

UC Office of the President

Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) Funded Publications

Title

Navigating Threats of Wildfires and Individual Rights to Adopt 100% Tobacco-Free Policy in Rural California Community Colleges.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6f40f74d>

Authors

Lui, Camillia K
Trieu, Sang Leng
Gomes, Anne-Marie
et al.

Publication Date

2024-04-20

DOI

10.1007/s10900-024-01361-6

Peer reviewed

Engaging students in advancing campus tobacco-free policies: A qualitative study of California community colleges' efforts

Setareh Harsamizadeh Tehrani, BS¹; Sang Leng Trieu, DrPH,¹; Lien Dao, BS¹, Carissa Samuel, BS¹, and Camillia K. Lui, PhD²

¹Student Health Center, Ohlone College, Fremont, CA, U.S.A.; ²Alcohol Research Group, Public Health Institute, Emeryville, CA, U.S.A.

Corresponding author:

Setareh Harsamizadeh Tehrani

Ohlone College

43600 Mission Blvd.

Fremont, California, 94539, USA

Department: Student Health Center

(510)598-8252

Setareh.tehrani.scccpp@gmail.com

Keywords: Young Adult, Students, Tobacco, Policy Making, Attitude to Health, Health Education, Health Equity, Health Policy

Summary Box: In 2021, U.S. young adults had the highest smoking and vaping rates and smoking prevalence is higher among community college (CC) students compared to their four-year counterparts. Student engagement has been recognized as a key strategy in tobacco control policy efforts. However, research on CC and on student engagement in policy efforts are limited. This qualitative study describes the levels, roles, and value of engaging students in advancing 100% tobacco-free policy in California CCs. Colleges should leverage their campuses' most important assets—students—as agents of change and involve them in the full spectrum of tobacco control efforts.

Abstract

Introduction: Tobacco use remains a significant problem for young adults. Given the large number of young adults attending college, a tobacco-free campus is one strategy to reduce tobacco use. Young adult engagement has been recognized as a common strategic practice in tobacco control policy efforts, especially in changing social norms around tobacco use.

Community colleges can leverage and engage students in adoption of campus 100% tobacco-free policies. This qualitative study examines the importance of student engagement in advancing 100% tobacco-free policies in community colleges and identifies strategies for campuses to involve students in such efforts.

Methods: Twelve community colleges were selected with key informant interviews from campus and community-based organizations who were involved in campus policy adoption efforts.

Thirty-three semi-structured interviews were conducted, transcribed, coded, and analyzed using a thematic analytic framework with inductive and deductive approaches to examine student engagement processes.

Results: Community colleges represented campuses with (6) and without tobacco-free policy (6) with variation by rural/urban geography and student population size. Three main themes emerged: (1) no ‘wrong-door’ for students to engage in tobacco control work; (2) myriad of ways for students to be involved in policy adoption; and (3) benefits of student engagement.

Conclusions: Students are doers, allies, and champions in adoption of 100% campus tobacco-free policy. Colleges should leverage their campuses’ most important assets—students—to be agents of change and to involve them in the full spectrum of interventions and advocacy.

Introduction

In 2021, U.S. young adults (YAs) ages 18-25 had the highest smoking and vaping rate (14.1% or 4.7 million people).¹ Given the number of college-attending YAs, a tobacco-free campus is one strategy to reduce tobacco use through student engagement.² California Community Colleges (CCCs), the nation's largest higher education system, passed a 2018 resolution supporting the adoption and implementation of 100% tobacco-free policies (TFP). Since the resolution is not binding, only 66% of CCCs are completely tobacco-free as of 2023.³

As more YAs pursue higher education,⁴ colleges are an opportune environment for tobacco prevention and cessation. However, much of the research has focused on four-year colleges, leaving community colleges (CC) an understudied population.⁵⁻⁸ This is surprising given that CC students make up more than two-fifths (42%) of all U.S. undergraduates.⁹ Smoking prevalence, particularly daily smoking, is higher among CC students compared to their 4-year counterparts, and CC students are less likely to quit.¹⁰⁻¹¹ In a 2016 survey, 11.6% of CCC students were current smokers versus 9.3% of U.S. college students.¹² Similarly, student engagement in CCs differs from that in four-year universities due to several factors. CCs tend to enroll a more diverse student body than four-year universities, with higher proportions of low-income and first-generation college students.⁵ Additionally, CCs often have fewer support services than four-year universities¹³ and the transitional nature of a CC along with having a shared governance structure make TFP-related student engagement more complicated.

