Introducing a Pet-Friendly Residence Hall Program at Penn State

A feasibility study

Prepared for:
Penn State Residence Life and Penn State Housing and Food Services

By:
Steph Nitopi and Caylie Hake

April 20, 2012

This recommendation report analyzes the feasibility of introducing pet-friendly housing at Penn State by evaluating several case studies of existing programs at other Universities. Multiple considerations are assessed to determine what type of pet program, if any, would be compatible with Penn State’s Residence Life mission.
This recommendation report focuses on the lack of opportunities for animal interaction on campus at Penn State. When moving to college, many students must make the huge adjustment of living in a new place without any of their family, friends, or pets. This can lead to homesickness and increased difficulty of acclimating to college. Introducing a pet program would fill this gap and appease animal lovers who are dissatisfied with the lack of animals on campus.

This report first analyzes the positive and negative effects that living with animals can provide. Research has shown that there are many therapeutic benefits of pet ownership such as reducing stress, loneliness, and anxiety. Experts question, however, whether college students are the proper candidates for pet ownership. There is a tendency among young people to make impulsive choices which can lead to issues when it comes to pets since they require a very large time and financial commitment [4].

The feasibility of introducing a pet program at Penn State is assessed by a number of considerations. The criteria we focused on include legal restrictions, consistency with organizational goals, compatibility with current housing assignment system, time required for training and policy adjustment, costs, physical space, community values, human impact, and pet impact.

The bulk of the research in this report revolved around compiling and analyzing several case studies of pet programs established at other universities. First, the pet program at Eckerd College is evaluated followed by a similar look at the program at Washington & Jefferson College. Then there are short analyses of alternative types of animal programs besides pet programs. Stephens College, for example, has a pet fostering program that works with their local animal shelter to allow students to foster pets until permanent homes are found for them, and Caltech has a similar program that seeks to care for homeless and abandoned animals (primarily cats) [3, 1]. Also, Rutgers has a Seeing Eye Puppy Raising club that allows students to raise puppies (while living on campus) for The Seeing Eye, Inc. [7].

The conclusions section discusses the feasibility criteria and considerations in relation to the findings of the research. We analyze each individually with regards to the impacts and consequences of introducing a pet program at Penn State. Overall, we found that a pet program at Penn State would indeed be feasible with the proper policies put in place to regulate the animals involved and with rules that hold the students involved accountable.

Our recommendations are that Penn State begins with introducing an alternative program similar to those at Stephens College and Caltech. An SLO could be created within residence life to accommodate students interested in fostering animals from local shelters. If the students abide by and enforce the policies and this type of program is a success, then we recommend expanding the program to allow students to bring pets of their own. We recommend that similar policies to those at Eckerd and Washington & Jefferson College (please see Appendices A-C) be put in place to ensure smooth functioning of the program.
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Introduction

Problem
Entering college can be a huge change for some students, and change can be scary. New people, new room, new life – there is a lot to get used to. One of the most difficult adjustments that most freshmen must make when moving to college is dealing with homesickness. Saying goodbye to your family and friends can be challenging, and leaving behind a beloved pet can sometimes take a huge emotional toll. In fact, one of the most common complaints from college students about feelings of homesickness is that they miss interaction with animals while living on campus. As a result, this can draw people away from on campus housing to off campus apartments that will allow their furry friends. For many students, however, this is not always a feasible or convenient option.

To address these problems, a growing trend on college campuses has been to introduce pet-friendly housing. Dozens of universities now have programs that allow students to bring animals to live with them in designated dormitories, and these programs have been wildly successful. Students report great emotional benefits from being able to bring their pets with them. It is being recognized more and more that interaction with animals can reduce stress, and this in turn helps students acclimate to college life easier. The idea still receives opposition at many universities, however, due to health and safety concerns. Also, there is debate over whether college students are in the best position for pet ownership. Pet programs address these concerns with policies that regulate what type of pets can be brought to campus. There are also rules in place that account for the well-being of both the student community and the pets. Therefore, we believe that introducing a properly regulated pet program here at Penn State could also be successful in filling the void of animal interaction for students on campus.

Research
As mentioned above, there are already a handful of colleges with these types of programs in place. Therefore, the bulk of our research dealt with studying these programs and how they are maintained. We will evaluate several schools as case studies to assess the feasibility of introducing such a program at Penn State. Other research involved exploring the positives and negatives associated with pet ownership to determine if allowing students to have pets on campus would truly be a beneficial option for everyone involved.

