERNING BOARD**

Adopted by the Board of Trustees May 27, 2004 Page 1 of 2

**BP 3555 SMOKE-FREE WORKPLACE POLICY**

**This policy is compliant with State law SB-846, Chapter 342, Sections 19994.30 and 19994.33,**

**of the Government Code Relating to Tobacco**

**SMOKE-FREE WORKPLACE POLICY**

It is the intent of the college's governing Board of Trustees to maintain a workplace that is conducive to the health and safety of our students and employees. Realizing the health hazards posed by smoking and by second-hand smoke, it is the policy of the Santa Barbara Community College District to maintain a smoke-free campus. In addition, the use of smokeless tobacco is prohibited in any campus facility.

This policy pertains to students, faculty, staff, administrators, visitors and the general public attending campus events.

This policy shall apply to all SBCC facilities, owned or leased, regardless of location, and all state and auxiliary vehicles.

Tobacco products shall not be commercially sold or distributed in any manner on campus. This includes free samples distributed by vendors. Advertising and sponsorship of campus events by tobacco companies is also prohibited.

The campus shall make available to students, faculty, staff and administrators information about smoking-cessation programs.

In any dispute arising under this policy, the rights of the non-smoker shall have preference. The district's Grievance Policy may be used in cases of unresolved disputes regarding this policy.

Signs which designate the campus as smoke free shall be posted when and where deemed appropriate by the Director of Facilities.

This policy is compliant with State law AB-846, Chapter 342, Sections 19994.30 and 19994.33, of the Government Code Relating to Tobacco.

Approved by the Board of Trustees

## Santa Barbara Police Department (SBPD) Police Officer Assigned to SBCC

We are recommending placing a full time Police Officer on Campus to provide support for the campus community. After discussions in college consultation and with the SBPD the proposal has been modified to utilize a retired police officer for a 4day 10 hour shift and officers on overtime for an evening 5 hour shift Monday through Thursday. After the fall semester the college and the SBPD would file a report evaluating the effectiveness of the program. This would be brought through consultation in the spring semester. The cost of this program would be approximately \$109,000 per year.

The officer would be responsible for responding to most of the critical incidents that occur on campus daily. Having the officer on campus would ensure the response was much quicker as the call would go directly to them on campus as opposed to the standard 911 dispatcher process.

These incidents may consist of:

- a. individuals with weapons
- b. individuals under the influence
- c. individuals who have committed a crime
- d. individuals who have violated school policy
- e. medical emergencies

In addition the officer will take an active role in emergency preparedness and response. This has gained importance with the occurrence of violent incidents reported on college campuses across the nation. In addition, in the event of a major disaster they will play a critical role in responding to campus needs and provide a critical interface with City Police and Fire departments.

The Santa Barbara Police Department has been very enthusiastic responding to this request. The SBPD believes this will increase police knowledge and awareness of the Campus aiding in a quicker and better response for critical incidents or emergencies. In addition, it is believed that an armed police presence on campus is a deterrent to all crimes, but in particular violent crimes.

The Police Department has been very flexible in the approach to staffing this position, with the focus on providing an officer that will meet our unique campus community. They understand how different our campus environment is and would ensure the officer would fit our campus culture. They have proposed making this a special position with a three (3) year commitment of the same officer to provide continuity and stability for the Campus.

The approximate cost of providing coverage is \$250,000 per year. This cost includes one full-time Police Officer and additional support as required. The additional support is for additional coverage of 25% of an office's time and for coverage of time off taken by the officer(s). The need on campus will fluctuate with the campus calendar and the contract cost will be finalized as the position responsibilities become more defined.

Having a Police Officer on Campus will provide valuable service to the college community meeting the growing requirements of emergency response and providing a safer, more secure environment for all. Our commitment is to provide the best educational experience possible, providing an environment where our students, faculty and staff receive the best response possible in an emergency and feel safe is a critical component of that experience.

# CPC Classified Staff Hiring Process

CPC Workgroup on Classified Staffing Priorities

April 11, 2013

## Introduction

The purpose of this document is to describe a College-wide process for hiring **new** classified staff. This is a challenging problem due to the diversity of jobs classified staff perform. However, in order to give all units of the College the ability to articulate their needs, a process needs to be created that is as fair as possible.

This process is broken up into 4 pieces:

- 1 Identification of Need
- 2 Allocation of the Number of Positions
- 3 Ranking of Positions
- 4 Hiring

There is also a process for the exceptions to the process. The next several sections describe each part of the process.

## 1. Identification of Need

Periodically, a call for proposals is made campus wide with a special effort being made to inform line management in Ed Programs and Operations of the opportunity to ask for staff. The request would come in the form of a series of questions answered by the potential direct supervisor of the requested new position. All of the aggregate requests would be compiled into a pool to be evaluated and ranked.