For over three decades, student engagement has been recognized as a strategic practice in tobacco policy efforts.¹⁴ Student involvement can advance comprehensive tobacco control efforts through social norm change, particularly with counter-marketing efforts. Student engagement can yield high economic returns at low cost. American College Health Association's (ACHA)

Statement of Tobacco on College and University Campuses recommends the development of a tobacco task force with student involvement.¹⁵ The literature on college students' involvement in tobacco control efforts is limited. After passing a TFP, one campus found that student ambassadors improved compliance and reduced cigarette butts at campus hotspots.¹⁶ Given the dearth of research on student involvement in campus policy efforts, this qualitative study examines the importance of student engagement in advancing 100% TFPs in CCs and identifies strategies for campuses to involve students in such efforts.

Methods

In this phenomenological study, twelve CCs were purposively selected based on criteria from our parent study that focused on facilitators and barriers to college TFP adoption. Selection criteria included geographic location, policy status and informed by prior study results.¹⁷⁻¹⁸ Up to three key informants at each CC were recruited based on their knowledge or direct experience with TFP adoption process, and included students, staff, faculty, or college leaders, or employed with a tobacco-related community-based organization or public health department. Key informants were recruited through our Study Advisory Board (including California Youth Advocacy Network and Health Services Association-California Community Colleges), websites, and referrals from key informants. Recruitment was done via email and telephone calls. A total of 33 key informants participated.

A semi-structured interview guide was developed using Ickes and colleagues' Campus Assessment of Readiness to End Smoking¹⁹ (including resources, leadership, knowledge, campus climate, political climate, and existing tobacco control policies) and Frohlich and Abel's Institutional Study of Inequalities in Smoking (ISIS) framework²⁰ (including individual efforts and collective networks). Questions included experience working at the CC or in the tobacco

control field, knowledge/insights on policy adoption process, and key players including students. Virtual interviews were conducted between January 2021-January 2022. All key informants provided informed consent and permission to record the interview. Public Health Institute's Human Subjects Review Committee provided IRB approval of study exemption #I18-015a.

Analysis followed Braun & Clark's reflexive thematic analytic framework, in which we acknowledge our positionality that reflects our own experiences (as students, college administrator, and external community partner), and our role as researchers in the interpretations of the participants' experiences.²¹⁻²² Based on Ickes and colleagues' campus readiness assessment and ISIS framework,¹⁹⁻²⁰ a codebook was developed deductively (e.g., campus leadership, student engagement), and then after review of the first six interviews as a group, inductively as new concepts emerged. Coding process began as a group with the first three transcripts to ensure consistency with interpretation of codes. Subsequent transcripts involved two coding teams (2 CC-level RAs with support from the second author, and 1 graduate-level RA with support from the last author) who independently applied codes again for the first three transcripts. When coding discrepancies occurred, the team discussed, came to a consensus on code definition, and documented the resolution in the codebook, which was applied to the remaining transcripts to ensure consistency. The coding teams independently coded the remaining interviews. Weekly coding sessions were conducted, and questions or conflicts were discussed and resolved. Dedoose software was used for coding.²³ Excerpts under the "student" code were extracted for this study and entered into Microsoft Excel to identify patterns. After first review of the 132 excerpts, a total of ten potential themes emerged. Following second review, we prioritized three themes based on the study goals to highlight unique aspects of the CC experience and to inform

student engagement in policy adoption. Through group discussion, exemplar quotes were selected to best characterize each theme.

Results

Selected colleges represented a diverse set of CCs by rural/urban geography and student population size in California, and key informants provided unique perspectives of CC students given their relationship as a student themselves or those who worked closely with students through campus services or policy efforts (see Table 1). Eight colleges actively involved students in the policy adoption efforts, and among them, six colleges/community organizations paid students via stipend or employment. Three key themes are presented below, and corresponding exemplar quotes are shown in Table 2.

Theme 1: No wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts

The first theme emphasizes that there is “no-wrong-door” for CC students to get involved in TFP work, with many opportunities for students to participate in committees advocating for TFP. Key informants reported that most students got involved formally through campus organizations such as student government (e.g., Associated Students, student senate), student clubs, and healthcare-related majors. For example, one stakeholder mainly considered recruiting students from health-related majors (see Table 2–Quote #1). Key informants expressed that many students were supportive of the efforts, and students viewed tobacco use as having dangerous health consequences (Quote #2) and considered secondhand smoke as a social injustice issue (Quote #3).

Students who served as campus leaders, student senate members, student health advisory committee members, or peer health educators play a crucial role in student engagement in tobacco-free efforts in CCCs as they are respected by faculty and other leaders on campus (Quote #4). It is important to educate students and staff to bring awareness to why a TFP is essential and beneficial (Quote #5).

Key informants reported that hiring paid interns is an excellent way of getting students involved in TFP efforts, and that colleges with paid and trained interns yielded better commitment and quality of work. According to one key informant from a community-based organization, the one helpful way to push the policy forward is to use students' voices whether in education or advocacy or anything else, and the best way to achieve that is through paid student internships (Quote #6). A college administrator also expressed that student interns enhanced both themselves and the policy work (Quote #7).

Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work

The second theme describes the concrete tasks that students partake in TFP efforts. These efforts are categorized into information gathering, education/awareness, advocacy, and activism. Data collection, observational studies, surveys, and focus groups are examples of information-gathering activities. Health fairs, presentations, and tabling are examples of activities that promote education and awareness. Examples of advocacy activities for TFPs include generating peer support, active involvement in meetings, creating videos, testifying at stakeholder or college board meetings, and participating in the student health advisory committee. Activism in TFPs can look like participating in rallies, garnering letters of support from student clubs, picking up

cigarette butts, and doing a park clean-up. As one key informant mentioned, involving students in TFPs is vital (Quote #8). Similarly, by partaking in different activities, students can build support from other decision-making bodies.

The wide range of student engagement in tobacco control policy work also allows students to bring their own creativity to these efforts such as with artwork or videos that use different mediums to highlight policy efforts (Quotes #9-#10). Key informants highlighted that students could either be leading tobacco-control efforts or be taking a supporting role. One key informant described how students took ownership (Quote #11). However, according to another key informant, efforts on their campus involved students in a less active way but still in important roles (Quote #12). Once students are in the space of tobacco control policy work, they are likely to become advocates for broader tobacco control efforts (Quote #13). Finally, one key informant described the benefits of using the Truth grant funding to hire one to two students (Quote #14). For CC students, compensation for participation was important.

Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement

The third theme describes the benefits of student engagement and the influence of students on the policy journey. A Student Services Coordinator at one college best exemplifies this theme (Quote #15) by emphasizing the value of putting students in leadership positions. Three subthemes emerged upon further analysis: (1) Student Influence on Stakeholders, (2) Student Impact on Policy, and (3) Student Skill-Building and Education.

Students influenced multiple stakeholder groups. The first group influenced is faculty/staff as they care about what students want on campus (Quote #16). Moreover, students

also influenced the Board of Trustees, a key CC governing body to approve a TFP, by providing evidence of student support on campus (Quote #17). Given the shared governance of the CCC system, decision-makers value the support of students. Lastly, when a group of students is involved, they often attract other students to join advocacy efforts. For example, one college that has a strong collegiate athletics program worked with its student body president to bring the entire sports team to their tobacco-free campus events.

Secondly, students impact policy by bringing unique perspectives, roles, representations, and life experiences. One external community partner described just how extensive this impact was that started with a paid internship and led to the passing of a student government resolution (Quote #18). This was especially important for campuses that heavily involved student leaders such as the student body president and student trustee (Quote #19). Multiple key informants acknowledged that students valued social justice and equity as part of the policy efforts, especially more so than other stakeholder groups as other groups were more concerned about “individual freedom” (Quote #20). As another unique contribution, several key informants described narratives of students who smoked but were still supportive of a TFP, and how they played a crucial role in policy messaging (Quote #21). Similarly, a student with asthma brought another powerful narrative at council meetings and on campus where they spoke about how smoke irritated their lungs. Finally, students themselves benefited greatly from being involved in these tobacco control opportunities (Quote #22). On top of gaining experience, they also learned about college policy process and gained a passion for tobacco control work (Quote #23).

Discussion

Establishing 100% tobacco-free CCs is an effective strategy to reduce tobacco use,²⁴⁻²⁵ and given the demographic profile of CC students who tend to be young adults from communities of lower socioeconomic status and racial/ethnic minority families, a TFP could address tobacco-related health disparities.²⁶ As of 2023, with only 66% of California CCs that are 100% tobacco-free, it is a high-priority for the remaining CCs to adopt a TFP.³ In addition, given CCC's shared governance structure in which students have a voice as faculty and staff in college-/district-wide decision-making processes, student engagement is a key ingredient for policy. However, there is limited research on student engagement in college tobacco control policy. Prior studies that have examined student engagement are often conducted in already 100% tobacco-free campuses and focused on the role of student engagement to improve TFP compliance.^{2,27-28} Findings showed that students report mixed feelings regarding their role and level of authority and often feel uncomfortable approaching others who are smoking on campus.^{2,27-28} The policy violators also expressed feeling uncomfortable being approached by student ambassadors; however, most of them reported the ambassadors approached them with kindness and they had a positive experience interacting with them.² Nevertheless, to our knowledge, this is the first study that explores the roles of student involvement in TFP adoption efforts on CC campuses using a sample of 12 CCs in California. Findings on how campuses leveraged student voices and involvement can serve as a roadmap for other colleges who are advocating for stronger a TFP.