Report Organization
This report is organized as follows:

- Positive Effects of Pet-Friendly Housing on Campus
- Negative Effects of Pet-Friendly Housing on Campus
- Feasibility Criteria and Considerations
- Case studies from select schools
- Conclusions based on the feasibility criteria and considerations
- Recommendations
Positive Effects of Pet-Friendly Housing on Campus

Pets can provide us with many therapeutic benefits such as easing loneliness, reducing stress, promoting social interaction, and sometimes encouraging exercise and playfulness. One of the reasons for these positive effects of pet ownership is that most pets fulfill the basic human need to touch. Holding, cuddling, and generally touching/stroking a loving, affectionate animal can have the ability to improve one’s mood. Recent studies exploring the benefits of the human-animal bond have found that:

- Pet owners are less likely to suffer from depression than those without pets.
- Playing with a pet can calm and relax by elevating levels of serotonin and dopamine.
- People with pets tend to have lower blood pressure in stressful situations than those without pets.
- Pet owners have lower triglyceride and cholesterol levels (indicators of heart disease) than those without pets.
- Prison programs have shown long-term changes in prisoners’ behavior after interacting with pets [9].

Pets can aid in the development of healthy lifestyle choices by helping to increase exercise, provide companionship, reduce anxiety, add structure and routine to your day, and provide sensory stress relief. These benefits can even play a large role in easing symptoms of depression, stress, bipolar disorder, PTSD, and anxiety [9].

Negative Consequences of Pet-Friendly Housing on Campus

Pets are not for everyone. If you don’t like animals, then pet ownership will not provide you with any therapeutic benefit. Also, owning a pet may simply not be practical for some people, especially for college students. A few drawbacks include:

- Pets cost money
- Pets require time and attention
- Pets can be destructive
- Pets require responsibility
- Pets can carry health risks for some people (such as allergies) [9]

These factors raise the question: are college students truly capable of responsible pet ownership?

The chaos of campus life leads many to question whether students are the proper candidates for pet ownership. Will the animals get proper care? Experts argue that there is a tendency among young people to make impulsive choices, which can lead to negative consequences down the line when it comes to pet ownership. The Humane Society of the United States warns that most pets require a commitment that lasts 15 years or more and many students don’t think that far ahead [4]. The uncertainty of post-graduation plans can leave many pets homeless once a student’s career ends.
Shelters in college towns report end-of-semester pet dumping or abandonment [4]. In addition to the time commitment, pet ownership is also a large financial commitment. With food, vet care, grooming, toys, bedding, etc., the bills can add up. These factors must be considered in the feasibility assessment of introducing pet-friendly housing at Penn State.

### Feasibility Criteria and Considerations

**Legal restrictions:** The law must be the first consideration when any policy change is debated. Pennsylvania has laws regulating nearly every aspect of animal ownership, including:

- Dog licensing
- Animal adoption
- Anti-cruelty regulations
- Exotic pet restrictions
- Zoning regulations
- Animal control and restraint
- Animal health provisions

**Consistency with organizational goals:** The Penn State Residence Life website states “Our mission is to provide a safe, comfortable, secure and nurturing living-learning environment that is conducive to students’ academic pursuits and personal growth while fostering a sense of community, civic responsibility and an appreciation of diversity” [12]. Housing and Food Services has comprehensive terms, conditions, and regulations that a student must accept in order to obtain a contract for on-campus housing. The literature states that students are expected to maintain sanitary room conditions, so it follows that Housing and Residence Life do not allow animals in residence halls for sanitation and health reasons. For some students, however, having their pet in the dorm with them would indeed help them in their academic pursuits, personal growth, sense of responsibility, and overall wellbeing.

**Compatibility with current housing assignment system:** Housing currently offers a variety of Special Living Options (SLOs), which bring together students with similar academic and personal interests. Students must request to live in an SLO and if offered a contract must in some cases pay dues to support that SLO’s activities.

**Physical space:** The University has limited space for students to live on campus, so students are not guaranteed housing. The creation of a new pet-friendly SLO would require significant student interest and support to ensure that the designated rooms will be filled. Otherwise, students who would like on-campus housing but not in pet-friendly areas might be placed on a waiting list for normal housing while pet-friendly rooms sit vacant.

**Time required for training and adjustment of policies:** Housing employees work hard to keep residence halls clean and livable. Staff members may need additional training if they are to work in residence areas allowing pets. The amount of time required to complete this training could vary depending on the number of animals permitted, the type of animals present, the number of areas allowing animals, and the number of staff members responsible for those
housing areas. Policy adjustment and rewriting would require time, as well.

