Assignment 3: Interventions to Reduce Exposure to Second-Hand Smoke

Background

In Assignment 1, you explored smoking and related health conditions as a public health problem in Maryland. In Assignment 2, you examined exposure to second-hand smoke as a possible risk factor for lung disease. The purpose of this assignment is to practice locating and synthesizing information about the effectiveness of particular public health interventions and the likely support for or opposition to those interventions among various stakeholders.

Assignment

For this assignment, keep imagining that you work for the Maryland Department of Health and I am still your supervisor. My boss has decided to allocate some resources to working with state legislators to propose a state law with the aim of reducing the incidence of lung disease in Maryland by reducing exposure to second-hand smoke. Based on preliminary conversations with some lawmakers and legislative aides, I believe the Maryland General Assembly (our state legislature) might be willing to consider one of these proposed laws (as written, with no amendments):

Policy Proposal 1 (Ban on Outdoor Smoking)

A proposed ban on smoking in certain outdoor spaces in Maryland. The ban would apply to outdoor seating areas of restaurants, spaces within 20 feet of entrances to government buildings, and all public parks. The ban would apply to ignited tobacco products only. It would not apply to electronic cigarettes. Anyone in violation of the ban will receive a \$20 citation, enforceable by police or health department officials who directly witness the violation.

Policy Proposal 2 (Ban on Smoking in Multi-unit Rental Housing)

A proposed ban on smoking in all indoor areas of multi-unit rental housing complexes in Maryland. The ban would apply to indoor areas of individual apartments as well as all indoor common spaces such as hallways and laundry rooms. The ban would apply to ignited tobacco products only. It would not apply to electronic cigarettes. The state may fine any property owner who does not enforce the ban up to \$5000 in one calendar year.

I would like more information before presenting one of these options to the state legislators. Your assignment is to gather information about each policy option and make a recommendation regarding which proposal I should bring to the General Assembly. Specifically, I want you to create a document in which you provide an assessment of each policy option and then make a recommendation as to which one to pursue.

Assessment

Your assessment should include a discussion of the following for each policy option:

Potential Impact

- If the proposal is passed into law and implemented, what will the public health impact be? The overall impact will depend on both effectiveness and reach.
 - Effectiveness: How likely is it that the law would meaningfully reduce exposure to second-hand smoke? Explain, <u>citing evidence</u> from the relevant literature.
 - **Reach:** Which segments of the population would the law cover? Is that a large (or otherwise significant) portion of the population?

Feasibility

- What is the likelihood of the proposal being passed into law and implemented?
 Successful implementation will depend largely on how much public support there is for the proposed law.
 - Stakeholders: Stakeholders are people or groups who will be affected by the law (people with a "stake" in the outcome), including people who will be needed for implementation of the law. Who would be most affected by the law and why?
 - Stakeholder Support: Which stakeholders would be likely to support the proposed law and why? What would their main arguments be?
 - **Stakeholder Opposition:** Which stakeholders would be likely to oppose the law and why? What would their main arguments be?
 - Stakeholder Influence: Which stakeholders will have the most influence over this policy process? Why?
- <u>Cite evidence from your research and discuss relevant concepts from the course</u> materials.

Recommendation

Recommend one of the policy proposals. Which policy option do you think is the better course of action for reducing the incidence of lung disease in Maryland by reducing exposure to second-hand smoke? Why? Justify your recommendation.

Other Specifications

Compile the information into a single document. I get confused easily, so please use a structure or format that makes it easy to compare the two policy proposals. There is no specific number of references you must cite, but your reference list should reflect a thorough search of the relevant literature and databases. You may use bullet points, tables, or other formatting that helps convey the information clearly, but also use complete sentences to explain your ideas.

This is an individual assignment. The product you submit must be your own written work. Assignments must be submitted via Canvas by the assignment due date and time. Please single-space your assignment and use the American Medical Association (AMA) style for formatting your references. For online sources, please also include the source's URL and the date you accessed it. You can access the AMA Manual of Style through the Sheridan Libraries web site, under the research guide for public health: https://guides.library.jhu.edu/c.php?g=202470&p=1461530

Modules 6 and 7 and our class on Library Resources on November 1st will help you complete this assignment.

Rubric

Grade	Criterion
Satisfactory	All of the following:
(100%)	Includes all components specified in the assignment instructions
	Conclusion about likely effectiveness of each proposal is supported by appropriate evidence from the literature
	The <u>major</u> stakeholders for each proposed policy are identified
	Rationale and evidence are provided for anticipated stakeholder support/ opposition and level of influence
	Recommendation follows logically from the evidence presented
	References are from appropriate, credible sources and are relevant to the question
	References are cited properly
	Document is well organized and presented clearly
Needs	Any of the following:
Improvement	One or more components is missing
(0%)	Conclusions about effectiveness for one or both of the proposals is not supported by
	appropriate evidence from the literature
	One or more <u>key</u> stakeholders not discussed
	Missing or weak rationale/evidence for anticipated stakeholder support/ opposition and
	level of influence
	Recommendation does not follow logically from the evidence presented
	One or more references is irrelevant or from a source that is inappropriate/ not credible
	One or more references is not cited properly
	Document is not well organized/ not presented clearly