The first theme highlighted that there are many ways for students to get involved in TFP efforts, to advocate for policy change, and ultimately achieve a tobacco-free campus. Students have some of the most impactful voices to advocate for what they believe is right.²⁹ Students do not need to come from any specific background to get involved in this work as long as they are

passionate and interested in campus involvement. They can become ambassadors or student interns who deliver presentations at classrooms or board meetings. Students can even informally support policy efforts by completing surveys, participate in tobacco-free events such as the Great American Smoke Out, and voice their opinion about passing a TFP on their college campus. CCs could employ a wide range of methods and channels for engaging students.

Students majoring in health-related disciplines are often the most deeply involved in tobacco-free efforts because they are the ones who have an interest in public health. The literature has shown that most students who lead tobacco control efforts on their campuses tend to major in health-related fields and have a passion to serve and improve community health.^{2, 27-28} Administrators can reach out to students who are passionate about social justice and public health issues who can become advocates for TFP efforts. They could build advocacy skills, provide training, and create a space for students to lead these policy efforts. If successful in educating young adults about the negative impact of tobacco smoke, there could more students from other fields or majors that are willing to participate in TFP efforts.

Lastly, CCs should consider dedicated funds for student engagement positions, such as through internal campus funding or external grants like Truth Initiative that support campus tobacco policy efforts. Having paid student interns is an effective way to engage students since they commit their time and energy to the work more than a volunteer status, and also produce better work quality and commitment. As Hunt & Scott's highlight, paid internships require interns to be more responsible and therefore provide much higher quality work.³⁰ Since CCs have a higher population of low-income students⁵, students are more likely to be looking for paid positions and student internships offer the opportunity to earn money while building their work experience.

Theme two highlights the myriad ways in which students can be actively involved once they enter the space of TFP work. They bring their creativity into the space. As agents of change³¹, students understand social norms around tobacco use among their peers in ways that are different from campus administrators and other professionals. Providing such an environment also makes participation more appealing and encourages students to develop passion and investment in tobacco policy work. For example, through the creation of artwork, students visually expressed themselves and demonstrated how a tobacco-free campus matters to them.

Additionally, it is essential for college administrators and staff to recognize that having students involved in TFPs creates an environment that is open to change since students can be champions of change. This aligns with the CDC's 2010 best practice user guide, which stated "youth enhance state and local tobacco control efforts by challenging conventional thinking, advocating for policies, and changing the social norms around tobacco use."¹⁴ However, college administrators and staff should keep in mind that the benefits for student engagement should outweigh the risks in tobacco control efforts as one TFP compliance study found that students may not be the best to deliver the intervention.²⁷

This theme also emphasized that students' level of involvement in TFPs mattered. This pattern highlighted the value of student engagement as students took ownership of TFP efforts on their campuses. This is an essential lesson that CCs that are not yet tobacco-free can incorporate for more successful efforts. Lastly, involving students in policies at their school creates an avenue for them to get more involved in local and statewide tobacco-free policies. This is an excellent opportunity for training students on policy advocacy and tobacco control experience for the future.

The third theme captured the benefits of student engagement as students influence other stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and the Board of Trustees. Students themselves also gain knowledge, experience, and passion for advocacy. The investment of students in showing support for policy results in faculty, staff, and decision-makers being interested in moving policy forward since students really are the “consumers” of CCs, a mindset that has been shown to have a positive impact on universities.³² Thus, having multiple student groups engaged results in the policy gaining more traction. Each student who is engaged also brings in more students who can continue to expand the circle of student supporters as exemplified by the sports teams supporting advocacy in one CC.

The student viewpoint often focuses on issues that students are facing first-hand and are passionate about. This perspective places students in the foremost role in gathering the student body’s support while representing the student voice. Ensuring the student perspective can be easily forgotten if students are not engaged. Since students are also the ones most affected by policy changes, the personal stories they share can carry weight throughout the campus community, and thus, it is critical to provide a platform for them to speak.

Being engaged in TFP advocacy does not send students home empty-handed, but rather, offers them distinct hands-on opportunities as they grow into more informed and empowered individuals. This type of experiential learning is what the Association of Colleges and Universities calls “high impact practices” that provide significant educational benefits for students who participate in them.³³ In fact, emphasizing student advocacy engagement through movements like this is a major part of most colleges’ mission statements. An urban Bay Area campus aims to “inspire participatory global citizenship grounded in critical thinking and an engaged, forward-thinking student body.” Students can best grow in participatory citizenship

when involved in advocacy work. Similarly, a larger Southern California urban campus' goal was to "create conditions for empowerment, critical thinking, and informed civic engagement" for their students. Adopting a 100% TFP on campus is a prime example to foster this goal and to empower students. This showcases how central to the college experience student engagement can be.