**Costs:** Animals can be dirty and cause other damages to human living space. Damages incurred by pets in residence halls and the potential for additional work for staff members are significant in terms of both the time and monetary cost of a policy change.

**Community values:** According to the 2007 U.S. Pet Ownership and Demographics Sourcebook, 37.2% and 32.4% of households own dogs and cats, respectively. Additionally, in 2006, nearly half of pet owners considered their animals to be family members [10]. However, many people do not want pets or simply do not like to be around animals, and these people must be given equal consideration. By creating an SLO, a community would be established for those who value the company of animals, while respecting the wishes of people who don’t want to live with animals.

**Human impact:** Having pet-friendly dorms would not only affect those students living in them but also any students or visitors passing through the general area. Some of the effects would be positive – interaction or even close proximity to animals lifts some people’s spirits, for instance. Other effects would be negative – forgotten piles of waste or disagreeable smells from a cage left uncleaned could be problematic and lower the housing quality. Human safety is of concern, as well, since any animal can, in threatening situations, become aggressive.

**Pet impact:** A major concern is for the pets’ safety, comfort, care, and overall wellbeing. Different species, and even different breeds, have varying needs. Some need large outdoor play-space, others need scratching posts and litter boxes, and still others need regular visits from their human companion. Proximity to other animals can also affect a pet, since some species are social and others dislike sharing human attention.

---

**Case Studies from Select Schools**

Pet programs have been a growing trend in colleges in recent years. Eckerd College in Florida has allowed pets for decades and now has more than 40 pets in their designated Pet House residence halls. The State University of New York at Canton began allowing pets in 1996, and Stephens College in Missouri created a pet program in 2004 [2]. More recently, Washington & Jefferson joined the colleges that permit students to bring pets to campus. Other notable schools that allow varying numbers and species of pets include California Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Lehigh University, University of Idaho, and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [8]. Following is a table of the types of animals allowed at these colleges and any exceptions the schools’ policies might have.

We will analyze the pet policies for two different colleges to see how feasible it might be to introduce this type of program at Penn State. First we will provide a case study of Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, Florida followed by a case study of Washington & Jefferson College in Washington, Pennsylvania.
Table 1: Types of pets allowed at different colleges [8]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>Cats</th>
<th>Rabbits</th>
<th>Hamsters</th>
<th>Guinea pigs</th>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Snakes</th>
<th>Lizards</th>
<th>Turtles</th>
<th>Fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eckerd College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp; J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Canton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lizards only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those permanently and appropriately housed in a 20 gallon aquarium/terrarium or smaller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For frats and sororities only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eckerd College Case Study

Eckerd College is one of the few schools to allow students to bring pets with them when they come to college. Such a privilege, of course, comes with its restrictions. Here are the basic rules and regulations in Eckerd’s Pet Policy.

Regulations

Pets are considered to be cats, dogs (under 40 pounds), rabbits, ducks, large birds, and ferrets, and domestic animals are considered to be fish, small birds, hamsters, gerbils, guinea pigs, amphibians, and reptiles [5]. Pets are only allowed in Eckerd’s five pet houses, but domestic animals are allowed in all complexes. A student can have one pet or two domestic animals during an academic year. However, students must live on the Eckerd College campus for at least one semester before they are able to have a pet live with them [5]. No pet is allowed to be left in a residence hall room/suite unattended during any break.
All pets and domestic animals must be registered at the beginning of each academic year. Students must pay a $125 registration fee which includes a veterinarian visit at the beginning of each semester to ensure that the pet is in good health and to obtain a mandated flea treatment for the entire year [6].

**Restrictions on Pets**

Pit bulls, Rottweilers, wolf breeds, any other aggressive breed (or any mix containing these) are not allowed on the Eckerd campus at any time. All cats and dogs must be housebroken, at least 1 year old, spayed or neutered, and have lived with the student’s family for at least 1 year prior to living on campus (the latter two as proven by certification from their veterinarian). Due to these restrictions the acquisition of a dog or cat, whether purchased or stray, while at Eckerd is prohibited [6].

