**BACKGROUND**

North Carolina Health and Wellness Trust Fund’s Teen Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Initiative

- 1st statewide program in NC to reduce and prevent tobacco use among youth
- Funding began 2003
- Currently supports 46 local coalitions and statewide organizations

University of North Carolina School of Medicine’s Tobacco Prevention and Evaluation Program

- Provides independent evaluation of the Initiative
- Logic models form basis for process and outcome indicators
- Monthly reports submitted by grantees through the Web-based indicator Progress Tracking System (WiPTS)
- Data are cleaned to ensure they conform with guidelines received in trainings and codebook

**PURPOSE**

To begin a national dialogue on the creation of standardized basic indicators for statewide tobacco control programs. Such a standard could:

- Provide detailed, operational definitions
- Increase consistency in reporting across state programs
- Improve data quality of evaluations

**RESULTS: NUANCES OF TOBACCO CONTROL INDICATORS**

When preparing to report activities and outcomes, grantees must consider two initial questions:

1) Does this outcome/activity meet the criteria for an indicator change?
2) If yes, how should this outcome/activity be quantified?

Figure 2 provides a sample of three indicators an initial discussion of decision rules to be addressed within those indicators.

**DISCUSSION**

Statewide programs would benefit from greater standardization of commonly-used tobacco control indicators. Based on North Carolina’s experience, the following guidelines are offered for the development of detailed indicator definitions:

- Based on best practices
- Created in collaboration with funders, grantees, and technical assistance providers
- Communicated in a clear and timely manner to all stakeholders

**CONCLUSION**

Given the variations in community programs within state youth tobacco control initiatives, *creating nationwide indicators* presents a challenge. However, the benefits of such indicators, with agreed upon definitions, can result in:

- Greater consistency across grantee reports
- Overall improved data quality
- Data would be more comparable nationwide evaluation that is currently not possible/feasible.