Strengths and limitations

Although a multi-campus qualitative study provides a rich, nuanced lens to understanding student engagement efforts, there are several study limitations. The semi-structured interviews allowed respondents to touch on students' involvement with the broader context of other barriers and facilitators of establishing campus TFPs. Among the 33 key informant interviews, three were students, which represented a small proportion. Identifying more students to participate as key informants may have shed a more in-depth perspective on their involvement, bringing in a greater volume of primary sources. This study team included three currently enrolled undergraduate students, all of whom were recent CC students themselves who were deeply involved in data collection, analysis, and writing of this manuscript; their engagement exemplifies, yet another entry point to integrate student voices. Also, four campuses (two with TFPs and two without) did not have student involvement in TFP efforts, nevertheless, we still include them in this study as key informants expressed difficulties in engaging CC students given their limited time on campus. Given the study was done with CC campuses and due to small sample size of 12 colleges, findings may not be as generalizable to four-year institutions or schools outside of California given the structure of other CC systems.

Implications

Students are important stakeholders in the journey to TFP adoption. As Jazwa pointed out, students are the most commonly cited contributors to advancing policy change.³⁴ This is no coincidence. ACHA Standards recommended a “Community-Based Approach” to facilitate change; students, one of the most impactful groups in the community must be engaged.

Moreover, students can be involved and empowered in multiple ways through many doors and a wide range of activities. Students can be agents of change in leading CC policy efforts. Whether this is through internship programs, student government, or survey responses, the student voice has power that can advance CC tobacco-free policies. Considering the limited amount of research on student engagement in TFP adoption, this paper spotlighted the key role of students in moving campuses towards comprehensive policies in the CCC system.

Conclusions

Institutions of higher learning should leverage their campuses’ most important assets—students—and to involve them in the full spectrum of interventions and advocacy. The themes described in this paper emphasized not only multiple entry points for students’ involvement, but that there is “no wrong” door to engage students. We recommend creating seats at the table for students in a purposeful, intentional manner while being careful not to tokenize them. Creating leadership opportunities for students can help to advance tobacco control opportunities and reduce tobacco-related disparities especially within community colleges.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the California Tobacco-related Disease Research Program's New Investigator Award [grant number #T29KT0530; PI: Lui]. We would like to recognize Anne-Marie Gomes, Nina Mulia, and Diane Schmidt for support with data management and analysis. For study recruitment, we thank Becky Perelli of Health Services Association California Community Colleges, Katie Moose at California Healthcare Collaborative, and Kim Homer Vagadori of the California Youth Advocacy Network. We express our deep appreciation to our key informants from community colleges and tobacco control stakeholders for sharing their experiences.

References

1. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *Highlights for the 2021 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*, <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/2022-12/2021NSDUHFFRHighlights092722.pdf>. Published 2021. Accessed July 9, 2023.
2. Kuntz M, Seitz CM, Nelson M. Enforcing a tobacco-free campus through an ambassador-based program: A phenomenology. *J Am Coll Health*. 2015; 63(3):195-202. doi:10.1080/07448481.2014.1003380
3. California Youth Advocacy Network. *California College and University Smoke/Tobacco-Free Policy Report Card*. Sacramento, CA. 2023. Retrieved June 30, 2023 at: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/582cd52d2994caad8bdc9000/t/648262c1355ff17b58be73b0/1686266570424/2023+STF+CA+College+and+University+Report+Card.pdf>
4. Public Policy Institute of California. *Higher Education in California*. 2016. Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_0416HEBKR.pdf. 2016.
5. VanKim NA, Laska MN, Ehlinger E, Lust K, Story M. Understanding young adult physical activity, alcohol and tobacco use in community colleges and 4-year post-secondary institutions: A cross-sectional analysis of epidemiological surveillance data. *BMC public health*. 2010;10:208.
6. Eren C, Keeton A. Invisibility, difference, and disparity: Alcohol and substance abuse on two-year college campuses. *Community Coll J Res Pract*. 2015;39(12):1125-1136.
7. McIntosh S, Wall AF, Johnson T, Kurtzman J, Ververs D, Ossip DJ. Tobacco control at community colleges: Context and opportunities. *Tob Prev Cessat*. 2016;2.