To help enforce the Pet Policy, Eckerd has a Pet Council consisting of students (both pet owners and non-pet owners) as well as Student Affairs staff members, which works the Eckerd College Organization of Students (ECOS) and the Office of Residence Life. The Council has the power to levy fines and remove problem pets from campus. Additionally, if any pet is in poor health, the College’s veterinarian can inform the Pet Council that the animal is unfit to live on campus. The Pet Council may also refer cases to the Student Community Standards Board for conduct action if students or pets do not abide by the owner responsibility policies and general rules of conduct. Please see Appendix A for Eckerd’s Rules of Conduct and Appendix B for Owner Responsibility [6].

**Washington & Jefferson College Case Study**

After inspection of the policies set out by Washington & Jefferson College, it appears that they used Eckerd College’s Pet Policies as a very close model for their own program. The rules and regulations, as well as the format of their documents, are very similar. Since Eckerd College has one of the largest and most successful pet programs, it is not surprising that other schools would use their policies as a guideline for their own. Listed below, however, are some key differences between the two colleges’ programs.

At Washington & Jefferson, pets are considered to be cats, dogs (under 40 pounds), small birds, hamsters, gerbils, guinea pigs, turtles and fish. Unlike Eckerd College, there is no distinction between “pets” and “domestic animals”, but other types of animals may be approved on a case-by-case basis by the Office of Residence Life. Additionally, students do not have to live on campus for one semester before being able to apply for the Pet House. Only one cat/dog or two small animals (gerbils, hamster, guinea pigs and birds) per residential room is permitted on campus in any academic year. In addition to the Pet House Policies, Washington & Jefferson also has house members decide on house rules that must be approved by the Pet House Resident Assistant and the Office of Residence Life [11].

The Restriction on Pets section written for Eckerd above is identical to what Washington & Jefferson requires. They also require a registration fee, but it is only $50 for both cats and dogs and $25 for all other pets. The Pet House Programming Fund can be accessed by residents of Pet House to purchase
pet-friendly items for the house such as toys, pet furniture, and to fund programs [11]. It does not appear that they require the veterinary visits at the beginning of each semester like Eckerd College does. Please see Appendix C for Washington & Jefferson’s Rules of Conduct.

These two Colleges have successful pet programs that require students to abide by very similar sets of rules. We think that by using these two case studies as models, we can determine which rules and regulations would be the most suitable for a pet program at Penn State. Below are some alternative animal programs that might also be good options to try before enacting a full-scale pet program.

**Alternative animal programs**

**Stephens College fostering program**

Stephens College has a unique Pet Fostering Program coordinated with Columbia Second Chance (CSC), a no-kill rescue organization. This is great for residents who want interaction with animals but do not have their own pets; instead of bringing a pet to campus, students can foster and prepare animals for a permanent home. Participating students help with animal training, health improvement, and reestablishment of trust in people. Students in the Pet Fostering Program receive a scholarship, room discount, food and medications for the animals, and pet deposit waiver. If parents or other circumstances prevent students from bringing the animals home over breaks, the pets can be left at the shelter [3].

**Caltech Animal Team (CAT)**

Caltech has a club called the Caltech Animal Team (CAT) that is devoted to caring for homeless and abandoned animals (especially cats) that live on the Caltech campus and nearby grounds. The club’s goals are to educate the Caltech community about responsible care and treatment of animals, encourage active maintenance of the cat population rather than turn to neglect and euthanasia, and act as a resource for the Caltech community in regards to cat and other pet care [1].

**Rutgers University Seeing Eye Puppy Raising Club**

The Rutgers University Seeing Eye Puppy Raising Club raises puppies for The Seeing Eye, Inc., a private, not-for-profit organization that seeks to provide service dogs for the visually impaired all across the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. The Rutgers chapter began in 2000, and has been a great success. Seven to eight week old German Shepherds, Golden Retrievers, Labrador Retrievers, and crosses of these breeds are placed with puppy raisers until they are sixteen to eighteen months old. Raisers must live in special dormitories, but puppies in the program are allowed to enter all other university buildings (except for dining halls, regular dormitories, and laboratories). Raisers are tasked with training the puppies in basic obedience such as house manners and walking on a leash and exposing the dogs to real-life situations a trained seeing-eye dog may encounter [7].
While these options still involve pet-friendly on-campus housing, these programs are great examples of alternative ways that students can get animal interaction during their college experience. As mentioned previously, one of the concerns with allowing college students to have pets on campus is the prevalence and fear of end-of-semester “dumping.” Students may impulsively obtain a pet that they may not be able to bring home for the summer or take with them after graduation. These sorts of programs combat that issue by providing a way for students to get animal interaction while on campus without bringing pets of their own.

