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How to Access Tips® Quitline Articles

1. www.cdc.gov/tips

2. www.cdc.gov/tipsimpact

Campaign Attributable Increases in Quitline Calls
- (2013) Impact of a National Tobacco Education Campaign on Weekly Numbers of Quitline Calls and Website Visitors
- (2012) Increases in Quitline Calls and Smoking Cessation Website Visitors during a National Tobacco Education Campaign

Measuring Cessation Outcomes
- (2014) Intermediate cessation outcomes among quitline callers during a national tobacco education campaign

Characteristics
- (2015) Changes in Quitline Caller Characteristics During a National Tobacco Education Campaign
- (2020) National Trends and State-Level Variation in the Duration of Incoming Quitline Calls to 1-800-QUIT-NOW during 2012–2015

Location
- (2016) The Influence of State-specific Quitline Numbers on Call Volumes during a National Tobacco Education Campaign Promoting 1-800-QUIT-NOW
- (2016) The Impact of a National Tobacco Education Campaign on State-Specific Quitline Calls
- The Influence of State-Specific Quitline Numbers on Call Volumes during a National Tobacco Education Campaign Promoting 1-800-QUIT-NOW. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/nwv100
- Changes in Quitline Caller Characteristics During a National Tobacco Education Campaign. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntu271
- The Impact of a National Tobacco Education Campaign on State-Specific Quitline Calls. https://doi.org/10.1177/0890117116646344
- Cessation Outcomes Among Quitline Callers in Three States During a National Tobacco Education Campaign. http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd12.150024
- Intermediate Cessation Outcomes Among Quitline Callers During a National Tobacco Education Campaign. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntu105
- Increases in Quitline Calls and Smoking Cessation Website Visitors during a National Tobacco Education Campaign—March 19–June 10, 2012. CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6134a2.htm

Tips® Quitline Article Links

Thank You!

If any questions:
zfg1@cdc.gov
Overview

• Utilization-focused evaluation principles

• Examples of applying these principles without collecting new data

• Key take-aways
Utilization-focused Evaluation Principles

• Focuses on intended use by intended users

• Emphasizes close collaboration between program staff and evaluators

• Creates actionable information


Case Study
Measuring program reach
What Did We Want to Know?

How well were priority populations represented among all QUITPLAN Services participants?

Was this consistent with state data on commercial tobacco use in priority populations?

Who Wanted to Know and Why?

**Intended users:**
Program management team, marketing team, research and evaluation team

**Intended use:**
Where are we doing well?
Where can we improve?
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A reach ratio (ReRa) compares the proportion of quitline participants from a subgroup to the proportion of the target population of tobacco users from the same subgroup.
What Data Do You Need?

- Participant demographics (service provider data extracts)
- Census data
- State-level commercial tobacco use rates for your populations of interest
ReRa = 1
proportionate representation of subgroup in program population

ReRa < 1
subgroup is under-represented in cessation program population

ReRa > 1
subgroup is over-represented in cessation program population

American Indian; LGBT

American Indian

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All services; cigarette smokers only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGBT

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpline only; cigarette smokers only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Menthol

All services; all commercial tobacco users

How Did We Use This?

• Support development of American Indian Quitline

• Inform grant-making

• Assess promotional campaigns
Lessons Learned

• Take care when interpreting results
  – Differences in available data across sources
  – More/less current data
  – Small numbers

• Consider using reach ratios to measure change over time

Measuring reengagement in services
What Did We Want to Know?

- What percentage of participants re-enrolled in our program after their initial enrollment?
- Did this percentage differ after we implemented a reengagement outreach process?

Re-enrollment vs. Reengagement

- **Re-enrollment**: participants who re-enroll in a program regardless of outreach efforts
- **Reengagement**: participants who re-enroll in a program after proactive outreach
**Who Wanted to Know and Why?**

**Intended users:**
Program management team, service provider

**Intended use:**
Was there a benefit from adding this process to our program?
What outreach method(s) had the greatest impact?

---

**What Data Did We Need?**

Participant enrollment data (service provider data extracts)

- Initial registration date
- Whether a participant received proactive outreach
- Types of outreach received
  - Phone
  - Electronic (text and email)
  - Both
- Subsequent registration date
Proactive Outreach Made a Difference

Re-enrollment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre (enrolled July-August 2015)</th>
<th>Post (enrolled July-August 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-enrollment</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0001

Most Received Phone Outreach Only

Outreach method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach method</th>
<th>57.7%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone + electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Receiving Electronic Outreach Was Most Effective

- **Electronic** includes phone + electronic and electronic only groups
- **p<.0001**

How Did We Use This?

- Continued reengagement process
- Augment scarce promotional dollars
- Shared with our service provider
Lessons Learned

• Understand your data

• Spend sufficient time defining how to attribute an individual’s re-enrollment to a specific outreach message/method

• Consider impact of opt-in requirements for email and text messaging when interpreting results
Key Take-Aways

- Utilization-focused evaluation principles can help guide evaluation planning
- Collecting new data isn’t always necessary
- Collaboration among program staff, evaluator and service provider fosters success

Resources - Reach Ratios


Resources – Reengagement
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