8. Pokhrel P, Little MA, Herzog TA. Current methods in health behavior research among U.S. community college students: A review of the literature. *Evaluation & the health professions*. 2014;37(2):178-202.
9. Lenk K, Rode P, Fabian L, Bernat D, Klein E, Forster J. Cigarette use among young adults: comparisons between 2-year college students, 4-year college students, and those not in college. *J Am Coll Health*. 2012;60(4):303-308.
10. Berg CJ, An LC, Thomas JL, et al. Smoking patterns, attitudes and motives: unique characteristics among 2-year versus 4-year college students. *Health Educ Res*. 2011;26(4):614-623.
11. James DC, Chen WW, Sheu JJ. Type of tobacco product used: are there differences between university and community college students? *J Drug Educ*. 2007;37(4):379-392.
12. Quinn S. HSACCC Research Report 2017 [Retrieved from: <http://www.hsaccc.org/2017WebResearch.Report.Susan.Quinn.pdf>]. Paper presented at: Health Services Association California Community Colleges Annual Meeting; Feb. 22-24, 2017; San Diego, CA.
13. Hatch DK. The structure of student engagement in community college student success programs: A quantitative activity systems analysis. *AERA Open*. 2017; 3(4):1-14, doi:[10.1177/2332858417732744](https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858417732744)
14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Best Practices User Guide: Youth Engagement—State and Community Interventions. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2010.

15. American College Health Association. ACHA Guidelines: Position Statement on Tobacco on College and University Campuses. Hanover; 2011. Retrieved from: https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/ACHA_Position_Statement_on_Tobacco_Nov2011.pdf
16. Ickes MJ, Rayens MK, Wiggins AT, Hahn EJ. A tobacco-free campus ambassador program and policy compliance. *J Am Coll Health*. 2015;63(2):126-33. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2014.990972. Epub 2015 Jan 22. PMID: 25612060; PMCID: PMC4334676.
17. Lui CK, Mulia N, Ye Y, Patterson D, Trieu SL. School and community factors associated with the adoption of 100% smoke-free policy by California community colleges, 2003-2019. *Am J Health Promot*. 2022;36(5): 869–875. doi: 08901171211073732.
18. Gerring J, Seawright J. Techniques for choosing cases. In: Gerring J, ed. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2007: 86–150.
19. Ickes M J, Wiggins A, & Hahn E J. Online readiness assessment for Smoke- and Tobacco-free campus policies. *J Am Coll Health*, 2018; 66(8), 817–820.
20. Frohlich KL, Abel T. Environmental justice and health practices: understanding how health inequities arise at the local level. *Sociol Health Illn*. 2014; 36:192–221. doi: 10.1111/1467-9566.12126.
21. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006; 3:77–101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

22. Braun V, Clarke V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qual Res Psychol.* 2021; 18:328–352. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238.
23. Dedoose. *Version 9.0.46, Web Application for Managing, Analyzing, and Presenting Qualitative and Mixed Method Research Data.* Los Angeles, CA: SocioCultural Research Consultants, LLC; 2022. www.dedoose.com.
24. Bennett BL, Deiner M, Pokhrel P. College anti-smoking policies and student smoking behavior: a review of the literature. *Tob Induc Dis.* 2017;15:11.
25. Lupton JR, Townsend JL. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the acceptability and effectiveness of university smoke free policies. *J Am Coll Health.* 2015;63(4):238–47.
26. Berg CJ, Yang YT, Pratt-Chapman ML, et al. Campus tobacco control policies and cessation interventions in college students: a commentary calling for research and action to address tobacco-related health disparities. *Transl Behav Med.* 2021;11(4):1030-1036.
27. Ickes MJ, Hahn EJ, McCann M, Kerckmar S. Tobacco-free take action!: Increasing policy adherence on a college campus. *World Med Health Policy.* 2013; 5(1):47-56.
doi:10.1002/wmh3.20
28. Seitz CM, Ragsdale TL. Student experiences with community-based enforcement of a smoke-free university. *Health Promot Pract.* 2019; 20(2):188-195.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839918782700>
29. Rouncefield-Swales A, Harris J, Carter B, Bray L, Bewley T, & Martin R. Children and young people's contributions to public involvement and engagement activities in health-related research: A scoping review. *PloS one,* 2021;16(6), e0252774.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252774>

30. Hunt W, Scott P. Paid and unpaid graduate internships: prevalence, quality and motivations at six months after graduation. *Stud High Educ (Dorchester-on-Thames)*. 2020;45. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2018.1541450
31. Dunne E, Zandstra R, Brown T, & Nurser T. Students as change agents: new ways of engaging with learning and teaching in higher education. *York: Higher Education Academy*. 2011. <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/14767/>
32. Hill F. Commentary #1: Why the conceptualization of students as consumers need not imply limited educational vision. *J Gen Educ*, 1995; 44(4), 222–226.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797269>
33. Association of Colleges and Universities. High Impact Practices. <https://www.aacu.org/trending-topics/high-impact>.
34. Jazwa A, Heath E, Jivani S, Redmon P, Sinha B. Lessons learned about post-secondary institution tobacco policy change by tobacco-free generation campus initiative grantees, 2018-2020. *J Am Coll Health*. 2021;1–9. doi:10.1080/07448481.2021.1953032.