**Conclusions Based on the Feasibility Criteria and Considerations**

Recall the considerations discussed earlier:

- Legal restrictions
- Consistency with organizational goals
- Compatibility with current housing assignment system
- Physical space
- Time required for training and policy adjustment
- Costs
- Community values
- Human impact
- Pet impact

Based on the programs established at other universities, it is feasible that Penn State would be able to introduce a similar pet-friendly housing program. If policies are carefully created with guidance from other schools, all of the considerations above will be addressed.

Legally, Penn State’s policy must not contradict Pennsylvania dog and animal laws. For example, dogs must be licensed, under control or restraint in public places, up-to-date on vaccinations, and treated humanely. Housing and Residence Life can include these laws as part of their pet policies and can take disciplinary action if students do not comply. The policy can also include regulations and restrictions beyond the law that will satisfy the goals of Penn State Residence Life to provide a safe, comfortable environment for students living on campus.

To help enforce pet policies, it would be best to have a pet-friendly Special Living Option. Because Penn State already has many SLOs that bring together students with similar interests, adding a new SLO in an existing residence hall would be compatible with our current housing assignment system. The University would not need to build an additional residence hall since an SLO area can be sized to fit into the physical space available. As with current SLOs, students would need to apply for pet-friendly housing, and this would offer Housing and Residence Life a method of monitoring the demand for the program. Additionally, because SLOs are typically concentrated communities, the on-campus living
experience of students who do not want to live with or near animals for personal or health reasons such as allergies wouldn’t be compromised.

At Penn State, the Housing staff in whichever dorm would allow pets would probably have to make slight adjustments to their maintenance routine. At other schools, however, students are held responsible for maintaining their living space in the pet-friendly residence areas and are held accountable for any damages or unsanitary conditions caused by their pets. Therefore, the time required for training employees in new protocols would most likely be minimal.

On a similar note, students will have to pay for any damages to their room or common areas. In regard to the cost of the program, other schools require residents to pay an additional fee to live in the pet-friendly dorms. Any maintenance or other costs that the SLO might incur could be covered by implementing a registration fee or regular dues for students with pets.

There is certainly a student community on campus that would love this program. Offering pet-friendly housing would create an opportunity for these students to interact with animals. However, students on campus who do not want to live around animals would not have to, since the pet community would be localized in a single SLO living space. This setup helps maintain a sense of community values and an understanding that groups of students may have different values. In addition, SLOs have executive boards that oversee the operations and functioning of the SLO, thereby enables better control and regulation of the pet-friendly housing conditions. For example, we do not suggest starting an animal-friendly SLO in a first-year student residence hall, since freshman students need time to adjust to college life and understand their new academic, social, and personal responsibilities before having an animal to care for. Initiating a foster program before allowing students to bring their own pets to school is also advisable since this would help gauge interest in a pet-friendly program and eliminate the concern that students will make impulsive decisions such as buying a pet that they can’t take home with them at the end of the year. The effects – both positive and negative – of allowing pets on campus could be analyzed, as well, before the University commits to a pet program permitting students to bring their own animals.

If the foster program went smoothly, then opening the pet policy to allow students to bring their own pets could be considered. For other schools with well-established pet programs, the policies are upheld so that students are fully responsible for their animals; this seems to have worked well and these programs continue to welcome pets from students’ homes.

Referring back to legal concerns and regulations regarding having pets on campus, the issue of the pets’ safety and wellbeing is accounted for. A proper pet policy would be put in place such that anyone who is found to be neglecting or mistreating their pet would face both the law and University disciplinary action.
Recommendations

1. Create a pet-friendly SLO on a single floor in a current residence hall (not in a first-year dorm).

2. Initiate a fostering program with Centre County Paws or another local shelter.

3. If the fostering program is successful and students show responsibility in abiding by and enforcing the policies, expand the program to allow students to bring their own pets (cat, dogs under 40 pounds, small rodents, and reptiles).

4. Update policies to include the students’ own pets. Use Eckerd College and Washington & Jefferson College policies regarding pet regulations, restrictions, and registration fees as models in order to ensure smooth functioning of the program.