Evaluations and ranking are performed by a subcommittee of CPC, the Classified Staff Hiring Subcommittee.

## 2. Allocation of the Number of Positions

The number of positions that would be allowed would be determined by CPC. This would be the number of positions or a dollar amount. This would be known before the ranking of positions.

## 3. Ranking of Positions

All positions to be ranked must be included in the relevant program review. To rank positions the Classified Staff Hiring Subcommittee would read all of the submitted requests and ask the requestors to come to the committee and answer questions regarding the requirements for the new position. This process is mainly to aid the subcommittee in learning about the College's needs which should improve the ranking process. Once all of the managers have been provided the opportunity to discuss the requirements for the new positions the subcommittee will rank all of the positions using a weighted ranking method (the "Wopat" method). In the event of a tie the two tied positions will be ranked separately and that ranking order use to resolve the tied order in the original ranking. Once ranked the positions within the allowed allocation of positions would constitute the subcommittee's recommendation. This would proceed to CPC.

## 4. Hiring

The recommendations of the committee would be brought to CPC for approval. If approved, hiring would follow normal College procedures.

## **5. Exceptions**

If a manager feels that there is an emergency hire they can petition CPC for an emergency hire. This should be discouraged and it is hoped that exceptions to the process are reserved for emergencies of need rather than planning.

## **Suggested Items to be decided by CPC**

Who is on the subcommittee? The committee recommends that we have a small committee (< 6 members) with wide representation.

How often do we put out the call for classified staff?

How often does the subcommittee meet?

## Budget for Orfalea Early Learning Center

Orfalea Early Learning Center is the Early Childhood Education Department's instructional laboratory.

2012-2013 need for district support: \$209,924

-per independent early childhood consultant who visited and reviewed the Center's staffing, operational practices and budget last fall

TOTAL PROJECTED INCOME for 2012-2013 = \$487,416

-Projected income from state contract 185 day program = \$98,116

-Projected other subsidized fees for 185 day program = \$94,000

-Projected faculty, staff and community fees for 195 days = \$195,400

-Projected other funding = \$99,900

[specifically: Children's Center Tax Bailout - \$28,300; childcare food program - \$25,000; SB School District (Special Ed placements) - \$6,200; Orfalea donation with interest - \$40,400]

TOTAL PROJECTED EXPENSES for 2012-2013 = \$697,340

-Supply costs are "extremely modest (\$3,500, or ~\$53/child for supplies and materials/year)

-Salaries and benefits = \$647,140

-OELC faculty and teacher salaries - "within range" on the low side compared to other city and community colleges

-Director's salary is "20%-30% lower than all directors' salaries" in colleges and school districts analyzed by consultant

-Budgeting for substitutes - essential to comply with legal ratios

-Cost of benefits - beyond OELC control.

All OELC faculty and staff teachers qualify as Mentor Teachers. Mentor teachers are not the norm in private sector/community facilities.

SBCC's state contract only funds subsidized children for 185 days of the year. There would be no subsidy for these children in a year-round program. Consultant had not seen programs successfully curb financial costs by operating on a full-year schedule.

Consultant comments:

"The Santa Barbara City College child care program is a model for other programs in that the administration has used every tool and strategy at its disposal to provide a program that serves the entire college community. . . The program supports the campus mission in many ways by functioning as an integral part of the academic program while providing care to student, faculty and staff children."

Category	Institution Sub-Totals	DTC/AS Recommendation to Fund	
Staff	\$3,721,469.00		
Faculty	\$2,165,520.00		
TLU	\$921,000.00		
Equipment (New)	\$374,363.11	\$48,994.44	AS Only
Equipment (Replacement)	\$439,469.83	\$261,201.83	AS Only
Hardware (New)	\$341,248.33	\$141,344.33	
Hardware (Replacement)	\$332,114.34	\$330,514.34	
Software (New)	\$165,958.13	\$133,852.00	
Software (Replacement)	\$237,988.00	\$234,069.00	
Service	\$0.00		
Other	\$514,163.65		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$9,213,294.39</b>	<b>\$1,149,995.94</b>	

### COLOR CODING KEY AND OTHER NOTES

Funded in 2012-2013	DO NOT RANK – Red
Removed from Ranking by Committee based on incorrectly included (should be a Work Order or duplicate request), insufficient info, or by Department Chair. The dollar amount should be zeroed out but create a comment with original amount.	DO NOT RANK – Orange
Item was put into wrong category and has been reassigned to this corrected category. A new number was assigned when it moved and may include a letter. Keep in mind that some item numbers may be completely missing after moving.	
Identified as "Priority One" by Originator	REVIEW and RANK = Green