Table 1. Characteristics of Community Colleges and Key Informants in Study Sample

College #	Selection Category – Region / Geography	Has 100% Tobacco Free Policy, Year Policy Adopted	Student Pop Size, 2019	Campus Lead in Policy Adoption	Has External Campus Partner	Student Involvement in Policy Efforts
CS1	Northern CA, Rural	Yes, 2019	9,315	Student Health Center & Student Services	No	Yes
	KI #17 Student Health Center Director KI #19 Student Health Center Director KI #20 Student Services Director					
CS2	Northern CA, Rural	No	10,942	Campus Smoke-free Task Force	CBO	No
	KI #14 CBO Project Director KI #16 CBO Health Educator KI #33 Student Health Center Director					
CS3	Bay Area, Urban	Yes, 2018	24,344	Campus-Community Smoke-free Task Force	CBO	No
	KI #2 Student Health Center Director KI #3 CBO Project Director KI #4 Student Health Services Staff					
CS4	Bay Area, Suburb	Yes, 2021 ^a	8,537	Faculty-Community Organization	CBO	Yes, Paid
	KI #5 College Faculty KI #6 Student Health Center Nurse KI #7 Student KI #13 CBO Project Director/Staff					
CS5	Central CA, Urban	Yes, 2016	11,840	Campus-Community Task Force	County Public Health Department	Yes
	KI #25 Student Health Center Nurse KI #26 College Vice President KI #34 County Tobacco Control Specialist					
CS6	Central CA, Urban	No	13,856	Student Health Center	No	No
	KI #24 Student Health Center Director					

Notes: KI= Key Informant; CBO=community-based organization

^a At the start of the study CS#4 did not have a tobacco-free policy, but adopted the policy during the process of this study.

Table 1. continued

College #	Selection Category – Region / Geography	Has 100% Tobacco Free Policy, Year Policy Adopted	Student Pop Size, 2019	Campus Lead in Policy Adoption	Has External Campus Partner	Student Involvement in Policy Efforts
CS7	Los Angeles, Urban	Yes, 2013	29,057	Student Health Center & Student Services	No	No
	KI #29 College Institutional Effectiveness Director KI #35 College Vice President					
CS8	Los Angeles, Urban	No	19,997	Student Health Center	CBO	Yes, Paid
	KI #11 Student Health Center Nurse KI #12 Student Health Center Director KI #18 CBO Project Director					
CS9	Southern CA, Urban	No	16,405	Student Health Center	County Public Health Department	Yes, Paid
	KI #23 Student Health Center Director KI #37 County Tobacco Control Program Supervisor					
CS10	Southern CA, Urban	No	14,228	Student group-Community Organization	CBO	Yes, Paid
	KI #27 CBO Senior Tobacco Control Manager KI #32 CBO Community Engagement Manager KI #36 Student					
CS11	Northern CA, Rural	Yes, 2021	1,862	Student Services	CBO	Yes, Paid
	KI #15 Student/CBO College Coordinator KI #21 CBO Project Director KI #31 College Vice President					
CS12	Central CA, Rural	No	2,873	Student Health Center	CBO	Yes, Paid
	KI #9 CBO Project Director KI #10 Student Health Center Director KI #22 College Director of Research					

Notes: KI= Key Informant; CBO=community-based organization

^a At the start of the study CS#4 did not have a tobacco-free policy, but adopted the policy during the process of this study.

Table 2. List of Exemplar Quotes from Key themes

Quote Number	Quote Code	Theme	Quote
1	CS11, #15 Student and External Partner Organization	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“our Pre-Med and Nursing clubs would have been probably the ones off the top of our head”
2	CS12, #9 External Partner Organization	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“When they started bringing that topic [campus smoke-/tobacco-free policy] to the Associated Students, the feeling among the students was that they were generally supportive. There was no student who was like ‘No, we don’t want this to happen,’ they were all like ‘Yeah, that makes sense. We should do this’”
3	CS11, #15 Student and External Partner Organization	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“We found that students do not have to come from a specific background to join tobacco policy efforts. They could be in any academic field, even athletics since “the teams are big so like if you get one team involved, you can easily get 10 to 30 people out of it. ...with ... Earth Day ... we have at least 15 basketball players choose themselves. ...if you get one person on the team excited about it, then we’re likely [have] ... a whole bunch of fans [too]”
4	CS2, #16 External Partner Organization	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“we can have those points of contact where we say like, ‘hey, you were on student senate, we heard that you were interested in this, come join our advisory committee’ and then we’re able to build up those ranks of people on campus who do have the passion, interests, and also have been in a leadership role that like faculty leadership would respond to on campus”
5	CS7, #35 College Administrator	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“the peer health educators... were doing a campaign associated with what [e-cigarette] and vaping could do, like mouth cancer.... they were trying to bring some awareness about that and how e-cig smoke actually can do worse damage to the lung”
6	CS12, #9 External Partner Organization	Theme 1: No Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	“[A strategy that has been working for us is] paid student internships. I think bringing that social justice and environmental justice to [the] lens of student interns so that they get kind of passionate about [tobacco-free policy] has been helpful.”
7	CS12, #22	Theme 1: No	“[An external partner] had employed two of our