1. Regardless of the circumstances, the pet owner is ultimately responsible for the actions of the pet.
2. All dogs and cats must wear their Eckerd College identification tag and a current rabies vaccination tag at all times.
3. All pets must live with their owners.
4. Unless approved by the Pet Council, visiting pets are not allowed to stay overnight on campus.
5. All dogs and cats must be housebroken before arriving on campus.
   Pets are not allowed inside academic and administration buildings, except Brown Hall. All pets must be on a leash at all times. And your pet must be under vocal command. Under no circumstances are pets allowed to run around outside unsupervised. Pets are not permitted in residence hall bathrooms.
6. Owners must clean up after their pets.
7. Facilities staff may not enter a room to make repairs or spray for bugs if a pet is inside. Pet owners should call Facilities Management to make arrangements in this case.
8. Owner negligence or mistreatment of a pet will not be tolerated. The Pet Council may refer the case to the Student Community Standards Board for conduct action.
9. Pets attacking other animals or humans will not be tolerated. The Pet Council may refer the case to the Student Community Standards Board for conduct action.
10. Failure to remove a pet from campus will result in a $500 fine and/or conduct action.

Failure to comply with the Pet Policy and/or requests of the Pet Council, may result in a $500 fine, conduct action, or additional action deemed necessary by the College.
Appendix B: Eckerd College Owner Responsibility [6]

In accordance with Pinellas County Law Chapter 14, Section 14-63, dogs and cats must be on a leash or tether when outside of their owner's residence hall room. The pet owner will receive an official warning if his/her dog or cat is not on a leash. On the second offense the incident will be forwarded to the Office of Community Standards for conduct action and and the Pet Council will be notified. On the third offense, the pet owner will be automatically placed on pet probation and the incident will be forwarded to the Office of Community Standards. In addition, the pet owner will be asked to meet with the Pet Council to discuss his/her non-compliance with the Pet Policy. If the problem persists, the owner will be asked to remove the pet from campus.

Abandonment, neglect and mistreatment of any pet by any member of Eckerd College will not be tolerated. No warnings will be issued. In the case of abuse, the pet will be removed from the situation in order to prevent contact with the person(s) responsible for the abuse. These actions will be subject to the discretion of the Pet Council and possible referral to the Office of Community Standards for conduct action.

In accordance with Pinellas County Law, Chapter 14, Section 14-30, an unauthorized person directly or in-directly disposing of inappropriate food or garbage in such a manner that it attracts an animal/pet will be considered animal mistreatment.*

Questions of what is appropriate or inappropriate for a pet to eat will be determined by the Pet Council and the veterinarian that is hired by Eckerd College to advise the Council and check pets during registration days.

No pet is allowed to become a nuisance to the members of the Eckerd College community. A nuisance is defined as, but is not limited to, excessive noise, physical harm to humans or other animals/pets, and destruction of property. Pet Council reserves the right to deem any other act a nuisance.

The Eckerd College Policy is adopted from Pinellas County Animal Services Animal Law/Codes.
Appendix C: Washington & Jefferson College Rules of Conduct

1. Regardless of the circumstances, the pet owner is ultimately responsible for the actions of the pet.
2. All dogs and cats must wear their identification tags and a current rabies vaccination tag.
3. All vet records must be on file with the Office of Residence Life and updated files sent in as necessary.
4. All pets must live with their owners.
5. All dogs and cats must be housebroken before arriving on campus.
6. **Pets are only allowed inside the Pet House – all other buildings on campus are prohibited.** All pets must be on a leash when outside the resident’s room. Under no circumstances is any pet allowed to run unsupervised outside the room. Pets are not permitted in residence hall bathrooms.
7. Owners must clean up after their pets. There is a bag receptacle on the porch of the Pet House to deposit pet waste.
8. Residence Life staff members will conduct regular checks of rooms to make sure that the pet is not being neglected, harmed or living in filth. Failure to maintain upkeep of your pet and living situation may result in removal of pet from campus and fines for cleaning of the room.
9. Abandonment, neglect, or mistreatment of any pet by any member of W&J College will not be tolerated. Pet abuse will result in appropriate action being taken. These actions will be subject to the discretion of the Office of Residence Life and Student Conduct Office.
10. No pet is allowed to become a nuisance to the members of the W&J College community. A nuisance will be considered as excessive noise, physical harm to humans or other animals, and destruction of property. If a pet becomes a nuisance the pet’s owner may be subject to disciplinary action.
11. Owner negligence or mistreatment, or pet attack (fighting, biting, and physical attacks) on other animals or humans will not be tolerated. Disciplinary Action will be determined by the severity of the offense and the discretion of the Office of Residence Life. The Office of Residence Life may determine to refer the case to Student Conduct Office.
12. Smoking is not permitted in or within a 20 foot radius of all campus buildings. Smoking will not be permitted in the areas surrounding common entry to the Pet House. Smoking poses a risk to both pets and pet owners.
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