	College Administrator	Wrong-door for student engagement in tobacco efforts	students as interns, and my motivation was to provide an educational opportunity for those students... they were really driving”
8	CS2, #16 External Partner Organization	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“it goes back to that ownership of what’s happening on campus, and then it’s working with those students to do different evaluations, or things on campus, continuing to raise awareness, setting up meetings usually with the Associated Students or the student senate, whatever the structure is on campus”
9	CS9, #37 External Partner Organization	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“students created their own artwork depicting why they thought that the campuses should go smoke-free.... student artwork made it onto a bus shelter, ads and billboards and other artwork that was placed on and around the school campuses”
10	CS9, #37 External Partner Organization	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“[The students] created this really wonderful kind video that shows testimonials from different students and faculty sharing why they wanna see their campuses go smoke-free”
11	CS5, #26 College Administrator	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“[If students] wanted to get in front of the board and say why this shouldn’t happen that could have made it a much more difficult process to adopt the policy, but you know, thankfully for us, we had a student body that again understood that this was the right thing and they were supportive and helped us implement as opposed to trying to be obstructionist at all.”
12	CS9, #37 External Partner Organization-LLA	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“[We have been] gauging the students as necessary, but then you have to be able to tell them. Ok, these are the steps that we need to take. So yes, gather the data, gather the evidence, show the support from the students”
13	CS10, #32 External Partner Organization	Theme 2: Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	“Some of the students from the school actually came out and spoke in City Council, and so they’ve tried to also make sure that the students are also involved in local [city] policy, not just at their school. And they really enjoyed it”
14	CS12, #9	Theme 2:	“[Students] did really advocate for the policy. They

	External Partner Organization	Myriad levels of student engagement in tobacco-policy work	did this survey; I know they did presentations to decision-making groups. I think they went to the faculty senate and the staff; they might have talked to the president and the students, and they were trying to gain support from all these decision-making bodies.”
15	CS1, #20 College Administrator	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“I very much looked to students just for their experience, and perspective...And so I think [it’s] so important... to put students in...a position of power. You know kind of let them take a lead, and not only does that obviously give them great experience that they’ll take later in life, but I feel like I learn so much from students”
16	CS12, #10 Student Health Center	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“I know the main players that are looked to for campus policies are students. So, if students initially say that’s what they want, they can rally around the committee structure that moves it up into policy”
17	CS10, #36 Student	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“It has to be a community effort because if I could get 75% or 52% of the students to say that this is important and this is something that they value in their college community, or even probably 35% or you know what whatever the statistic could be then it would become important to the board and it would become important to the people that oversee the bigger policies”
18	CS12, #9 External Partner Organization	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“Because if we didn’t have Jon [student intern], the students wouldn’t have adopted this resolution [in student government] I don’t think. And Jon wouldn’t have known that this is such an important issue unless we advertised a paid student internship”
19	CS5, #26 College Administrator	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“You know we did have students at everywhere along the way weighing in, and I think they did a good job representing what the students wanted the campus to look like”
20	CS12, #10 Student Health Center	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	“The students really picked up that piece saying that you’re not free you know, it’s not a freedom issue to make other people sick...and I think it was best to come from the students”
21	CS1, #20 College Administrator	Theme 3: Benefits of student	“So, while there was you know obviously a lot of people feeling alienated and upset about the policy, there were also those students who could see the

		engagement	value in it, and I felt like he was such an asset to trying to reach out to those students and help them understand like we really just want what's best for you. We're not trying to alienate you from this campus, this campus is just as much yours as the rest of ours"
22	CS10, #27 External Partner Organization	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	"What really got them [students] involved...was just all the policy work that we were doing and the opportunities for them to be part of what [American Cancer Society] could offer, [whether] it will be state work or going to DC...as part of our national lobby day effort. Or to get involved with the larger effort, because a lot of them were looking to transfer to a four-year university so that appealed to them..."
23	CS12, #9 External Partner Organization	Theme 3: Benefits of student engagement	"Yeah, he [student intern] kind of care about tobacco and smoking but it's probably not his top issue that he cares about. But bringing him into this and then having him host and attend different webinars and he's just like really gotten into it and really like this social justice part of it, inequity and stuff. And so now he can take that passion with him"